

WHOSE KNOWLEDGE COUNTS?
EXPLORING COGNITIVE JUSTICE IN
COMMUNITY-UNIVERSITY
COLLABORATIONS

CERI JAYNE DAVIES

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment on the
requirements of the University of Brighton for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy

February 2016

Abstract

There is a growing contemporary interest in how universities can play a role in making a difference to community and social issues, and to question how universities' authority to create and legitimate knowledge becomes an increasingly important in the struggle for social justice. This thesis engages with this timely debate by exploring the intersection of knowledge, power and participation in community-university engagement. I situate my enquiry in specific forms of practice between academic and community and social actors collaborating to produce shared knowledge about issues of social justice. My particular focus is on how diverse ways of knowing, including that of Indigenous peoples, can count towards the way in which such issues are both defined and addressed. I specifically make use of the concept of 'cognitive justice' – or whose knowledge counts – to analyse how attention is paid to epistemology in these collaborations.

I used a qualitative research design and conducted fieldwork in Canada and the UK to develop 10 case studies. I interviewed academic and community partners about a project they collaborated on in order to explore how people understood what they were doing together, how knowledge was used, shared and legitimated and how these encounters were framed with respect to social justice. My conceptual and analytical framework focused on an exploration of deliberative processes of participation and cognitive justice in this landscape.

This thesis makes the case for cognitive justice in community-university engagement in three main areas. The first is to suggest that the participative conditions necessary for cognitive justice include relational practices of engagement and the presence of deliberative characteristics to knowledge creation and use. The second is to argue for an inseparable connection between knowledge and participation in practice, and thus that the degree to which cognitive justice can be considered central to social justice requires practices to go 'beyond recognition' of diverse knowledges alone. The third considers the ways in which forms of engagement themselves can be considered cognitively just. I argue 'doing' cognitive justice requires new arrangements between researchers and researched which also brings with it ethical and methodological considerations.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	i
List of Abbreviations	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Declaration	v
Chapter 1	1
Introduction	1
Research Enquiry	1
Motivations	2
Aims & Conceptual Framework	2
The Study	3
Outline of Thesis	4
Intended Audience and Contribution	7
Conclusion	8
Chapter 2	9
Universities and the ‘Idea of Engagement’	9
Introduction.....	9
A Brief History of the ‘University’	10
Europe	12
The UK.....	14
Canada.....	17
The Idea of Engagement	20
Civic & Community Engagement.....	22
Engagement & Social Justice.....	24
Modes and Practices of Engagement	25
Contexts of Engagement in the UK & Canada	32

The UK's Path Towards Public Engagement	33
Canada & Community Based Research	36
Conclusion	38
Chapter 3	40
Knowledge, Social & Cognitive Justice	40
Introduction.....	40
Distinguishing Forms of Knowledge.....	41
Scientific Knowledge.....	42
Practice Knowledge	43
Experiential Knowledge.....	44
Indigenous Knowledge	45
The Relationship Between Forms of Knowledge	47
Different Epistemological Assumptions.....	50
Science and the 'Universal'	50
Contesting 'Science'	53
Discourse.....	54
Relationship Between Knowledge and Power.....	57
Social & Cognitive Justice.....	60
Cognitive Justice.....	63
Conclusion	66
Chapter 4	68
Knowledge & Participation	68
Introduction.....	68
Participatory Action Research	69
Ethics and Positionality.....	74
Community-University Engagement	76
Public Participation.....	80

Communicative Norms & Dialogue	83
Deliberation.....	84
Community-University Engagement as Democratic Engagement	87
Conclusion	89
Chapter 5	91
Methodology	91
Introduction.....	91
Research Enquiry	91
Methodology	94
Reflective Practice	97
Implications for the Research Design	100
Fieldwork sites	101
The Case Study	103
Case Study Selection.....	105
Ethical Considerations	106
Negotiating Case Studies in Fieldwork.....	109
Methods.....	112
Semi-Structured Interview	112
Field Notes and Documentation.....	114
Guided Conversations	115
Analysis/Interpretation.....	116
Description – Analysis - Interpretation.....	118
Description.....	119
Analysis.....	119
Interpretation.....	121
Conclusion	121

Chapter 6	123
The Case Studies: Context, Aims and Participants.....	123
Introduction.....	123
Case Studies	124
Island Place - Canada.....	124
River Place - UK.....	137
Guided Conversations	144
Island Place - Canada.....	146
River Place - UK.....	147
Conclusion	147
Chapter 7	148
Putting Engagement into Practice.....	148
Introduction.....	148
Academics and Activists?	148
Beyond the Binary	149
Community-Based Identities	153
Influencing Positions	154
Different Contexts, Different Approaches?	158
Understanding Engagement	160
The Bigger Picture	160
Doing Things Differently.....	165
Spaces of Change?	167
Collaborative Practice	171
Power Relations	171
Duration and Pace	174
Characterising Collaboration	176
Responsibility and Relational Accountability	178

Conclusion	182
Chapter 8	184
Locating Knowledge in Community-University Collaborations	184
Introduction.....	184
Exploring Knowledge	185
Describing Knowledges	185
‘New Knowledge’/’Old Knowledge’	188
...New Understandings.....	190
Contested Knowledges.....	192
The Deliberative Basis of Collaborations	194
Dialogue.....	195
Authenticity.....	198
Legitimacy and Knowledge Use.....	200
Whose Knowledge Counts?.....	201
Conclusion	211
Chapter 9	212
Knowledge, Power & Participation in Community-University	
Engagement	212
Introduction.....	212
Understanding Community-University Collaborations	212
The Big Picture	214
A Relational Practice of Engagement	218
Values, Identity and Positionality	222
Knowledge & Participation.....	225
Exploring Cognitive Justice.....	229
Conclusion	236

Chapter 10	237
Conclusion	237
Cognitive Justice as a Normative Idea.....	237
Participative Spaces for Change – Implications & Potential.....	241
Future Directions for Research	245
Conclusion	247
Bibliography	249
Appendix 1: Topic Guide for Semi-Structured Interviews	272
Appendix 2: List of Respondents in Guided Conversations.....	274

List of Tables

Table 1: Distinctions Between Forms of Engagement

Table 2: Summary of Data

List of Abbreviations

ARVs	Antiretroviral drugs
BME	Black & Minority Ethnic
CBPR	Community Based Participatory Research
CBR	Community Based Research
CBRC	Community Based Research Canada
CE	Chief Executive
CEIMH	Centre of Excellence in Interdisciplinary Mental Health
DRC	Development Research Centre on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability
CR	Critical Realism
CSDS	Centre for the Study of Developing Societies
Cupp	Community University Partnership Programme
CURA	Community University Research Alliance
GUNi	Global University Network for Innovation
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
IK	Indigenous Knowledge
JRF	Joseph Rowntree Foundation
LEK	Local Ecological Knowledge
LGB	Lesbian, Gay & Bisexual
LGBT	Lesbian Gay Bisexual or Transgender
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCCPE	National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement
Nesta	National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts
NIHR	National Institute of Health Research
OCAP	Ownership, Control, Access and Possession
PAR	Participatory Action Research

PPI	Patient and Public Involvement
PRIA	Participatory Research In Asia
RCUK	Research Councils UK
REF	Research Excellence Framework 2014
SSHRC	Social Science & Humanities Research Council for Canada
UKCPN	UK Community Partner Network

Acknowledgements

I begin these acknowledgements by recognising and honouring the gift of stories that people were prepared to share with me that made my empirical research possible. It is these voices and perspectives from two continents that you see as you read and that I have heard and conversed with in my mind as my thesis took shape. These stories also gave me the gift of new transatlantic friendships, and Maeve in particular; with whom I share a new found sisterhood.

Grateful and unending thanks must go to Professor Marian Barnes and Dr Kepa Artaraz who have tirelessly, patiently and incisively guided me towards what you read today. Six years and 131 days is quite a commitment to me and my ideas – and my mind and sentence structure are now sharper things. Deep thanks also to other kind colleagues at the University of Brighton who have given me precious time, lunchtime therapy sessions, flexibility, understanding and motivation to arrive here.

To my family: whose history and background I draw on as a source of strength and inspiration. They are the roots of fairness, equality and community that are in my being. They remind me who I am and where I come from and they gave me the gifts of enquiry, exploration, determination and to know what it is to work hard. I have followed the Welsh proverb ‘dyfal donc a dyr y garreg’ to the letter! Translated to Rhondda English – ‘constant beating breaks the stone’ (Diolch, Cu). They have offered me their care, love, unstinting belief, chocolate brownies and proofreading skills to keep me going forwards.

To my dear friends: who never once failed to ask how it was going – now we can finally talk about something else and I can have that extra Tuscan mule/stay out past midnight/visit for the weekend/not have to call you back (delete as appropriate).

I look forward now, with my face towards the sun, proud that I have travelled this distance and explored a new path, where I seek to make a difference anew.

Lastly and most completely, to my travelling companion and beloved – Dougal, to whom I owe (mostly my sanity, and a few months of cooked dinners), but most seriously my deepest love and gratitude.

Declaration

I declare that the research contained in this thesis, unless otherwise formally indicated within the text, is the original work of the author. The thesis has not been previously submitted to this or any other university for a degree, and does not incorporate any material already submitted for a degree.

Signed:

Dated:

Chapter 1

Introduction

In this chapter I introduce the focus and scope of my research enquiry. I include my personal motivation for this research and explain my research aims and conceptual framework. I follow this by briefly describing the main aspects of my study. I then provide an outline of the thesis, noting the key issues and arguments developed in each chapter. I conclude by suggesting intended audiences for my research and how it makes a contribution to the field.

Research Enquiry

In this thesis I explore how academics and community groups work together to produce shared knowledge about issues of social justice. My particular focus is on how diverse ways of knowing, including that of Indigenous peoples, can count towards the way in which such issues are both defined and addressed. I specifically make use of the concept of ‘cognitive justice’ – or whose knowledge counts – to analyse how attention is paid to epistemology in these collaborations. Different ways of knowing are not recognised in traditional forms of knowledge production and are thus excluded from or misrecognised in defining and understanding everyday lives. I locate this enquiry in specific forms of practice between academic and community and social actors in the context of community-university engagement. This in turn sits within a contemporary interest in how universities can play a role in making a difference to community and social issues, and to question how universities’ authority to create and legitimate knowledge becomes an increasing pivotal force in the struggle for social justice (see Gaventa & Bivens, 2014).

This is not a new argument. Scholars and activists working in participatory and emancipatory paradigms have taken a critical and explorative stance to this agenda. Feminist theory, for example, which I make use of in my thesis offers theory and practice of alternative means of creating and using knowledge that re-situates legitimate knowledge and contests dominant paradigms. However, in recent times, the proliferation of activity under the umbrella of engagement has brought with it a range of specific opportunities for academic and community actors to participate together, from public engagement with research to co-production of knowledge.

These different forms of participation thus constitute different opportunities for who can get involved in this activity and in what ways. Empirical literature on community-university engagement has tended to focus on accounts of projects and best practice to build and sustain collaborations. Yet the relationship between participation by different groups in forms of knowledge production and their epistemic inclusion cannot be assumed, and so warrants additional attention here.

Motivations

My interest in this topic stems from my own personal and professional background as a community practitioner/activist with commitments to equality, participation and social justice. I have a longstanding interest in questions of why it is that some knowledge counts for more than others – why as a woman my opinion has in some circumstances been overlooked in favour of explanations from men, or why when as a community development worker, I frequently encountered groups struggling for recognition to be experts in their own lived experience, for example, caring for their disabled children. When I first joined the University of Brighton, in a role supporting the development of community-university partnerships, I became more interested in the narrative of the university playing a role in social and community issues and how that was actually happening in practice in different contexts. Knowledge is central to this interest because it is a key site of struggle in terms of defining and determining issues and solutions that make a difference to people's lives.

Aims & Conceptual Framework

The aim of my research therefore was to explore what happened when community and university partners collaborated over topics of shared interest and how in these encounters different ways of knowing were understood, shared and used. I conducted fieldwork in the UK and Canada and spoke to community and academic partners who were working together on issues relevant to social justice, social change, empowerment or natural resources. My conceptual framework was therefore based around the following:

- The **activity** of community-university engagement as it relates to social justice (following Escrigas et al, 2009);
- the legitimacy, use and development of **knowledge** – cognitive justice (following Visvanathan, 1997, 1999);

- and the **participative norms** that knowledge is produced within – deliberative characteristics (following Dryzek, 2000; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Young, 2000).

My interest in the potential for forms of community-university activity to make contributions to issues of social justice, and in whose knowledge counts within this led me to define the following research questions:

1. What evidence is there that community-university collaborations have explicit objectives that focus on social change?
 - a. Is there evidence that even in the absence of these explicit objectives, the collaborations have the potential to generate social change goals?
2. Why do community and social actors decide to collaborate with universities?
 - a. How do people understand the activities they engage in?
 - b. Are the norms of these relationships the same across different places?
3. How can the concept of cognitive justice be understood through this collaborative activity?
 - a. In what ways is knowledge used, negotiated and re-defined in these collaborations?
 - b. Do new knowledges emerge?

To make sense of this enquiry, my conceptual references are those based in community-university engagement, democratic theories of participation and social change; specifically deliberative democracy and an emerging literature on cognitive justice, knowledge democracy and ecologies predominantly drawn from Global South scholars. This range of conceptual starting points reflected my particular interest and experience in forms of participation. In 2009 when I began my research, it was also the case that the literature on community-university engagement was emergent, and did not provide theoretical or practical examples of all the issues in which I was interested. I therefore constructed a conceptual framework that would reflect the characteristics of my enquiry and work with ideas of epistemic pluralism.

The Study

To explore my research aims and questions I chose a case study approach, with interviews as my primary method, based on fieldwork in two geographical locations,

the UK and Canada. These are represented as River Place and Island Place respectively in my thesis. Selecting a location outside of the UK was driven by my interest in cognitive justice, through which I purposefully sought examples of collaboration that included Indigenous voices. I selected one university in each of these places on the basis of their membership to a national or international network that was concerned with community-university engagement. My approach was to work with a key contact in each place to explore potential collaborations for case studies and negotiate fieldwork. It was thus the specific instance of collaboration that was the case study, rather than the institution itself. During two separate fieldwork periods between 2013 – 2014, in which I was based at River University and Island University, I conducted 16 interviews with academic and community partners from 10 case study projects on which to substantially base my analysis. Case study projects were working on a range of topics such as homelessness, Indigenous language revitalisation and youth unemployment. In both sites, I also had additional recorded conversations with individuals who were not active in collaborations at that time but had relevant experience that they wanted to share.

Outline of Thesis

I begin in Chapter 2 by considering the relationship between universities and society over time. This chapter focuses on how universities are currently interpreting their relationships, with society in general and community and social actors in particular. I also identify the contextual policy and practice factors influencing how universities in the UK and Canada are responding to this agenda. I note that definitions of engagement are contested, and explore how different versions inscribe different practices and categories of actor in terms of who participates. In doing so, I give consideration to how community and social actors are conceptualised with respect to engagement. I demarcate my interest in forms of engagement that reflect Hall & Dragne's (2008: 271) claim that 'universities are the single, largest underutilized source for community development and social change available', and thus concentrate on exploring further those practices which concern the co-production of knowledge.

In Chapter 3 my focus is on knowledge itself, both in terms of how different ways of knowing can be distinguished and how these distinctions relate to issues of epistemology and power. I give consideration to how social constructivist

perspectives situate knowledge with respect to social relations and thus require that 'science' also be viewed in a socio-political context (Fischer, 2003). I further consider power with respect to Foucauldian conceptions of discourse and reflect on how discourse constitutes the subjects of community-university engagement and how power acts to legitimate and de-legitimate different ways of knowing. This chapter also discusses the concepts of social and cognitive justice and I expand on my understandings of these ideas in relation to their use in my research and analysis. I follow Fraser (1997) & Young's (2000) theories of justice, drawing attention as they do to difference and that they both allow for a conception of justice that will break with institutional and social assumptions as they currently stand, which is important to my understanding of cognitive justice. I also expand further on cognitive justice (Visvanathan, 1997), noting in particular that cognitive justice calls for epistemic plurality and forms of dialogue between different ways of knowing. Visvanathan (ibid) also argues that people should have a right to the decisions that affect their lives and thus epistemology is politics.

Chapter 4 concludes my background literature and focuses on the parallels between the theorisation and practice of forms of participatory action research (PAR), community-university engagement and public participation. I explore how methods of PAR, which are indicative of key forms of engagement (Etmanski et al, 2014; Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005) address knowledge, power and positionality. I then consider how the spaces in which university and community actors come together to generate knowledge for social change can be understood to constitute one context for developing 'science' that impacts people's lives. Thus, I argue democratic theory is relevant to such contexts as well as to spaces in which policies are deliberated. I draw on theories of deliberative democracy (Barnes, 2012; Dryzek, 2000; Cohen, 1997; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Young, 2000) to see what resonance they have for my research enquiry, particularly as they incorporate dimensions of dialogue and forms of expression that reflect a range of modes of expression in everyday communication. The final section of this chapter briefly considers connections between people's participation within community-university activities and how the knowledge they co-produce or access on interests and needs that reflect their lives can be useful to mobilising these interests in a democratic context. Drawing on other scholars that have begun to identify the overlap between community-university activity and

democratic engagement (Cuthill, 2010; Gaventa & Bivens, 2014; Leach & Scoones, 2005; Visvanathan, 1997) I conclude by considering how theory with respect to ‘spaces for change’ (following Cornwall & Coehlo, 2007) has particular resonance here.

In Chapter 5 I make a case for my methodological choices. My methodology is informed by participatory and community based research paradigms and I also draw on feminist theory. I reflect on my own positionality as a researcher and address the potential paradox between being informed by and not rigorously practicing PAR methods as part of this study. This chapter further outlines the ethical considerations of my study and notes the need for relational (Fisher, 2006) as well as practical approaches. I introduce the case study as my main method and my analytical framework which, following Wolcott (1994) is based on three stages of description, analysis and interpretation. In line with my analytical approach, Chapter 6 describes the 10 cases developed from interviewing 16 academic and community partners in my fieldwork sites of Island University (Canada) and River University (UK).

Chapters 7 & 8 present my findings in detail. Chapter 7 is concerned with what people were doing and how they understood their engagement. Strong themes emerged on the need for relational practices of engagement that challenged traditional dichotomies of academic and community identities and could include expressions of emotion. My analysis also suggested that people understood their experiences through one of three themes - ‘the cache of the university’, ‘public accountability’ and ‘doing things differently’ with respect to historical understandings of science and research.

The data presented in Chapter 8 provides evidence that actors had a plural understanding of knowledge and affirmed that cultivating ‘ecologies’ of knowledge had a role to play in meeting the agendas of those involved on issues of social justice. In reality whose knowledge counted towards new understandings, insights and solutions within these ecologies rested on a combination of recognition and the presence of deliberative principles. This chapter develops three main types of relationship between different forms of knowledge. These were, ‘the application of theory’, ‘the dominant discourse of research’ and ‘transforming the discourse of research’.

Chapter 9 presents my discussion with respect to what my empirical work has to say about the ideas outlined in chapters 2, 3 & 4. I focus on the significance of relational and emotional dimensions to research and further explore how cognitive justice has been used and useful to my enquiry. I make the case for cognitive justice in community-university engagement through three points which highlight the participative conditions necessary, the extent to which it can be considered central to social justice and how forms of engagement themselves can be considered cognitively just.

I conclude the thesis with Chapter 10, which considers how my research aims and questions have been met. I emphasise that ‘doing’ cognitive justice requires new arrangements between researchers and researched which also brings with it ethical and methodological dimensions. I also highlight that without seeing community-university engagement through a more critical and specific lens there is a real risk of reproducing injustice in endeavours that many see as progressive and focused on social change. In this chapter I also outline the limitations to my research and suggest directions for future study that can build on my enquiry from here.

Finally, a note on language. My thesis has been concerned with fieldwork in two different geographies, but in this thesis I keep to UK conventions of spelling, except where using a direct quote from literature or a research participant. My work has also included Indigenous communities and research paradigms. The terms Indigenous, First Nations and Aboriginal all appear in my thesis as referenced through these communities themselves and relevant literature. I predominantly use First Nations and Indigenous, except where using a direct quote from these sources.

Intended Audience and Contribution

As evidenced above, the theoretical backdrop to my thesis draws in the main on the work of those in democratic theory, participation and with respect to cognitive justice. It is my intention that this thesis will have value for those working in engagement and grappling with issues of participation – be they academic, practitioner or some combination of both. It offers insight for how and why community organisations might engage, and practice suggestions as to how people can act on their intentions of using research and forms of collaboration to address shared issues of social justice. It

draws attention to questions of knowledge, which hitherto have been underexplored in these contexts (Hall & Tandon, 2015). My contribution to this debate can be summarised through my empirical exploration of cognitive justice, and promising connections between the work of community-university collaborations to democratic theories of participation and social change. My work makes this original contribution in two parts; extending an understanding of cognitive justice as it pertains to community-university engagement and providing an empirical contribution to the call for new practices and methods for cognitively just, and thus socially just engagement. My intention is thus also to communicate these findings to different audiences – through academic means such as publication and to inform teaching, but also through forms of practice that work with academic and community actors. This can be within my professional practice, but also in my activist roles, supporting others in their endeavours. I intend to maintain a diverse range of channels to reflect on, interpret with others and consider how these findings can be of use.

Conclusion

This chapter has introduced my topic, the aims and research questions for my study and offered an overview of the main concepts that underpin the thesis. I have also given an overview of the content of the thesis. I turn now to Chapter 2, the first of three background chapters to consider the relationship between universities and society over time; the contemporary interpretation of which I explore through the ‘idea of engagement’.

Chapter 2

Universities and the ‘Idea of Engagement’

Introduction

This chapter aims to explore how the relationship between universities and society has changed over time. I begin by taking a brief historical look at the foundation and purpose of the university in Europe and North America – the two regional settings for my research. I outline the key historical stages of development that have led to the ‘modern’ university in the West. These were closely connected to changes in society, from the mediaeval world of the 12th century to post-industrial and developing societies in the 20th century. I also provide an overview of the 21st century agendas that are prominent in higher education in the UK and Canada – the two country settings for my research.

Beyond their two core missions of teaching and research, universities are commonly understood to have a third mission, which is concerned with how the university relates to the communities of which they are part. I discuss how in the last 20 years, there has been a renewed focus on this agenda, which is accompanied by debates on access to knowledge, public accountability and relevance, and the social responsibility of higher education. This has also been accompanied by emerging theory and practice which uses the language of ‘engagement’ – the emphasis and meaning of which is broad, as are the multiple user groups it can imply. I explore how universities have understood the idea of engagement, noting that varying methods and dynamics stem from these different understandings. I also give consideration to those who are participating in activities with universities and demarcate my interest in engagement with community and social actors. I then offer further definition of those efforts that are of core interest to my thesis. These are designed to address dominant understandings of science and knowledge production and promote the development of knowledge needed by community and social actors in the pursuit of social justice.

The final part of this chapter turns to look in more detail at patterns of development of engagement in the UK and Canada. I consider the arguments for and against

universities acting on this idea to develop a better sense of context, which is relevant for my empirical research.

The subjects of this chapter can be looked at and understood from different perspectives. The multi-disciplinary nature of this topic offers empirical contributions from those who are involved and engaged as practitioners from social geography to education. Theoretically, this chapter focuses on contributions from sociology, science studies, political science, critical theory and development studies.

A Brief History of the ‘University’

Universities provide ‘experts’ and play a role in the intellectual life of society, interpret science and scholarship for a wide audience, add to the wealth of ideas in society and increase the knowledge base (Altbach, 2008; Geuna, 1999; Ruegg, 1996; Boothroyd & Fryer, 2004). They also maintain global links, act as engines of social mobility and stimulate local economies. Education institutions have also been seedbeds of nationalism of many colonised nations in the 19th and 20th century (Altbach, 2008; Newitt, 2007). The university as a physical entity consists of buildings that house facilities such as teaching rooms, computers and libraries. Modern universities have certain capacities including specialist expertise, people’s time and physical space that mean they can perform roles such as preserving cultural and scientific artefacts, offer facilities and resources for cultural performance (Chatterton, 2000; Vessuri, 2008) and organise scholarly and scientific material for future generations.

Alongside these observable functions, the historian Frijhoff (1996: 43) notes the three purposes of a university to have been learning, virtue and utility. Since their earliest establishment¹, these purposes have contributed to the definition of universities and informed their missions and charters. These charters have historically had student-led, religious and vocational foundations in response to societal interests of the time. According to Perkin (2007) universities are now key institutions of modern and developing societies everywhere and they contribute directly to national and local development (Boothroyd & Fryer, 2004, Laing & Maddison, 2007). However, we

¹ Taxila or Takshashila in what is now Pakistan is considered to be the earliest known site of learning (See Tandon, 2008). Whether it can be defined as a university is contested. This debate centres on whether Taxila reflected the now established characteristics of a university when it was founded which include formal organisation of scholars and degree awarding powers (Thomas, 1944).

cannot assume that the purpose and function of the university in these different places is as uniform as Frihoff's three broad purposes would suggest. In his work on the history of the university for example, Ruegg (1996: 8) indicates a more specific purpose – that early universities existed to 'form the minds of the elite' (p8). Bourdieu argues that this remains a function of the 'modern' university (see Nash, 1990 for a good overview). Bourdieu's critique here is to problematise the role of the university in what he sees as the two major aspects of the struggle for power in modern industrial societies. These are the distribution of economic capital (wealth, income and property) and the distribution of cultural capital. He contends that the education system 'deflects attention from, and contributes to, the misrecognition of its social reproduction function' (cited in Swartz, 1997: 193), and thus argues that such a system supports the reinforcement, rather than redistribution of unequal economic and cultural capital. This reading of universities indicates a narrow and asymmetric relationship to society that is not structured to respond to new challenges and that relies heavily on dominant arrangements and maintenance of the status quo. This is an important perspective as it raises debate about how the role of universities moves beyond the narrow set of interests implied here.

In the 21st century, this debate endures within global societal contexts that Hall & Tandon (2015) argue require us to re-think the role universities are playing in relation to societal challenges. Escrigas (2008) suggests the natural environment, social injustice, poverty and inequality as some of these challenge areas. Attention to 'engagement', 'third stream', 'third mission' or 'extension' activities of universities and what they imply for the specific role of universities as institutions focused on knowledge and education is therefore timely and important. The UNESCO World Conference in Higher Education (1998) was held to guide the social role of higher education in the twenty first century in re-examining educational policy and practice for the new millennium and at a time of increasing global change. It developed 15 fundamental principles for higher education, which included the use of knowledge generated for the benefit of society and the importance of reflection on the ethical dimensions of knowledge. The declaration it produced emphasised the importance for higher education of social responsibility and the need to ensure that teaching, research and dissemination were 'mutually enriching' with tangible outcomes for society (Hart & Millican, 2011).

However, this is not to suggest that engagement clears the way for a straightforward association between societal need and university response, nor that acting on interpretations of ‘engagement’ in practice supersedes the core functions of universities as places of learning and knowledge production. As I shall discuss later in this chapter, ‘engagement’ is subject to contestation, power, and local as well as global influences, which work for and against the idea.

This next section concentrates on the development of the modern university in Europe and North America to illustrate the longstanding dynamic between universities and the role they play in society. I then offer an overview of how the contemporary development of higher education in the UK and Canada has implications for how its role is understood in relation to society.

Europe

Perkin (2007) suggests that the history of the modern university is that of the European institution. The first European universities were established in the 11th and 12th Century and were distinct in their founding charters (See Anderson, 2004; Perkin, *ibid*; Watson 2008). Bologna University in Italy was established in 1088 and is believed to be the oldest centre of scholarly learning and teaching in the Western world. The ‘first’ universities in Paris, France, Salamanca, Spain and England (Oxford is the oldest English speaking university in the world) appeared during the next 250 years. All had academic or religious charters, with core missions of teaching and research and at various points in their history received Royal or religious confirmations (Altbach, 2008; Tandon, 2008; Neave, 2000; Ruegg, 1996). These origins are significant as they had implications for how universities operated. For example, scholars at Bologna largely focused on the subject of Roman Law and were central to its development in the mediaeval period (Berman, 1999). In this way they developed and maintained authority on these ideas in mediaeval life.

In the 16th and 17th centuries the main task of the university was the training of clergymen, physicians, lawyers and civil servants (Ruegg, 1996). Through creation of guilds, which we now recognise as schools of faculties, universities began to provide support for vocational forms of scholarship that represented services needed in society. Perkin (2007) in his comprehensive review of the history of the European university notes that mediaeval universities ended up in a third intellectual space

between the state and the church. At this time, the characteristics of mediaeval life were changing in a series of political, economic and social ways. For example, an increase in communication between geographic territories was made possible by a rise in exploration and the means to travel. Ruegg (1996) notes that one consequence of this was a decrease in the explanatory influence of superstition, in favour of reason. This meant that universities were beginning to become more secular and subject to influences beyond the church or state, even though much of society was still profoundly religious (Ruegg, *ibid*).

By the 17th and 18th century, these changes were part of what was known as the ‘Age of Enlightenment’. This time represented a profound shift in the place and purpose of knowledge production in society. The ‘enlightenment’ was characterised by values or principles that were critically questioning of traditional institutions and morals, and had a strong belief in rationality and science (Kors, 2003). However, the shift away from religious orthodoxy that these principles resulted in was replaced with another of a different kind. The enlightenment did not represent a great opening up to knowledge and ideas in the general population, rather it too only stood to serve a narrow grouping of interest and intellectuals. The historian Chartier (1991: 27) suggests there was a marked difference between those who saw themselves as a ‘truly enlightened public’ in contrast to the ‘blind and noisy multitude’. This view also had implications for the public sphere as a place where issues, ideas and opinions were formed and mobilised in 18th Century Europe. Chartier (*ibid*) notes that such a domain was only ‘public’ to relative degrees and restricted only to the activities of ‘learned men’.

The steady evolution of a preference for experimental method and discovery eventually led to the establishment of the research-led university. In 1810, von Humboldt created a highly elite research institution (Elton, 2008). Characterised by ‘academic science’ (Vesurri, 2008), German universities began to focus on developing research specialisms, which brought technological advancement in society at a time of industrialisation. Berlin’s lead was followed first by other regional and then by Europe-wide universities because according to Bourner (2010), the opportunity for research training attracted a large number of students. Professors in von Humboldt’s model also committed themselves to research and publication, which gave them a reputation not enjoyed by staff in other universities who confined

themselves to teaching. Bourner (ibid) goes on to say that this enhanced the esteem of the German universities as well as German academics. This was significant as it meant that at this time the most successful universities prioritised the advancement of specialist knowledge. The idea of universities as ‘Ivory Towers’ was linked to von Humboldt’s model (Ruegg, 2011) and this word became synonymous with elitism and an inward focus on what was happening within universities, rather than also considering how this related to broader societal life (Gascoigne, 2002).

In the 18th and 19th century, across Europe universities also began to promote professional training, particularly of doctors (Anderson, 2004) in response to the needs and opportunities of this more modern scientific era (Boothroyd & Fryer, 2004). The emergence of a ‘new’ type of university also included the distinguishing feature of academic freedom. According to Karran (2009) such freedoms involve a separation from political and religious control that remains an important defining characteristic of the workings of universities in the European Union. However, Deem (2002) suggests that the role of academics as independent and impartial knowledge workers is problematised by increased state intervention and depleting public funding.

More shifts were to occur again in the 20th and 21st centuries. In the 1980s and 1990s for example, human and social development issues were becoming more visible and significant in terms of how universities might relate directly to them (Tandon, 2008). Within this climate, universities had again begun to be perceived as ‘prerequisites for the success of nations’ (Vessuri, 2008) and increasingly, of regions and cities – a re-invention of roles promoted as early as the 1800s. Now, in the 21st century, a ‘third’ mission has become more explicit in many ‘Northern’ universities (Tandon, 2008), which encompasses human and social development through processes of ‘social engagement’.

The UK

Since the mid-1960s UK universities have seen many changes to the number of institutions, to funding systems, public accountability, management and governance and to the composition of the student body (Deem 2004). Greater international mobility of students and the impact of the internet have also generated new challenges (Watson, 2012). These agendas all have implications for the relationship between politics, society and university purpose in the 20th and 21st centuries. Two themes I

concentrate on here are greater access to education and social mobility, and the notion of the university as a public good or interest.

In the late 20th century, global economic change meant that government became preoccupied with expanding higher education to meet the needs of this transforming economy (David et al, 2008). In the 1960s and 1970s enrolments in higher education increased dramatically as tuition became heavily subsidised by state investment and the Robins Report (1963) recommended the expansion of the higher education sector. In 1997 the Labour government set a target of 50% participation. Closing the social class gap became the focus of a policy for ‘widening participation’ (Trow, 2005).

Thus equality of opportunity with respect to higher education was originally linked to concepts of individual social mobility. In his introduction to David et al’s (2008) report, Ian Diamond, the then Chief Executive of the Economic & Social Research Council (ESRC) claims the general narrative of access to higher education is about moving it from being an elite privilege to a mass opportunity. However, the politics of ‘widening participation’ and its value as part of this move are contested. Widening participation has been critiqued by those who see it as a form of social engineering (see Bibbings, 2006), and policy makers and researchers cannot agree on who it relates to and what impact it has on whom (David et al, 2008). Wakeling (2013) for example, believes that educational expansion has not led to more equity or social mobility and has had little long-term impact. And as McQuillan (2011) observes social mobility in itself does nothing to challenge or correct the inequities that create those social divisions in the first place.

The Office for Fair Access (an independent public body that regulates fair access to higher education in England) suggests that, despite active attention to this area, it remains the case that only one 18-year-old in disadvantaged areas accesses higher education for every three in advantaged areas. And those in advantaged areas are seven times more likely to go to universities with the highest entry requirements (OFFA, n.d). David et al (2008) found that these policies have not led to fair or equal access to equal types of higher education that may lead to equal benefits in the graduate or professional labour markets. This suggests that access to elite institutions remains as much about class as it is about ability.

Alongside ‘widening participation’ universities in the UK have been part of a broader neoliberal agenda that has positioned students as consumers and universities as a provider in the market. The Brown Review in 2010 resulted in an increase in undergraduate student fees to as much as £9000 per year and the withdrawal of large percentages of state funding. These factors have intensified pressure on universities to deliver student demands for a ‘service’ related to the cost of higher education. These changes are also accompanied by trends that call for increased accountability of universities. The official line is that these are designed to lead to better information on which to make choices about where to go to university and for institutions themselves to have insight into how to improve the ‘student experience’. For example, the National Student Survey run by Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) gathers and publishes data on how students view the quality of their courses. And in 2015, the Higher Education Green Paper proposed a Teaching Excellence Framework, a metric for ensuring students receive ‘excellent’ teaching experiences (BIS, 2015).

These issues are not restricted to teaching. Questions about knowledge production, mobilisation and the socio-economic impact of research are now part of the context for higher education. For example, ‘open access²’ publishing is now emerging in response to amongst other drivers that large proportions of research are paid for with public money. Another driver is policy related. Most prominently in recent years attempts to capture the ‘impact’ of research have been conducted through the Research Excellence Framework 2014 (REF). The REF exists to assess the quality of research in UK higher education institutions, from which allocations about government funding for research are decided. In 2014, part of this assessment included the impact of research outside of academia. This has brought questions about the changing relationships between universities and other groups, institutions and systems back into focus.

Altbach (2008: 10) suggests that ‘the idea of a public good as a key factor in supporting higher education relates directly to the roles that academic institutions can

² This too is not without its complexities. Whilst the intention is to broaden access to knowledge, the costs of publishing still have to be met. In current models, these costs are borne by the institutions from which the authors are publishing. What gets published and in which journals therefore rests on the ability of that institution to pay. Linking the distribution of knowledge and ideas to an economic model therefore has implications for which ideas are in circulation.

play in society'. This definition seems to align with attempts to consider the relevance and accountability of higher education as suggested above. However, claims for universities to be a public good are difficult to evidence on the basis of the definition provided by economists. According to Stiglitz (1999) public goods are those that are 'non-rivalrous' and 'non-excludable'. What this means is individuals cannot be effectively excluded from use and where use by one individual does not reduce availability to others. This is easily demonstrated for utilities such as street lighting. However, in relation to higher education, the influence of the state, questions of access and the increased positioning of universities in a market context complicate this. The term public good can also be used in relation to the 'common wealth' or public interest and technical economic properties. While Altbach's (2008) definition is more helpful in understanding the potential benefits of universities to society, the increasing impact of consumerism on UK higher education suggests the technical definitions have become more prominent within public discourse.

Canada

Whilst the history of the university in Europe can be traced through classical, medieval, early modern and contemporary times, the university in North America has a somewhat shorter history. Formal models of the university were a European colonial import in North America and the emergence of the first universities in the USA and Canada were associated with modernising societies through industrial and technological development. This history in Canada has been particularly contested as I expand on further below. The introduction of European intellectual traditions into the Canadian context explicitly excluded Indigenous populations.

The educationalist Ross (1896: 3) describes higher education in Canada as 'a plant of late origin, and it was for a long time a plant of slow growth'. This was because after colonisation, the population was small, settlements were isolated and people were preoccupied with the practical tasks of, for example, making arrangements for administering justice and systems of exchange for growing commerce. From this early, slow growth higher education in the early 21st century has expanded and Canadian universities educate more than 1.7million students annually (Universities Canada, n.d).

Colonists in mid 1700s Canada also began the establishment of an institute of higher learning with implicit modernising ambitions. In common with the Land Grant Colleges of the USA, the establishment of universities in Canada accompanied a migration of rural people coming to urban centres to access education. Ross (1896) suggests that colonists saw education both as a means of civilising community and an effort to establish educational opportunities in their own language for the future of their young people. The model of education that came through colonial import in Canada has had significant consequences for modern educational provision and the role and place of universities in society today, and here I concentrate on these. With systems of higher learning being developed apart from and inaccessible to Indigenous populations, a separation occurred that was entrenched politically with the establishment of the ‘Indian residential school’ system in 1876. Residential schools were a network of boarding schools for First Nation, Metis and Inuit children funded by the state and administered by the Christian churches that continued in operation until the early 1980s. A wider policy of ‘aggressive assimilation’ of Aboriginal peoples into European-Canadian society resulted in over 150,000 children being forcibly removed from their families and deprived of their ancestral languages and teachings (Regan, 2010). Jones (2014) suggests that early colonists saw this as necessary for their success and this approach underscored public policy for the next three centuries. The controversy over not just the treatment of children in schools, but the broader implications for family and cultural life, have latterly been acknowledged by the government and a Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Operating 2008 - 2015 its purpose was to document and give visibility and voice to survivors and their communities³. The report of the commission, published in May 2015 opened with the following:

“For over a century, the central goals of Canada’s Aboriginal policy were to eliminate Aboriginal governments; ignore Aboriginal rights; terminate the Treaties; and, through a process of assimilation, cause Aboriginal peoples to cease to exist as distinct legal, social, cultural, religious, and racial entities in Canada. The establishment and operation of residential schools were a central element of this policy, which can best be described as “cultural genocide.” (TRC, 2015: 1)

³ Website of the Truth & Reconciliation Commission which includes its final report: <http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/index.php?p=3>

The cultural oppression experienced by Indigenous populations has left a deep legacy of mistrust in institutions of learning like universities. This has been compounded by research practices that have not respected Indigenous ways of life or knowing (Wilson, 2004). The disjuncture between universities and Indigenous populations is therefore quite stark. This is not just an issue of perception. There are now 98 universities in Canada and all of them are public. In 2011, The National Household Survey in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2011) found that 9.8% of Indigenous people aged 25-64 have a degree, compared with almost 27% of non-Indigenous Canadians of the same age group. Research conducted by Universities Canada (2013), a membership organisation for Canadian universities, however, notes that that nearly two thirds of universities offer transition programmes, and almost three quarters have outreach programs in Indigenous communities that provide educational support to students and potential students. Other efforts such as specific spaces, courses and practices that support and respect Indigenous life and communities, aim to redress these issues.

Indigenous communities' experience and access to higher education in Canada is one facet of the contemporary picture. Jones (2014) has published a detailed view of what he sees as the current status of higher education, which also includes access, quality and funding, particularly in the context of a devolved model of higher education provision. I have chosen to focus on the contested nature of higher education here with respect to Indigenous peoples as it offers important context to my research enquiry and the interpretation of the idea of engagement, which is central to my thesis.

This brief history of universities in Europe and Canada has suggested that the place and purpose of universities has changed over time. Private, elitist, political and colonial interests have influenced the depth and nature of the role of universities. The question of influence from, and accountability to, the 'public' has become more prominent recently. The historian Barnett for example (2014) drawing from his work studying higher education argues that the university has a responsibility to reach out to the community, to have a care or concern for the community and to play its part in enhancing the community. There is growing interest in how universities interpret their activities with respect to being more outward facing. The following sections

consider what this means in practice and what it suggests, in terms of different ways of interpreting the ‘community’.

The Idea of Engagement

Sir David Watson (2008), introducing his influential book on Managing Civic and Community Engagement notes that whilst there is an international convergence of interest on issues about the purposes of universities and colleges and their role in a wider society, he considers there to have been a ‘dearth of scholarly attention to the practice (as opposed to the rhetoric) of civic engagement by universities and colleges in various cultural contexts’ (p1). Another difficulty in pinning down how such engagement might be described and understood is that there is no single agreement about what it constitutes. As Facer et al (2012) argue, a lack of a coherent knowledge base upon which to draw contributes to engagements’ struggles as an emerging field of theory and practice. However, Hall & Tandon (2015) suggest that engagement can be understood as representing some kind of activity driven by an institution to interact with those external to it that is oriented towards problem solving and forms of mutual learning. I therefore begin this section by exploring grand narratives of the kind Watson alludes to that emphasise the broad agenda of engagement. I then look at different modes and practices of engagement implied by such narratives.

A critical consideration in understanding engagement is the question of who constitutes the actors implied in the use of terms such as civic, community, social or public engagement. Those outside universities as institutions include industry, private business, local and national government and other public services. They also include voluntary and community organisations, social movements and informal interest groups as well as individual citizens. Duggan & Kagan (2007: 4) note in their work on university engagement and urban regeneration that modern interpretations of engagement extend who is involved in this agenda - that ‘what used to be ‘reach-out to business’, has now become ‘reach-out to business and the community’’. My research focuses on ‘community’ rather than ‘business’.

Before exploring ‘engagement’, I therefore give some consideration to who might be participating in the ‘community’ engagement activities described below. My aim here is also to clarify relevant terms used in this thesis. It has become conventional in

the UK to divide social life into the market, state, private and public sectors (Salamon & Anheir, 1992). In North America, demarcation from the market is the main signifier of other groupings activities (ibid). One consequence of this approach is that groupings only get defined in relation to something else, which leaves less opportunity for communities to define themselves. Another consequence is that conceptions of community develop in response to political need and definition (Halfpenny & Reid 2002). I further argue below this is also the case for university-led descriptions of engagement.

There is no agreed definition on what it means to be a ‘community’ partner to engagement activities. In the UK, the Community Partner Network (UKCPN - created for those engaged with university partnerships to share learning) offers a simple definition - that community partners are people who are part of community organisations (UKCPN, n.d). These organisations will be drawn from communities of interest, geography and identity. Banks, Armstrong et al (2013) define ‘community’ with respect to these characteristics, but also include those who share a practice, such as a football team. Frazer (2000) approaches the idea of community through values, and that activity in this definition can bring together elements such as solidarity, commitment and trust. I use the term community and social actor to encompass people who are connected via this range of characteristics and so as not to reify individual identities.

A further distinction of relevance is the context in which these community and social actors operate. I understand them to be located as part of civil society – considered by Edwards (2009) to represent collective, creative or values based action - and with connections to the public sphere. In the public sphere political participation can be enacted through talk (Fraser, 1990) and public opinion can be formed (Asen, 1999), in relation to the state and the needs of society. I develop a more extensive discussion on the notion of participation with respect to community-university engagement and how this can be understood in relation to conceptions of community, civil society and the public sphere in Chapter 4.

Although I maintain a theoretical distinction for the purposes of my thesis between community and social actors and academics, it is of course a false dichotomy. Academics also inhabit community and social identities that may connect them with

others in relation to interest, geography or identity. For example, we cannot assume that academics cannot also be activists. Much of the early community-based research activity in the UK and Canada was down to individuals with activist commitments and intentions to issues such as feminist or anti-apartheid movements. Throughout my thesis I use these distinctions as a shortcut to demarcate those involved, but the diversity of people and the extent to which they self-identify in my research is further developed throughout. These distinctions are also attached to how definitional language and collaborative practices construct categories of participant. This in turn has implications for how people are defined and are accompanied by assumptions of their capacities, interests and participation. I return to this idea below.

Civic & Community Engagement

Watson (2008) takes a comprehensive view of civic and community engagement and considers engagement in three domains, which he calls first, second and third order. These orders progress in complexity in terms of the relationships they imply for actors outside of the university, and thus the responsibilities of the university as a social, as well as educational institution. For example, first order engagement is as a result of simply ‘being there’, by which Watson references a primary role of universities – to produce graduates who go to work, and whom he suggests are in turn part of civil society, where they make economic and civic contributions. The second order is structured and mediated primarily by contracts. These constitute the means by which the university delivers services, research and development and consultancy. In this domain he also acknowledges the university is likely to be an important local or regional player, providing for example an expanded consumer base in localities for example with students and private housing. The third order concentrates on ‘academic citizenship’ and how the university makes strategic choices about how it will act on this. In this way Watson conceptualises the engaged university as one that is connected to the range of possible actors, organisations and connections that the university might make externally, rather than a single definition.

An increase in theory at least of the role of the university in relation to society is opening up not just the educational or research discourse of the institution but also its civic and moral purpose (see Brennan, 2008; Harkavy, 2006; Watson, 2003). Two

definitions offered by international organisations concerned with universities that capture the characteristics of this follow.

The first is from the Association of Commonwealth Universities, an early promoter of engagement who adopted the phrase ‘the imperative of engagement’ and define it as:

Strenuous, thoughtful, argumentative interaction with the non-university world in at least four spheres: setting universities’ aims, purposes and priorities; relating teaching and learning to the wider world; the back-and-forth dialogue between researchers and practitioners; and taking on wider responsibilities as neighbours and citizens. (ACU, 2001: i).

Similarly to Watson’s orders, this definition emphasises interaction across a wide ‘sphere’ of university activity and the need for universities to take on wider responsibilities beyond teaching and learning. This definition also particularly promotes the idea that the university itself, and the people who work within it are part of the world outside. The second is from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching based in the USA. They also take a grand narrative approach to engagement and introduce ideas of exchange and mutual benefit as well as highlighting the mechanism of partnership through which to do this:

‘the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity’. (Carnegie, n.d)

These definitions are broad in their scope. They conceptualise engagement as an overarching idea and are generic in their intent. However, whilst part of the same agenda, my interest in engagement is tied to the idea that we should, following American scholar Boyer (1996: 19), ‘connect the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic and ethical problems...’. This perspective reflects a growing undertaking of universities to recognise their part in addressing social issues through the lens of social justice and the transformational potential of involving communities in generating their own solutions to contemporary social issues (see Boyer, *ibid*; Escrigas et al, 2009; Hall & Dagne, 2008). Engagement of this kind

means that universities can be important institutions in the quest to re-imagine the means by which communities pursue social change outcomes (Lerner & Simon, 1998; Maurrasse, 2001; Watson, 2007, 2011). Gaventa & Bivens (2014) think this should prompt universities to think not only about social justice in the larger world, but also their own distinct role in shaping cognitive justice and knowledge democracy. It is my argument that connections to community and social actors working towards social change goals is a frame of engagement that offers tangible ways in which to contribute to contemporary social issues.

Networks to support those who also subscribe to the idea of universities as agents of social change have grown and there are also emerging connections between interested scholars, managers and practitioners who are sharing theory and practice. There are now a number of global networks and journals concerned with this particular area, and the UK and Canada each have a national network that provides a context for this work happening in universities. These are the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (UK), and Community Based Research Canada.

What these and similar networks arguably provide is an opportunity for sharing, debating and advancing activity that can contribute to the engagement work carried out in different institutions. They are therefore important to the development of the agenda of engagement and the potential it can hold for making a difference to community and social issues. However, as Fraser (1990: 6) cautions it is ‘not possible to insulate special discursive arenas from the effects of societal inequality’ and this is a reminder that issues of power, and wider structural factors of inequalities, particularly with respect to knowledge remain present even in the purposeful development of community-university spaces with such potential.

Engagement & Social Justice

In order to understand how engagement may be linked to social justice, I offer here a brief review of what I mean by social justice, which I expand on in Chapter 3. There are two interlinked ideas here. One is about social justice derived from processes of engagement that add value to social transformations, and the other about institutional changes required within universities themselves.

The work of critical theorist Nancy Fraser on ‘affirmative’ and ‘transformative’ justice offers terms within which to describe this debate. Fraser (1997) argues that ‘affirmative’ remedies are aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes of social arrangements without disturbing the underlying framework which generates them. In contrast, ‘transformative’ remedies are aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes precisely by restructuring the generative underlying framework. The fact that where engagement activities exist, they operate within a framework defined by dominant historic, structural and cultural understandings of what ‘science’ is and who ‘communities’ are, means that the need to explicitly decentre dominance remains. Barinaga & Parker (2013: 6) similarly note that calls for transformative approaches to engagement do not necessarily signal a challenge to the possibilities of ‘re-inscribing the sometimes harmful role universities have played in their engagement with communities’. The participation of those both directly affected by particular issues and working for change is consistent with what development studies authors Visvanathan (2009), Santos (2007) and others, would highlight as the injustice connected to people as knowledge producers not having a say in the ‘science’ that affects their lives. What this suggests in particular is that forms of recognition of communities and their ways of knowing are an important part of this picture. The strategies, practices and activities that constitute forms of engagement are therefore crucial in meeting such ambitions.

Universities interpret their role in relation to engagement in a number of different ways, more or less orientated towards participatory practice and issues that contend with social justice and I discuss the specific context that engagement is acted on in UK and Canada in the final part of this section. I now turn to consider the variation in modes of engagement that are understood within the idea of engagement with community and social actors and I note those methods and practices which are more aligned with the ambitions of engagement for social justice outlined above.

Modes and Practices of Engagement

Collaboration between universities and particular communities are not new phenomena. For example in the UK in the 1970s, the rise of protest issues including feminism, Lesbian, Gay & Bisexual (LGB) activism and environmentalism prompted new alliances. In 1972, Sussex University Students and LGB people from Brighton

established the Sussex Gay Liberation Front⁴. Their organising led to the first Brighton Gay Pride march in July 1973. Activism and research also overlapped in fields such as mental health and service user movements (see Survivors History Group, 2012). According to Brown, Ochoka et al (2015: 96), Canada had a ‘deep and politically orientated’ practice of activist researchers working in labour and anti-apartheid movements and in the struggle for Indigenous sovereignty. However, prior to institutional efforts to organise this work, activity of this type here and in the UK was limited to individual researchers.

But the identification of academic links to political and social struggle highlights the importance of distinguishing different types of activity that constitute community-university engagement. In this section I offer a brief overview, then focus on those practices that align most closely to a narrative of engagement located in commitments to social justice. Alongside different patterns in historical exposure to engagement activities, meanings of engagement vary according to institution, discipline and the outlook of the individual academic (Watermeyer, 2011). For example, research clinicians may understand engagement to be a core feature of daily working life whilst a laboratory biologist may experience little connection to those whose specimens they examine. In some contexts, such as health and social care research in the UK, user, public or citizen involvement has become official policy and thus researchers are required to at least consider what engagement means in the context of their work.

Different meanings of engagement have implications for forms of participation and the degree to which knowledge is shared, used and negotiated. These have been developed into typologies, such as that of Benneworth et al, (2009)⁵ and dimensions, according to Hart, Northmore & Gerhardt (2009)⁶. Table 1 below offers my summary of the main distinctions between different forms of engagement as they relate to practices, and what they imply for the dynamics of community-university

⁴ http://www.sussexstudent.com/campaigns/content/751183/protest_at_sussex/

⁵ Benneworth et al (2009) conceptualise engagement against 4 key areas of activity for a university, including engaged research, knowledge sharing, service and teaching.

⁶ Hart, Northmore & Gerhardt (2009) outline seven dimensions, which are public access to facilities, public access to knowledge, student engagement, faculty engagement, widening participation, economic regeneration and enterprise and institutional relationships and partnership building.

relationships with respect to this. My thesis does not concentrate on links with business or industry, and so they are not addressed here.

(Table 1 can be found on the following page)

Table 1. Distinctions Between Forms of Engagement

Form of Engagement	Example	Dynamics of Relationship
Research Consultancy & Evaluation	Usually contractual. Area might be co-defined but methods and delivery are not.	<p>Increasing levels of participation and mutual benefit</p> <p>Passive ‘knowledge transfer’, activities ‘done to’</p> <p>Active ‘knowledge exchange’, activities ‘done with’</p>
Service Learning	Students gaining course credits for volunteering on projects.	
Improving access to knowledge	Public engagement, public communication of science.	
Community-university partnership	Topic to be worked on is jointly defined but may not be jointly delivered.	
Research Alliance/Knowledge Exchange	Multi-agency working. Topics and some delivery may be co-delivered.	
Co-production of knowledge	Research agenda and delivery co-defined by participants.	

What these examples immediately give rise to is a certain vagueness in language and a demarcation of those practices which situate communities as sources of knowledge (which I shaded in grey) and those which situate communities as passive recipients of knowledge. Across a spectrum from public engagement with science to co-production of research, community-university activity reflects a shift in theory and practice concerned with challenging historic but persistent narratives based on approaches to knowledge that often marginalise social actors and the knowledge they produce. Terms such as public engagement (Wellcome 2006; Watermeyer, 2011), civic engagement (McIlrath & Lyons, 2012; Watson, 2008), community-university partnership (Hart et al, 2007), outreach (Zlotkowski, 1998), community based

research (Strand, 2000) and so on are all part of literature that relate to the variations outlined in Table 1.

There is now an emerging literature on forms of engaged scholarship – practices and methods that respond to calls for the university to be committed and connected to social issues - that provides insight into how this can happen. These draw on a growing number of research methodologies that support designing and researching with communities, which I give further consideration to in Chapters 3 & 4. These include Participatory Action Research, Community Based Research and forms of emancipatory research (see for example: Barinaga & Parker, 2013; Banks, et al, 2013; Boser, 2006; Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005; Jolivette, 2015; Schroeder, 1997). However, specificity is important because the dynamics implied between different forms are bound up with issues of power and participation. And as Barker (2004) highlights, engaged scholarship itself points to a diversity of ways to define and address social issues, and not all scholars claim to value participative methods, or offer critiques of power.

Different forms of engagement thus open up different opportunities that lead to different forms of participation and thus create very different circumstances and opportunities for people to take part (see Barnes et al, 2003 for a discussion with respect to public participation). If we imagine a continuum of interactions around the theme of community-university interactions in the shaded part of the table, with ‘public understanding of science’ at one end and ‘co-production partnerships’ at the other, we can hypothesise that less deliberative modes of community-university interactions maintain the ‘other’, even unconsciously, to preserve a purpose for elitist modes of knowledge production. But even where co-productive partnerships exist, they are likely to be operating within a framework boundaried by dominant historic structural and cultural understandings of what ‘science’ is and who ‘civil society’ are. Which groups participate then can rest both on how they are constructed and on which communities have the capacity and confidence to approach a university or even know this is a possibility. I discuss this further in Chapter 4, but by way of an example here I use ‘service learning’ and ‘community-university partnership’ from Table 1 to illustrate.

Tufts University in Boston, USA run a voluntary healthcare clinic in ‘underserved’ neighbourhoods in which students studying dentistry offer free advice and care⁷. In terms of participation, this suggests two things. The first is that people can receive benefit from this activity, but only of the form decided on by the programme, with minimal control on that process or decisions. In this way, people are recipients of ‘expertise’ and a ‘helping’ model that may not build capacity or respond to individual circumstances. The second is that the designation of ‘underserved’ contributes to a particular perspective of individuals in the target communities. This re-enforces the need for help and this perspective has arisen from the way in which privileged positions frame knowledge of these groupings (following Barinaga & Parker, 2013).

At Simon Fraser University in Canada, they run the Vancity Office for Community Engagement⁸ which is a physical space in Vancouver that develops public talks, dialogues, workshops and performances commonly through community partnerships. One of these partnerships is with an organisation that brings women writers, activists and storytellers into the university space to hold public talks on topics from bookmaking to protest. The visibility these perspectives are afforded through this process is a key aspect of this form of participation. Community partnerships rely on the assumption that the community has something to offer and that communities are considered as the source of questions, issues and capacity. They may have information needs that would benefit from student capacity to develop some research; be working on a policy agenda where engaging with academic research can strengthen a position; or have access to particular groups and communities that researchers want to reach.

Distinguishing forms of engagement is important because as Bivens et al (2015: 8) identify, different conceptions carry with them different theories of change for making an impact in the world. They suggest:

‘outreach, service or service learning frequently focus on volunteerism and charitable action. Community engagement tends to have a community development focus, while civic engagement frequently frames engagement as a way of moulding university

⁷ Website of the public health and community service programme at Tufts University: <http://dental.tufts.edu/academics/public-health-and-community-service/>

⁸ Website of the Vancity Office for Community Engagement at Simon Fraser University: <https://www.sfu.ca/sfuwoodwards/community-engagement.html>

students into active citizens. Community-based research and community-university research partnerships focus more on the role of academics and the knowledge production capacities of universities as a means to creating social and structural change'

In theorising this area, these explanations also say something about the value or purpose of different forms of engagement. As I highlighted above, my thesis is concentrating on those conceptions that are concerned with knowledge co-production towards the 'social and structural' change Bivens et al (ibid) identify above. This implies forms of collaborative research as the mode to achieve this.

Universities are being more systematically challenged to abandon historic normative understandings of the place of 'elite' knowledge being transferred to waiting communities and rather to find ways to establish, as Freire's work (1996) offers, a 'permanent relationship of dialogue' as an effective mechanism for ensuring that the complexities of interactions for change are addressed. This implies the need for active involvement of communities in the systematic investigation of new knowledge through research and methods and practices that can bring this about. The use of cognitive justice in my research enquiry has direct application here. Cognitive justice (Visvanathan, 1997) draws attention to plural epistemologies and asks questions about how and in what ways different forms of knowledge are in relationship to each other (ibid; Visvanathan, 1999). It promotes dialogue rather than competition between different ways of knowing and is framed within principles that 'science' should support community and social lives. In this respect the design and practice of research collaborations are a key method to address inequities in knowledge production.

Despite the growth in theory and practice of social, civic or community engagement (see Hart et al, (2007); Gelmon et al, (1998); Watermeyer, (2011) for a useful overview) the implications of these efforts are not consistent across different institutions and geographical areas. Since forms of engagement are reliant on local choices, issues and conditions this is not surprising. In their recent global survey of institutional arrangements that supported research partnerships between academics and civil society organisations, Hall, Tandon & Tremblay (2015) provide empirical case study examples of activity from 12 countries, alongside a global survey.

According to Tremblay (2015) the terms Community Based Research (CBR) and Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) were those most commonly used, but there was also evidence of a continuing contradiction between professed commitment to co-production of knowledge and the actual practices of CBR. For example, of the 336 respondents to their survey, less than 15% identified research projects or questions originating at community level.

The final section of this chapter now turns to think about the patterns of development of community and research engagement in the geographies relevant to my research. They provide a specific insight into how the idea of engagement discussed above has been interpreted in these contexts.

Contexts of Engagement in the UK & Canada

This final section considers how the idea of engagement outlined above is being acted on in the UK and Canada. As I will explore, both countries have formal engagement networks, a range of institutional structures and examples of practice which reflect the range of forms of engagement I outlined in Table 1 above. In both settings, this is connected to policy and funding imperatives and how communities are viewed and understood in relation to the university. However, dominant ideas about engagement activity in the UK and Canada are differentiated, primarily from origins in policy, and practice respectively. This differentiation is reflected in the terms used by the two national networks for engagement. As I will explore, neither designates the only meanings of engagement, but they are a useful way to reflect the emphasis in these places:

I begin with the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) in the UK:

'Public engagement describes the myriad of ways in which the activity and benefits of higher education and research can be shared with the public. Engagement is by definition a two-way process, involving interaction and listening, with the goal of generating mutual benefit.' (NCCPE, n.d)

In Canada, the national network Community Based Research Canada (CBRC), draw on a specific definition of engagement that relates it to practice, following Etmanski et al (2014):

‘The term community-campus engagement is multifaceted and includes: *community engaged scholarship, civic engagement, research networks, community-based research and knowledge mobilization* among others’ (CBRC, n.d)

Both definitions retain core characteristics of the overarching ideas I introduced on p23 of a two-way process, exchange and mutual benefit, and in both geographies as I will expand on below, there is evidence of how engagement is connected to themes of social justice.

The UK’s Path Towards Public Engagement

Since 2000, universities in the UK have seen a series of attempts by policy makers to incentivise deeper engagement with wider society, beginning a policy-transition from promoting models of public understanding of science, to public engagement (Davies, 2013). Currently, UK engagement at an institutional and policy level remains standardised by the language and understandings of public engagement. The normative use of the term, particularly in policy discourse, can obscure a diversity of meaning. For example, the NCCPE (n.d) suggests their definition (see above) can encompass other types of engagement (e.g. civic or community) that also share aspirations of better connecting the work of universities with society. As I will outline, public engagement is not just differentiated in language, but principally through practice over which there are struggles for meaning that connect public engagement with social justice.

According to the Duncan & Manners (2014, 2015) four key policy moments have followed this original shift that explain the contemporary agenda for engagement in the UK. These began with a major culture change initiative called the ‘Beacons for Public Engagement’. Funded by Research Councils UK (RCUK⁹), the UK Higher Education Funding Councils and the Biomedical Science charity The Wellcome Trust, this led to the establishment of six projects in the UK hosted by universities

⁹ RCUK is the coordinating body for the seven main research funding councils in the UK.

that aimed to respond to developing a culture of public engagement¹⁰. The Beacon's initiative was a response to a survey jointly carried out by the Royal Society¹¹ and Wellcome Trust in 2006 that concluded structural and cultural changes were needed to support researchers to listen to the public and engage them in their work, and for those researchers to be valued and recognised for that activity. These efforts suggested that public engagement could include presenting to the public, working with museums and galleries and involving the public as researchers.

The three other key stages were the establishment of a Concordat for Public Engagement, the Researcher Development Framework and the Research Excellence Framework, which I introduced on p16. The Concordat was developed by RCUK to set out clear expectations for research funders that would strengthen existing good practice in public engagement by ensuring it is valued, recognised and supported. The Researcher Development Framework was developed to set out the knowledge, behaviours and attributes of 'successful' researchers. One of its four domains¹² is engagement, influence and impact, which specifies public engagement.

In parallel to this activity, funders sought to make their expectations about public engagement more explicit. All Research Councils now require applicants to complete a 'pathways to impact' statement, in which researchers must set out how they will ensure their research makes a difference and to whom. However, it remains the case that community partners can still not lead or co-lead on funding proposals of this kind. In other examples the National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) and Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) now require user involvement in the definition, conduct and dissemination of research and programmes such as 'INVOLVE'¹³ exist to support the public engagement in health and social care research. In another development, in 2010 a cross-research council funded programme – Connected Communities – was established to understand the changing nature of communities in their historical and cultural contexts and the role of communities in sustaining and enhancing our quality

¹⁰ These were CUE East (University of East Anglia), Manchester, UCL, Beacon North East (Universities of Newcastle & Durham), Edinburgh Beltane, Beacon for Wales.

¹¹ The Royal Society aims to recognise, promote, and support excellence in science and to encourage the development and use of science for the benefit of humanity.

¹² The other domains are: 'knowledge and intellectual attributes', 'personal effectiveness' and 'research governance and organisation'.

¹³ Website of INVOLVE, <http://www.invo.org.uk/about-involve/>, established in 1996, which includes a evidence and best practice on engaging the public in research.

of life. Significantly, it promotes and recognises new ways of researching with communities, and the connections between academic and community expertise.

Within this landscape, there are there are also understandings of ‘engagement’ that do not use the terminology of public engagement and are more explicitly focused on community-university activity as it relates to co-working with communities, often concerned with the agenda of social justice. For example, JRF commissioned research in 2012 (Robinson et al, 2012) to ask how universities could support ‘disadvantaged communities’. They found that universities invested in a range of activities to do this, which included community-university partnerships, distinguished from public engagement by their emphasis on co-production. The importance of a more plural range of activity is that it can arise and be defined in numerous ways. It therefore offers different opportunities for community and social actors to define their needs and possible responses to them with university partners.

In the JRF report, the University of Brighton (my home institution) was highlighted for offering institutional support to this mode of working, which is unusual in the UK sector. The Community University Partnership Programme (Cupp)¹⁴ is also an example of having an ‘open point of access’ to the university through the Helpdesk, which enables any community member or organisation to make an enquiry about co-work with the university, which can be responded to in a number of ways.

Similarly, the participatory research hub at Durham launched in 2015, provides a helpdesk for enquiries and runs events that support the development of local research collaborations. The hub is located within Durham’s research centre for social justice and community action¹⁵. The centre is one of few examples in the UK which has co-governance arrangements, being overseen by academic, practitioner and community partners. Another example includes the Centre of Excellence in Interdisciplinary Mental Health (CEIMH)¹⁶ at the University of Birmingham, where academics and practitioners are involved in delivering teaching and research.

¹⁴ Website of Cupp: www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp

¹⁵ Website of the Centre for social justice and community action: <https://www.dur.ac.uk/beacon/socialjustice/>

¹⁶ Website of the CEIMH: <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/research/activity/social-policy/ceimh/index.aspx>

In these ways strong commitments are made to an agenda that links engagement with social justice. However, they are confined to individual examples, and part of a landscape within which there is a steady rise of universities developing activity particularly in relation to funding and policy agendas that are less partnership focused. For example, many universities now employ public engagement professionals, who mediate and develop their public engagement. In doing so these individuals play a key role in defining what sort of participation is possible and how access to the university and its resources are mediated.

In Chapter 3, I consider further how the prevalence of public engagement constitutes particular communities. I argue that the construction of particular actors has implications for the extent to which they can be understood as knowers and whether such forms of engagement can encourage reciprocity and mutual respect, two characteristics highlighted by Robinson et al (2012) as important to accessible and meaningful collaborations.

Canada & Community Based Research

In Canada, the dominant language and activity associated with this area, rather than 'engagement' per se, is related to Community Based Research, Community Based Participatory Research and latterly Community University Research Partnerships (see Hall, Tandon & Tremblay, 2015). As I will outline below, engagement work in Canada has developed a coherent context for the practice of engagement and networking within and between university and community partners that are sources of information, practice and innovation. An emerging funding and policy context that is orientated specifically to forms of partnership that emphasise CBR principles support this. This focus on practice has more immediate connections to engagement and social justice, as these approaches are framed within related principles and action.

However, clarity and coordination of community-university activity did not occur in earnest until 1998. Universities relationships to wider society have traditionally been driven by large amounts of funding for science and technology activity towards the health & wellbeing of Canadians and economic growth (Benneworth et al, 2009). The higher education landscape is still dominated by business and technical interests through the Federal government's interest in university's role in Research &

Development. Thus ‘who’ is implied in community-university engagement and thus where resources should be invested is still contested.

Brown, Ochocka et al (2015) suggest you can divide the history of community based research into three periods, and I draw from their comprehensive overview here. They also recognise research approaches, and the Indigenous academic research community as important to the CBR landscape. They note that resistance to top down research approaches has accelerated Indigenous research approaches, most of which are community based.

They describe the first period as pre-1998, which they call the ‘foundational years’. They explain that the community based research movement was based outside of the walls of academia. Individual activist researchers were engaged in a range of social issues and examples of related work such as a participatory research network and women’s movements were influential.

The second period was funder driven. In 1998 the Social Science & Humanities Research Council for Canada (SSHRC) ¹⁷ established Community University Research Alliance (CURA) grants. Brown, Ochocka et al (ibid: 96) report that academics whose ideological or epistemological preferences were aligned to working with community groups ‘flooded’ SSHRC with proposals. It was also significant that these proposals were jointly made between academic and university partners. Hall (2005) stresses that it was the SSHRC CURA grants that laid the foundations for engaged scholarship practices in Canada, and not the work of Boyer (see Boyer, 1996) in the USA.

The current ‘engagement era’ began in 2012 when the Governor General called on universities and communities to become closer partners in knowledge production and use. Brown, Ochocka et al (2015: 97) write that by 2015, Canadians had a national scene where nearly ‘every university has some CBR or equivalent written in to its strategic plans’ and some kind of support structure. Canadian academic, Budd Hall also holds the UNESCO co-chair ¹⁸ in Community Based Research and Social

¹⁷ SSHRC is one of three national federal research granting agencies along with the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

¹⁸ He co-holds this Chair with Dr Rajesh Tandon, an Indian academic and founder of the non—profit community based research organisation, Participatory Research In Asia (PRIA).

Responsibility in Higher Education and is based in the University of Victoria. This is helping contribute to an emerging policy environment, which is supportive of such activity.

Canada also has a range of partnership structures that support engagement activity, and notably not all of them are situated in universities. For example, the Community Based Research Centre in Ontario was established in 1982 and works on behalf of community organisations to serve their research needs in collaboration with universities (Hall, 2011). Elsewhere, community partners jointly govern some university structures, and some structures are restricted to one discipline and wholly university governed.

These patterns of development provide a picture of engagement in these different geographies. They draw out what facilitates or encourages universities to have a more outward focus and I note that these have policy, practice and discipline specific drivers. However, the influences and factors which set the context for higher education in both these places suggest universities are subject to contradictory forces.

For example, as I set out earlier, UK universities are subject to increasing pressure to operate in a market place, competing for students and income in a global sector, whilst also being local to communities through agendas of engagement. Similarly, they are required to attract income, and support structures and staff for engagement activity are often costly to an institution rather than being a source of income generation. There is a risk of retraction around this area as resources and focus are linked directly to policy pressures. However, in the quest for distinctiveness, engagement and connection to locality can be utilised as ways to attract students, resources and profile. In the Canadian context, universities face similar pressures, and despite turning their efforts 'towards building just and sustainable societies' (see Brown, Ochocka et al, 2015) they also face the challenge of reconciliation with Indigenous peoples, particularly as colonising practices are often re-enforced through Western knowledge systems.

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that historically the role of universities has been understood in a number of different ways, linked to changing contexts in society since

the 12th century. I have discussed how this role can now be interpreted by focusing on how universities act on a third mission beyond teaching and research and consider their relationships with external actors. In doing so I have explored how the contemporary idea of engagement has been interpreted and demarcated by specific interests. These are university relationships with community and social actors that focus on the co-production of knowledge to contribute to complex social issues.

I have given consideration to who constitutes the community and social actors that may engage with universities and noted that understandings of engagement can serve to inscribe and constitute particular conceptions of community that have implications for who can participate and in what ways. This is further explored in Chapters 3 and 4. I have also discussed how the development of engagement agendas have happened differently in the UK and Canada, characterised by a policy context that promotes public engagement and a practice context that promotes community based research respectively.

The enduring focus of universities as institutions is concerned with generating and transmitting knowledge – and contemporary calls for universities to play their part in a knowledge co-production means that an exploration of community-university collaborations needs to explore how knowledge is understood and negotiated within them. I now turn to this topic in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3

Knowledge, Social & Cognitive Justice

Introduction

In this chapter I consider different types of knowledge and how they can be distinguished. I identify knowledge that is developed through research and teaching, in practice and within unique cultures or societies such as Indigenous knowledge.

I then demonstrate the different epistemological assumptions that underpin these ways of knowing. I show how through historical and positivist understandings, science or scientific knowledge is often afforded greater legitimacy than other categories of knowledge particularly in relation to what constitutes research and expertise. I include a brief discussion of how positivism has been challenged in the social sciences and how the influence of constructionism has given rise to alternative explanations and epistemology that counter such narrow conceptions of legitimate knowing. Throughout the chapter and in my thesis, I use the term knowledges to encompass this shift and the plural understanding of different types of knowledge in the social world. This also reflects my positionality as a researcher, which I discuss further in Chapter 5.

As part of this discussion I make use of the idea of discourse as a way in which to locate knowledge with respect to power relations. As I expand on in this section, understanding discourses as connected to mutually reinforcing and reproducing relationships between power and knowledge has implications for how ideas of engagement, knowledge and individual actors are understood and responded to. This leads me to describe an overview of the relationship between knowledge and power, which I do in two main ways. The first is to consider how power acts on how a problem is defined and researched, impacting what types of knowledge are afforded legitimacy and thus made use of in developing policy and addressing social and technical issues. The second is to consider who has access to research knowledge and how the dominant discourse of research, and science in particular, is problematic in maintaining barriers to such access.

Of central importance to my thesis are the intersections between knowledge, power and participation, and I address the question of how people are making sense of their

collaborative work together through two further concepts – social justice and cognitive justice. Cognitive justice is concerned with how multiple epistemologies are recognised and incorporated into how knowledge is produced and legitimated. I use this idea as a tool to explore how the dynamics and interplay between the categories of knowledge this chapter is concerned with are represented, used and negotiated in community-university collaborations. With respect to social justice, I note the disputed ways it has been thought about and in particular I draw on the work of political theorists Nancy Fraser and Iris Marion Young to emphasise my understandings. I suggest that social and cognitive justice can be viewed as related concepts and the final section of this chapter goes on to discuss cognitive justice and its use in my research in greater detail.

Distinguishing Forms of Knowledge

In the context of community-university engagement, the co-production of knowledge is underexplored but subject to emerging attention. Co-production implies multiple perspectives being brought to an issue, and these perspectives stem from different ways of knowing (see Jasanoff et al, 1997). To locate my explorations of collaboration or co-production between academic and community and social actors I begin by considering how different forms of knowledge can be distinguished.

At a simple definitional level, from the Oxford Dictionary of English (2010:976) for example, information, skills, knowledge and ‘know how’, are all descriptions of how we gain understanding of a subject or develop what is codified about something. From a cognitive standpoint, knowledge represents an understanding of phenomena.

In 2014, the Global University Network for Innovation (GUNi) published its 5th World Report on Higher Education. Its focus was on community-university engagement and knowledge creation and it sparked a debate with the editors about how to describe and understand knowledge. Their summary acknowledges that knowledge can be defined in diverse ways:

‘...the facts, feelings or experiences of a person or group of people, a state of knowing or awareness, and/or the consciousness or familiarity gained by experience or

learning.... Knowledge is linked to practical skills, to our working lives and to universal and abstract thought...’ (Escrigas et al, 2014)

The quote above demonstrates the multi-dimensional nature of knowledge – that it can encompass many things, arises in relation to different experiences and does not necessarily imply the need to be explicit. Here I distinguish different categories of knowledge, which reflect the forms of knowledge likely to be in use in the community-university collaborations of my study. These are presented as a means to demarcate ways in which different types of knowledge have been conceptualised.

Scientific Knowledge

In an academic context, knowledge is traditionally highly structured and categorised into disciplines. Science is a word taken to reference several disciplines such as Biology, Medicine or Physics. Science is both a body of knowledge, which Nickols (2012) defines as the theoretical or practical understanding of a discipline or subject, where sufficiently codified or captured, but also a way of knowing. Scientific knowledge includes epistemological principles and technical boundaries of understanding that give rise to the figure of the ‘expert’. Stengers (2007: 135) cites the example of the scientist in the laboratory, where ‘no other knowledge can, for instance, rival biology in what concerns the role of the DNA molecule in protein synthesis’.

This way of knowing is connected to the scientific method, which sets rules about how knowledge is obtained. This is characterised by observation, description, experimental investigation and theoretical explanation of phenomena. According to Barnes (2013: 7) science is conceived of as a uniquely rational process leading to ‘present truth’, and becomes a collection of unchanging facts. In this way science suggests a form of knowledge that is uncontestable.

Within the scientific research community, the principal reference group is other researchers. Problems tend to be framed in ways consistent with current research and theory, methods are applied that are acceptable to other researchers, and findings tend to be interpreted conservatively and usually in reference to other research or theory (Shavelson, 1988).

Science is an umbrella term that is commonly associated with natural or physical disciplines. However, social science disciplines also make claims to using systematic methods through which to investigate phenomena. Such phenomena include ‘knowledge’ itself which may be regarded critically as socially defined and constructed. I explore below critiques of the universal objective nature of what often comes under the banner of ‘science’.

Practice Knowledge

Practice or professional knowledge is associated with training or a vocation, where the skills needed to practice are learned through experiences and drawn from the professional community. This can include research in applied and professional fields such as nursing, environmental engineering or architecture. Problems are generated and solved within the context of the practice, based on needs or questions in real time. In the ever-changing worlds of contemporary practice, practitioners regularly encounter challenges of adequacy and capacity of their knowledge (Higgs et al, 2004).

The sources of knowledge drawn on are generally less explicit than the ‘science’ defined above, and knowledge developed in this way is often strongly influenced by contextual factors shaping practitioners’ actions. These can include practice guided by research evidence and that guided by the particularity of a circumstance. Both can be drawn on in order to make decisions relevant to a certain context. For example, an occupational therapist who works with patients with dementia, may have access to research that identifies links between creative activities and wellbeing, but in practice knows if a particular patient prefers drawing, listening to music or dance. Sometimes however, there is a tension between evidence-based practice and the knowledge of ‘what works’. Research evidence is often associated with universal findings that are considered to have a general application, which may be at odds with contextual decision-making.

Making decisions appropriate to context requires particular skills. This relates to what Bourdieu (1977) has conceptualised as an individuals’ *habitus* (the set of socially learned dispositions, skills and ways of acting that are often taken for granted, and which are acquired through the activities and experiences of everyday life). It is

these small and minute adjustments, gained through experience and impossible to enunciate, that make the difference between success and failure of a task being pursued by a practitioner.

The term practice also has the connotation of being something transferable, teachable, transmittable or reproducible (Turner, 1994). Polyani (1958) suggested a tacit dimension to knowledge that referred to phenomena that could not be articulated through written or verbal forms. His perspective was that knowledge of this type could only be transmitted through practice, for example kneading dough or playing a musical instrument. Another view on this is what Clandinin & Connelly (1995: 7) call 'practical knowledge' 'that body of convictions and meanings, conscious or unconscious, that have arisen from experience (intimate, social and traditional) and that are expressed in a person's practices'.

Experiential Knowledge

Experiential or lay knowledge is defined through lived experiences of the world and knowledge can be mobilised through drawing on 'experiential expertise' (Collins and Evans, 2002) that people have acquired in everyday life. For example, parents/carers of children with disabilities will have experiential knowledge of navigating healthcare provision.

Experiential knowledge is not systematised or formal and thus is different from both academic and practice knowledge. Nevertheless, the concept of practical wisdom has relevance to understanding this sphere of knowledge. Practical wisdom involves making good choices in our everyday lives and such wisdom relies on both proper aims and proper skills, and combines feeling with thinking (Schwartz and Sharpe, 2010). Lacey (2009) emphasises that such wisdom cannot be taught but requires experience of life. It also requires an understanding of what might be good or bad and individual subjectivity plays a big part. Most importantly, experiential or lay knowledge are also accounts of people's lives and experiences and so can be contrasted most sharply with practices of academic production and use. The contrast between lay and scientific knowledge brings into relief inequalities in the opportunity for 'non experts' to use this knowledge as citizens in policy in the public sphere and

therefore influence change. I discuss this further in the sections that follow on knowledge and power.

Experiential knowledge has been recognised as valuable for policy makers, including in relation to health services. For example, McKinley & Yiannoullou (2012: 115) note that, the UK government has made it a requirement that people who use mental health services are at the heart of services in terms of their ‘design, delivery, commissioning and operations’ precisely because this positions them to uniquely understand how such services can meet their needs.

In the context of public policy, this category of knowledge is often referred to as ‘local knowledge’. According to Fischer (2000) this refers to knowledge grounded within local citizens. He also discusses this as ‘ordinary knowledge’ using Lindblom and Cohen’s (cited in Fischer 2000: 194) definition: ‘knowledge that does not owe its origin, testing, degree of verification, truth, status or currency to distinctive... professional techniques, but rather to common sense, causal empiricism, or thoughtful speculation and analysis’. Ordinary local knowledge thus refers to knowledge pertaining to a local context or setting. In this way, people develop knowledge from day to day experience of actual conditions, rather than scientific observation or experimentation. Contextual specificity doesn’t lend itself to codification. The idea of knowledge bound by place is also commonly understood in relation to Indigenous or traditional knowledges.

Indigenous Knowledge

Indigenous knowledge (IK) is a system of knowing that is separately categorised from experiential or lay knowledge but hard to define. Joranson (2008) argues that IK does not fit neatly into more compartmentalised ways of understanding.

It is comprised of such localised expertise as the ability to ‘distinguish unfertile soils by colour or scent’ (ibid: 64). But this knowledge is also embedded in the cultural traditions and beliefs of Indigenous communities. IK is defined as held in common among members of a local community (Joranson, 2008) and it is characteristically situated within broader cultural traditions. IK systems tend to view people, animals, plants and other elements of the universe as interconnected by a network of social

relations and obligations (International Council for Science, 2002). As Boven and Morohashi argue, 'it is only when we try to translate these local practices into Western terms that we are confronted with the need to choose a certain definition' (2002: 12)¹⁹. Therefore, IK is conceptualised as a set of characteristics which include being tied to a particular place and set of experiences; orally transmitted and shared to a much greater degree than other forms of knowledge (Ellen & Harris, 1997).

There is a large literature that looks at IK in environmental knowledge production (for example: Allen et al, 2009; Ellis, 2005; Fischer, 2000; Gerhardinger et al, 2009). The ecologist Berkes (2008: 8) defines this Local Ecological Knowledge (LEK) as 'a cumulative body of knowledge, practice and belief, evolving in adaptive processes and handed down through generations by cultural transmission'. Interest in LEK is in part prompted by environmental problems posing a real challenge to classic scientific knowledge production (Hage et al, 2010) as it can offer perspectives that science cannot (Fischer, 2000). However, as Allen et al (2009: 239) highlight, if Indigenous knowledge about the environment is viewed more broadly as a system for which Indigenous peoples understand and engage in the world (Raffles 2002), then it by definition must encompass more than ecological knowledge.

In research and policy making processes IK has been criticised for seeming undynamic or 'slow'. In his work on IK and environmental research and management, using examples from New Zealand and Canada, Berkes (2009: 153) suggests that IK can be most usefully understood as process and not content. In relation to environmental issues, this distinction draws a line between information that can be 'passed on' and traditional knowledge process as a way of observing, discussing and making sense of new information. For example, according to Peloquin & Berkes (2009) the Cree people of Wemindji build a knowledge base of climate change through their sensitivity to 'read' critical signs and signals from the environment. If they were not constantly interacting with the land, they would not be able to respond effectively to what they were observing.

¹⁹ See also Tuhiwai Smith (1999) and Agrawal (2002) for similar discussions.

The ways in which Western ways of knowing and Indigenous or ‘non-Western’ cultures are often in contrast is also the source of the concept of cognitive justice. Shiv Visvanathan, the originator of the concept, was struck by the influence of Western agribusiness over what constituted knowledge of Indian farming practices, rather than accepting understandings from Indian farmers about what works in terms of growing crops. From his perspective, different knowledges are connected with different livelihoods and lifestyles and should therefore be treated equally (Visvanathan, 1997). This gave rise to his exploration of cognitive justice as a way to suggest epistemic pluralism in pursuit of more just and democratic world.

The Relationship Between Forms of Knowledge

Different types of knowledge have been considered appropriate to different functions and contexts (Sayer, 1992; Serres, 1997; Stengers, 2007; Visvanathan, 1999, 2007). However, the inclusion of ‘other’ knowledges outside of the scientific paradigm remains problematic. This reflects the dominance of Western scientific ideas underpinned by epistemological assumptions that Visvanathan and others contest. Such a hierarchy has obvious implications for the way problems are identified, and solutions are proposed.

Literature in development studies in particular has surfaced the question of whose reality, knowledge and voice counts in how we understand particular issues, e.g. poverty (see Chambers, 1983; Cornwall, 2003; Standing & Taylor, 2007) and how they can be addressed. Chambers’ influential work (1983, 1991, 1995, 1998) in this context argues that attention can and should be brought to such questions about the relationships between different types of knowledge, rather than assuming that professional and scientific knowledge alone can provide solutions for issues in the Global South. In the context of sustainable development for example, Indigenous forms of knowledge have as much, if not more, to contribute than ‘modern scientific knowledge’ (Chambers, 1983). And as Fischer (2000) argues, experiential, lay, local or Indigenous knowledges enable perspectives that science cannot. Thus, in the context of environmental planning for example, much science lacks social legitimacy. These points reflect a more general trend in development studies that has argued against and problematised the Western import of knowledge to development settings,

and instead promoted local, 'people centered' approaches to knowledge recognition and production (see for example Chambers 1995; Connell, 2007; Warren et al, 1995).

Questions of whose knowledge counts within a development context are also, as Standing & Taylor (2007) note, linked to the increasing political economy of knowledge, wherein scientific knowledge is linked with wealth, power and prestige, but also in the context of a knowledge society, characterised by how knowledge is used and by whom, the role of knowledge producing institutions and relationships between institutions in the global North and South. They argue (ibid) that the ways in which knowledge is validated, prioritised and legitimated socially, is therefore a vital consideration in this landscape. There is also evidence of these ideas in contemporary literature on natural resources (Colfer, 1995), education (Kelly et al, 2008), policy making (Fischer, 2000; Goodman, 2013) and health care (Stewart, 2001), oriented to questions of whose voice, evidence and perspective is made visible in decision-making processes.

Chambers' emphasis though was not just that different people would have something to say about an issue, but that different perspectives illuminate multiple dimensions to its definition and understanding. Returning to the example of poverty, Chambers (1995) observes not just that narrow technical definitions colonise common usage, but that such definitions ignore important language and concepts that are required to make sense of poor people's reality such that they may express, analyse and articulate their own needs in ways that cannot be encompassed through Western discourse. Chambers also argued that insights into the difference in realities/perspectives held the potential for a new paradigm. This paradigm, he suggests, rested on altruism on the part of professionals, and 'reversals' on what institutions, professions and people are committed to in the development and use of knowledge. In other words, he questions what would need to be turned on its head to make the idea of other realities, analyses and decisions about development issues possible. For example, he suggests that professionals have to unlearn old things and learn new ones (Chambers, 1991) and how participatory research and practice can be used and by whom to make a difference (see also Cornwall, 2003; Cornwall & Gaventa, 2008).

In my thesis, by drawing more broadly on contributions from democratic practice and community-university engagement, the question of whose knowledge counts, represented in my use of cognitive justice is a core thread of my enquiry. These literatures reflect versions of the characteristics highlighted by Chambers and others and are picked up in my exploration of participation and deliberation in Chapter 4.

How different categories of knowledge exist in relationship to each other is an underpinning idea in cognitive justice. The relationship between academic and other knowledges in the domain of community-university engagement has included a range of dynamics, which I outlined in Table 1 of Chapter 2. These included knowledge transfer, or the process through which one unit (e.g., group, department, or division) is affected by the experience of another (Argote & Ingram, 2000), often for the purpose of commercialisation, knowledge translation (the exchange, synthesis and ethically-sound application of knowledge, within a complex system of interactions among researchers and users (Sudsawad, 2007) and knowledge exchange (the processes by which new knowledge is co-produced through interactions between academic and non-academic individuals and communities (AHRC, 2013). These different types of relationship represent a range of processes that are increasingly dialogic in terms of research and knowledge creation. However, according to Tandon & Singh (2015), with respect to community-university collaborations, the co-production of knowledge is not particularly well understood and requires further exploration.

I am proposing cognitive justice as a useful way to understand these dynamics further. Cognitive justice draws attention to epistemic plurality and dialogue between different forms of knowing. This requires adequate recognition of a diversity of legitimate knowers on issues and science that affect people's lives. Visvanathan argues that it is through forms of dialogue, rather than the privileging of one set of ideas over another that people can judge for themselves what is beneficial based on the problem and possible solutions (see Kraak, 1999). Similar debates are held in literatures on LEK. Berkes (2009: 151) suggests that rather than bringing different ways of knowing together in a science versus traditional knowledge debate, it should be reframed as 'science *and* traditional knowledge dialogue and partnership'. This is similar again to Chamber's view on recognising other knowledges in processes of development and Santos' (2007, 2008) calls for an ecology of knowledge, to place

science in the context of the diversity of knowledges existing in contemporary societies. I return to the theme of the interrelationship of different ways of knowing in the final section of this chapter, where I also expand in greater detail on cognitive justice and its relevance to my research enquiry.

I now turn to a discussion of the underpinning epistemologies that situate the relationship of knowledge and power that is necessary to explore and understand how different ways of knowing relate to one another.

Different Epistemological Assumptions

In this section I outline why it is that some knowledges are seen to be more legitimate than others in producing knowledge for policy, social and technical solutions. I consider how this results in an epistemological hierarchy about what and whose knowledge counts and suggest that such a hierarchy not only excludes ‘non-scientific’ forms of knowing, but has also been detrimental to the practices of different social groups.

Science and the ‘Universal’

Multiple authors have argued that the privileging of scientific knowledge presents ‘Western science’ as superior to other categories of knowledge, promoting knowledge that is at once objective, neutral, not situated, timeless and true (Delvaux & Schoenaers, 2012; Gross and Levitt 1994; Koertge 1998; Nanda 2003). This can be attributed to the view that Western philosophy assumes epistemology is universal. How and what we know has been the subject of debate since Ancient Greek times. It was the Greek philosopher Plato who stated that knowledge was defined as ‘justified, true belief’ (Plato in Frost, 1946). The definition of knowledge in the abstract was consistent with contemporary thinking that maintained knowledge as a rational higher ideal, somehow separate from the context and experience in which it was located. Philosophers have continued to refine and re-define our understanding of knowledge over time (see for example: Kant, 1908; Locke (cited in Gillies, 2000); Rousseau, 1972), eventually accommodating perspectives that see knowledge as based on observation, causation and experiment and accommodating individual experience.

The result of this historical development is the epistemological privileging of modern science. This has been maintained by the trajectory of universities as knowledge producing institutions with origins in European societies (see Chapter 2). Thus, assumptions about what constitutes valid knowledge reflect norms of ‘science’ and in particular a Western conception of science, through which other ways of knowing are effectively discounted in terms of legitimacy or importance.

The epistemological basis on which such knowledge is considered to be universal is contested by authors from a history of science, social science and philosophy backgrounds. This contestation rests primarily on the recognition of alternative epistemological assumptions that locate knowledge in relation to the context it is developed from. These scholars argue that as all knowledge is situated, there is no ‘universal’ or indeed complete knowledge (Santos, 2009; Polyani cited in Grene, 1969).

Berger & Luckmann (1966) established these understandings about knowledge in their work on social constructionism. Constructionists therefore seek to understand ‘science’, as with other ways of knowing, in its socio-political perspective (Fischer, 2003). As Berger & Luckmann (1966: 83) argue theoretical knowledge is ‘only a small and by no means the most important part of what passed for knowledge in a society...’. They identify the sum total of ‘what everybody knows’ about a social world as an assemblage of maxims, morals, proverbial nuggets of wisdom, values and beliefs, myths...’ (ibid). From this point of view, the fundamental principles of science do not produce insights that contend with everyday life, and its complexity.

The context for the validation of knowledge – rather than some abstract and presumed truth is instead according to Berger & Luckmann (1966: 58), everyday life, which is ‘taken for granted by myself and others until further notice, that is, until a problem arises that cannot be solved in terms of it’ (ibid). Thus epistemology that assumes knowledge is a social construction will deal with empirical variety but also with the processes by which any body of knowledge comes to be socially established as reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966: 15).

Constructionism assumes that reality is the product of social processes (Neuman, 2003), which in turn construct our everyday lives and experiences. However, Neuman (ibid) goes on to observe that not all of us possess the same ability to define

reality. One outcome of the action of power in the systems, language and functions of science is that knowledge that has gained such legitimacy has often maintained its status to the exclusion of conflicting ideas (Sibley, 1995) and the disqualification of ‘other’ knowledge (Hoy, 1986) that can also contribute to the tackling of social, intellectual and cultural problems. Scholars predominantly from the Global South cite this reification of knowledge as influential in suppressing other non-scientific forms of knowledge, particularly that of Indigenous knowledge and at the same time, the social groups whose social practices it informs (Santos, 2008; Ellis 2005; Kraak, 1999; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999).

From a philosophical perspective, Fricker (2007) employs the concept of epistemic injustice to describe how somebody can be wronged in their capacity as a knower. She argues that the most basic epistemic practices – conveying knowledge to others and making sense of our social experiences, are compromised when subjected to unequal power and the systematic prejudices they operate (p7). This leads not just to a distortion of what knowledge is powerful, but a distorted representation of lives and possible responses to them. Santos (2008: ix) goes further to name as ‘epistemicide’ practices which do harm in attempting to suppress other forms of knowledge and thus reduce understandings of the world to Western epistemology. One example of this would be the loss of First Nations languages in Canada. Burnaby (1996) found that in the Province of British Columbia only 5% of those with aboriginal status reported fluency in their language. Gessner et al (2014) cite the residential school system as the main reason for language loss. As discussed in Chapter 2, this system embodied colonial imperialism and epistemology that actively harmed First Nations people. The inability to adequately represent your experiences by drawing on a particular way of knowing has real consequences for people’s life chances. For Visvanathan (2005) epistemology is politics because science acts on development and pedagogy, and thus determines life chances.

Santos (2008) suggests that the recognition of epistemological diversity is a highly contested terrain because it conveys contradictory epistemological and cultural conceptions, but also contradictory political and economic interests. Therefore, as Gieryn (1999) argues, the representation of science has less to do with the cultural realities they supposedly depict and more to do with the cultural realities they sustain. A social or practice context to knowledge directs us to consider where unequal forces

act on people and experiences. We need more adequate explanations for social life that can also acknowledge different epistemological bases for categories of knowledge.

Contesting 'Science'

Feminist and Indigenous critiques of science argue that there is no separation between the self and how and what we know (Stanley & Wise, 2002; Harding, 1991; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). The reliance on abstract methods and meanings that characterise the 'scientific method' are therefore misguided. As Fischer (2005: 61) suggests, positivists have simply falsely imported into the everyday world the epistemology of another domain.

Thinking from personal lives, such as that embodied in experiential, local or Indigenous knowledges is important. With increased attention to the social context of knowledge there is a growing awareness that scientific or technical knowledge alone cannot solve all problems (Berkes, 2009; Collins and Evans, 2002; Fischer, 2000, 2003; Jasanoff, 2008). Kinsella (2002) encourages us to view expert knowledge as a public resource, to which both specialists and non-specialists contribute, fostering democratic participation and enhancing the quality of public decisions on issues with technical or policy dimensions. Vessuri (2008) thinks that if science is to address social/technical problems it must be produced in a way that allows it to be linked more easily and rapidly to action communities and Harding (1991) suggests that our picture of the world would indeed be very different if 'other' voices were powerful in shaping the general direction of scientific research.

According to Santos feminist criticism has provided some of the most powerful resources for critiques of a scientific knowledge monoculture, and in particular, of the way it has historically excluded or marginalised certain subjects such as women (2008: xxxii). Feminist researchers propose that women's and men's characteristic social experiences should provide equal ground for reliable knowledge claims – the point is, they are not 'equal' in the social sphere and the methods and understandings 'available' to examine this have been shaped by culture-wide androcentric prejudices (Harding, 1987).

Feminist thinkers have argued that 'science' is locked into contemporary forms of capitalism and imperialism as systems of domination. In rejecting this system, feminism has been left with the task of constructing both the forms and content of a different, alternative science (Rose, 2005). The project of challenging and overthrowing existing canonical knowledges leaves the question of what they might be replaced with. Harding (1991) considers there to be three main options:

- Feminist empiricism: staying loyal to scientific traditions (i.e. the characteristics of the 'knowers' are irrelevant to the discovery process)
- Feminist standpoint science: re-dressing bias by giving voice to women's experience
- Feminist postmodernism: abandoning traditional scientific methods entirely.

Empiricists and standpoint theorists both attempt to ground accounts of the social world which are less partial and distorted than the prevailing ones. Ultimately, the argument for a standpoint epistemology is both that scholarship can give a voice to traditionally marginalised groups, but also that such an approach can apply the vision and knowledge of those marginalised to social activism and social change by placing them at the centre of the research process (Brooks, 2006). Collins (1990: 209) claims that concrete experience can then be the ultimate criterion for credibility of these knowledge claims. Jaggar (1997) and Collin's (1990) research demonstrates that experience and knowledge gained from social actors can be used as a means to draw attention to social inequalities and injustices.

Traditional empiricism does not direct researchers to locate themselves in the same critical plane as their subject matters (Harding, 1987: 184) and so it is hard to see how the relationship between the two groups can take account of social dimensions without a transformation in epistemological understanding. This directs us to the need for participatory research practices, which I will expand on in Chapter 4.

Discourse

I have suggested in Chapter 2 that different forms of community-university engagement set rules and expectations that have implications for dynamics of power. Drawing on understandings that legitimate particular forms of knowing and practice in relation to a hierarchy of scientific knowing also inscribes and constitutes publics

and communities in relation to them. What the discussion above has demonstrated is that social constructionist perspectives contest universal ideas of science and suggest that different versions of reality not only reflect but legitimate particular forms of social organisation and power asymmetries (Riger, 1992).

According to Foucault, these rules, systems and procedures comprise discourses - a conceptual terrain in which knowledge is formed and produced (cited in Hook, 2001). Discourse is essentially talk in context, but Foucault's work highlights the ways in which language and communication are anchored in social processes – discursive practices – through which knowledge is produced and practiced (Barnes et al, 2007). Knowledge thus establishes and maintains certain beliefs and practices as common sense and legitimate and is enmeshed with power.

From a post-modern perspective, Foucault suggests that as all contexts are constructed, how discursive formations are constituted goes beyond language and words to combine with other forms of communication such as body language, symbols and technologies. In this type of discourse, meanings are created, power is conveyed and the world is rendered recognisable through the recognition and interaction of the various discourses in which we are embedded (Dittmer, 2009: 276). For example, according to Foucault, one's understanding of the self is defined by various discursive formations that shape the individual's identity. For example, one's identification of the self in gendered terms is the result of various 'engagements with a range of discourses and practices that define the individual according to a certain gendered identity' (ibid: 277).

Foucault (1969) sees statements as important indicators of the rules and conditions in a larger field of discourse (or discursive formations). Which statements are acknowledged as being significant or insignificant provides important insight into the mechanics and dynamics of phenomena. Taking this as a starting point, we can begin to see how different rules, boundaries and political or cultural situations give rise to different discourses that are concerned with knowledge.

The effects of discursive practices make it virtually impossible to think outside of them. Another way to understand this is that discourse is concerned with the ways in which truth is produced by power. Foucault shows us that behind such talk of truth lies a 'will to power' and an ideological interest that hides other aims:

'Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true' (Foucault, in Rabinow 1991: 72-73).

What counts as 'the truth' is enshrined in particular scripts and ways of seeing (Taylor, 2000) that constitute our ideas and understandings, our selves and others. By way of example, I consider how discourses construct different ways of knowing the public with respect to public participation (Barnes et al, 2003; Barnes et al, 2007).

Barnes et al (2007: 10) argue that there are four discourses of public participation²⁰, which each have implications for shaping individual subject positions. This rests on their argument that publics are socially constructed and subject to discursive practices that both define and constitute who people are. For example, the first of these discourses – the empowering public discourse – focuses on consistently marginalised or disadvantaged groups or communities. It constitutes this disadvantage as deriving from institutional discrimination and thus seeks to support interventions that will act to empower these communities. However, this discourse is a site of struggle between different views of power, inequality and political agency. It does not take account of the way in which civil society groups for example have initiated their own strategies for challenging the state.

Barnes et al (ibid) also argue that particular policy initiatives target particular publics and so through discursive practices, identities are bestowed on social subjects, which may also be accompanied by publics having to learn new languages to be heard within participative fora. They offer the example of two people in a community meeting concerned with community safety. One participant using the language of anti-social behaviour, and another a language now considered redundant in policy terms, for example, 'hoodlum', will make evident that some voices are afforded legitimacy, and others marginalised. Discourses therefore suggest suitable subject-

²⁰ These are 'empowering', 'consuming', 'stakeholder' and 'responsible' public.

positions for participations but also produce particular practice and speaking norms (Barnes et al, *ibid*: 198).

What this shows is that not all discourses are of equal importance or impact. However, Foucault (1978) is clear that discourse doesn't only work for power with respect to dominant ideas saying 'we must not imagine a world of discourses divided between accepted discourses and excluded discourses, or between the dominant discourses and the dominated ones; but as a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies' (Foucault, 1978: 100). This then provides a particular 'backdrop' to the practices and activities of community and university actors in my research.

Relationship Between Knowledge and Power

Santos (2005: 409) argues that forms of knowledge are distinguished by the way they characterise both the designations of ignorance and knowing, and the trajectory that connects them. So there is no 'ignorance in general' or 'knowing in general' as each form recognises itself in contrast. Feyerabend (1988) claimed that there is no idea which is not capable of improving our knowledge. Yet, some ideas count for more than others.

Knowledge or research can be conceived as resources to be mobilised to influence public debates (Gaventa & Cornwall, 2008) and in the UK in particular, there are increasingly opportunities for citizens²¹ to engage with science in the context of deliberative policy making. One driver for this proliferation of activity, which I draw on again in Chapter 4, is that public participation enables lay or experiential knowledge to generate better policy decisions. This is particularly the case in complex and diverse societies in which 'expertise' is widely distributed and social and cultural differences generate multiple perspectives (Barnes et al, 2007). Even so, with respect to policy or academic engagement, increasing opportunities for participation do not necessarily enable epistemological inclusion.

²¹ I adopt the language of citizens, users and publics for this section as they relate to the literature on public participation and democratic theory. This literature is a rich source of empirical material that represents overlapping themes with community-university engagement and so is highly relevant in my exploration of issues of knowledge and power.

With respect to knowledge and power, this terrain can be understood through a focus on a politics of knowledge (See Leach & Scoones, 2007) that is to say, who can influence and shape knowledge production, and how access to relevant knowledge is gained in order to be mobilised in people's struggle for rights and social change.

Multiple examples now exist within the realms of energy, environment, health care, defense, and science. For example, there are now Patient & Public Involvement Forums for every NHS Trust in the UK. The purpose of these forums is to ensure local people have a say in decisions about local health services. User, public or citizen involvement has thus become official policy in relation to health and social care in the UK. This policy shift also requires researchers to demonstrate how they have involved people in defining the issue and developing research proposals – and in how they will carry out and disseminate the research. Despite this proliferation of new areas for participation, Kinsella (2002) argues that many of these opportunities are also dominated by technical expertise, which can serve to ignore competing perspectives and values that might otherwise be explored. However, Fischer (2005) argues that in contrast to dominant understandings of scientific rationality, citizens employ their own modes of rationality which need to be taken into account in evidence based policy making. Fischer (ibid) suggests from his work on environmental policy making that citizens process technical information from a sociocultural perspective, rather than through intellectual analysis. He suggests that people's reactions reflect a different form of rationality. Were this to be incorporated in forms of decision making, how a problem is defined could operate within what Fischer (2005) calls a practical discourse - the mode of reason geared to the everyday world of social action, where people make judgements and use information in action.

In the context of community-university relationships, there is also an increase in mainstream approaches to 'citizen involvement' with science, via forms of research, with science or policy making. However, as Leach & Scoones, (2005: 35) argue, these mainstream approaches to 'citizen involvement' are based on a model of the citizen 'grounded in liberal theory' where citizens engage passively, or participate in spaces orchestrated by an institution. Examples of this dynamic with respect to academia include public lectures, research trials and consultation on technological advancements. However, these approaches sit in contrast to the citizen as a bearer of

knowledges located in particular ‘practices, subjectivities and identities’ (ibid: 28) that much of this chapter has argued for.

This prompts me to return to Barnes et al’s (2007) work outlined above in the section on discourse. If we apply this thinking to the categories of ‘public’ or ‘communities’ that are produced within practices of community-university engagement, we can suggest how different rules and norms may construct different subject identities. I do not propose to offer a comprehensive analysis of this here, but this view has implications for different engagement practices and the extent to which they influence who participates and how. These are dimensions of participation that I explore further in Chapter 4. For example, practices associated with public engagement, or public understanding of science are situated within the scientific discourse. A normative implication of which is the separation of academics and ‘publics’ and the distinction of who holds expertise. This would suggest that in participative fora that stem from this discourse may limit or constrain non-academics to have a voice or be heard on matters of science. By way of contrast, practices of participatory research may challenge and contest this distinction, drawing on a different set of normative rules and practices that construct participants as more active contributors and supporting them in defining, rather than be restricted to negotiating on forms of knowledge that affect their lives. These circumstances thus, following Barnes & Prior (2009) may subvert assumptions about identify and expertise.

In Chapter 4 my focus is on the range of ways in which community and social actors can engage with universities in different ways, through forms of research and activity that challenge normative expectations of them as ‘users’ of science. I consider both the co-production of research but also instances where citizens have enrolled accredited scientific experts sympathetic to their perspectives, forming alliances that give their claims greater strength and legitimacy, reflect a different dynamic with respect to engaging with knowledge (Nelkin 1987; Hoffman 1989).

To illustrate how scientific knowledge can be mobilised by community and social actors, I use the example of Robins’ (2005) empirical work on AIDS activism in South Africa with respect to the struggle for access to Antiretroviral drugs (ARVs). Robins demonstrates how South African activists had to overcome issues such as drug patent policies and pricing as well as contesting government research that

underpinned the political claim that there was no viral cause of aids. To do so, activists drew on existing mainstream understandings of virology and disease causation to argue for investment in anti-retroviral treatments.

Returning to the context of community-university collaboration, this brief discussion demonstrates that questions remain about claims to inclusion or participation in knowledge production. One issue is the extent to which people outside universities can pursue topics of interest to them as defined by them. Self-definition could be key to the achievement of epistemological representation and inclusion. By calling for increased attention to the co-production of knowledge in collaborative research, Tandon & Singh (2015) remind us that community-university engagement may hold potential here.

This leads me to the final section of this chapter, which deals with the concepts of social and cognitive justice in situating knowledge at the centre of community-university engagement.

Social & Cognitive Justice

According to Gaventa & Bivens (2014: 153) universities' authority to create and legitimate knowledge becomes an increasing pivotal force in the struggle for social justice. What this chapter has discussed so far is rather the way in which universities and modern science have been sources of injustice for diverse ways of knowing and the social groupings that make use of such knowledge. As outlined in Chapter 2, contemporary calls for the university to recognise its role with respect to social justice are made through claims for the transformative potential of collaboration between universities and communities on a range of social challenges. To understand the specific contribution that might be made by the sort of perspective Gaventa & Bivens offer, in which a focus on knowledge must be central, I suggest cognitive justice offers a useful lens through which to explore this.

The final section of this chapter considers social and cognitive justice in turn and develops a theoretical position to inform the analysis of the empirical data generated by my research.

The notion of social justice is disputed. Originating principally through understandings about fairness and wealth, early usage of the term was restricted to the redistribution of wealth, concerned with class politics – rich and poor or owners and workers. Rawls (1971) developed his theory of justice, which proposed an absolute social justice as part of a governing moral order, to which all people were responsible through their associations with one another resulting in a kind of egalitarian redistribution that focused on justice for individuals. Whilst Rawls suggested that this theory should apply to the basic structure of society, his and other theories of this kind did little to account for post-modern understandings which give primacy to social context. Feminist critiques in particular have challenged Rawls' ideas on the basis of the failure of difference-blind economic egalitarianism to assure justice for minorities and women (Fraser, 1996). Okin (1989) for example highlighted that such a conception of justice did not account for hierarchies embedded within social context such as familial relations, and failed to recognise the patriarchal nature of society.

I have drawn on the work of political theorists Nancy Fraser and Iris Marion Young in order to develop a way of thinking about social justice in relation to community-university collaborations. Both challenge the idea of social justice as solely distributive (i.e. about fair distribution of wealth) and they advance theories that contend with justice in relation to groups rather than individuals.

Young's position is to argue that concepts of social justice should not be limited to individuals and instead should recognise social groups – that is 'people who are differentiated from at least one other group by cultural forms, practices, or ways of life' (Young, 1997: 7). Social groups are those which differentiate people in ordinary discourse – so for example, men or women. This is important because for Young, specifically identifying inequalities according to group categories helps identify structural inequalities. This perspective led to her fundamental works calling for a politics of difference. Young purposefully demarcates the idea of social groups and identity as this is central to her position on 'difference'. Her position is that social groups do not have substantive unified identities, and as such a politics of difference is one that should avoid homogenising people or their experience.

A further aspect to Young's (2000: 31) understandings of social justice was to identify two ideals – that of self-development and self-determination. These can also

be understood as ‘inclusion as participation’ and ‘inclusion as transformation’ as they relate to the extent to which people’s needs are met to enable them to exchange perspectives on their lives in contexts where others can listen, and being able to participate in determining one’s action and the condition of one’s action, against conditions of domination (Young, 2000: 12). Thus Young (2000: 33) defines social justice as ‘the institutional conditions for promoting self-development and self-determination of a society’s members’.

Nancy Fraser’s understanding of social justice also contends with social and political issues together (Fraser, 1997) on the basis that inequalities stem from political economy and structural inequality. Her theory of justice rests on three separate but interrelated issues. These are redistribution, recognition and representation (Fraser, 2009: 13), which speak to forms of injustice related to economics, cultural equality of status and representation. The politics of recognition are particularly relevant to my thesis as the ways in which how and what people know is recognised and included in knowledge production is a core element. Thus Fraser suggests that the politics of recognition can relate to cultural domination (being subjected to patterns of interpretation and communication that are associated with another culture and are alien and/or hostile to one’s own); non-recognition (being rendered invisible via the authoritative representational, communicative, and interpretative practices of one’s culture); and disrespect (being routinely maligned or disparaged in stereotypic public cultural representations and/or in everyday life interactions) (Fraser, 1996).

Fraser (2001) observes that in contemporary socio-political climates, claims for recognition, based on the emergence and visibility of various groups with claims to justice, such as Indigenous people, risk displacing those of redistribution. She argues that both are required for an adequate conception of justice, that social justice must contend with structural issues of poverty, inequality and at the same time, cultural imperialism and status hierarchy within a vision of emancipation.

Fraser (1997) also suggests two forms of remedy with respect to justice – affirmative and transformative. She argues that ‘affirmative’ remedies are aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes of social arrangements without disturbing the underlying framework, which generates them. In contrast ‘transformative’ remedies are aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes precisely by restructuring the generative underlying

framework. I find evidence in the work of Young & Fraser that suggests the possibility of ‘denormalising how institutions formulate their rules’ (Young, 1995: 202). Thus they both allow for a conception of justice that will break with institutional and social assumptions as they currently stand rather than bending institutional rules to allow people in subordinate positions to conform more easily to existing structures of political and social organisation (Martinez-Buscunan, 2014). These ideas align with emancipatory and other participatory methodologies that can underpin community-university engagement.

This thinking is also consistent with Anisur Rahman (cited in Gaventa & Bivens, 2014: 153) writing about the relationship between knowledge inequalities and forms of injustice saying there is a ‘need to attack both oppressive structures and relations *and* who has social power of knowledge generation’.

My thesis proposes that cognitive justice offers a language to connect efforts in producing, mobilising and legitimating different types of knowledge within ideas of social justice. Further, it draws attention to whether there is a genuine interest in seeing knowledge production as a shared responsibility of the practitioner and research communities (Bickel & Hatrup, 1995: 36).

Cognitive Justice

Cognitive justice is based on the principle that all knowledges should co-exist in a dialogic relationship to each other. Thus cognitive justice is first of all a call for making other ways of knowing visible (Van der Velden 2006). The concept was developed by the Indian academic Shiv Visvanathan, an anthropologist and human rights worker now based at the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS) in Delhi, India.

As noted above, the concept was first discussed as a response to the negative impact of Western science on developing countries, through a particular example of the juxtaposition of Indian farmers’ knowledge of farming based in knowledge of local conditions and that of Western agribusiness in terms of whose knowledge counted in determining farming practices. For Visvanathan (1997) this was representative of broader issues relating to India’s development – that where such knowledge clashes where present, they did little to enable people to use their own ‘sciences’ to strengthen

their circumstances and in turn contribute to democracy. Visvanathan thus began by arguing that development needed to be replaced by cultivating justice – such that it could draw attention to different ways of knowing as central to everyday lives. In his conception, this can only come about through dialogue between different ways of knowing, not by domination at the expense of the other. It is these dialogues of knowledge that are perceived as contributing to a more sustainable, equitable, and democratic world.

As well as being used in the field of development (Santos, 2008; Gaventa & Bivens, 2014) it also now features in fields such as development for technology and Indigenous technology (Eubanks, 2011, Bidwell & Winscheirs-Theophilus, 2015; Van der Velden, 2006), climate change (Salazar, 2011) and education (Odora Hoppers, 2009, 2015). Cognitive justice has also been mentioned in relation to the community-university field explicitly (by Gaventa & Bivens, 2014) though it remains underexplored here. In this thesis I explore the value of this concept as a framework within which to further understand, critique and progress the efforts of community and university partners in pursuing engagement for transformation, in line with the discussion on social justice above.

The principles of cognitive justice are:

- All forms of knowledge are valid and should co-exist in a dialogic relationship to each other.
- Cognitive justice implies the strengthening of the 'voice' of the defeated and marginalised.
- Traditional knowledges and technologies should not be 'museumized'.
- Every citizen is a scientist. Each layperson is an expert.
- Science should help the common man/woman.
- All competing sciences should be brought together into a positive heuristic for dialogue. (Visvanathan, 1999: 3)

The idea of cognitive justice sensitises us not only to different forms of knowledge but to the diverse communities of problem solving (Visvanathan, 2009) and power relationships within them. Visvanathan's definition of cognitive justice revolves around the right of a plurality of knowledge structures to co-exist in a dialogic relationship with one another (1999).

Further, cognitive justice recognises the right of different forms of knowledge to co-exist and carry weight in the decisions that affect people's lives. Visvanathan views reforming science as a means to strengthen democracy. In the late twentieth century, he argues, science has come to permeate politics – from decisions about atomic bombs to hydro-electric power plants, from bio-prospecting to health care (Visvanathan, 1997). Cognitive justice promotes epistemic pluralism, which can result in other knowledges playing a role in a democratic and dialogical science (Odora Hoppers, 2009), which remains connected to the livelihoods and survival of cultures.

Cognitive justice is a normative principle for the equal treatment of all forms of knowledge rather than an attempt to universalise a 'new science'. It offers a way of situating actors (such as those involved in community-university engagement) in a dialogic relationship which may generate an inclusive knowledge base from which actions, imperatives and priorities are shared.

Others have proposed similar ways of thinking about diverse knowledge systems to inform social change. Santos (2004, 2008: xx) writes of ecologies of epistemological diversity that maximise the contribution of different kinds of knowledge aimed at building 'a more democratic and just society'. Hess & Ostrom (2007: 4) view diverse knowledge through the idea of 'the commons' defined as 'a general term that refers to a resource shared by a group of people'. Joranson (2008: 66) adds that this can express shared resource pools that contain ideas that result from perception, experience, and/or study'. In this way 'knowledge commons' elevates individuals to a role above mere consumers (Boyle et al, 2007) based on traditional modes of knowledge production that position 'non-scientists' as passive. It allows an individual to imagine himself or herself as one who generates ideas rather than one who merely consumes them (Joranson, 2008: 66). Hall (2011) and Hall & Tandon (2014) argue for a move to a knowledge democracy – which they define as acknowledging multiple epistemologies that are intentionally linked to values of democracy and to processes of creating and using knowledge.

This focus on realising the recognition of different groups and their ways of knowing has been conceptualised by Nancy Fraser as an 'affirmative' remedy to an issue of injustice as highlighted on p62. That is, redressing the injustice whilst leaving

identities and group differentiation intact. However, I suggest that cognitive justice theorises what Fraser would call a transformative remedy, in which attention is not just paid to the boundaries of what we understand or acknowledge, but the ways in which those boundaries are drawn. She explains a transformative remedy as ‘aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes of social arrangements precisely by restructuring the generative underlying framework’ (Fraser, 1997: 23). Such a remedy then is one that deconstructs underlying understandings, assumptions and identities requiring them to be re-thought and formed. The principles of cognitive justice for example include ‘every citizen is a scientist, every layperson is an expert’ (Visvanathan, 1999: 3). The principles also imply the need not just for visibility of recognition of multiple knowledges, but that they should be in dialogue. To achieve such an outcome points to a requirement to go beyond recognition and instead or as well as to pay attention to the way we think about what knowledges are legitimate to contribute to social issues, but also the identities, cultural status and representations of knowers themselves. It is in this way, I explore cognitive justice as offering a perspective from which to understand potential links between forms of community-university engagement and social justice.

But whilst cognitive justice has received some theoretical attention, there are very few empirical examples of these ideas and principles *in practice*. This poses questions for its use in analysis and I discuss this further in my methodology, Chapter 5 and in my discussion in Chapter 9. The tentative links between social and cognitive justice made above indicate that ‘doing’ cognitive justice requires new practices that can accommodate breaks in institutional and social assumptions about knowledges and the social groupings that constitute them.

Conclusion

This chapter has distinguished different categories of knowledge and has explored the different epistemological assumptions that underpin these. It has problematised the universal claims of Western science. Using post-modern and constructionist ideas I have developed the case for knowing in social contexts, introduced the relationship between knowledge and power and considered where unequal forces are acting on people’s experiences. I further investigated this relationship by delineating the

concept of discourse and providing examples of how power affects what knowledge is afforded legitimacy and how it can be accessed and mobilised for social issues.

The last section of this chapter has considered the concepts of social and cognitive justice as I am using them in my thesis. I have suggested that there are fruitful connections between these two ideas in terms of understanding how community-university engagement might make claims for social justice. I have argued that the relationship between participation and epistemological inclusion cannot be assumed. I suggest that in exploring cognitive justice we can also keep a critical focus not just on the imperative for knowledges to be in dialogue with each other, but also the mechanisms and spaces used to achieve this. It is to this topic I turn next. Chapter 4 explores how the theory and practice of participation can contribute to an understanding of community-university collaborations.

Chapter 4

Knowledge & Participation

Introduction

This chapter concentrates on the parallels between the theorisation and practice of forms of participatory action research (PAR), community-university engagement and public participation. I begin by exploring the different ways in which research practices under the umbrella of PAR address knowledge, power and positionality which demonstrate commitments to knowledge pluralism of the kind considered in Chapter 3. PAR is indicative of key forms of engagement between communities and universities but it is not the only one. I go on to reflect on some of the different ways in which community and social actors can define and mobilise their interests through different forms of participation in a range of engagement practices and in particular highlight service user involvement with research. I do so to address parallels between user involvement with participatory research and in public participation. Democratic theory is predicated on the involvement of people in the issues and decisions that affect their lives. The spaces in which university and community actors come together to generate knowledge for social change can be understood to constitute one context for developing ‘science’ that impacts people’s lives. Thus, I argue democratic theory is relevant to such contexts as well as to spaces in which policies are deliberated.

As part of this argument, I explore the value of drawing on theories of deliberative democracy to see what resonance they have for my research enquiry. Deliberative democracy pays attention to participation and knowledge as well as to communicative dimensions of dialogic processes. I suggest these are of interest to developing normative rules to forms of community-university engagement that also intersect with social justice. The final section of this chapter briefly considers connections between people’s participation within community-university activities and how the knowledge they co-produce on interests and needs that reflect their lives can be useful to mobilising these interests in a democratic context.

A particular consideration for this chapter is that of language. Reviewing literature on participation with respect to PAR, user involvement and democratic theory, is to

encounter multiple concepts on 'who' constitutes those implied in such activity. Terms such as 'public', 'community', 'citizen' and 'users' all feature in these accounts, which as I indicated in Chapter 3 following Barnes et al (2007), can be understood as social constructs that are formed out of a range of discourses and ideologies that are historically embedded in institutional practice (Burr, 1995). I do not intend to substantially explore these differences, but I note the use of language as it differs from that adopted for my thesis thus far in terms of 'community and social actors'. These actors may overlap and be distinct from other conceptualisations.

Participatory Action Research

This section offers a brief exploration of participatory approaches in social research. These are the ways in which relationships between universities and communities have been primarily mediated to date with respect to knowledge co-production and are a central practice in relation to the forms of engagement my thesis is interested in. I give consideration to the benefits of PAR as well as its challenges and make note of ethical developments alongside these practices. I also consider how PAR can give rise to transformations – both in terms of the topic, but also in terms of the identities of those involved.

A debate about terms is beyond the scope of this chapter. My aim here is to consider how this range of practices, which could be loosely grouped under PAR, draw attention to useful considerations for community-university engagement and social justice. Fals Borda and Rahman (cited in Cornwall, 2011: 204) suggests that PAR illuminates structures of power and defines the methodology as seeking to combine research, adult education and socio-political action with the aim of empowering poor and oppressed groups. This perspective thus makes connections to the influential work of Paulo Freire in adult education research and how PAR is a means to enlighten or emancipate individuals and groups so they take up and use the knowledge developed (Reason & Heron, 1995). Feminist theory has also been a key contributor to this form of research, evolving out of a refusal to accept theory, research and ethical perspectives that ignore, devalue or erase women's lives, experiences and contribution (McIntyre, 2008).

Methodologically, literature concerned with action research, participatory research, empowerment evaluation, emancipatory research, community based participatory research and so on focus on cooperation, participation and generating action for change (Barinaga & Parker, 2013; Banks, et al, 2013; Boser, 2006; Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005; Jolivette, 2015; Schroeder, 1997). Kemmis & McTaggart (cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 2005) argue such research is distinct from other forms of social inquiry by its political and methodological intent. PAR is practiced across disciplines; it is frequently used in the social sciences, development studies, education, and human geography and features particularly in research concerned with ‘user involvement’ in relation to health and social care, which I introduce further below.

According to Bergold & Thomas (2012) the common aim of these approaches is to change social reality on the basis of insights into everyday practices that are obtained by means of participatory research—that is, collaborative research on the part of scientists, practitioners, service users and others. Kemmis & McTaggart (2005: 279) suggest that PAR investigates actual, rather than abstract practices and directly engages with constructionist understandings of the world. For example, in the work of Ward & Gahagan (2010) on collaborative research with older people they clearly demarcate processes of research as engaging with older people as knowers with expertise, rather than passive consumers of policy decisions and public services. PAR therefore provides multiple opportunities for research practitioners and participants to construct knowledge and integrate theory and practice in ways that are unique to a particular group (McIntyre, 2008).

These practices are founded on trusting and respectful relationships between those involved (Cuthill, 2010). In my own methodology (Chapter 5) I highlight how such approaches promote and consider inclusive methods of identifying the research topic and equitable participation in its address (see for example, Armstrong & Banks, 2011; Boser, 2006; Chiu, 2006; Harding, 1987; Savan & Sider, 2003). However, paying attention to the relationship between knowledge and power, the inclusiveness of PAR methods and the extent to which equitable participation is assured is bound up with considerations such as how projects are established, the way in which people participate and to what extent their voice is influential.

In Chapter 2, I suggested some of the ways opportunities for developing relationships between community and university partners were mediated. In some examples, this is through university-based teams who can ‘broker’ connections between different stakeholders. In others, connections rely on individual links between an academic and community partner, or through relationships with practitioner organisations, such as the National Health Service. I also noted that certain forms of research funding require user involvement in research and highlighted the risk that forms of participatory research are increasingly driven in a UK context by policy agendas imposed from above and thus there is the risk of co-option of participatory efforts. These then represent some of the beginnings of participatory research.

In her work on art therapy in community research settings, Kapitan (2012) reflects that ideally the development and ownership of PAR activity should happen with the community within which the issues are experienced. In her case, she was invited by community projects to incorporate art therapy within their ongoing research. In other projects, the researcher may be the one who initiates the relationship. In fact, in their work on a global survey of community-university research partnerships, Hall, Tandon & Tremblay (2015) report that only 15% of these collaborative projects were initiated by community partners. Banks, Armstrong et al (2013) also suggest that community ownership and equal partnership in projects is less common than professionally controlled projects that contain community participation. Creese & Frisby (2011) suggest that when communities initiate research there are generally fewer problems that arise in terms of language or communication, understanding of local culture and trust building.

The crucial process of establishing relationships is thus an opportunity to set clear boundaries and expectations and develop shared understandings and language about the research that people are engaging in together. This is also a way to give consideration to who can be involved in the research and how their involvement will be facilitated. As Cornwall (2008) reminds us, we cannot assume that being involved in a process is equivalent to *having* a voice or that indeed it will be heard.

Developing a shared language is one way to develop inclusion and call attention to different meanings in processes of collaborative research, particularly where

communities do not initiate research. McIntyre (2012) found that although her research with a group of young people in the USA on the effects of violence on them and their communities was initially driven by her initiation, she spent time developing opportunities for language to be challenged, changed and negotiated so the project made sense to everyone. She explains that in doing so participants also considered a number of other issues, such as non-attendance at sessions, that led to setting the parameters and rules for the project which they collectively upheld.

Cuthill (2010) suggests that there are often different levels at which people engage in projects and thus can result in people playing different roles. According to Ward & Gahagan (2012) through their collaborative research with older people, these roles were negotiated as a group and people worked at different paces. This is also representative of the reality that people will want to do different things. For example, in their experiences of setting up a resilience research forum, (Davies, Hart et al forthcoming) suggested that despite the collaborative nature of the research, some community participants and practitioners did not demonstrate interest in certain activities such as selecting speakers for forums and left these tasks up to 'the university'.

Opportunities to develop consensus on the nature of the method and research design are often affected by the time and resources required to create support for effective participation. Creese & Frisby (2011) also suggest that the time and resources available can be constrained if the researcher involved is engaged in one project amongst others. This is an important consideration in terms of the nature of commitment a researcher may have to a project. This also serves to highlight the privilege that researchers commonly experience, which includes funded time to participate. Thus barriers to participation can be attributed to practical aspects of the project such as time, access and resources, which can often be reflected in the capacity of individuals to participate. For example, if you are a volunteer and also work a 9-5 job, this would affect your ability to make research meetings, or compromise your ability to engage fully in decision making if the processes are continuing outside your participation. However, a further barrier to participation rests in adequate forms of communication and expression.

The normative rules constructed through how research is established and people involved has implications for how people's voices can be heard. A variety of methods are available to PAR researchers that seek to reflect participants' everyday experiences directly or through forms they can recognise. For example, McIntyre (2008) used photovoice - an approach to investigating phenomena in which people make use of photography to raise awareness and make change – with a group of young people as a means to make data collection a part of their everyday lives rather than a separate task. In this project, young people went into their neighborhood's with two rolls of film and the photographs they took revealed powerful images of their daily lives, which became subject to collective interpretation (ibid). Cook (2012) also discussed the value of co-designing research so that those who will be the subject of it can also choose how they want to contribute. In her work on patient and public involvement (PPI) she reports that methods chosen by the group for their research included interviews and focus groups, but also incorporated a questionnaire, photography projects, blogs, diaries and mapping processes in order to generate a range of ways in which data could be gathered and people involved. Methods that visualise or rely on other creative forms and thus don't rely on literacy, familiarity and confidence with verbal expression can also be important ways to include people and their stories in research and as such, using multiple approaches in PAR projects can contribute to a richer body of data that can be used to effect change. These can also include forms of emotional expression, which in dominant approaches to research and data analysis are normally excluded.

However, even within collaborative projects, those participating do not necessarily do so equitably. One circumstance this could relate to is 'insider' group differences. Brady, Brown & Wilson (2012) reflect on this through their project of young mothers' involvement with service user research and training through which they observed inter-group difference in terms of how young women interpreted their identity. There were tensions between people who responded to stereotypes about young mothers differently which served to, in some cases, inhibit participation in the exercise.

The dialogue implied in forms of PAR are a key element for establishing communications from which activity can be generated, roles negotiated and aspects of

co-work challenged. As a methodology, PAR necessarily prompts critical reflection, and this is often represented as a spiral, or series of iterative stages through which to develop individual and collective action (see Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005; McIntyre, 2012). This core component thus requires reflexivity, particularly on the part of the researcher. Borg et al (2012) suggests this can be personal in form, with respect to the relationships among the partners and on the research process itself. Reflexivity can also keep in view the extent to which a research project is meeting its aims of change. Ward & Gahagan (2012) note that they were aware of maintaining expectations in their collaborative research that the work might be leading to an identifiable solution and the reality that results would be emergent.

In an overarching methodological reflection on their theory and practice of action research, Kemmis & McTaggart (2005) highlight the extent to which they have previously exaggerated assumptions that the rhetoric of empowerment can help lead to changes in reality. They acknowledge that this has been a tension within collective expectations for change through such participatory research.

Ethics and Positionality

As noted above, feminist approaches to PAR in particular were based in part in rejection of existing ethical frameworks. Subsequent authors have also highlighted the inadequacy of procedural and regulatory forms of ethics, particularly as they are based in understandings of research that imagine the researcher apart from their collaborative context and assume them to be impartial and objective. As different authors have pointed out, this is inadequate for forms of collaborative research that require a conception of the researcher as embedded in the context of the research, with situated relationships and responsibilities (Banks, Armstrong et al, 2013; Boser, 2006; Barnes & Henwood, 2015; Ellis, 2007, Fisher, 2006; Riecken et al, 2004). This is also something I address I discuss in my Methodology (Chapter 5).

As Boser (2006) highlights, procedural ethics that concentrate on informed consent, confidentiality and the avoidance of harm cannot be easily applied to PAR projects, as they are by nature, emergent rather than pre-determined processes. Similarly, anonymity and confidentiality need to be negotiated and require a more collective responsibility. For example, in PAR people may wish to see themselves represented

in research by the use of their own name, which can become problematic if some do and some don't. Nicholls (2009) discusses a 'collective reflexivity' in collaborative processes, in which it becomes a collective responsibility to understand how the collaboration determines the enquiry.

Issues of ethics are also closely linked to positionality. That is, the way in which researchers can demonstrate their place connected to values and personal biographies within collaborative settings. I want to highlight two elements of this here. The first element relates to the recognition that it is a contradiction to be outside of the world you are operating in as a social researcher. This was particularly noted by Oakley in the early 1970s during her influential study on motherhood²² where she found herself in personal situations with women that the current textbooks of the time could not help her with. She found herself responding to these situations which made sense to her as a person, rather than through subscribing rigidly to dominant thinking of the time that researchers should be objective. This informs the second element, which is how a researcher can demonstrate or make visible their particular ethical, ideological or political position within research, and how that may account both for their motivation and affect their relationship to an issue. For example, Banks, Armstrong et al (2013) suggest in their literature review of CBPR, practitioners of it are usually researchers with a strong value commitment to social justice.

Thus positionality is a fundamental way that researchers can address power. In doing so, a researcher might also begin to consider how their acts are intertwined in practices that connect them to the situations they are in. Researchers can also take positions with respect to the subject matter, their values and how that relates to the status and quality of relationships they develop. Emotions are an intrinsic part of this consideration and they have a role to play in collaborative research. McIntyre (2008) for example identifies humour as significant both to how people worked with each other and to her too. Finding personal connections through something like humour, or by being clear about positionality and identifying connections this way has also been described as leading to friendship (see for example, Horowitz et al, 2009; Koster et al, 2012; McIntyre, 2008).

²² See Oakley (1979)

Kemmis & McTaggart (2005: 284) suggest that activity within PAR must be part of a social process of transformation ‘of selves as well as situation’. For example, Gaventa & Bivens (2014) empirically observed that researchers using PAR became more aware of social justice issues through their involvement in global projects as part of the Development Research Centre on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability (Citizenship DRC) at the Institute of Development Studies, UK and this also raised awareness, or built upon, existing moral or political aspects of their positionalities. Similarly, McIntyre (2008) says she came to realise her own capacity to create change as part of two projects in different locations that dealt with themes of violence in communities.

Leach et al (2005) suggest that by viewing interactions relationally, such as through forms of PAR, rather than through binary definitions, it may be possible to embrace a more fluid, decentred and experience based notion of expertise. Such an abandonment of historical ‘archaeology’ (see Foucault, 1969) which this would engender can have significant consequences for how to approach, understand and give rise to new discourses of research, knowledge and participation that may be incubated within community-university arrangements. In her work on recognition-redistribution in social justice, Fraser (1997) argues that the transformative aim of justice is not to ‘solidify’ an identity but to deconstruct the dichotomy concerned so as to destabilise fixed identities. This would further help connect these practices to the social processes and struggles for justice they are connected to.

Community-University Engagement

Participatory research in the context of community-university engagement is increasingly referred to as Community Based Research (CBR) or Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR), which are particularly common in the North American context. Etmanski (2014, cited in Bivens et al, 2015: 12) has developed a table of terminology and traditions associated with CBR, which identifies 29 separate but interlinked ideas demonstrating the breadth of language and emphasis in this area, but also reflecting the alignment of these ideas to the broader principles of PAR discussed above.

CBR and CBPR are delineated by the idea that CBR involves research done by community groups with or without the involvement of a university (Strand 2003), whereas CBPR is defined as a partnership approach to research that involves community and social actors in all aspects of the research process and share decision making and ownership (See Israel, Schulz et al, 1998). CBR in particular emphasises the democratisation of knowledge (Strand, 2003: 5) through the validation of multiple sources of knowledge, and CBPR recognises this as all partners to research contributing their expertise. Both are committed to knowledge production connected to forms of action. In the UK, whilst these terms are in use, 'community-university partnership' is more commonly used to make reference to co-production of research. Accepted good practice for forms of engagement of this nature are commonly represented in 'how to' guides or included in academic publications (see for example: Hart, Maddison & Wolff, 2007; Hall & Tandon, 2015; Suarez-Balcazar, 2008; Wright et al, 2011). These give primacy to characteristics of cultivating trust, seeking mutual benefit, establishing shared language and addressing inequities in knowledge production.

Whether community partners agree on this good practice is another matter. There is a relative absence of community partner voices in literature on engagement at the meta-level of theorising participation and engagement, though there are a few exceptions (UKCPN, n.d; Banks, Armstrong et al, (2013, 14); Brown & Strega (2005); Hart, Maddison & Wolff, 2007). Banks, Armstrong et al (2013) suggest that in the UK, community-based groups and organisations see the value in conducting research themselves, or in partnership with others, in order to gain evidence to satisfy funders, influence policy and practice and develop new skills, knowledge and confidence. Weerts (2005: 222) has also reflected this in an example from the USA, but also suggests that common issues for community actors in partnership engagement include worries that their agendas or capacity will be co-opted, and back in the UK Duggan & Kagan (2007) report cynicism about the intentions of universities from their work with people and regeneration.

Whilst PAR can be an instrumental practice, a range of other forms of engagement can also support individuals and social groups to reflect their knowledge and mobilise their desires (following Vio Grossi cited in McIntyre, 2008). Epstein (1996) for

example, considered the ways in which social movements²³ in particular might engage with science, which can take the form of collaboration or contestation. He lists these as (a) disputing scientific claims; (b) seeking to acquire a cachet of scientific authority for a political claim by finding a scientific expert to validate their political stance; (c) rejecting the scientific way of knowing and advancing their claims to expertise from some wholly different epistemological standpoint, and (d) attempting to ‘stake out some ground on the scientists’ own terrain’ by questioning ‘not just the uses of science, not just the control over science, but sometimes even the very contents of science and the processes by which it is produced’ (Epstein 1996: 12–13). On this last point, Barnes & Cotterell (2012) have discussed the significance attached by the disability movement to control over research. They highlight how some disability activists have argued against non-disabled people carrying out research on disability issues. They note that these views are located in emancipatory ideas of research that directly illuminate oppressive structural factors.

With respect to community and social actors’ engagement with community-university activity, practices are not uniform and as I noted in Chapter 2, actors can be constructed differently, from passive recipients to more active co-producers of knowledge. In the following section I consider how these practices have a role to play in helping people define their interests, build capacity and mobilise their enquiries through different forms of engagement. These examples fall into two categories, which relate to knowledge mobilisation and research activities. I indicate how in both cases knowledge is considered valuable to meeting a group interest or need and from which participants may derive some benefit, but I only consider the latter category to adequately connect community-university engagement with social justice.

The first of these categories relates to access to information, data or skills which may benefit a group’s activities. These are what Leach et al (2005) would see as people’s passive engagement with knowledge, or participation in spaces that are orchestrated

²³ The relationship between social movements and ideas of knowledge, power and participation are a subject in their own right, although they are not the subject of my thesis. They are important here because such activity, for example with respect to feminism, has led to actionable outcomes, such as opportunities for women to take part in policy making. This is not without critique. The official adoption of feminist agendas through public policy could be argued to undermine the radical challenge the movement is grown from.

by an institution. Examples of this include public lectures, research trials and consultation on technological innovations. However, this could also take the form of an environmental campaigning group making a request for, or accessing through open access routes, a set of data on greenhouse gas emissions for example, that would inform their position on the issues. Another example relates to forms of 'citizen science': the involvement of 'non-scientists' in scientific investigations through projects in which a range of individuals gather data for use by scientists to investigate research questions of importance (Trumbull et al, 2000). The agenda of public engagement with science in the UK also represents examples of activity that would come under these descriptions.

The extent to which these activities can be connected to engagement for social justice is unresolved. However, from the perspective of cognitive justice, which recognises knowledge production as a site of struggle for social justice, these arrangements continue to marginalise people and their ways of knowing. Such activity, whilst communities may derive some tangible benefits, does little towards transformative remedies (following Fraser, 1997) that forms of justice could be based on.

The other aspect of community-university engagement I consider here is where engagement can have a role in supporting deliberations that help individual participants clarify their interests through research and developing knowledge. These are thus consistent with understandings of community and social actors as sources of knowledge about what works in their communities and social groups and where they seek to make change to identified issues through the process of collaboration.

I use the Count Me In Too project (Browne, 2007; Count Me In Too Action Group, 2007) to illustrate an example that was initiated by community partners. This was a collaborative research project between the Lesbian Gay Bisexual or Transgender (LGBT) community in an area of the South East and university researchers that gathered evidence on LGBT lives to inform public service delivery. This project developed from a previous piece of community-led research, from which partners designed, carried out and analysed further research into core strands of relevance including Domestic Violence & Abuse, Community Safety and General Health. This activity led to a community research desk between 2009-10 to make data and research

on LGBT lives available. The data thus became available to others to draw on and for research group members themselves through public meetings and other fora to engage in deliberations with agencies like the health service and police in order to advocate changes to services.

In some disciplines, such as health and social care, funders including the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) require researchers to demonstrate how they have involved people in defining the issue and developing research proposals – and in how they will carry out and disseminate the research. User involvement in research is a field of theory and practice in its own right. It is, however, an illustration of the co-production of knowledge within community-university engagement that is linked to, and responds to, an increasing opportunity for user involvement in the design and deliberation of services and policies in the democratic sphere.

For example, Duffy & McKeever (2012) discuss changes to policy and practice that resulted from collaborative research between service users and academics to consider how large health and social care organisations could meaningfully engage with service users and carers. They suggest that the service user and carer views developed through the research helped shape recommendations that went on to be embodied in action plans for the organisations they targeted. This ability to link collaborative research activity to processes within which participants are engaged with public deliberations thus suggests an implicit connection to actors' experiences of public participation.

Public Participation

In Chapter 3, I noted that knowledge or research can be conceived as resources to be mobilised to influence public debates (Gaventa & Cornwall, 2008). In the UK in particular, there are increasing opportunities for citizens to engage with science in the context of deliberative policy making.

One of the characteristics of late 20th century political life in the UK has also been the opening up of policy making communities that have been subject to a broad range of theoretical and empirical attention. Barnes et al (2007) in introducing their book on Power, Participation and Political Renewal, set out this landscape by suggesting that

public participation 'is viewed as capable of improving the quality and legitimacy of decisions in government' (p1). Such participation has been accompanied by an explosion of participative forums (Barnes et al, *ibid*) that have taken the form of expert panels, consultations, online engagement and shared governance. Examples of these fora exist in health and social care (Rowe & Shepherd, 2002; Rutter et al, 2004), justice (Smith & Wales, 2000), energy and environment (Devine-Wright, 2005; Eden, 1996; Fischer, 2000) and community development (Banks & Shenton, 2001; Billis, 2010; Gilchrist, 2003; Taylor, 2007). This has also been the case in the development literature as scholars grapple with questions about how to involve citizens in decision and policy making in a development context (See Hickey and Mohan 2005 for a good overview). It has also been accompanied by the prevalence of a partnership ethos (Barnes, 1999; Taylor, 2000; Deakin & Taylor, 2001) in the identification and resolution of policy problems (Sullivan & Skelcher, 2002). According to Giddens (1998) this represents a way of citizens exercising their responsibility, as a way of offering choice and responsiveness in public services, and as a way of fostering community renewal and development.

However, as Barnes et al, (2007) suggest, a considerable issue for realising this ambition is the extent to which public bodies can commit to addressing institutional inertia and the power relationship between themselves and public participants. McKinley & Yiannoullou (2012) identified limits in the degree to which mental health service users involved in training design could influence decisions about the overall programme. This was despite the health service involved advertising their model of participation as based on Arnstein's (1969) ladder of participation. They suggest there were insufficient skills or knowledge in the health service to maximise user involvement, and recognise existing experiences that could have addressed issues of power more explicitly. In another example from their literature review of Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) in health services, Staniszewska et al (2012) suggest that whilst a range of impacts had been evidenced, lay members of PPI boards did not rate their influence on key decision-making boards highly.

Barnes & Cotterell (2012) note how the rise in the greater involvement of service users in policy making has resulted in service users also seeking greater involvement in research that affects their lives. They suggest that such research is now a

significant site of achieving change, such as that suggested by Duffy & McKeever's (2012) example above.

An increase in participation with institutions has also demonstrated new tensions and dilemmas for voluntary organisations, social movements and other civil society groups seeking to engage with the state in relation to public policy and service delivery (Barnes et al, 2007, Deakin & Taylor, 2001; Lowends & Sullivan, 2004; Taylor, 2000). They have become more present in a landscape in which the lines between the state and voluntary and community sector are becoming increasingly blurred, particularly with respect to the delivery of public services. Changing relationships with the state have drawn community organisations into new, often uncomfortable, organisational arrangements, affecting their work and their roles in relation to service users and community stakeholders (Milbourne, 2009). For example, Deakin & Taylor (2001: 5) observe that new roles have emerged including 'becoming competitors in the welfare market, on the one hand or taking on a watchdog role on the other, providing advocacy for individual citizens and mounting collective campaigns'. This is of relevance to my enquiry as it demonstrates something of the context that most community and social actors engaging with universities will be situated within, and how they understand their relationship with the state. This perspective is also relevant as it can affect how such organisations understand their relationships with universities.

I suggest that aspects of community-university engagement, PAR and public participation overlap with respect to tensions, benefits and challenges common to 'participation'. Each must contend with structural relationships of power that can impact how people work and pursue knowledge together, and how the construction and mobilisation of actors within participative spaces can impact the extent to which real change can occur. There is also a risk that attention to power can be subsumed or ignored by the rise in more cooperative relationships that indicate new ways of doing things.

In her theoretical work in relation to the democratic polity, Mouffe (2005) argues that instead of trying to erase the traces of power and exclusion, forms of participation require us instead to make them visible so they can enter the terrain of contestation.

As Gaventa (2009: 26) suggests we need to ask of participative opportunities 'how they were created, and with whose interest and what terms of engagement' in order to keep an eye on power. This also reflects the reality that many alleged participative spaces may offer 'choice' on decision-making, but not necessarily 'choice' on the decisions available. Further to this, Fischer (2000:18) suggests that scenarios that involve technical vs everyday language, such as in environmental planning, tend to give shape to an unequal communicative relationship, which also makes it more difficult for citizens to influence decisions in these instances.

Communicative Norms & Dialogue

From the perspective of social justice, the way people participate and how power is illuminated and addressed also relates to the extent to which people can communicate and as with Fischer's example above, be heard with respect to this. The theory of cognitive justice would suggest that the conditions of participation and cognitive representation need to be satisfied in order for social justice to be possible.

The example Young (2000) gives of a wheelchair user making a claim to physical changes to City streets that allow them greater mobility is a useful starting point here. She argues that without appropriate opportunities to share their experiences, through modes of communication, which make sense to them (e.g. storytelling), decision making processes that do not legitimate or recognise this as a valid representation will not accommodate this information. We can view this both by exploring how different modes of communication might enable and support people's access to, and involvement in, certain activities with respect to knowledge. What these suggest for participation in community-university activities is the necessity for attention to people's individual context and the ways in which that influences their participation. Particularly with respect to knowledge, the ways in which people will participate should also adequately reflect their ability to have a voice, and use it to articulate their needs, interests, questions and solutions to issues of social justice. It should enable them to demonstrate what they know. Normative rules about 'knowledge spaces' as discussed in Chapter 3 have historically rested on forms of expression that are validated by rationality and reason, and sit implicitly within a hierarchy of value. This raises questions as to how people and their diverse forms of knowledge,

explicitly drawing from other perspectives, values and epistemologies, can be included in such processes.

The idea of deliberative democracy is one of the ways in which greatest attention has been paid to not just encouraging people to be active in participatory democracy but to better involve people in the complex issues involved in policy making. It also aims to enable ‘ordinary citizens’ to engage in dialogue with the issues [that affect them] and the decision makers in a democratic and policy context (Barnes et al, 2007). Given this dual attention to participation and knowledge, deliberative democracy offers a valuable approach to exploring community-university engagement, where knowledge is central. I am suggesting there are potential parallels between deliberative democracy as inclusive decision-making and theories of knowledge co-production that promote collective problem solving with the issue of how voices are strengthened and legitimated – who is ‘in’ and ‘outside’ the debate – and the rationality within which that debate is constructed. I explore these issues further below.

Deliberation

Barnes et al (2006) recognise the value of deliberative democracy in distinguishing the potential of dialogic processes from representative democracy (that seeks to assess public views through the aggregation of preferences). In recent years, proponents of ‘deliberative democracy’ have argued that it can be considered to offer a set of normative ideals which contain inclusion and equality (Young, 2000), thus providing potential for fora that may take account of individual ‘capabilities’ (see Nussbaum, 2006) or challenge existing norms of privilege. And therefore the reflexive aspect of these practices is critical, as evidence of democracy itself is now widely taken to be deliberation, over for example aggregative or representative forms (Dryzek, 2000).

Normative characteristics have been developed and added to by various authors. Alongside Young’s ideas of inclusion and equality noted above, Dryzek & Neimeyer (2012) also emphasise the right, opportunity and capacity of anyone who is subject to a collective decision to participate. Similarly, Dryzek (2000: 8) uses the idea of authenticity, through which he means people should communicate in a non-coercive manner. Cohen (1997) also argues that ideal deliberation includes being free from

authority or any prior norms or requirements. He suggests that such unequal power would be obtained through something like economic wealth or the support of interest groups. Dryzek (2000: 162) thinks that authenticity requires contestation rather than acceptance of prevailing understandings and institutions and authenticity must influence collaborative outcomes. Young (2000) also suggests the ideal of 'reasonableness' as a way to describe that through deliberation one must be open to dissent and hearing that ideas are inappropriate or incorrect. Gutmann & Thompson (2004) also add the ideal that deliberations should be accessible, by which they mean the act itself must be a collective, rather than individual or private endeavour, and the reasons for discussion and solutions must be understandable to relevant audiences. Finally, Gutmann & Thompson (ibid) also mention the principle that deliberations must be 'binding'. This relates technically to the outcome that the process must lead to a 'decision or law' that is enforced for some period of time. But also more generally to signify that participants must commit to the process and intend that discussions will make a difference, rather than deliberation just for the sake of deliberation or for individual enlightenment. These ideals provide a backdrop to some of the ideas that community-university collaborations could engage with as they also seek to grapple with issues of participation that relate to inclusion and equality, and in particular authenticity given the context for existing inequities with respect to knowledge and power.

Fraser (1997) argues that the discursive relations among differentially empowered publics, so critical to the dialogic forms of interaction and knowledge 'conversation' discussed above, are as likely to take the form of contestation as that of deliberation. This signals a further significant aspect of deliberative approaches – and that is the way in which people communicate with each other within such fora. Some of the above has implied contestation – however my discussion of community-university activity in this chapter largely implies cooperative forms of engagement. However, the literature in this field has little to say about 'voice' or forms of communication and does not suggest that these spaces might be spaces for conflict.

What is considered an ideal form of communication is contested. Some proponents argue that rational and reasoned debate 'among equals' is required (Fishkin, 1991) - and such dimensions also govern dominant forms of epistemic production in

universities. Yet Young (2000) has argued that reason is usually seen as neutral and dispassionate and will therefore exclude many people. Critical analysts of deliberation have suggested that Fishkin's ideal cannot be achieved because it is not possible to assume that power relations can be excluded from deliberative processes (see Barnes et al, 2007). I again return to Cornwall's truism therefore that voice alone in terms of participation is not enough – and indeed Visvanathan (2007) who originated the concept of cognitive justice would agree. Dryzek & Niemeyer (2012) suggest deliberative practices should allow any kind of communication – stories, humorous gossip, rhetoric. Mouffe (1999) would also suggest that deliberation enables the introduction of questions of morality and justice into politics. Dryzek & Niemeyer (2012) then argue that this requires the listener to have an open mind, and a willingness to engage with alternative positions. Barnes (2008a) has also discussed the significance of storytelling in the process of policy making, and what these explorations point to is the incorporation of a range of communicative expressions in terms of how people engage with and deliberate on issues. Following Young (2000), including emotional expressions in deliberation can also be a way in which local, experiential or lay knowledges can be contributed to processes of democratic engagement. Barnes (2008b) has also argued that emotional expressions emphasise the significance of the issues that are the substance of debate, and so finding processes that adequately recognise people and their contributions to processes – in this case of democratic engagement – is important. This is also important with respect to collaborative research, as PAR approaches must also contend with everyday practices and expressions in order to adequately represent and interpret people's reality.

The final noteworthy connection I want to make between deliberative approaches and processes of collaborative 'research' is in considering what is produced from such efforts; in relation to community-university engagement, how this can relate to diverse ways of knowing. Parkinson (2006) has suggested that deliberative practices can tackle questions neither purely in theory nor practice – but a combination of the two – and Cooke (2000) explores how deliberation can contribute constructively to the epistemic quality of an outcome. The practices of engagement that may draw on the methodology and characteristics outlined earlier in the chapter may then reflect both elements of the combination suggested by Parkinson (2006). These are further

helpful perspectives for thinking about not just participation but epistemology in collaborative work.

Community-University Engagement as Democratic Engagement

The final section of this chapter suggests some possible ways to view the parallels suggested above between forms of community-university and public participation with respect to deliberations in research and policy making. Various authors have now identified intersections between community-university activity and democratic engagement (Cuthill, 2010; Gaventa & Bivens, 2014; Leach & Scoones, 2005; Visvanathan, 1997) suggesting that activity of this type is connected to democratic processes. However, Fischer (2003: 202) identifies an inherent tension between democracy, standing for open discussion on the part of all citizens, and science that has always been the domain of the knowledge elite. I would suggest that both the indications of this chapter and that of Chapter 3 can contest this analysis. In this chapter I have shown how the rhetoric of public participation as a means of democratic engagement remains subject to discourses and dynamics of power that have implications for equality and inclusion. In Chapter 3, I also suggested how the concept of cognitive justice could incorporate compatible understandings of social justice and epistemic plurality in knowledge production. I have built on these ideas through a discussion on the intersection of knowledge and participation.

Following this still theoretical proposition, the idea of ‘spaces for change’ has particular resonance here. Following work in development studies (e.g. Cornwall and Coehlo, 2007; Gaventa, 2006b) this relates to areas of activity that are characterised by democratic, participative or inclusive principles where people are working towards a common goal, in particular where the space to achieve these goals might not have existed before.

In Chapter 2 I established that for the purposes of my thesis, I am conceptualising participation as being between academics and community and social actors. Two further terms I introduced in Chapter 2 were civil society and public sphere. Following Evers (2010) I understand the community organisations involved in my study as part of civil society. Most associated with social action and social values,

civil society is theorised as separate from the state and associated with activity that responds to ‘failure’ in the private or public sectors (ibid; Edwards, 2009; Salamon and Anheir, 1992; Young, 2000). Young (2000: 186) considers it to represent voluntary association, decentralisation and ‘freedom to start new and unusual things’. Civil society organisations constitute part of the public sphere in which political participation can be enacted through talk (Fraser, 1990) and public opinion can be formed (Asen, 1999), in relation to the state and the needs of society. Young (2000: p173) cites the public sphere as one continuous space that is a site of struggle, the ‘primary connector between people and power’.

I draw on these as working concepts that give a context to the activity of actors engaging with universities, and to outline potential connections between activity in community-university spaces and these ideas. My specific interest (following Dryzek, 2000) is to concentrate on those parts of civil society that constitute the public sphere whose basic orientation is determined at least in part by state activities, or increasing opportunities to get involved in influencing them, such as those represented by deliberative policy making or user involvement discussed above. Thus, I imagine a thread between community-university engagement, civil society, the public sphere and the state in terms of how and where different people might define issues and interests, and mobilise for social and political change through democratic engagement. Dryzek (ibid: 162) also considers that forms of deliberation require engagement across discourses (such of civil society and public sphere), which he suggests is possible. In this way, in line with Foucault’s perspective that discourses are neither fixed nor uncontested, changes in arrangements are also a possibility. From a methodological perspective as I noted above, Kemmis & McTaggart (2005: 284) suggest that activity within PAR must be part of a social process of transformation of selves as well as situations. They thus consider the role of collective action through such methods and how it might be conceptualised in formulating the ‘action’ element of the project and its engagement with the public sphere. The collective formed by a PAR research project can be imagined as an open space constituted to create communicative action and public discourse aimed at addressing problems.

To be clear, there is insufficient theoretical or empirical literature to make any firm claims. However, Young (2000) suggests that the deliberative model responds to the ability of individuals and groups to promote and protect their interests in politics and policy and also identifies its use in solving collective problems. I am therefore suggesting that the university could have a role in supporting community and social actors to respond to these collective problems by defining their interests through forms of engagement. An explicit focus on change-orientated knowledge (see Hart et al, 2007: 5), which may be an outcome of community-university interaction, carries political implications and helps connect the potential of community-university space to broader policy agendas and how publics can respond to them. In addressing the knowledge debate with a focus on co-production in community-university interactions, there is also a new opportunity to observe and understand how change-orientated knowledge may be produced in arenas that are not explicitly bounded by binary understandings of 'scientific' and 'other' knowledge. It is possible that in this way, the aspirations of university engagement can be met through becoming part of a local resource base for communities through the deliberate cultivation of interactions in such a landscape to bring a dimension to supporting communities and social change that others do not.

Conclusion

This chapter has considered how a group of practices under the umbrella of PAR are orientated to address issues of power and positionality in forms of collaborative research. I have highlighted some of the factors bearing on the extent to which such ambitions can be realised, including how research is initiated. I have also drawn attention to the importance of reflexivity, positionality and ethics.

I have explored how community-university engagement can function to both mobilise and co-produce knowledge that is of value for community and social actors. In particular, I note that action oriented forms of research have a role to play in supporting people to define their interests and knowledge that can contribute to issues of social justice. In doing so, I have also suggested the overlap between involvement in forms of research and how that can be used to make an impact on policy, or in public deliberations. To further explore this I outlined the theory of deliberative

democracy noting its use as it draws attention to communication and dialogue – key components, as I interpret it, of cognitive justice in practice. I concluded by theorising this overlap further to suggest connections between people’s participation within community-university activities and how these can be useful to mobilising these interests in a democratic context.

This exploration completes my background chapters where I have introduced the significant theoretical themes to my thesis. These were the relationship between universities and community and social actors, knowledge, social and cognitive justice, and the intersection of knowledge, power and participation. The next chapter introduces my methodology and the thesis develops my empirical data from there.

Chapter 5

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter develops the methodological approach to my research enquiry and how it guided my data collection, analysis and development of theory. I begin by introducing my research questions, epistemological and methodological position. I then expand on this to develop a more detailed discussion of the key implications of this positioning and an exploration of the case study as a method. I go on to outline my method choices further and describe my fieldwork. The final section of this chapter discusses my approach to analysis of this data and interpretation in my findings.

Research Enquiry

The aim of my research is to explore what happens when community and university partners collaborate over topics of shared interest and how in these encounters different ways of knowing are understood, shared and used. This enquiry is framed within the potential for forms of community-university activity to make contributions to issues of social justice, and an exploration of whose knowledge counts within this. This has led to the following research questions:

1. What evidence is there that community-university collaborations have explicit objectives that focus on social change?
 - a. Is there evidence that even in the absence of these explicit objectives, the collaborations have the potential to generate social change goals?
2. Why do community and social actors decide to collaborate with universities?
 - a. How do people understand the activities they engage in?
 - b. Are the norms of these relationships the same across different places?
3. How can the concept of cognitive justice be understood through this collaborative activity?
 - a. In what ways is knowledge used, negotiated and re-defined in these collaborations?
 - b. Do new knowledges emerge?

My research is located within my own moral and ethical sensibilities, informed by applied experience and an increasing body of literature and research on participatory and community based research which promotes and considers inclusive methods of identifying the research topic and equitable participation in its address (see for example: Armstrong & Banks, 2011; Boser, 2006; Chiu, 2006; Harding, 1987; Savan & Sider, 2003). Such approaches were introduced in Chapter 4 and can be loosely grouped under the heading of Participatory Action Research, or ‘PAR’. A summary of these approaches relevant to my enquiry is as follows:

- The deliberate prioritisation of community participants’ perspectives on the process in which they are engaged;
- The recognition of the moral and political dimension of research;
- The recognition of the need for social change to improve the lives of publics who engage with elite civic institutions.

In addition, feminist thought orientates me broadly to Harding’s argument that ‘politically value-laden research processes’ produce more complete and less distorted social analyses (1987: 182). Feminism contests science’s claims of neutrality and objectivity and emphasises the importance of social relations in general and gender relations in particular (Letherby, 2003: 20). As such, many voices and different ways of knowing can arise and form ‘collective knowledge’ (Cotterell & Morris, 2012). Maynard (1994) suggests that feminist research is also often concerned with changing people’s situation rather than simply understanding it, and thus makes a connection to AR approaches as outlined above. Although my research is not explicitly gendered, nor do I follow a specific PAR method (which I address further below), I take a lead from this positioning and use these ideas in relation to my study. In particular, feminist thought orientates my analysis to come to grips with the cultural specificity of experience, and thus with the medium through which Stanley and Wise (2002) argue all experience is channelled—the body/mind/emotions (p193). I take direction from Bourdieu’s position that the subject-object dichotomy favoured by rationalism is false (see Swartz, 1997). This alerts me not just to the question of what is true but the view of feminist theory in how we might instead treat binary dichotomies, not as

oppositions but rather as ‘co-operative endeavours for constructing selves... through collective relational systems of action and interaction’ (Stanley and Wise, 2002: 195).

Broadly interpretivist, my research approach is premised on respecting the differences between people and objects and requires me as a researcher to investigate and understand the subjective meaning of the social action/phenomena under study. Ontologically, I take a constructivist position – accepting that not only are phenomena produced through social interaction but also that they are in a constant state of revision. However, within this ontology I would also highlight that accepting the availability of a pre-constituted world of phenomena for investigation is problematic and understand my research practice as examining the processes by which the social world is constructed (Burr, 2003). This perspective therefore is both the substance of my research approach, but also informed my research design and choice of methods.

Critical Realism (CR) offers a further perspective on ‘truth’, which has resonance here. As a philosophical discourse on modernity, CR is positioned to reject historical debates and experiences of positivist science and develops an understanding of social science that is necessarily ‘explanatory critical’ and is explicitly emancipatory in stance. In doing so, it seeks to unlabour science and other ways of knowing to promote truth and freedom, which therefore may lead to transformation of social structures and emancipation. Whilst a bold aim, such a characterisation develops dialectical processes and opens up the possibilities for ontological understanding that encourages, in its truest form, a critical realist to ‘start with the framework that seems most appropriate to her object and follow the logic of discovery wherever it takes her’ (Hartwig, 2007: 100).

Not unproblematic or uncontested, this expands my broadly constructivist approach to take an explicit position to ontology that include ‘emotionality’ and interpretations of this relating to care, love and respect as inscribed as culture and amenable to ‘rational’ analysis. It also alerts me to the possibility of transitional epistemology, emancipatory ideas of the work of social science and a reminder that in the pursuit of my analysis ‘no upshot is guaranteed’ (Billig, 2001).

From this background, I chose to use case studies to explore my research questions. The case study is a specific form of enquiry that allowed me to consider a unit of activity embedded in the real world, a specific community-university relationship from two fieldwork sites in Canada²⁴ and the UK²⁵. Flick (2009: 134) suggests that case studies can capture the process under study in a ‘very detailed and exact way’ that maintains a focus on context and thus are ideal for in-depth ‘holistic’ investigations (Sjoberg, Williams et al, 1991). The implications of choosing the case study for this research and the positions above are discussed further in the sections that follow.

Methodology

The topic and focus of my enquiry can be broken down into three main conceptual areas that form the framework for my research. These are:

- The **activity** of community-university engagement as it relates to social justice (following Escrigas et al, 2009)
- the legitimacy, use and development of **knowledge** – cognitive justice (following Visvanathan, 1997, 1999)
- and the **participative norms** that knowledge is produced within – deliberative characteristics (following Dryzek, 2000; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Young, 2000)

The links between knowledge, participation and power are therefore fundamental to my methodology. PAR approaches are intended to reduce the negative impact of power imbalances in the research process. They can also encompass methods that avoid de-contextualisation of participants and their experience. In contrast, methodological positions favoured by more traditional scientific paradigms have a tendency to treat the individual [participant] as a separate entity devoid of social context (Bryman, 2004). This is problematic for a number of reasons. The values of research promoted by a ‘science’ derived from this traditional paradigm have already been discussed in Chapter 3, but in brief have been argued by some to present Western science as superior (Gross and Levitt 1994; Koertge 1998; Nanda 2003),

²⁴ This is referred to as Island Place in my thesis.

²⁵ This is referred to as River Place in my thesis.

characterising and promoting knowledge that is at once objective, neutral, not situated, timeless and true. Delvaux & Schoenaers (2012) argue that it is such understandings of scientific knowledge that are seen as an especially valid representation of the world, leaving little room for alternative or other views and perspectives. The traditional empiricism that these dominant ideas gives rise to does not direct researchers to locate themselves in the same critical plane as their subject matters (Harding, 1987: 184) and so it is hard to see how the relationship between the two groups can take account of social dimensions without a transformation in epistemological understanding.

In addition, scholars from the Global South have also expanded on much of this thinking, particularly in relation to 'non-Western' ways of knowing. In this literature, the 'monoculture' of scientific knowledge is understood as incomplete (Santos, 2006), giving rise to different perspectives on what knowledge is needed, by and for whom in pursuing social and community change (see for example, Appadurai, 2000; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; Visvanathan, 1999, 2007).

From a social science perspective, Lincoln & Guba (2000) contest the idea that we can produce knowledge free of time and context. Chiu (2006: 188) furthers this in asserting that it is 'intellectually unsatisfying to hear voices without knowing how they were generated and encouraged in dialogues, how they were previously disrupted and silenced, and how they reveal multiple identities and social locations, thus leading to the unsettling of existing power relations'. Swartz (1997), in his work on the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu, suggests that concepts that are developed in abstract from the social world become reified with a kind of symbolic power they do not deserve. Such symbolic power enables the creation of dominant narratives on truth, validity, rigour and legitimacy not just in terms of what research might be done, but also how and by whom. Claims to knowledge and truth are critical issues. They lie at the heart of discussions of identity, power and change (Burr, 2003) and discourses that are intimately connected to institutional and social practices that have a profound effect on our lives (ibid). Therefore, who should influence such agendas and how becomes central and important in exploring the diversity of actors and sources of knowing implied in community-university relationships.

An approach characterised by PAR provides perspectives on challenging dominant narratives, demonstrated in practices of engaging those whose lives are impacted by the research issue directly into the research process (Boser, 2006). Through forms of community-university activity community based voices and knowledges that have been historically subject to shifting or patterned asymmetries in power relations (Hayward, 1998) and epistemologies are now increasingly challenged. With the boundaries of the traditional scientific paradigm being increasingly questioned and contested it is becoming necessary to find ways to develop new forms of collective approaches to solving social issues that include a range of perspectives, discourses and goals.

The idea of cognitive justice, describing a necessity for different types of knowledge to carry equal weight to one another and exist in dialogue, rather than competition or dominance, over one another has resonance here. Introduced in Chapter 3, this idea draws on issues of knowledge, power, legitimacy and politics and encompasses much of how I am conceptualising a wide range of people and perspectives being engaged in knowledge generation linked to social change outcomes. From the field of development studies, Visvanathan (2007) argues that a ‘people’s epistemology’ is as central as people’s participation in any discourse on democracy. In other words, where science determines people’s life chances, as with supporters of democratic equality, those people who are affected by the outcomes should have a say in the process of science or knowledge making. Visvanathan goes further to suggest that epistemology is politics (2005).

If we see changing relationships between community and university (part policy, part moral, part epistemologically driven) as a form of transition and accept that post-positivist epistemologies and ‘science’ are frequently in tension, we can argue for a transitional epistemology (Harding, 1987) or arrangements that can follow this line of debate. The notion of transition can imply that a logical endpoint will see a change in the established order and this could risk hegemony of a different type. However, binary distinctions are too simplistic for community-university relationships and here, cognitive justice offers me another way to look at this as the emphasis is on dialogue along a continuum rather than an either/or position. Chiu (2006) claims that despite using participatory methods, some researchers still have not presented the exact

mechanisms or process that lead to gaining new knowledge. By starting research from an alternative position, by using PAR we can arrive at empirically and theoretically more adequate descriptions and explanations, or at least those that are less partial and distorting (Harding, 1991). By surfacing this epistemological challenge and connecting explicitly to cognitive justice I am looking at power through practice (Foucault, 1969) and the bearing this has on the legitimacy, development and use of knowledge in these spaces.

Political scientist Iris Marion Young (2000) highlights problem solving along with promoting cooperation and furthering social justice as purposes to the value of democracy. Boser (2006) considers the mechanism of action research to be grounded in democratic norms. Exploring whether interactions between university and community may reflect deliberative arrangements is one way of thinking about science, knowledge and engagement between different perspectives. Participation as change making has become increasingly present in mainstream democratic discourses, policies and investments (that are financial, structural and cultural), and, around the world, forms and meanings of democratic participation are under contestation (Gaventa, 2006a). Participative spaces that contain deliberative characteristics e.g. accessible, based on reasoned discussion, dynamic (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004); critical in their orientation to established power structures (Dryzek, 2000) have emerged. It is within this context that I situate my enquiry and see these orientations as an opportunity to move beyond traditions in democratic practice and knowledge production in which the boundaries are historically and conceptually marked out.

Reflective Practice

My enquiry contains an understanding of how the knowledge produced within the traditional scientific paradigm is a function of a power imbalance between researchers and the objects of their study (Burr, 2003). As such, reflection on the place of participatory processes, analysis of power dynamics and researcher reflexivity are all of primary importance across my study. I now turn to address these elements further in relation to my methodology.

In my research I draw explicitly on participatory methodology, however my enquiry

was not the result of community partners indicating they wanted it done, nor was it conducted in a participatory manner that closely followed PAR principles. These seemingly paradoxical positions can be better understood through the following explanations. One of the primary factors determining my choice of method was conducting research outside of my networks in my 'home' location built up over almost a decade. This decision was mainly driven by the need to avoid potential conflicts of interest between my professional position at the University of Brighton in the Community University Partnership Programme (Cupp) (see below) and my PhD research. Cupp holds a large number of contacts and relationships, some of which I am personally responsible for that would be likely candidates for case studies in my research. It was also the case that as I was pursuing my PhD outside of my professional role, issues of emphasis and the type of enquiry I wanted to pursue may not have been compatible for Cupp. I wanted to pursue my research as freely as possible. This defining choice meant that I would be new to fieldwork settings and the actors in them. This factor, plus the limited amount of time I had in each setting (four weeks in Canada and two fortnightly visits in the UK, one year apart) had a real bearing on my ability to enact PAR principles. For example, this was insufficient time to build up trusted relationships and in depth knowledge of the issues important to people. In addition to this reality, in line with my interest in cognitive justice, I was purposefully seeking examples of collaboration that included Indigenous voices and my only access to such a context was geographically outside of the UK. Thus much of this decision-making was predicated on what would make good research for the PhD. This has led to an on-going tension between my epistemological position, which gives rise to methods which challenge or move away from more dominant ways of knowing, and the imperative to satisfy a traditionally academic award such as the PhD. As Sandra Harding (1991: 40) suggests - 'what gets to count as a problem is linked with the purposes for which research is done', which is a useful summary of the situation with respect to my research.

However, it was an intention of my research that the method itself became a useful tool for respondents. My aim was to contribute to a greater understanding of their participation and enable participants to reflect on the processes in which they are engaged, rather than simply to collect data for my research. Reflection is recognised as an essential part of the knowledge generation process through experience (see

Pettegrew, 2000) and within the context of PAR methodologies also mirrors principles and aims- following Freire, (1972) –of emancipation and transformation. Methodologically, this practice can give voice to participants (e.g. including narratives of experience in the write up of research) in the process of knowledge creation. As I discussed in Chapters 2 and 4, there are different forms of engaged research that are underpinned by similar values. These values have led and shaped my thinking – but not in this case my research design. As I now expand on below, this theoretical and my own practice knowledge of participatory methodologies influenced how I carried out my research.

In my role as a researcher I acknowledge that my positionality is informed by my professional background in community-university engagement, and before that in community development. Since 2008 I have worked for the University of Brighton overseeing a programme of community knowledge exchange in the Community University Partnership Programme (Cupp). This work means on a day-to-day basis I support academic and community organisation staff and volunteers to develop partnerships on topics of common interest. My role requires me to have a good understanding of public and community engagement, and an appreciation of the different forms it can take. I hold multiple overlapping identities that account for my interest in my thesis topic but also orientate me in a particular way to my object of study. In addition to my role as a practitioner, I have a background in activist and development work characterised by capacity building and social justice issues. I have also previously been awarded degrees in Biology and Natural Resource Management and worked as a community practitioner and facilitator in the UK and internationally. I consider my position to be at the boundary of academia and community. What this means is I have enthusiasm and a passion for exploring questions such as whose knowledge counts and a view on issues of collaboration, engagement and research from multiple vantage points.

My approach to community-university engagement is therefore rooted in principles of knowledge exchange, which emphasise mutual benefit, and an equitable approach to knowledge - recognising the value of different types of knowledge, especially that held in communities and developed through practice. The discussion above has begun to make explicit not just the case for contextualised research inquiry, but also

one that has a political dimension and can situate participants and their voice. It furthermore highlights the need for recognition of social change to improve the lives of publics who engage with elite civic institutions, such as universities.

Implications for the Research Design

Based on the considerations introduced in this section my research design has the following characteristics:

- ‘Loose’ (Miles & Huberman, 1994), as theoretical constructs are relatively underdeveloped;
- Goal orientated, in order to develop theory and engender change in working practices between community and university (Flick, 2009);
- An explicit component of reflection in the incorporation of new knowledge (Chiu, 2006);
- The adoption of triangulation in order to increase theoretical generalisation. This supports my approach that a small number of cases will then be more informative than a more detailed single case study (Bryman, 2004).

In practice, the characteristics listed above required me to develop a research design that did not pre-determine every element of data collection and valued the input of expert and non-expert collaborators through networks and relationships across a range of individuals and settings. As I proceeded with the collection and analysis of my empirical work, I had to keep an open mind and go on looking for data – and so my design had to be open enough to account for this and give primacy to empirical evidence rather than hypothetical testing. The nature of my research approach and questions also necessarily invited participants to reflect and discuss their experiences in relation to the themes covered within interviews and left open possibilities for them to make connections back to improving or changing practice.

Fieldwork sites

The main implication of such a methodology for my research was that I could not secure participation until I had met and talked with potential respondents. What this meant in practice was that in the field I was reliant on connections mostly brokered through my institutional contact. In some ways this made selecting my fieldwork sites particularly important. The criteria I set for this were as follows:

The University

- a. In different socio-political contexts.
- b. At least one case to take account of the juxtaposition of ‘Western’ and ‘Indigenous’ knowledge systems.
- c. At least one case to be located in the UK or Ireland.
- d. Member of a national or international network concerned with public or civic engagement.

In Chapter 2 I offered greater detail of the type and pattern of community-university relationships evident in my chosen fieldwork sites (see below). Choosing to select my ‘sample’ through membership networks standardised the context for community-university relationships and offered clear and public information that allowed me to more quickly and appropriately identify institutional contacts to approach. In line with a commitment to contextualising participants’ experience, locating cases in different countries recognised that different socio-political contexts would engender different conditions and therefore give rise to different meanings of processes that lead to outcomes and changes that might occur. There were also practical considerations which included the location of sites and the associated cost, duration of time I could spend at a fieldwork site (as a part time doctoral student, this was also time negotiated away from my day job) and that the languages spoken needed to include English. Based on this, I selected two sites as follows:

A. Island University, Canada: This university contains a team dedicated to the study and practice of community-university engagement, with the aim of contributing to solutions about community issues. It is co-governed by community and university partners. Review of their website indicated a range of possible projects including

topics of housing and homelessness, aboriginal communities and community development. I had previously met the institutional contact – the operations director of their community engagement team, Millie²⁶, at a UK conference. I followed up with Millie and we arranged the basis of my visit via email and Skype. I went out to Island University for four weeks in March 2013. I made a return visit in May 2014.

B. River University, UK: This university conceptualises engagement as encompassing community, public, civic and business. They emphasise the link between engagement informing research and teaching. Less public information was available about specific projects that might form case studies, but their website contained details of large-scale projects and events that the institution was involved in. These included projects relating to community media and food science. This university does not have a dedicated team supporting community university collaborations, but Dorothy²⁷, who I knew through a national engagement network, coordinates their work. Dorothy and I arranged the basis of my visit via email and through one face-to-face meeting. I went to River University for two weeks in November 2013. I made a return visit in December 2014.

Within each site, I sought out community-university projects that could form individual case studies for analysis. My approach to identifying and speaking to participants is outlined in detail in my Methods section on p112. The section that follows outlines my choice of the case study as a method, and the criteria I used to guide the selection of participants.

My original research design included three fieldwork sites. These were to be located in different social and political contexts with at least one case in the UK and one in the Global South. The Global South was selected in particular to enable consideration of a context in which Indigenous knowledges come into dialogue with Western knowledge systems. These were originally outlined as Canada, UK and either Malaysia or India pending confirmation from my university contacts there. My fieldwork in Island Place, Canada conducted in March 2013 generated twice as much material as anticipated and allowed me to investigate alternative knowledge systems

²⁶ Millie is a pseudonym.

²⁷ Dorothy is a pseudonym.

in relation to the ‘Western’ university with the engagement of First Nations communities. This led to a re-appraisal of the material I could develop to support the theoretical substance of my research. This, coupled with practical and research considerations about generating sufficient depth to the thesis, meant I took the decision to reduce the number of case studies to two as outlined above.

The Case Study

The major advantage of case study research is that it allowed me to look at specific contexts across more than one fieldwork site and maintain a methodological coherence. In distinguishing case study (‘naturalistic’) methods from other positivist approaches Gillham (2000: 8) provides a summary on the difference in emphasis between the two, and those that most closely relate to my methodology include:

- Qualitative data
- Emergent research design
- Subjectivity
- Participation
- Emphasis on the meaning of changes that have occurred

Lincoln & Guba (1985) identify that naturalistic data are a requirement for contextual explanation and understanding, and Stake (2000) argues that if research is to be of value to people it needs to be framed in the same terms as everyday experience. In this way, case studies build up ‘a body of tacit knowledge on the basis of where people *are* as oppose to generalised or abstract findings’ (p7). Stake (ibid) observes that what is happening and deemed important within the boundaries of a case study is what is considered to be vital and usually determines what the study is about as opposed to some other external driver or theory. And Gillham (2000) sees case studies as research into the processes that lead to results – rather than the significance of the results themselves. Some commentators also regard the case study as involving quite different assumptions (to more positivist traditions) about how the social world can and should be studied (see for example, Flyvbjerg, 2006; Hamilton, 1980; Simons, 1996) and have argued that case studies should form a distinct paradigm. The case study method allows for the researcher to place themselves within the context being studied (Flyvbjerg, 2006), in what Sandra Harding would call the same

‘critical plane’. Giddens (1982) suggests the most valid descriptions of social activities presume the researcher possesses the necessary skills to participate in that plane. As I have demonstrated above in the section on reflective practice, it is this proximity to reality and learning process for the researcher that leads to a more advanced understanding.

The case study has come in for criticism from more reductionist research paradigms that identify limits to how generalisations (empirical or theoretical) might be drawn from the research. In such traditions, generalisability is seen as a signifier of strong theory. Stake (2000) has argued that when the aims of an enquiry are understanding, extension of experience and increase in conviction in that which is known, any ‘disadvantage’ relating to the limits of generalisation disappear. Flyvbjerg, in outlining five misunderstandings about case study research (2006), also argues that it is precisely context-dependent knowledge that allows people to develop expertise; and that it is regressive to make ‘rule-based knowledge’ of the sort often generated through more generalisable studies the highest goal of learning. PAR methods are concerned with the co-creation, rather than the discovery of knowledge (Chiu, 2006) and the role of reflection in these processes gives attention to the value and learning implicit in context-specific empirical work as well as conceptual generalisability.

By placing myself in the context being studied through methods and practice (in terms of my professional background), I stood a better chance of developing deeper understandings. Rather than a critique of lack of objectivity or a tendency to verification, these positions allow views to be tested directly in relation to phenomena as they unfold in practice. This dialogic relationship gives the ‘critically reflexive researcher’ what Ragin (1992: 225) calls a ‘special feature of small-N [number] research’, a real time relationship that is more likely to result in revision and critical engagement with the data being generated, producing a greater number of observations and knowledge that has greater insight and depth of understanding. That my theoretical framework draws from more than one academic discipline can also leave scope for readers of different backgrounds to make different interpretations of what has been developed. For Stake (2000: 19), where case studies may be ‘epistemologically in harmony with the reader’s experience’ they are thus to that person a natural basis for generalisation. This is in line with the critique Harding

(1987) makes of scientific objectivity, arguing that it makes life unrecognisable to many.

Gomm et al (2000) argue that the theoretical value of the case study is that it can uncover causal processes linking inputs and outputs within a system. Thus, although data may remain specific to that context or environment, the theory and some of my conceptual development may be useable by others or generalised in understanding how other cases work. And so I suggest the ‘naturalistic generalisation’ that Stake identifies is a clear way to think about how my case study research may be drawn on by future users as they ‘recognise the essential similarities of cases of interest to them’ (2000: 23). In Chapter 9 of my thesis I reflect further on the contributions that my case study research can make to democratic theory and engaged scholarship with respect to knowledge, participation and social change. These future users are intended to be both within and outside the academy; for those doing as well as studying community-university engagement.

Having outlined the use of the case study for my research, I now discuss the criteria applied for selecting projects through which to generate case studies, and the ethical considerations relevant to my research:

Case Study Selection

The case studies developed in my thesis were drawn from the two fieldwork sites I have outlined above. Before going into the field, I developed a set of criteria which guided selection of potential cases, and I expand on these below.

Individuals were invited to participate in my research on the basis of their involvement with a specific instance of community-university collaboration. The topics that these projects were addressing should relate to social justice, social change, empowerment or natural resources. Specifying these areas was intended to develop commonality across my case studies, but not be restrictive in the topic they focused on. I kept my criteria as broad as possible primarily because, as I would be researching in unfamiliar contexts, I would need to wait until I was in the field before I knew my participants. So for example, someone working in homelessness and another in youth employment may be working with different groups, but such projects

would be dealing with issues relating to one or more aspects of my criteria. Natural resources form part of this list because globally, natural resource issues in relation to management, extraction and ownership are increasingly accompanied by social injustice.

I did however set two exclusion criteria. One was to exclude student projects. My research looked at examples of co-production, rather than one-off activity and therefore I wanted to remain focused on institutionally sustained relationships, rather than individual student projects. The second was to exclude community based projects that were solely subject to local authority governance. This was largely pragmatic as in the UK, projects of this type would ethically be subject to additional tiers of consent.

Ethical Considerations

The ethical implications of this study related to practical considerations of research design and participant 'recruitment', but also to what I would understand as relational ethics, that is a focus on ethical actions explicitly in relationship to the people in my study.

Informed consent was established through using an information sheet that told people about me and the study. This was always accompanied in person, or through email with a verbal/written introduction to who I was, what my research was about and why it was that I was requesting their participation. On this basis, participants selected the location and time for interview based on what would be convenient and comfortable for them. A full schedule of visits and interviews were shared with my key contact in each fieldwork setting and lone working protocols were adhered to. My interview design did not include topics for discussion that were likely to cover any highly personal issues, and participants were invited to interpret and respond to questions in whatever way made sense to them. Non-response to questions was also respected. Before interviews began, participants were invited to sign a consent form and confidentiality was discussed and agreed. Individual requests to not be recorded, or for parts of our interview to remain confidential as the interview progressed were adhered to. This was revisited once transcripts were returned to participants, and requests for changes were respected.

It was originally my intention that participants should choose how they wanted to be represented in the research – including the use of their own name. What became clear was that in some case study projects the community and academic partner had given different responses to this. With one partner happy to be named and another wanting to remain anonymous, this left a scenario where confidentiality was likely to be broken by association. After fieldwork was complete and all interviews transcribed, I took the decision to instead give all respondents a named pseudonym. It is interesting to note that requests for anonymity were almost always made by the academic partner to a case study project.

This example also illustrates that whilst some elements of an ethical approach could in some sense be ‘pre-determined’ before fieldwork through thinking ethically, it was only once in the field that ‘acting’ ethically became a reality. Here I drew on relational ethics, which required me to value and respect the connection between myself and the people in my study (Ellis, 2007). This meant in the first instance not making assumptions about who I would meet, rather people and their being were relationally constructed between me as a researcher and the participant. This particularly avoided assumptions around categories like who might be vulnerable, or marginalised. Indeed, in satisfying ethical review in my institution, it was clear that an assumption was made about who was or wasn’t vulnerable depending on whether they had an academic or community label. My practice background already told me this wasn’t the case.

Although I did not determine case studies until in the field, I was still considering how best to address interpersonal situations (Fisher, 2006). I produced an outline that introduced me and my research that could be shared by my key contacts ahead of my visits to both fieldwork sites. This was not the same as my participant information sheet which was tied to formal ethical approval, but intended to be used to let people know something about me ahead of my being there should they want to know. My practitioner experience suggested that this would be one way to mitigate the scenario of arriving and expecting people to want to engage with my research without knowing anything about me.

Relational ethics are also consistent with my views and perspectives on knowledge, as acting explicitly in relationship to others meant developing dialogue between me and my participants that could illuminate their values and priorities. This also resulted in avoiding singular reliance on what I determined to be of use/value through my enquiry. In my fieldwork visit to Island Place for example, I spent my first week listening and observing before carrying out my first interview. This gave me some insight into the mode and form of engagement and the communities that the university was currently working with. Island University is located on the traditional territories of the Coast Salish people – and place appeared to be a critical and important concept for the First Nations’ peoples I heard from. In addition, I had heard some reflections from Indigenous community members who had co-worked with non-Indigenous researchers and they emphasised the necessity to ‘know’ who they were working with. This was an explicit recognition that the distanced ‘researcher’ was problematic. As someone who was already coming from a different place, I decided to change my participant information sheet to be more personal. It now included my name, rather than ‘the researcher’ and a brief background. I think this choice made it more possible to demonstrate my intentions and for people to know a little about me before deciding to agree to an interview.

This also further re-enforced the importance of acknowledging that in Island place I represented an identity as a ‘White British’ researcher from a Western university exploring the experiences and perspectives of actors that may be ‘invisible’ in dominant research discourses. I therefore held the perspective of an outsider ‘looking in’. Agyeman (2008) argues for a conscious ‘positioning’ of the researcher who may or may not be part of the lifeworld of individuals or groups being researched. Acting on this in the field included sharing my previous experience of conducting research in different cultural settings and being reflexive in my approach to identify any possible issues that require addressing. There were two ways in which to view this. Collins (1990: 232) argues that in order to make legitimate knowledge claims, researchers should have ‘lived or experienced their material in some fashion’. And whilst my experiences of community activism and engagement made it possible for me to have a sense of the context my participants were operating in, this experience did not often extend to the particular projects or communities that some of my projects were focused on. However, Miller & Glassner (2004) would suggest that the existence of

social differences between the interviewer and interviewees can be put to use in generating mutual understanding. They propose that explanations or reflections are prompted in navigating this difference which are points or sources of learning that provide a context within which social worlds come to be better understood (ibid: 135). One of these points of learning for me was the perspective in West Coast First Nation's traditions of 'gift' giving. In this way, people spoke about their participation in research or sharing of stories as 'gifts'. This had an effect on how I thought about what the act of the interview was and helped locate the stories shared with the people who gave them. This was in contrast to conventional research approaches which tend to favour distance.

One cross-cutting issue however in each setting, was that I could not assume an 'equal voice' among all participants nor that my participants constituted a homogenous group. Boser (2006) alerts us to how in this instance, community and university actors, as participants may each reflect disparate interests and demonstrate a varying level of capacity to advance their own interests. Participation may be influenced by current or historic relationships and it is possible that individuals may have felt constrained or enabled in a given situation – thus resulting in shifting or patterned asymmetries (Hayward, 1998) in participants' capacities to respond to or participate in my proposed methods. This called for reflexivity as a mode of continuous self-analysis (Callway, 1992) and my practitioner status meant this was something I was used to doing. This status also helped to build credible connections with participants as I was able to share my experiences on common issues or offer perspectives (in and outside of the interview), which resonated.

Negotiating Case Studies in Fieldwork

My fieldwork was carried out at two different times in two different settings. Fieldwork meant negotiating time away from my paid work, mostly in the form of annual leave. I was therefore restricted to making separate, time limited visits. As outlined on p101 initial access to fieldwork sites was negotiated with a key contact and I was for the most part reliant on their cooperation and understanding to facilitate access to the field and potential participants. Prior to each site visit I had shared an overview of me and my research and discussed this with my key contact in order for them to think about possible contacts for interview on my arrival. I did not encounter

any significant issues in this process as both were accommodating and helpful in the practical aspects of arriving and having a base in both university sites.

My visit to Island University overlapped with a significant internal conference the community engagement team were organising which focused on community based research, and a separate one-day symposium on the theme of 'knowledge democracy'. When I began to negotiate my fieldwork period, I became aware of these events and planned for my visit to overlap with it. As a result, I also benefitted from a first week of 'orientation' where I could explore the university and hear presentations from individual projects, three of which went on to form case studies in my research. The single campus nature of Island University helped this. My access to participants was thus determined through a combination of direct approaches from me and brokered through my key contact Millie, as introductions via email or in person. These initial contacts were with either an academic or community partner to a project – who were then in most cases able to put me in touch with the other. In all cases I followed contacts up by email attaching my participant information sheet and an outline I had prepared that explained who I was. Via email we then set a date and location for interview. Interviews were carried out in people's offices, in cafes, in one instance the university library and in another, in someone's home.

The community engagement team were also involved in a series of workshops and events in the weeks I was visiting. This was an opportunity to explore the context of their work in more detail and develop connections to people that facilitated my understanding and could allow me autonomy in pursuing conversations. All 10 of my interviews and 10 conversations were carried out within that fieldwork period. I returned to Island University for a conference in May 2014 where I presented on the initial findings to a general audience. This was based on a paper I developed and shared with case study respondents. I had limited responses from three participants, and all agreed to the usefulness of what was represented. One participant suggested I make more of the importance of community and university partners understanding each other's roles, and the difference of encounters that are specific to Indigenous partnerships. Both these points were incorporated in my exploration of findings – in Chapter 7 particularly.

In contrast, my visit to River University was more heavily dependent on my key contact, whose base, and therefore mine, was in an office physically located away from the main campus of the university. River University also had several smaller campuses in different parts of the city and my key contact, Dorothy's role was internally focused meaning she did not regularly get involved in non-university meetings or events. My access to participants was heavily reliant on Dorothy who introduced me in all cases via email, and so my subsequent introductions, information sharing and negotiating an interview were all initially 'virtual'. These contacts were also all academics, and from them I was signposted to community partners who might be interested to speak to me about my research. In one case the academic partner introduced me via email, and I made independent approaches to the others, using the contact details I had been given. Most interviews were carried out in people's offices, with one in a university cafeteria and one in someone's home. My initial visit to River Place did overlap with a larger engagement conference that was not directly associated with the university. As with Island place, as I became aware of the conference, I planned my fieldwork visit accordingly. My experience at River University was less connected and dynamic in terms of fieldwork. The relatively disconnected nature of accessing participants also meant that in my first fieldwork visit in November 2013, I conducted seven interviews and one guided conversation. I was then able to make arrangements for a further two interviews who were not available in this initial window as part of a follow up visit in December 2014. When I returned, one of my participants was subsequently unwell, and so we arranged to hold the interview one month later using Skype once I had returned to Brighton.

The interviews and guided conversations (see below) that generated data for my research provided an opportunity to reflect, discuss and explore issues of community-university engagement with different people I interviewed. Academic respondents in particular were pleased to have the opportunity to discuss their work. In most cases, these respondents also saw themselves as the only person in their department of discipline area conducting research of this type. The chance to speak freely about their work and hear perspectives and experiences from mine was welcomed. It is an explicit part of my methodological position to recognise a moral and political dimension to research and I opted for subjectivity as a strength (Wolcott, 1994) in facilitating and carrying out interviews. Another element of my method that relates to

this was to offer something in return for each interview. This was based on my own grassroots experiences of acknowledgement of people's time and recognition of the exchange of time and the gift of a story. These exchanges included, facilitating a community development workshop, taking minutes at a resident meeting, writing a short blog for a website and sharing some references on participatory research methods.

By explicitly incorporating my practitioner background, points of connection and familiarity were developed which supported my access to interviews. Despite this, there were also instances where some people were still wary of being researched or had too many requests of this type, and saw me as just another one. These may in part account for some of the non-responses to my requests for participation as outlined in Chapter 6.

Methods

In this section I introduce my data collection methods, which consisted of semi-structured interview, field notes, documentary review and guided conversations. Qualitative research is inherently multi-method in focus (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998) and here the use of multiple methods, or triangulation reflects an attempt to secure an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question.

Semi-Structured Interview

My research is focused on understanding the detail of community and university partners working together. In case studies, semi-structured interview allowed an exploration with depth. Interviews were also reflexive spaces. The topic guide I produced (See Appendix 1) invited particular responses from people as I was interested in the detail of their experience, but participants were also free to discuss or share other information as they chose. The interviews were based on four key headings of collaboration, knowledge, motivation and legacy. People were invited to begin by sharing that background and in many cases were points of synergy or recognition in some of our engagement experiences that were reflected in our discussions.

The four headings then supported discussions in which respondents described their particular project, including how it began and how that person understood their collaborative work. I asked people to think about any particular concepts or ideas they drew on to guide their work and any words or phrases they would use which they thought described it. Asking people for words or phrases seemed difficult for people to respond to, with most opting for sentences or opting not to answer the question. This section of the interview also focused on greater detail of the aims of the project, how they came to be determined and what the outcomes of the collaboration were. The next section of the interview was focused on knowledge, experiences, practices and identity. This broad range of words was used to capture how people were making sense of what they were bringing to the collaboration without wishing to overly define it for them. Questions also concentrated on how people understood different forms of knowledge and how or whether they thought multiple forms of knowledge were relevant to their co-work. The questions that then followed were related to motivations - asking why people were involved in their collaborations and whether they thought their work connected to any particular development, justice or social change agendas. However, in practice most of these points were often covered in the opening parts of the interview, with people's backgrounds bound up with their motivations and interests. The final section of the interview asked questions about what the longer term outcomes of their collaborative project were, or might be. I also asked people to reflect on how they thought community-university activity could in particular support community or social actors in their social change goals.

I spoke in-depth to 16 partners from 10 different projects, six of these were from Island place, and four from River place. They ranged in topic from health and wellbeing in Indigenous communities to the digital economy. These interviews lasted between 45 minutes and 1.5 hours and were substantially explored for the purposes of generating data and full descriptions of these case studies can be found in Chapter 6. These interviews were recorded and transcribed. Participants frequently commented on the value of the space in helping them think through aspects of their project that they may not have considered before, either within interview or when their transcripts were returned.

In the development of case studies, it was not possible to access responses from one community and one academic partner per project²⁸, and in some interviews participants spoke more broadly about their experiences of collaboration, in addition to the project I had sought them out to discuss. These factors made making ‘matches’ between speakers and their experiences asymmetrical in some cases. I set out further details of this in Chapter 6.

Field Notes and Documentation

I used field notes to record workshops and conference presentations and in making contextual observations of how community and university partners were presenting and talking together. I chose this method rather than participatory observations as although oriented by participatory approaches it was not appropriate within the case studies to occupy such a position due to my early relationships with participants and the time-limited nature of my field visits.

In Island Place I attended four workshop sessions as well as the opening and closing plenaries of Island University’s one-day symposium on ‘knowledge democracy’. The plenaries offered both a global perspective to community engagement, but also a clear Indigenous context to the work happening at Island University. Individual workshop sessions concentrated on particular projects including citizen engagement, food security and homelessness. I selected these sessions as the names of the presenters and their projects had been identified by my key contact Millie as possible case studies that I could take the opportunity to hear more about. In two out of three sessions, I followed up with presenters. The third, relating to food security fell outside of my case study criteria as the work was predominantly student focused.

I also attended two sessions on different days at the week-long Island University conference on community engagement. These related to aboriginal research partnerships and the benefits of community based research (CBR) from academic and community perspectives. I followed up with the presenters in one of these sessions. After this week, I also went to a community based afternoon workshop that focused on some of the different ways groups in Island place were acting on community and

²⁸ It was not possible to access community partners in four of these cases and an academic partner in one case.

social change agendas. In only one example was this linked collaboratively to working with university partners.

In River Place, at the regional engagement conference, I attended one workshop session on mapping public and community engagement plus opening and closing plenaries that focused on the future of engaged universities and creating environments where engaged research can flourish. Elsewhere in the conference I was co-presenting two sessions of my own, one on community partner perspectives and one with a Canadian colleague on engagement practices in our respective countries.

The notes from all of these sessions were used in real time in the field to reflect on people's descriptions and experiences of engagement as well as to capture key ideas, concepts or points that I wanted to think further about. These were used to further in analysis to understand the context within which each university was operating.

I also kept brief notes from interviews and guided conversations (see below) but these were limited. I did this to better be engaged in constructing a listening space with participants. I also used selective documentary review to learn more about the institutional context in both fieldwork sites and also identified individual case study project reports, grey literature and websites where available. These were policy or strategy documents for the universities, and specific project reports and website descriptions of individual case study projects where available. These were reviewed to gather further information about the context of each institution and individual projects, such as facts and figures and as such they were not subject to any systematic analysis. In Chapter 6 I specify the documents accessed in relation to individual case studies where relevant and also highlight in Chapters 7 + 8 where these sources were drawn on in my analysis.

Guided Conversations

In identifying possible participants for my case studies when in Island Place in March 2013, it became clear that there were also a range of key informants who would enrich my data collection. These people were both academic and community based and had experience of engagement, often in senior or coordinating roles and who

didn't fit the criteria I was applying for case study interviews. For example, where people were working primarily with students. In response to this, I developed a topic guide to shape these conversations. Including these responses in my data collection added further contextual experiences and perspectives of engagement. Conversations were recorded and transcribed. Guided conversations lasted approximately one hour. In Island Place I spoke to ten people. I sought to repeat this approach when in River Place and spoke to one person. As I further describe in Chapter 6, I had contrasting experiences in my fieldwork with respect to the networks and connectivity my key contact had in each setting which impacted the number and range of people that I spoke to.

The data that arose from these methods is represented in in Table 2. below. A full descriptive account of the case studies and further detail of the guided conversations is developed in Chapter 6.

Table 2. Summary of Data

Fieldwork Site Type of Data	Island Place (Canada)		River Place (UK)	
	Academic respondent	Community Respondent	Academic Respondent	Community Respondent
Interviews	5	5	4	2
Guided Conversations	7	3	1	0

Analysis/Interpretation

I have now outlined my methodology and how that positions me to design and carry out my research, in particular highlighting that issues of power, participation and knowledge are significant to my analysis. I have also introduced my methods and the three sets of data generated from them of varying depth and focus. What follows is a discussion of my analytical approach to this data and how through a system of theoretically informed coding and interpretation two principal categories emerged concerned with what people do in their collaborations and how knowledge is used, defined and legitimated. These form the empirical basis of Chapters 7 & 8. I have further interpreted these findings specifically in relation to the concept of cognitive justice and this is more fully explored in Chapter 9.

I follow Wallcott (1994), who suggests that qualitative ‘data work’ occurs in three main stages – description, analysis and interpretation²⁹. Such an approach has supported the incorporation of different types of data arising from the different methods used. These three distinct stages have been applied to the different data my research generated and together contribute to an overall interpretation that has responded to my research questions. Flick (2002:229, 2007) argues that the combination of multiple methodological practices, empirical materials, perspectives and observers in a single study is best understood as a strategy that adds rigour, breadth, complexity, richness and depth to any enquiry.

My research design is based on an interest both in what people do and what they say. In addition to much of my methodology discussion, perspectives on practice theory (see Shove et al, 2012) have additional resonance here. ‘Practices’ according to Reckwitz (2002: 250) are a ‘routinized way in which bodies are moved, objects are handled, subjects are treated, things are described and the world is understood’. Whilst the term itself covers a broad range of ideas, ‘slimline practice theory’ (Shove et al, 2012) is essentially concerned with the dynamics of social practices; their emergent patterns and connections. Aranda & Hart (2014) discuss it in terms of the social and symbolic significance of participation. Dimensions of this include the meanings, motivations and emotions of this and the impact on sense of self and identity. Shove et al (2012) argue that the action of practices can be explained by the pursuit of individual interests and I make a connection here not just to an analysis of what people are doing, but also how they might make sense of this through the ‘talk’ of the interview. I do not claim to draw in full on such ideas nor suggest I have taken a purist approach to their application. However, as I will explain below, in following Wolcott’s (1994) Description – Analysis – Interpretation approach to data in developing my findings, such ideas are significant enough to note here in relation to this overall process.

²⁹ He explains these stages in brief as: Description – producing an account that stays close to the original data; Analysis – systematically producing an account of key factors and relationships among them; Interpretation – giving sense to the data by creatively producing insights about it. I explore these further in the section on analysis on p116.

Description – Analysis - Interpretation

Wolcott (1994) suggests there are three major ways to ‘do something’ with descriptive qualitative data. These relate to representing an account that, firstly, stays as close to the data as originally recorded. The second approach is to expand and extend beyond a purely descriptive account with an analysis that proceeds in ‘some careful, systematic way to identify key factors and relationships between them’ (p10). These stages are not unusual in making use of qualitative data and they look familiar to what Miles & Huberman (1994) describe in their three concurrent flows of activity in approaching analysis – data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing. Wolcott’s third ‘way’ is to ‘reach out for understanding or explanation beyond the limits of what can be explained with the degree of certainty usually associated with analysis’ (1994: 13). In this way he says the goal is to make sense of what goes on in the data and ask the question of ‘what does it all mean’?

Wolcott’s (ibid) suggested trajectory then is one that I follow, understanding all three of these categories as part of what might otherwise be named ‘analysis’. These categories are not mutually exclusive, and although working analytically with my data includes systematic review and an element of interpretation, it is not the case that I can equally do both. I therefore emphasise my approach to data as that of analysis. A further strength of this approach in relation to ‘doing something’ with my data is that Wolcott discusses the idea of being able to ‘zoom’ in and out of data – like a lens in a camera. In this sense I have concentrated most fully on my case studies as the starting point in generating data. Another important consideration is that I have explicitly based my analysis of case study data within a theoretically informed framework related to the conceptual framework introduced at the start of this chapter. Gibson & Brown (2009) note that theory can act as a tool in analysis – as a means of working with data in some particular and motivated way. As such my analysis has a ‘context’ and beginning at this point coheres my conceptual framework, research questions and methodology.

What follows then is the process I followed in order to zoom in and back out of my data. Starting this with a systematic treatment of case study data and then moving to a

more macro perspective, something that has built layers of interpretation by also incorporating my two other forms of data.

Description

I began by transcribing all case study interviews. I then wrote summaries of each interview as a way to locate and understand respondents and what they had discussed. Descriptive accounts of my case studies can be found in Chapter 6. These provide a fuller sense of the actors, context and detail of projects that I used in my approach to analysis. Of note in these first stages of transcribing is that I already began noticing phrases, descriptions and words that I considered relevant to my coding framework.

Through the development of descriptions, I also drew on field notes and documentary review to produce these accounts. I therefore include these data in this section of my approach as it was used more as ‘supporting’ material, rather than being subject to any distinct systematic treatment. I then brought these data back into view as I ‘zoomed out’ at an interpretive stage. I treated guided conversations in much the same way. However, sections of seven of these conversations have also been included in my findings chapters where they allowed me to interpret a theme further or provided an extended perspective to the point being made. These were thus considered in sequence after analysis of my case study data was complete.

Analysis

My approach to analysis meant systematically coding transcribed semi-structured interviews from my case study projects. My coding framework was drawn from my conceptual framework and contained 4 major headings: (1) Community University Interactions, (2) Social Justice, (3), Deliberation & Participation and (4) Knowledge. Each had a sub-set of prompts that pointed me to particular aspects of data. Transcripts were manually coded which meant reading them multiple times in this stage.

Potter’s (2004) assertion that the interview is an arena for interaction in its own right (rather than an exercise in harvesting data) is consistent with the characteristics of my research approach already described. Such data was viewed as naturally occurring talk, as a form of natural conversational interaction (p205) - drawing on

intersubjectivity and mutual meaning making (Miller and Glassner, 2004). In reading my transcripts, codes were considered alongside a list of guiding questions that point to the ‘why, what, how, who, where and when’ of what is happening in my data. Following sociologists Emerson, Fretz & Shaw (1995: 146) these include how participants talked about, characterised and understood what was going on.

Within my analytical approach, particular textual choices I have made reflect my motivation to seek out evidence of how people understood their work together, how knowledge from different actors was negotiated and used in generating outcomes for the collaboration, and how both of these phenomena related to themes of social justice. Issues of justice act both on how people engage and participate with each other but also in developing more holistic inputs and understandings of social issues. In particular, (drawing from political scientist Iris Marion Young and critical theorist Nancy Fraser) I was looking for how this might be utilised through discussions of difference and evidence of transformations in practices and power as an outcome of collaborations. This was also relevant to how people understood what they were doing together, and the meanings they drew on to make sense of their work.

Relating more closely to questions of knowledge and participation, my particular interest was to explore whether case study interviews showed any evidence of people collaborating through a frame of cognitive justice. As I discussed in Chapter 3, the literature offers little direction in how cognitive justice might be interpreted in practice. As such, I was looking for evidence of plurality in addressing the topic of interest and what participative conditions this was most likely to arise in. Here I was concentrating on forms of deliberative practice that would shape the norms and dynamics of relationships. I expand my interpretation of this in Chapter 9 to further elaborate on this distinctive element of my work

Once applied to transcripts, codes were organised into categories and extrapolated from data. I then began to look for patterns and connections, and was also alert to data that didn’t ‘fit’ with my theoretically driven analysis. My coding framework originally contained over 36 separate prompts that covered a range of possibilities, but in particular the extent to which people’s background informed their positionality and dimensions of emotion in practice were all additionally significant. This work

resulted in two main themes, which formed the empirical basis of Chapters 7, and 8. One was concerned with how people talked about engagement and did participation. The second was concerned with how people understood and discussed knowledge, and the ways in which knowledges were included or excluded from collaborative processes.

Interpretation

The interpretative stage of my analysis has included my three different sets of data together and as a mode of assessing my research questions (Wolcott, 1994: 256), and can be considered a natural stage of the thesis in terms of the discussion presented in Chapter 9. As noted above, equal weight cannot be given to both analysis and interpretation and it has been my aim to locate major findings as tied to the analysis I have outlined above. However, I subscribe to Wolcott's view that we use both analytic and interpretative frameworks in our approach to qualitative data, and this has been a particularly sensible way to make use of the different data my study has generated.

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined how I am positioned as a researcher in this project and what that has meant for my approach to fieldwork, methods and the analysis which contribute to the findings that follow in Chapters 6, 7 & 8. My approach to data has relied on reading community-university collaborations as an emergent rather than resultant formation. It has also meant putting an emphasis on how people were making sense of their worlds and the social relations that shape them; paying particular attention to where actors held shared or separate understandings about their experiences and asking questions about the assumptions, flows, processes and positionalities that underpinned this. My analytical framework positioned me to take a conceptually informed approach to my case study data and prompted critical engagement with whose knowledge counted in the identification and address of an issue.

The following chapters – 6, 7 & 8, encompass the description-analysis-interpretation approach I have taken to working with my data. In doing so I present my case study

projects and build on the two principal empirical themes I have identified through analysis and interpretation.

Chapter 6

The Case Studies: Context, Aims and Participants

Introduction

This chapter focuses on descriptive accounts of the projects that form the substantive data set for my study and the actors that participated in them. My original methodological design was predicated on interviews with both academic and community partners who were working together on the same project. As outlined in Chapter 5, in order to access respondents, I had to work through key university contacts in my two fieldwork sites. These contacts helped me to identify projects that could form individual case studies, which I did once I was in the field. Here I offer specific description of case studies

I spoke in-depth to 16 partners from 10 different projects. Six of these projects were located in Island place, and four in River place and ranged in topic from health and wellbeing in Indigenous communities to the digital economy. However, I did not uniformly speak to one community and one academic partner per project. It was not possible to access community respondents in four cases, and an academic partner in one. Besides, in some interviews participants spoke more broadly about their experiences of collaboration in addition to the project I had sought them out to discuss. These factors made making ‘matches’ between speakers and their experiences asymmetrical in some cases and this is highlighted where relevant in the descriptors below.

Following these individual case study descriptions, I also include a brief overview of the guided conversations I carried out with eight academic and three community partners as introduced in Chapter 5. These respondents were people in a range of roles including in senior academic and NGO positions, a local councillor, lecturing staff and people with responsibility for engagement activities within Island and River universities. These individuals were not directly affiliated with one of the case studies, but had previous experience of engagement through other projects over the last 10 years. These conversations were used as ‘supporting’ material in order to extend my interpretation of the significant points made through case study analysis.

Case Studies

In identifying potential participants for interview, I worked with my main university contact at each site to explore current or recent projects that partners could share their experiences of. These projects varied in their duration and scope, and degree of formality in terms of funding. They all met my criteria of working across themes of social justice, social change, empowerment or natural resources. Interviews were carried out individually, except in one case - 'Neighbourhood Development Project'. I spoke to three people involved in this project, interviewing one community partner separately, and then a further community partner and academic together at their request.

The descriptions below focus on accounts of individual case studies across fieldwork sites. They are intended to demonstrate who I spoke to, the focus of their project work and their experiences of collaboration.

Island Place - Canada

Peer Research in Aboriginal Communities

Respondents:

Cara works in an academic research centre focused on Aboriginal health and wellbeing. Her academic career has been characterised by her community engagement practice, and now she doesn't do any other type of research.

Sonia works for a national non-governmental organisation that provides advocacy and support to aboriginal peoples living with HIV/Aids across Canada. Prior to this she was a social worker, primarily working with young women who engage in sex work.

I also attended an afternoon workshop where this project was discussed as part of an internal university conference exploring aboriginal research partnerships. Here I heard from both respondents talking about this project and their experiences of collaboration more widely.

The Project: Peer Research in Aboriginal Communities is the latest in a series of research projects that Cara has been involved in with Sonia's NGO over the last 15 years. This project, originally prompted by requests from service users in the NGO, focuses on capacity building and skills development that supports service users to act as community based researchers. It began in 2012 and Cara described her role as providing advice and training on how to frame and explore research questions from needs and ideas identified within the organisation. Sonia represents service users' needs and interests in the partnership. She also described her role as being the bridge between academic and community worlds. She is responsible for getting research activities going within her organisation and disseminating information. The dispersed nature of the NGO means that the quality of the relationship between Cara and Sonia is critical in getting work done. Sonia works nationally in her role, and so it is uncommon for Cara to physically be able to visit service user groups across this geography. Practically this means they rely on frequent communication on phone/email and Skype and then undertake to follow up within their own organisations to move things on. They also have the opportunity to get together at conferences, which Sonia cites as a key opportunity to connect, both to her academic partner but also others in the field.

Cara was clear that this project was initiated by the community organisation. In this way she presented her role as supporting an existing research agenda rather than necessarily mobilising her own. Therefore, she saw her role as 'in service' to the community. She noted that when she began her research career, this way of working had less support from her university. In sharing that she had recently been promoted to 'full professor', Cara felt that work of this type was not detrimental to her research career.

A key driver for this particular research relationship is that Sonia's NGO are required to have an academic 'research' partner in order to secure one of their major strands of funding. Whilst this may go some way towards understanding why the partnership occurred in the first place, hearing both partners describe their collaboration, it is clear that they both view this work as representing more than a requirement, or a one-way exchange of expertise to enhance the NGO's work. Their collaboration is part of a much wider agenda for them both about the ethics and practice of research with

Indigenous people and supporting the voice of marginalised individuals. When the partnership first began, there was very little support for research of this type, but this has improved alongside protocols for Indigenous community based research. Experience from this collaboration has allowed the partners to make contributions at a national policy level and to internal systems and protocols for their respective organisations. It has also allowed spaces for reflection on what the NGO is trying to achieve and has lent legitimacy to their activities at a strategic level, which Sonia identifies as crucial to meeting their goals. This project has also led to a peer research network being developed nationally across the different offices of the NGO.

Their partnership to date has resulted in ongoing funding to continue their work together, being able to apply for grants, develop community based research capacity and share skills and knowledge on how to disseminate and use their research. Working with the university has also opened up other opportunities that are meaningful to the work of the NGO – for example, developing contacts with epidemiologists which connect them to clinical aspects of their HIV/Aids research work.

Neighbourhood Development Project

Respondents:

Lisa is the Director of Community Agency that funded this project. The Community Agency is a national organisation with regional offices. She has a background in adult and community learning.

George is a resident of one of the pilot neighbourhoods in this project – Riverside - and lead convener of the development plan group for his area.

Kate is also a resident of Riverside. She had a dual role in this project as she was employed by Island University to work as a facilitator of the programme in its first year. She has a background in lecturing and social work.

I also attended one community session on a native reserve and a Riverside resident's meeting where I heard from a wider range of people about their experiences of the programme.

The Project: The Neighbourhood Development Project began as a one-year project between 2011-2012 initiated by the Community Agency and supported by staff and graduate students from the university. The project focused on supporting three local neighbourhoods – Riverside, Parkland and Oceanside – to develop resident groups and action plans to work on things they would like to see improved in their area.

This work was part of a change of strategy for the Community Agency to work more at a resident level – something they had not previously done. They also wanted to use ideas of ‘asset based community development’ (abcd) and community mapping to help them do this. The Community Agency already had a five-year relationship with the university as they had been a board member on one of their governance committees and they were a donor to the university. This gave the Community Agency some insight into how a partnership could be developed with the university. The partnership was formalised through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) that spanned three years from 2011. This was negotiated and agreed by the director of the Community Agency and the operational director of the community engagement team at the university.

In the pilot phase of this project, groups of residents met six times to develop their action plans. These meetings were attended by between 10-20 residents in each area, graduate students, representatives from the Community Agency (usually Lisa) and up to two mapping experts from the university. At each meeting they were supported to use collaborative mapping tools to identify assets, challenges, visions and actions for their areas. These were then collated and presented in the form of a map, which was distributed to residents in that area and were to form the basis of future community activity linked to an identifiable residents group.

From Lisa’s point of view, the presence of graduate students in particular was the key to making the project work. They were not sure that residents would have participated so fully if more was required of them in terms of tasks such as organising meetings and keeping records. George and Kate also commented on this, highlighting the amount of time these activities took and that residents were unlikely, certainly in the set up stages, to have invested in this. Lisa also thought that the university

connection provided a real draw that meant residents were more likely to engage with these processes than if the Agency alone were asking for their participation.

When the pilot project came to an end, partners agreed it had been a successful approach to engaging residents in community development processes. A report was produced which outlined the context for the project and included information on this new way of working between the university and community and the partners began to roll out the mapping tool to other neighbourhood areas and onto local native reserves where the Community Agency has a remit to work. For the university, this has been an opportunity to offer graduate students live community based projects and has allowed staff to develop a good reputation within the communities involved.

Although a MoU was developed between the partnership, Lisa reported that it hadn't really been monitored, adjusted or re-negotiated over its lifespan. She also reflected a feeling that the detail of the partnership itself had not had much attention, although the lead partners had a good interpersonal relationship and saw each other regularly and at other events. This resulted in quite a responsive relationship. Lisa said this was characterised by lots of conversation, but they hadn't spent much time writing anything down in the form of plans or strategies to document what they were doing, and they normally only wrote up any partnership information in a rush and to a deadline. She says she felt a bit like the MoU was a standard 'official' document and she hadn't found a way to raise that with her university colleagues at the point we spoke.

After the pilot had finished, the partners recognised that they would be leaving a gap with local people – having generated community activity but not connected to any particular follow up. This coincided with ambitions that both shared for a more city-wide approach to supporting community development and so the next stage of their partnership was to develop a series of workshops together to address this. The workshops focused on providing information and ideas to people in the city wanting to take community action in their neighbourhoods. These activities are still ongoing.

Reviving Indigenous Languages

Respondents:

Edith works in an academic centre studying linguistics. She has spent the last 10 years involved in supporting community based language revitalisation and was the Principal Investigator on the funding bid that supported the majority of this project.

I also attended a workshop that discussed this project as part of an internal university conference on Indigenous research relationships. Here I heard from a local community participant to the project - Donna - who spoke alongside Edith about their partnership experience. I was not able to carry out an interview with Donna. She passed me her contact details but did not respond to my follow up approaches within my fieldwork period.

The Project: This project secured funding from a national research council to work on the revitalisation of two native languages spoken in communities local to where the university is now located. A native heritage society approached the university in 2001 for help applying for funding to do this work and they and Edith began discussing how a partnership could support this. The aim was to support local people to use, teach and learn their Indigenous languages and preserve them for future generations. At the same time, a separate community based organisation – a treaty group – were preparing a strategic plan for similar work within their own community. The native heritage group, the treaty group, a national heritage council and the university together secured funding of \$1M over five years to co-work on this aim.

A Memorandum of Understanding was developed that broadly separated responsibilities; gathering and maintaining documentation and pedagogy as community led, and funding management and methodology to be university led. A steering group of about 10 people, which included representatives from the main partnership and local elders from the two language groups/communities, met every few months over the period of funding to discuss and monitor delivery of these areas of responsibility. The work of the project outside of these formal structures involved a large number of community based meetings, discussions and workshops. These were attended by a mixture of participants from the wider language communities, Edith and a representative from the native heritage and treaty group.

From Edith's perspective, these meetings were not always straightforward. The nature of the topic meant that strong feelings and a lot of emotion was expressed. She reported that this often took the form of anger and grief. From her point of view, it was important to find ways to negotiate these expressions in order to develop adequate strategies and responses to the project itself. In addition, and in the early stages of the project as issues and understandings were being negotiated between partners, she says many community members expressed dissatisfaction with the university and the arrangements for compensation of their time. Donna also touched this on in the presentation I attended. These issues were related to equity and the recognition of 'expertise', as well as the clear asymmetry in who was paid what for their involvement in the project.

This created a context that Edith was constantly trying to navigate and eventually found exhausting. She says she felt very responsible for the delivery of the project and to meet the needs and requests of those communities involved. She was drawn into new ways of working she did not have much experience of and with little support from her academic base. This was further made difficult by what she saw as the denial of her academic identity. She discussed the stigma and challenge she felt from the community that was associated with her academic status. Not having experienced something like this before, and feeling a responsibility for keeping the project moving, she said she felt it necessary to 'repress' her academic identity in order to get work done. In other words, she focused on taking on mediating, facilitating and project management roles, and listening and responding to the communities' direction, rather than assuming a position of directing or providing 'research' content to these sessions. She talked about not leading with her academic status in these spaces, instead being there as a 'helpful' person.

Despite these personal experiences, the outcomes of the project were considered to be successful by the partnership as a whole, with a number of reports and online resources also being developed. The funding for this project came from a programme specifically designed to support community-university research. Therefore, the final report that I read directly reflected details of the collaboration itself as well as the project outcomes. One of which was the production of a website which I viewed

focused on how people have put the findings of the collaboration into use. It also provides resources for learners of the languages the project was designed to support. These outcomes have contributed to how research in the university is carried out with Indigenous communities locally and how community-university relationships are seen as connected to language revitalization efforts. As part of her presentation, Donna reported that an important measure of success had not been the production of outcomes like reports. Instead, those communities involved in the research process were able to exercise control and ownership of their own efforts to secure and maintain their language heritage. Apart from the steep learning curve Edith feels she followed, the project did also help her to train non-Aboriginal university faculty and students in community-based research and to have community members give them guidance in issues related to culture, protocol and working in and with communities.

Participatory Research on Homelessness

Respondents:

Bree works in an academic research centre. She has a background in nursing and strong working relationships with a range of community agencies that provide services and support to people marginalised by homelessness and substance use in her local area. She has recently been recognised by her institution for distinction in community-engaged scholarship.

Rae is an Indigenous social activist and campaigner. She spent her childhood in care after being removed from her First Nation's family home and experienced her local school system as the only Indigenous pupil. She is a member of a number of health advisory councils on women's health and Indigenous issues and is heavily involved in homelessness activism and awareness raising.

I also attended a workshop that discussed this project as part of an internal university conference on community-engaged scholarship.

The Project: Participatory Research on Homelessness is a community-university arts based research project that started in 2009. The original aim was to work with people who had lived experience of homelessness in order to communicate their everyday challenges and document their everyday lives using visual images. Bree had

previously been working on a number of issues to do with homelessness policy and through that met a number of activists and community contacts including Rae. Together they discussed using visual methods and Bree put forward the idea of photovoice – a specific methodology that uses participatory methods to create and share knowledge, informed by the experiences of the people who have personal knowledge of the issues. Rae liked this idea as she had been working for some time to raise awareness of housing and homelessness issues in the city and she thought this could be a tangible way in which to involve people with lived experience. Their partnership, which was also linked to the work of a city-wide action group (made up mostly of service providers) thought this would be a novel way to approach the issue.

Over the following 8 months, information sessions were put on in community venues to let people know about the project. These sessions were facilitated through gatekeepers like Rae. They also involved some undergraduate nursing students. Those involved were given a camera and according to a newsletter piece on the project published on the university website more than 300 photos were taken. These were collectively reviewed and analysed and 80 images were selected to represent issues and experiences of homelessness in Island Place. The photos were exhibited in the university and the offices of the city-wide action group. A short video was also made that represented key issues and solutions. These included personal experiences of things like having no personal space when you are on the street, or never having a full night's sleep, to more structural issues of people 'pushed' into lying or criminality due to their circumstances. Both Bree and Rae talked about using people's skills and gifts as the solution – seeing the people they were working with as having talent and time to contribute to their communities with skills from carpentry to social care.

Bree and Rae agreed the importance of working through relationships across university and community boundaries, even though they come from quite distinctly different backgrounds. Bree drew very explicitly on critical theory, citing authors and literature that oriented her worldview and Rae from much less formal and much more experiential learning.

Neither respondent discussed much of the detail of how they worked together – instead talking more generally about their experiences of the 'other' (e.g. university or

community) as it characterised nearly all the work they now did. In this way, the project was what connected these two individuals, but both of their activities are part of a wider reaching agenda of work in this area. Most recently they have revisited their partnership informally to act on a campaign to reverse a policy that made it illegal for homeless people to sit, lie, squat or kneel anywhere on the 'sidewalk'. This was part of a broader effort that involved a high level of student protest. Again, Rae was able to work with nursing students to help them understand the clinical implications of people having to, for example, stand all day.

Reclaiming Indigenous History

Respondents:

Abby is an Indigenous young person studying herbal medicine. She worked with the academic centre for youth research on this project and continues to link with them as a part time community researcher on aboriginal youth empowerment projects.

I did not have the opportunity to speak to any others directly involved in the project. The main academic contact had moved on since the completion of the project. I did speak to Tasha, the manager of the centre for youth research in a guided conversation who touched on this project (see below and Appendix 2). I also watched the films Abby and her co-researchers put together as a result of this project. These reflected each community researchers approach to the themes and messages they wanted to convey about themselves and their families' experiences.

The Project: Reclaiming Indigenous History was a project carried out by seven Indigenous young people, working with the centre for youth research in 2012 that created digital stories documenting resistance to the residential school system in Canada. Residential Schools were a state sanctioned policy of removing Indigenous children from their families to place them in an education system that aimed to make them English speaking and convert them to Christianity. They operated between 1840 and 1996. Reclaiming Indigenous History was funded by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada³⁰, and aimed to increase awareness of

³⁰ The TRC's mandate is to inform all Canadians about what happened in Indian Residential Schools (IRS). The Commission will document the truth of survivors, families, communities and anyone

resistance acts and strategies, their relevance in today's context, and to promote intergenerational healing.

Abby was one of the group of young people who met regularly with the academic convenor through sharing circles and other culturally appropriate formats to discuss the project aims and outcomes over 10 months or so. She had originally responded to an advert on a community e-list that put a call out for youth research assistants. Abby reports her experience of working in partnership with the research centre as positive. Her main connection was to the academic convenor who was employed only to work on this project. Her links to the institution were therefore not particularly strong and she understood her role more as one of participating in a specific project as part of a group rather than of working in partnership directly with the university.

In the beginning, she explained the group had planned to interview elders in their families and communities about their experiences of residential schools, but the project shifted in focus when it became clear that this would prove too difficult. The youth research assistants realised that for many of their relatives, these discussions might be off limits, and/or that relatives refused to share their stories because they were too painful. In discussion with the centre, they changed tack and instead developed digital stories and narratives of their own which included exploring Indigenous teachings to understand healing, maintaining Indigenous language and the idea of warriors to explain residential school children's experiences.

The digital stories created have been used in relation to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission as well as presented to academic staff and local students. Since an initial 'launch' phase there has been continuing activity. For example, the videos have been shown in local schools and at research conferences, with the youth researchers always invited to go along to talk about them as well. Abby thinks that sharing these stories with lots of different people, of different backgrounds and ages, has been a great way of seeing different perspectives on them and the issues they speak to. An important

personally affected by the IRS experience. See more at:
<http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/index.php?p=10>

part of the research was also to inspire young people to go and talk to their elders, with the idea that they are keepers of knowledge, and that by speaking with them and other people, discussions can start on this topic. In this way, Abby thinks the research is finding ways to ‘live’ beyond the end product of the research period. Part of the mandate of the TRC was to have Indigenous people’s history acknowledged in schools’ curriculum and this project was originally meant to feed into that. Abby told me that this has been happening in Northern Canada and is still something to be worked on elsewhere.

Indigenous Curriculum

Respondents:

Alice has a background in counselling psychology and leads an interdisciplinary research centre at the university. Her work focuses on emerging adulthood transitions and mental health. She also researches and has published in the area of community-based research.

I did not have the opportunity to speak to any of the others in the project. When I first approached Alice I had in mind to discuss the Reclaiming Indigenous Histories project (as above), as was suggested by my key university contact. When we met, she wanted to speak with me about Indigenous Curriculum as she thought her relationship to the other project was too tangential. This was late on in my fieldwork visit and she was unable to provide me with a suitable partner contact within the remaining time.

The Project: This project developed counselling education and training that integrated Indigenous values and traditions into the curriculum by co-designing it with community leaders from six First Nations. The intention was that operating in this way enabled the partners to bridge the worlds of academic requirements and Indigenous community cultures so that the course could respond to community needs. These needs were to provide part-time accredited learning for adults working in mental health and ‘helping contexts’ within Indigenous communities. The course was designed to take place on weekends and in an intensive summer institute on campus and in community locations.

The course began its development in 2008. One community leader from each of the six First Nations plus Alice and two of her community colleagues went on a retreat to identify the values that should underpin the programme and begin discussions over how their two aims could be achieved. Together they developed the underpinning values of the curriculum, which included the Indigenous paradigm as central, including the circle and stories³¹, ceremony, culture, language and communal healing. The course was piloted in 2013 with a cohort of 8 students and, at the time of writing is ongoing.

The process of development and now the delivery of the course is overseen by an advisory committee of different university staff, community agencies and Indigenous community members, some of whom were in the original development group. But as Alice notes, one of the difficulties she finds in engagement with local community agencies is that staff so often change, and this has impacted on the regularity and consistency of the meetings. Alice also mentioned the particular challenges the group has faced over situating Indigenous practices and ways of knowing into a formally accredited university system. It has been Alice who has undertaken all of this – in part because she has knowledge of how to navigate and ‘work’ the system – but also because she speaks a language and can claim legitimacy that some of her community colleagues don’t have in the academic system. She has still found this a struggle and says that, so far, it has relied mainly on senior managers within the university who are prepared to support work of this type. Her reflections were that should this leadership change, it would likely make it harder to deliver the course. There was a general thread running through much of this interview suggesting that, although Alice conducted a high degree of community engaged research, it was harder to assess from her comments the depth or longevity of the relationships which were implied.

The first cohort of students from the course were just about to graduate at the time of our interview and Alice did not share anything further about the impacts or outcomes of the work for herself or colleagues at this time.

³¹ The circle is a unifying idea across First Nations cultures that promote values of change, wholeness, difference and balance. Individual concepts are interpreted variously by different First Nations. The circle emphasises interconnection to people, place and spirit (Manitoba Ed, 2003). Circle talks are a foundational approach to First Nations pedagogy-in-action. They provide a model for an educational activity that encourages dialogue, respect, the co-creation of learning content, and social discourse. (See <http://firstnationspedagogy.ca/circletalks.html>)

River Place - UK

Health & Wellbeing in the Community

Respondents:

Ross is an academic working in health research. He has worked extensively with community and voluntary sector organisations in his career. He terms this the ‘third sector’.

I was not able to speak to any others directly involved in the project. Ross put me in touch with the CEO of the charity he partnered with, but he was unable to make time to meet me during my fieldwork period. I followed this up on a return visit to the City but received no reply.

The Project: This project began in 2013 as a partnership between Ross and a large health and wellbeing charity. This charity runs a centre (‘the centre’) that provides services to residents in an area of deprivation in the City. One of these services is based on ‘social prescribing’ – whereby GPs can refer patients with social, emotional or practical needs to non-clinical services, often delivered in their communities. This project was an evaluation of the centre’s delivery in this area. Ross secured funds for this work through a scheme specifically to support research partnerships between HEI’s and the ‘third sector’.

Ross and the CEO of the charity met when they were both involved in a city-wide project that explored non-clinical health and wellbeing needs. They stayed in contact and the CEO later sought Ross’s involvement in this evaluation. In deciding whether to engage in the partnership, Ross says he felt comfortable working with the CEO as they had a prior relationship. In terms of the partnership, Ross positioned himself as the ‘researcher’ and referred to standards of rigour as part of his approach to the work.

He suggested that he and his CEO partner had different goals in their collaboration. His opinion was that the CEO wanted the evaluation to show the organisation in a ‘good light’, whereas Ross wanted to produce something he would consider impartial.

He linked this tension to other experiences he has had with third sector organisations and suggested that from his point of view, such ambitions were understandable but not valid in a research context. In this collaboration, Ross said he and the CEO were both clear about this tension and the resulting evaluation was carried out in a way that satisfied Ross' approach, and went towards making the case for the centre's model of service delivery. The evaluation report was solely authored by Ross as the 'academic', and this was seen by the centre to confer additional legitimacy to its findings.

The outcomes of Ross' partnership with the centre have been two-fold. The relationship between Ross and the CEO of the centre is ongoing. The evaluation report also made policy recommendations that have gone towards the city-wide health board's review of funding social prescribing services, but provided little further information about the nature of the collaboration from which these recommendations were drawn.

Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) Heritage Project

Respondents:

Marissa works as Professor of History at an academic centre. She has experience of working with cultural organisations such as museums as an advisor, and more recently in working more directly with local community organisations to support and develop their research ideas.

Laila is a long time activist and community organiser on issues of black history, regeneration and adult learning. She is currently on the board of a charity that manages a community library and café.

The Project: The BME Heritage Project was set up in 2007 to collate and provide an archive for objects and items that reflect the histories of local BME communities in the City. At the outset, this partnership involved River University, museums, galleries and libraries services of the local authority, as well as community groups and residents with an interest in the topic. The archive has long term funding from the Lottery and a single city-wide partnership now supports the work.

Marissa and Laila were involved for the first year of the project (2007-2008). Marissa played an advisory role to the partnership on the more technical aspects of collation and categories in archiving and Laila worked as a community facilitator – making people aware of and encouraging them to identify objects for the archive.

As such, they worked together as part of a wider partnership. In both interviews, Marissa and Laila talked more generally instead about their experiences of ‘engaged research’ and working with a university respectively, with some reference to this project. Neither could not recall much of the detail to their working relationship, beyond their recollections of the wider partnership. This may be partly due to the length of time that had passed since they had been part of the project.

Marissa, described her involvement in the BME Heritage Project as peripheral, and understood her role as one of being an ‘expert’ brought in to advise on aspects of curating and archiving. The project directly linked to her research area and she already had good links with the museums service. Her time on the project was limited and she dipped in and out of meetings/broader stakeholder groupings rather than being committed to a process over a timescale. In contrast, Laila’s role was more consistent. Over 12 months she worked for the project to provide outreach to identified communities – working in one neighbourhood in particular – and attending regular steering group meetings (she did not specify their frequency). Laila’s opinion of the wider partnership was that it was a ‘sensible’ group of people to pull together, but she did not think there was adequate cultural understanding or representation from the groups the project centered on. Her experience was that some of the communities involved mistrusted the project and/or lacked understanding of what was required. This led in particular to resistance to ‘give up’ items for an archive. Laila didn’t feel that these concerns were addressed directly by the partnership in this start-up phase, and her recollection of the role of the university in the project was not very detailed.

The outcomes both Marissa and Laila discussed in relation to the project were also quite separate rather than shared. For Marissa, this was just one project in a range of other activities and scholarly work she was engaged in. The work was another expression of the relationships she already had with the museum service and she did not mention any direct outcomes that had a bearing on her position. Laila was able to

identify outcomes that led to longer term relationships with people in the city including a prominent individual who she has gone on to publish a book with.

Both interviewees had broader collaborative experiences beyond this project. Marissa's work has long been concerned with civil rights and black history so she saw herself as frequently relating to communities in her research. However, she talked about a change of relationship more recently as she had begun to work directly with communities - taking ideas and questions from within communities to relate to her research, rather than already having her ideas and questions mapped out.

Laila had subsequently worked with River University and other Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the City on topics of black history and adult literacy. She reported that from her experience these relationships had frequently been characterised by power inequities, issues of resource distribution and the need to de-stigmatise black students.

Young People and Employment

Respondents:

Sarah works in an academic arts and education centre. She also has particular responsibility for civic and cultural engagement at her institution. She has been a long time collaborator with her local community, most significantly through the 10 years she spent on the board of the Community Media Organisation.

Claire is the director of the Community Media Organisation. She has been working in the neighbourhood her organisation operates in for the last 18 years and is interested in the relationship between arts and wellbeing. She has been awarded an honorary degree by River University in recognition of her contribution to community cohesion, social justice and support for schools and colleges in the local community.

The Project: This project is the latest in a decade long collaboration between these partners which began when Sarah joined the board of trustees at the organisation. In that time, they have worked on projects including awards from the Arts and Humanities Research Council, Arts Council England and the National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts (now Nesta). Sarah says one of the most significant

of these was the award for £4.5m for a community building in this area of high deprivation. They use a Memorandum of Understanding to formalise their relationship.

Both partners have initiated projects. This is sometimes funding dependent, as for example, universities are not eligible to apply for some community-based streams. Conversely, the Community Media Organisation cannot lead on many significant sources of research funding. Claire saw this as having an impact on who can influence and develop research questions and approaches, despite her relationships with the university.

Young People and Employment was focused on the opportunities and barriers for young people wanting to get into the creative and digital industries in the City, and to look at the connection between education, skills and employment. Sarah explained that youth unemployment was of particular significance in the City. Sarah, Claire and representation from a city wide economic board managed by the City Council oversaw the project. The aim was to interview employers, young people, universities and creative industry organisations alongside a review of the relevant literature.

Sarah and Claire were the main resource for the project. Sarah took a lead on interviews and literature review, and Claire worked through her networks and knowledge of the local area to gain access to participants for research. What both partners informally knew was that the creative industries are 'very middle class', and the real route to employment in them is higher education. These two factors made them aware that it was important to focus on including young people from disadvantaged backgrounds, including Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) young people who face additional issues of educational attainment. Their long term working relationship made it possible to have these open conversations and together they worked to ensure that these people's voices could be heard and represented in the project and its final report.

Once the research period was completed Sarah, who had responsibility for writing up the 'official' report, expressed surprise and interest at how much pressure she felt from different partners to represent their interests in the final version. She also

reflected how this sat with the idea of being an impartial researcher. She recognised this as a difficult position to navigate and was very aware that ‘for certain organisations, saying certain things can have a massive or a detrimental [effect]...’. The report was available on a website which also summarised the main recommendations. All partners are represented in name, but little further information provided about the nature of the collaboration from which these recommendations were drawn.

After the final report was completed, Sarah and Claire made a series of presentations to highlight the findings locally. A number of new partnerships have developed out of this including with a government department, a local education partnership and a national funder. Sarah says 80 jobs for young people have been created so far.

Claire talked less about the impacts of this particular project on her organisation, but did offer reflections on her partnership with River University in general. There are two universities in the area in which Claire works and she mentioned the difficulty they have trying to work with their different cultures. She was also clear that her organisation doesn’t want to do ‘one off’ projects – she wants to see River University take the relationships seriously and co-design a five-year program of research – or at least a framework for that.

Local Knowledge in the Natural Environment

Respondents:

Lauren is a researcher with an interdisciplinary background. She has developed her community engagement work over the last 10 years and has most recently been focusing on community and lay knowledge in the natural environment.

I was not able to speak to any others directly involved in the project. Lauren agreed to put me in touch with her community partners but on following this up with her, I was not able to get a response. I contacted her again on two further occasions but received no reply.

The Project: This was a one-year national research council funded project, which explored how different communities experienced a big flooding event in 2007.

Lauren wanted to understand the extent to which local communities with histories of past extreme flooding events are better equipped to cope during and after new floods. The research design included an advisory group composed of members of a local flood action group, the parish council and local councillors. Lauren already had an established relationship with many of these ‘stakeholders’ from previous work when at a different institution. In these regular advisory group meetings (Lauren did not specify their frequency), partners collected stories and photographs as well as identifying other sources of information (such as websites and maps) to generate data for the research.

Lauren described their work together in straightforward terms. This project was heavily influenced by the structure and timeline of the funding grant and so was very focused on delivery. These existing relationships helped that to happen as no particular time was given over to cultivate them and stakeholders were discussed in quite formal terms. In the main, from Lauren’s point of view, the advisory group meetings went to plan. She did reflect that in some cases different stakeholders had felt very strongly and emotionally about what they were sharing, and there were some strong divided opinions on flood management policy in the locality. She saw her role here as wanting to be impartial about these expressions of feeling. This was in part because she saw herself as the figurehead of the project – wanting to keep people on track and also because she didn’t want to express opinions that agreed or contested those of participants, in case it put her in an awkward situation with other stakeholders in her field of work.

The advisory group recorded the evidence of its work on a detailed blog that included photographs, maps, individual testimonies and background literature. The project made recommendations for agencies responsible for flood risk management policies, in particular on how the inclusion of community and local knowledge could be incorporated in policy development.

This section has provided a descriptive overview of the 10 case study projects that inform my thesis. I now expand on the additional conversations I had with those people in fieldwork sites who had experience of engagement but who were not directly affiliated with one of the case studies described above.

Guided Conversations

As outlined in Chapter 5, during fieldwork it became clear that there were a range of other people outside of the eventual case studies with experience of community-university engagement that I might speak to. They were either not currently in an active collaboration, or their work fell outside one or more of my criteria for case studies, for example, projects that only involved students. As I expand on below, these people often had not just direct project experience, but strategic oversight of the place of engagement within and outside of the university. They therefore could provide an additional perspective on the context of engagement in Island or River University which would be helpful to my enquiry.

In Island place, after discussing my research aims, my key university contact identified 10 people I could approach to speak to based on her knowledge of them and her personal networks. In River place, my key university contact was the only person I sat down with for a conversation. As also noted in Chapter 5, we had less frequent face to face contact and she also had fewer networks within and outside her institution beyond those case study projects suggested. I prepared a separate topic guide to the one used in case study interviews. This guide had fewer topic areas, and was used to offer some direction to conversations rather than moving systematically between questions as with my semi-structured interviews. These topics covered the background of the respondent, the scope of their engagement experiences, their motivations for and understandings of engagement and how they saw their community-university work in the future. All conversations were recorded and transcribed.

In both fieldwork sites, I spoke to eight people who held different roles within the university, two who held senior positions in community agencies and one local government councillor who also ran a micro-lending charity. Of those working in universities, five had, or previously held strategic responsibility for community engagement activity. Of the remaining three, two were lecturers whose main engagement activities were through students as part of curriculum, and the third was the manager of a research unit that supported young people to participate in research

projects. Appendix 2 gives further brief details of all 11 respondents and their pseudonyms. I approached analysis of these data thematically and subsequent to the analysis of case study interviews. Transcripts were read against the themes that arose from case study data, and specific findings were drawn on relevant to points or perspective that also arose in these data.

This range of respondents offered perspectives on engagement that came from both academic and practitioner experiences, and in some cases people held a mixture of both. These conversations and in particular those held with people responsible for the coordination of community engagement at their institutions contributed to my understanding of the longevity of engagement at each place and the origins of any current institutional commitment to engagement work. In both fieldwork sites, forms of engagement were important to the institutions' strategic plans, and in Chapter 7 I reflect further on some of this detail as it set the context for engagement at both universities.

All respondents identified that their activities were in some way driven by community needs and issues and that there were a variety of ways in which people acted on these opportunities. The activities that academic respondents discussed happened in two main ways. One mirrored the types of relationships outlined in my case studies – those that were based on collaborative approaches to addressing a topic and that often involved a mixture of roles between partners. Unlike these case studies, the activities of other respondents I spoke to were linked to student curriculum where their focus was on opportunities for students to work on 'real world' projects. Whilst these were driven by knowledge of social issues and activities that students could get involved with, e.g. local government housing policy, the scope of these activities were thus clearly determined by student project needs, for which they received academic credit.

Those community respondents I spoke in Island Place reflected that the institution was often difficult to navigate to find out what opportunities for engagement there could be and these relied on a mixture of ad hoc connections and more structured opportunities. Respondents had variously been on the governance board of the community engagement team, employed as a part time community researcher and been involved in a previous research project (as lead of their community

organisation). These examples represent different ways in to a relationship with the university but all these respondents saw the value of linking with the university on the topics and issues that were important to them.

I have not used findings from all of these conversations in my thesis. But the following list names the people who feature briefly in Chapters 7 & 8.

Island Place - Canada

Cassie is a former director of a women's housing NGO. She now works for a housing research network that promotes the use of research and relationships between researchers and housing organisations. She was involved in a research partnership with Island University some years ago in her former role. She remained connected with the community engagement team after that to maintain future research opportunities.

Justin is a historian who works as a researcher at Island Place. He previously had a leadership role in the university's community engagement team in 2006. He has run a native field school, on reserve for 15 years. He responds frequently to Indigenous treaty group requests for information on land rights.

Lara is a local government councillor and director of a microlending charity. She has previously worked as a part-time community researcher at Island University – employed by their community engagement team. She has been a partner to initiatives that followed from the Neighbourhood Development Project case study.

Luca teaches on sustainable food systems. His PhD worked with Indigenous communities on issues of sustainability and he is involved in food systems work with multiple stakeholders within and outside the university.

Melinda is a lecturer who teaches anthropology and supports student projects on community based issues including homelessness. She also discussed her personal activism, which has included arranging talks and debates on university premises.

Tasha is a research centre manager who oversees the delivery of a range of research related to children and young people. She coordinates partnerships, develops funding bids and builds capacity with youth researchers to co-deliver projects. Tasha had a community-based background. Before her university role she worked for many years in the women, homelessness and poverty sectors.

River Place - UK

Dorothy is responsible for coordinating public and community engagement at River Place. Her role involves working across the institution to embed public engagement and help community and other organisations to work with the university's staff and students.

Conclusion

This chapter has described the 10 case study projects that form the substantive data set for my study. It has presented the actors involved in these projects and their pseudonyms for the purposes of my research. This chapter has also included an overview of the 11 guided conversations I had with people in addition to my case study material. I have offered brief descriptions of who these people were and a summary of themes covered in conversation. The following chapters, 7 & 8 now set out my findings in relation to the two principal themes of how people talked about their collaborations (Ch 7) and how knowledge was discussed, used and legitimated (Ch 8).

Chapter 7

Putting Engagement into Practice

Introduction

This chapter sets out how research participants talked about their community-university collaborations. It considers how people positioned themselves in their work and the practices and approaches that were adopted to support collaboration. The chapter also considers what motivated actors to participate in engagement activities and the place of community-university collaborations as a mechanism for social change.

I begin by looking in detail at who the people in my research are. I explore how respondents identified themselves within their work and acknowledge that in many cases this disrupted conventional binary academic/community groupings. I next discuss how people understood engagement. This was seen by many as ‘doing things differently’ to more traditional approaches to research, and connected to acknowledging and valuing the different perspectives, contributions and capabilities different actors brought to collaborations. My data demonstrate that engaged approaches could develop spaces where different roles and identities could be negotiated and addressed. Respondents noted this as important to bringing different perspectives, capacities and options to their collaborative work.

The chapter highlights relationships as a defining feature of collaborative practice and goes on to establish norms of trust, reciprocity and mutual benefit as aspects of this and how power relations acted on my case study examples. The final part of this chapter explores in more detail how my data evidenced relational accountability, the presence of emotions and expressions of ‘care’ as underpinning ideas of working relationally.

Academics and Activists?

My thesis reflects an assumption that university and community actors are conceptualised as separate groups, characterised by distinct features. On the one hand, we have ‘academics’ who reside within an institutional context, traditionally

positioned as experts and knowledge producers. On the other, we have ‘community’ and social actors who may span individual to more organised collectives and more commonly draw on lived experience to mobilise on community and justice issues.

My analysis of data indicates people didn’t retain such a separation in practice and a far more differentiated picture of how people identified themselves emerged. Respondents drew on a range of reference points to inform the way they practiced their participation in engagement activities. These included reference to scholarly perspectives such as critical theory, and to personal factors such as family backgrounds. Taken together, these provided a ‘frame’ for experiences, perspectives and values from which people constructed their positions, decisions and actions in relation to their collaborative work and one another. In identifying such variation in how people thought about themselves, an either/or binary of ‘who was who’ was hard to establish.

This section begins by exploring people’s accounts of how they saw themselves in their collaborations. I consider the specific elements that people included in their ‘frames of experience’ and offer some reflections from fieldwork on how the different contexts people were operating in had a bearing on their engagement practices.

Beyond the Binary

A distinguishing feature of my data was that very few respondents discussed their identity in collaborations without reference to any other influences, experiences or ideas. People’s explanations were often accompanied by extra information that gave an insight into how they came to identify themselves in a particular way. This resulted in a ‘disruption’ of traditional ways of looking at these groups and was demonstrated with both academic and community respondents.

At Island University, Alice and Cara considered themselves researchers, but offered qualification on what that meant to them. In our opening exchanges, both respondents discussed their background and experiences of engagement. When asked how they identify themselves within their case study collaborations they responded as follows:

Alice: 'Well, I would probably identify myself as a researcher who is committed to equitable and collaborative partnerships and community partnerships... I am not sure – I haven't really thought about that' (84)

Cara: '... So I consider myself obviously a researcher but I would say I am, uh... I don't know – a social justice researcher?...' (35)

In both these examples there was also hesitation or a pause for thought before responding, expressing a degree of uncertainty about their view or that they hadn't considered it much before. The clarity offered by an institutional position perhaps leads people to feel they do not have to define themselves, or are not used to doing so. The qualifications offered here relate to ideas of community partnerships and social justice and imply a relationship to activists' agendas.

However, most academic respondents didn't go as far as to label themselves activists per se. Edith at Island University, said she had always seen herself as having '*an activist personality*' (29), but as the quote below indicates, she interprets this in her academic role by identifying herself as an ally to communities in their activities for change:

'I think it's really, really important that we not see ourselves as helpers... I see myself as being a potential partner, an ally... so I guess to that extent I am an activist but I'm not sure I would call myself that' (Edith, 38)

Lauren, an academic in environmental science at River University is a further example of this. We discussed her voluntary work which is the same field as her research – but as she explains:

'I don't think I would describe myself as an activist but I suppose I'm going in there [through her

research] with quiet ways of trying to empower people...’ (Lauren, 106)

A further factor acting on how academics were choosing to identify themselves was that many were making use of previous experiences to inform how they expressed their role. Sarah at River University for example had been a community based practitioner before her current academic post. This helped to inform how she saw herself – ‘*with an instinct to work collaboratively*’ (176) - and to flag what she saw as a potential issue of academics not having a more flexible take on their identity. She highlighted that in her view if you were ‘*somebody with a very particular identity... not open to discussing that*’ (60) it could cause problems in engagement work.

There were some examples in my data, such as Melinda, a lecturer in anthropology at Island University for whom the question of identity and positioning was completely fluid. She described herself as having a ‘foot in both camps’ as a result of always having been involved in activities and issues in the community:

*‘I’m not quite sure that people in the community necessarily know when I’ve got my university hat on and when I’ve got my community member hat on’
(Melinda, 1)*

By responding in this way Melinda doesn’t align herself with either an academic or community label – instead inferring she has multiple roles, determined at different times. This indicates that she doesn’t see the interests and practices of her personal, community and academic experiences as incompatible, or that a separation is desirable or possible. It was also the case that people within the university could be at once both ‘academics’ and citizens or residents of a place, which was important to some in interpreting their activities. In the few examples where this point of view was apparent, respondents including Melinda, went further to suggest that the hyphen that separates community-university groupings in how we talk about engagement should be erased.

Running counter to this, some in universities resisted the notion of more fluid identities. In this short exchange with Ross an academic at River University, we are exploring how he sees himself in collaborative work:

Ross: I would be the PI if you like, for the project. In others, you know, I have been the lead, you know the joint lead with other universities and other people.

Ceri: OK, yep: and then are you always the 'academic' (in inverted commas)?

Ross: I suppose yes. Yes I am. And I tend to see ... you know I like people to see me ... as a bit more than not just an academic. And ... but I am really. (chuckles)

Here, Ross' first response was to identify within traditional academic roles, and those that confer esteem – for example, the PI. Despite leading with this position in his early responses, he also expresses that he'd like people to 'see him as a bit more' than that. But throughout the remainder of our interview, these other qualities, experiences and values are not expressed. He is adopting a position as being predominantly located in academic ideas, norms and values. Justin, at Island University responded similarly:

'I mean my base is the university and so I identify myself as a scholarly or academic university based partner... you know I'm quite comfortable in my skin that we have valuable knowledge here...' (65)

Justin also offers a justification that suggests he values the clear delineation of university and community distinctions and his view that this is legitimate. Though they were few in my data, these responses suggest a more explicit separation of how actors identified themselves and the positions they took in their collaborative work.

The findings above suggest respondents are choosing to situate their work within values of community action and that for many, including multiple influences was an important feature of constituting academic identity. Despite this more fluid interpretation of how they saw themselves, for some an academic-activist separation remained desirable suggesting that distinction in role was important.

Community-Based Identities

Respondents who worked in organisations or communities outside of the university commonly described themselves as ‘the community worker’ or ‘community partners’ in collaborative relationships. There was generally less exploration with community based respondents on how they saw themselves. Whereas many academics recognised a ‘dual’ reality of being a researcher and a member of wider communities, the same did not apply to most community respondents.

People tended to explore their identities through the skills and ideas they brought to or used in their collaborations. Lisa, who was part of a community development project local to Island place, offered this detail:

‘Oh, officially I’m supposed to be managing the project. Unofficially... I tend to be more, there are days when I’m a fire-fighter, and there are certainly days when I’m a translator’ (30)

Lisa identifies herself here as carrying out the practical tasks of making the project work and indicates that these were not shared with her academic partners. Claire in River place also alluded to management of project workers, activities and ‘relationships with the community’ in her experiences. Here, many community partners were describing themselves as in roles that mediated or bridged academic relationships and the communities they were working with.

Some community partners however, deliberately sought to position themselves separate to the academy. Rae at Island place for example, explained her identity as connected to the values she placed on her and others’ life experience:

‘When people ask me what my degree is I tell them NBSW – the No Bullshit Worker – and they’re like... I say you can put all the fancy letters behind a person’s name you know, but its life experience that they bring forward that is the most valuable’ (16)

This situates Rae clearly at a distance from more traditional academic and educational ideals, which gives her distinction in collaborations and expresses what she values in terms of them – to support the inclusion of and provide her own experiential perspective. As an Indigenous woman this distancing may also be explained by her previous negative experiences of non-aboriginal educational systems.

Sonia on the other hand put forward a much more mixed picture of identity in her collaborative and community work. Following experiences as a graduate student and a social worker, in her current community based role she supports peer researchers living with HIV/Aids. She described herself as someone who does community based as well as academic activities, *‘such as data analysis’* (144). She highlighted the opportunity and difficulty she has in a position that can ‘speak to both’ community and academic roles.

These examples from community and academic respondents start to suggest that identifying and communicating roles or positions within collaborative work relies on the meaning you can attribute to your activities rather than the ‘title’ you may have. Many academic and some community respondents suggested a blurring, to different degrees, of their identities which encompassed their interests, influences and values.

Influencing Positions

This section looks briefly at some of the elements that made up people’s frame of experience – those factors that contributed to the positions and decisions respondents took in collaborative working. These were tied to the expressions of identity outlined above.

- *Theory*

Where evident in my data, it was academic respondents who mainly discussed the use of conceptual ideas or specific theory. In an example of the use of theoretical work being applied to navigate her research approach at Island place, Bree explicitly identified theories of social justice and cited the work of the political scientists Iris Marion Young and Nancy Fraser. She used these reference points to give meaning to her understandings of justice and inferred that these were central to how she approached her work in health equity. She went on to say that clearly drawing on such a theoretical framework informed her choices of methodology:

'...[I] definitely tended to draw on critical social theory, in terms of a lot of the methodologies we use... and I see all of that fitting in with um, an approach, a community based research approach that says, we're going to work collaboratively...'
(430)

By explaining her approach in this way she is demonstrating that theoretical ideas have a role in inspiring and navigating her work. Whilst this example makes use of theory produced within Western ways of knowing, Cara at Island University – a health researcher and Indigenous woman – made use of concepts situated in an Indigenous worldview. She identified theoretical influences from aboriginal scholars, and went on to discuss the work of Albert Marshall, a Mi'kmaw elder who coined the term 'two eyed seeing'³², which refers to the gift of multiple perspectives (that can include Indigenous and Western).

The extended quote below shows how Cara made the connection between 'two eyed seeing' to Indigenous ways of knowing and being:

³² Two-Eyed Seeing refers to learning to see from one eye with the strengths of, or the best in, the Indigenous knowledges and ways of knowing, and from the other eye learning to see with the strengths of, or the best in, the Western (mainstream) knowledges and ways of knowing, but, most importantly, learning to use both these eyes together, for the benefit of all (Canada Education Association, 2014).

'For a lot of Indigenous people, prior to contact and since then even, there is a really pragmatism about life and a pluralistic sort of perspective that allows you to um, to adapt things um, based on other people's learnings without valuing one over the other. It's not about domination, it's about collaboration. So the actual philosophy is, pluralism. Seeing something with many eyes turning the full 360 degrees around something in order to understand it better. And the more people that help the better you are going to do it and every individual brings something special. Well that is all part of Indigenous philosophy so, um so I bring that to my work' (Cara, 109)

Cara is making use of such theory to inform her work and it is also notable that she deems this theory to be compatible with her work in an institution where aboriginal ways of knowing are historically marginalised. She prioritises the use of this theory for its alignment to her identity as an Indigenous woman and an academic.

By combining conceptual ideas with research and collaboration, these examples suggest that theory played a role in supporting academics to make decisions about their practice and the social justice efforts they were directed towards.

There were fewer examples of community based respondents drawing on theory or academic approaches in their work. The evidence here pointed more to people conflating theoretical ideas with how they understood 'academia' more generally. This was illustrated through people questioning or opposing the use of 'theory' where it obscured or diverted attention from people's lived experiences as a source of valid knowledge. For example Tasha, a research manager in Island University discussed the 'myth of academia' in relation to community organisations trying to evaluate what they do. Her view was that community workers buy into the 'lie' of reifying research evidence as the most – perhaps the only – legitimate way to prove the value of what they do. In doing so, they often overlook the knowledge and experience they have 'in

house'. This suggests a counterpoint to how useful 'theory' is seen to be in the work collaborators are doing with each other.

- *Family and Community*

It was a feature of my data that academics and community participants readily drew on aspects of their community or family backgrounds.

Kate, a social work lecturer at Island University explained that the small town she grew up in had a culture that '*essentially was community development*' (118). She explicitly connected her experiences of home to what she does now:

'...I did some national health projects. And they always turned in to community development projects – like somehow, you know, my culture sort of followed me around... (149) I was carrying my [province] culture and putting it into my work'

Similarly, community partner George who worked with Kate on a project at Island University drew on his experiences growing up in apartheid-era South Africa as formative to his sense of social justice, and subsequent choices about the career he wanted to pursue (teaching) and his approach to working with people and building community.

Other influences on people's activity included the political. Marissa, at River University talked about this as what framed her approach:

'my politics basically... a commitment from my background in America, and the civil rights movement and things like that to social justice' (4)

Respondents who were also from Indigenous communities (at Island place) made clear connections to their cultural background and experiences of family in terms of their outlook on collaboration and research. What this highlighted was that respondents needed to navigate not just multiple perspectives, but also different

systems of belief and ways of knowing. These included cultural teachings and beliefs as well as skills seen as particular to that group, e.g. oral traditions. All the Indigenous people I spoke to made a reference to their Nation suggesting this was a significant identifier.

Sonia for example discussed the importance of family as a large part of her identity and that her Indigenous perspective was central to how she approached collaboration:

'I know where I come from... I come from an Indigenous perspective, I come from you know, a Cree perspective' (Sonia, 102)

In the case of Cara and Sonia, they also discussed their identities as women. Taken together, these aspects raise instances where overlapping social identities also feature in the recognition and inclusion of ideas and ways of knowing.

Different Contexts, Different Approaches?

I conclude exploring how people saw themselves by presenting some short reflections on how the varying settings they were in provided a context for the way they approached, or thought about, their collaborations. The most obvious differences were due to place as my fieldwork was carried out in two different geographic and socio-political settings.

Various extant terms were used to name what people were doing together: 'community based participatory research', 'engaged scholarship' and 'community engagement'. However, these were not universally applied in practice. Participants at Island University tended to use the first two, and River University the latter. North America has a longer history of terminology and practices of Community Based Research (CBR) or Action Research, which may go some way to explaining the preference for this terminology. These also follow trends in policy and research council funding in Canada which give primacy to these methods and approaches. In the UK, the use and ownership of these terms is more limited, with the policy landscape over the last 10 years or more focusing on community engagement in the civic sphere, which was reflected in a more non-specific use of the term. This has

continued to change since my fieldwork was conducted, and the language of co-production and public engagement is now more commonly used in UK research funding and policy discourse³³. This is of course in relation to community-university engagement specifically and does not take account of the wide body of participatory or emancipatory research which takes place in disciplinary fields such as mental health, social policy and development studies. Medicine and health sciences also have a recent history of public and patient involvement within which attention is paid to lay involvement in research processes and health service delivery.

It was observable that UK responses tended to be more traditionally aligned to historic and bounded roles of ‘researcher’ and ‘researched’ whereas in most Canadian examples this binary was more fluid. At Island place, people tended to introduce themselves with descriptive information rather than official titles. Possible reasons for this include a prominent policy context in the UK of ‘knowledge transfer’ and the role of the ‘expert’ in meeting policy objectives. The contrast between places was also evident when considering the governance arrangements for community engagement at both sites. In Island University, co-governance arrangements are in place that ‘model’ engagement institutionally, and there was no evidence of this in River University. Island University, additionally, contended with a commitment to, and engagement with, Indigenous discourses and approaches that provide a fundamental base of challenge and disruption to taken for granted positions and possibilities within sections of the university.

River University case studies were also characterised by being more project orientated, with some of these relationships shorter term. Enduring connections were not identified across all case studies in this setting. This weaker relational connectivity also bore out with increased difficulty during fieldwork with identifying and accessing community partners through my academic links. There was only one case of this in Island place.

³³ One major driver for this that I mentioned in Chapter 2 has been the Research Excellence Framework, a system by which UK universities are assessed on the quality of their research. For the last submission in 2014, a weighting in this assessment was given to research impact – the reach and significance of research on society, economy, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia.

Understanding Engagement

My analysis suggests that people understood their engagement with each other by locating their activities as part of a 'bigger picture'. This included narratives of public accountability and social justice and in many cases respondents saw what they were doing as challenging the status quo of traditional understandings of 'research'. People saw engagement as a distinct opportunity to work together on problem solving, learning, capacity building and co-producing knowledge for 'real world' issues. To do so required new approaches, ideas and perspectives on working with one another that could bring people together to work on a common problem or agenda. People were motivated to work in these ways because they had a passion for the topic and saw it as a way to make a difference. Respondents recognised that engaged approaches could develop spaces where different roles and identities could be negotiated and addressed to develop something that would not otherwise be possible.

The Bigger Picture

Public accountability of institutions was a feature of how people understood engagement and set the context for some of their activities. Alice, at Island University described how she saw this:

'this is a publicly funded university and this is public money going into these programs... I mean we all live in a world where I think we need to be accountable for our actions' (358)

Community partner Laila in River place shared this view and thought that engagement was one of the ways universities could act on this. Tasha at Island University also highlighted why accountability was an important part of the engagement agenda:

'I think that there's, there are tremendous resources in the university that can be put at the service of really complex social issues... So we really do need to call it to account and – that's the harsh way of framing it' (51)

In my Canadian case studies, public accountability was often interspersed by ideas of ‘service’. Cara at Island University for example, explained that her research only made sense located as part of a community and that she wanted to work in service to the community. Edith also at Island University however, felt that this emphasis on wanting to make a difference should not be about academics seeing themselves as ‘helpers’ but rather as potential partners. This emphasis on understanding engagement as about being a partner alongside, rather than ‘doing to’ communities was clear across both fieldwork sites. It was common for academic respondents to demarcate their activities from other forms of public engagement or community development for example, that may have different implications for the dynamics of how they worked together.

Alice, an academic at Island University considered some of these distinctions to be about where money resides and how it is used. She suggested that engagement as she understood it needed to sit outside of the normative expectations some community organisations might have about what the university is there to do:

‘They [community organisation] get development and they get funding for development but they don’t always understand that when you are a community researcher – what community research is about. And that we have to ... we are researching here. We are not giving you money for community development’
(Alice, 634)

This indicates that Alice sees engagement as being about a two-way process, where all actors are active partners in a process of research. This quote also suggests that she thinks this isn’t always understood by some of the communities she might work with.

In contrast, Claire a community partner in River place commented on the will in her organisation to be partners to research, rather than recipients of occasional offers to participate in research projects as respondents or end users of research. Claire reflected the following:

'And so I think what I would like to see is much more of a longer-term commitment from the universities because they tend to dabble' (337)

In this way, she places the onus on the university to understand engagement as a two-way process that requires a longer-term view to separate it out from other activities that might require relationships between universities and outside organisations.

As also outlined in Chapter 6, respondents who I spoke to in conversations additional to case studies also demonstrated some of the different types of activity that constituted engagement. This ranged from student project activity, to community partners being involved in governance of engagement activity within the university, to academics responding to individual requests to access or mobilise certain types of knowledge (e.g. legal documents) in support of activists needs.

Though engagement activities may have varied, case study respondents all saw collaborations as a way to give social issues visibility. Dorothy, a partnerships manager at River University explained that she understood this as an aspect of engagement:

'The universities are big kind of power houses and the issues that they take on, perhaps could you know ... could be escalated to policy makers and so you can raise a social issue through a big partner. So it is kind of that power and influence if you like' (Dorothy, 387)

Many community partners saw the reality of universities being able to mobilise on issues they shared as an aspect of their activities with academic partners.³⁴ Understanding engagement in this way implied a strategic element on the part of community and social actors to seek out ways of achieving their objectives. Some

³⁴ Some community based respondents talked about developing 'allies', but this word was used more in the Canadian setting – in part because it relates to an understanding of how non-aboriginal people can know and respect Indigenous peoples and ways.

community partners recognised that different contributions were helpful to their agendas, and in some cases this related to feeling that you needed the perceived legitimacy of academia to move an issue forwards.

For example, Lisa in discussing what her community organisation hoped to achieve with a new project reflected:

'I don't think [we] could ever do this alone and have the veritas (sp) to go in to a community and say 'we are going to create this [project]' (53)

Recognising that different contributions could work together was also part of community based Lara's understanding. She connected this to what she saw as the purpose of research:

'...that's what research should do – it should be mobilised to create action in the community and in the world' (Lara, 126)

This quote from Lara also suggests that she sees engagement as relating to the wider world – and that activities which can include and make use of different contributions, including research is part of the picture of engagement. Locating engagement as part of a bigger system within which social issues arise, and action can be taken was also identified by Island place academic Bree. She clearly saw her work as looking at the 'whole system' and pointed out that her understanding of engagement was also about doing different things at different times:

'...because you've now engaged as a researcher in a problem that's impacting the community and it's not as simple as 'I'm going to do this one project' right. ...so sometimes it's knowledge translation of existing research, sometimes it's doing programme evaluations, sometimes it is an original research question' (301)

Locating research as part of a community issue worked on by activists, or an organisation meant that, for many, engagement was understood as thinking about how research could be brought to bear on a common problem or agenda. Most collaborations were working with or attending to issues within communities that demanded an approach that could encompass giving visibility or voice to certain groups (e.g. Peer researchers in Aboriginal Communities and the BME Heritage Project); responding to historic (and present) injustice (e.g. Reviving Indigenous Languages); and political and cultural issues that intersected with social issues such as housing and homelessness, youth employment and higher education. Respondents therefore understood engaged research to be connected to forms of social justice and community based activism. Some respondents explicitly named their work as being ‘justice focused’ or about ‘social justice’ as well as education and equality and changes in policy that implied contributions to structural shifts in responding to marginalised communities. The use of these terms was also reflected in some documentary sources for projects, for example the final project report submitted to the funder for ‘Reviving Indigenous Languages’ and in online dissemination of ‘Participatory Research on Homelessness’. Some of these agendas were also more or less overtly part of a struggle for recognition and inclusion of groups and issues.

The opportunity to work on common agendas was seen by community based Sonia as also giving voice to marginalised groups such as aboriginal people living with HIV/Aids. Here she was talking about what developing peer research in her organisation meant to those she works with:

*‘more and more are coming forward and saying
‘this is what we need, this is what we want, this is
what we have to share’...’ (217)*

This example also demonstrates how engagement involved community members in shaping research and using their capacities and ideas in addressing the problems identified.

Engagement was therefore discussed as being about connectivity of contributions and different agendas, framed within ideas of accountability, and orientated towards

agendas of social justice and action that makes a difference. This was based on people identifying something in common to work on, the necessity of collaboration on issues of shared interest and a recognition that ‘research’ could involve different people and contributions to keep it connected to action.

Doing Things Differently

What became clear from my data in people’s understandings of engagement was that collaborations were accompanied by the notion of ‘doing things differently’. People understood their work as contesting dominant framings of the university as the ‘expert’, and the associated research practices that stem from this more objective and positivist discourse. For many academic partners, their work was often happening apart from what would be considered mainstream research, and for some this work was not valued by their institutions in the same way as more ‘traditional’ forms of research. Some academic respondents seemed to show that they were choosing not to align with the dominant discourse of academia, and a stereotype that they think didn’t applied to them. For example, Melinda described – *‘you know, the publish, publish, publish kind of type’* (21) that she didn’t recognise as relevant to her work. For community based respondents, working with universities as partners rather than as subjects of their research, or subject to the outcomes of research was a new experience. Actors in my case studies were involved in activities that had outcomes useful for communities, focusing on personal connections and developing capacities for communities to be involved in research. Thus collaborations that were ‘doing things differently’ required an approach to understanding each other where assumptions that underpinned the status quo were as Sarah at River University put it – *‘turned upside down (78)’*.

Relationships were central to achieving this and relational concepts were used by people in both fieldwork sites demonstrating their importance in engagement alongside development and access to knowledge and having shared goals. Cara shared her view on how she works:

‘Everybody has a different understanding of what a word means. But I guess when I think about

collaboration... there is more of a relational component to it... It has to be relational' (222)

Rather than a definition, university based Edith talked about investing in activities that develop relationships such as finding out information, identifying funding sources, checking in regularly with her community partners, taking direction, listening and responding.

At River University, Marissa reflected on how she had made some of her connections to community partners:

'if you are here long enough and you forge links you get, actually get to know people quite well and you get these organic links' (76)

The 'forging links' that she mentions indicates that these connections can take time to develop and require a presence with community issues and in community spaces that may lead to future forms of relationship. This also implies that in spending time getting to know one another, you may develop shared or overlapping interests or objectives that can be addressed in collaboration. In Island place, NGO based Sonia expanded on what building such connections and relationships could lead to. In her case, this included a network of support and knowledge that contributed to issues of Aboriginal Health her organisation was focused on:

'...it's drawing on that network right, its introducing people that are interested in research, introducing them to academics that work in the field that are interested in doing it or that have the same kind of common goal to help with that' (680)

It was a feature of my data that people understood making connections and building relationships as an intrinsic part of engagement, regardless of whether there was always a funded project to work on. George, a community partner at Island place

describes how when he first moved to his neighbourhood, he sought out a conversation with [name of academic], and though no project was on the cards at that time, he as he put it *'kept those relationship pieces'* (58) with the university, which at a later point were re-visited for a project. This commitment to relationships was also demonstrated by examples where academics were effectively working beyond their funding to maintain relationships. Sarah at River University for example, talked about continuing to work on a digital workforce project even though her funding finished some months prior to our interview.

Spaces of Change?

It was a clear feature of my data that people placed value on the multiple contributions their co-work involved. The degrees of fluidity in the way people saw themselves and each other also expanded the possibility that different actors had different capabilities to contribute to addressing social issues. My data suggests that this could result in doing things that might otherwise not be possible by one or another partner alone, and could support the achievement of objectives that focused on social change.

Cara, at Island University offered an example of the combination of different offerings and perspectives that might be present in a collaboration:

'...so not only do I bring [research skills] to the research project, but I also, I'm able to share those with my research partners who maybe haven't had those kinds of, that kind of training. So I bring that to them, they teach me other things about how to work well in communities. About community protocols, about Indigenous ways of knowing that I may never have learned or forgotten...' (210)

These combinations could also mean, as Sonia highlighted, that different collaborators in different contexts may be able to do something through their shared efforts *'that the other might be constrained by'* (380). One of these more pragmatic constraints for community partners was access to funding and/or extra capacity for

their work through student input. For example, Donna who worked together with Edith at Island University on ‘Reviving Indigenous Languages’ pointed out that her community couldn’t have accessed \$1M to meet their objectives without their university partnership. Claire, at River place also highlighted access to large funds through structures such as research councils as an important backdrop to supporting her work with Sarah in community media. Lisa highlighted the ‘pure benefit’ of using interns and graduate students as part of her collaborative work in Island place. Her view was they brought critical capacity, and a different perspective to making the project happen and thinking about where it could go next.

My interpretation of the data also suggests that people understood their collaborations as spaces where these differences were addressed, negotiated and used to meet actors’ objectives that would not otherwise be possible. Bree, an academic at Island University thought that ‘*significantly re-framing a problem*’ (388) through combining multiple perspectives was the real power of working in collaborative ways. George, a community partner involved in the Island place neighbourhood development project thought about this more through the metaphor of ‘*the more at the table, the richer the feast*’, going on to say:

*‘I’ve no respect for anti-academic or anti-intellectual stuff because it is uh... I mean it’s about bringing the totality of human experience around one particular place, and seeing what transpires’
(line 1188)*

This quote also implies that George sees spaces of engagement as places that can deal with the continuous emergence of ideas in approaching an issue.

The collection of perspectives and capabilities that many of my case studies represented were demonstrably tied to shared objectives that focused on social change. Collaboration was seen as a significant approach to achieving such ambitions, as outlined by Edith, at Island University:

'...anytime you are talking about social change you have to understand it doesn't happen in a vacuum, you have to come together in order for it to happen in a truly authentic way. So we have a collaborative project where people are coming together and getting to know each other then it's possible to create...' (466)

My analysis of empirical data shows there were three broad outcomes from collaborative work that can be situated within notions of social justice. These were:

- capacity building: creating new skills and competencies,
- developing procedures or best practice that supported collaborators to work together and
- producing and sharing new information on a topic that moved agendas at a local and policy level.

In the quote above, Edith, a theoretical linguist is reflecting on the first of these from her work in the 'Reviving Indigenous Languages' project. Capacity was built with community members to share their endangered First Nations' language and support new learners. A system for recording and sharing language was developed alongside people's own competencies. Speakers of the language began to increase and a school was created to support their ongoing teaching. A website developed from the project now provides resources and more information to support people's learning, and promotes the collaborative approach that led to the project's success. In this example, collaboration with the university also developed trusted relationships, built on recognition of each other's contributions that has led to other forms of work.

The second outcome was developing procedures or best practice that supported collaborations to work together effectively. For example, changing ethics procedures within review processes to include 'Ownership Control, Access & Possession'³⁵ in relation to research with Indigenous communities. Another was developing criteria for partnership opportunities within a local community organisation that had

³⁵ See: <http://www.naho.ca/documents/fnc/english/OCAP.pdf> for further information

previously had a negative experience with being or providing ‘research subjects’. Naming and putting together these procedures was made possible through connecting to and locating alternative discourses in these community-university relationships.

The third outcome was forms of information dissemination that shared new information and offered new analysis on a topic. This took the form of research papers and reports, policy documents, attendance on governance and decision making structures, community newsletters and events and film and photo capture. Sarah at River University talked about her work with a local community media organisation as an example of moving the agenda along at a local and policy level. Working together and with a variety of other stakeholders, they produced a report. As outlined in Chapter 6, Sarah felt the partners to the report were keen that it reflected their agendas. As she explains below, this information produced an immediate local response that has prompted further action, none of which she thinks could have been achieved without working together:

‘...there are 4 or 5 things that have immediately come out of that... that are about taking on thinking around certain aspects of this [the project] further and this is being seen and we are being looked at... being given platforms to speak left, right and centre – asked to be involved in things...’ (Sarah, 249)

My findings demonstrate the central place of relationships in people’s understandings of engagement. These understandings were based on a combination of individual positionality, expertise and a shared commitment to making a contribution towards common agendas. The presence of these dimensions points to the importance of understanding or appreciating the personal nature of who was involved, in terms of all their interests, skills and knowledge, thus characterising collaborations with a more embodied ‘human’ focus. Rae, a community partner at Island place reflected on this when considering how her engaged relationships with the university should contend with real lives, rather than through ideas of research that may keep a distance between different groupings:

'For me, my message around research is I still want to remind the people attending [Island University] or whatever university – behind every research project there's always a human touch' (493)

This approach to recognising the 'human touch' gives visibility to who people are, and their different contributions to collaborative efforts. Negotiating these differences provided a dynamic for realising the value and place of collaborations with respect to achieving social change objectives.

Collaborative Practice

The final section of this chapter considers the dynamics and norms of the collaborations people were involved in. Dynamics impacting relationships included forms of power and the duration and pace of activity. Norms such as trust, reciprocity and mutual benefit were all characteristic of the relationships between partners, and my data also suggests that responsibility, accountability and the presence of emotions were important aspects of co-working.

Power Relations

Forms of power affected people's experience of engagement in two main ways. The first related to established power inequities between university and community partners. The second related to how 'gatekeeping' by community partners of their contacts and connections affected partnership development and reach. It was notable that power was not explicitly mentioned in many of my case study interviews. It is through analysis of how people talked about their experiences that I suggest how power was acting on relationships here.

Previous negative experiences of research, collaborations or the university as an institution made some community partners hesitant about engaging with academics. One of the clearest examples of this was in the Canadian context, where oppressive legacies of colonisation are still felt keenly:

'we [Indigenous people] are trying to meet the demands and expectations of getting that degree and it's cost them their culture' (Rae, 31)

These previous experiences had very powerful effects on how the university and research was seen. This led to an uncomfortable reality that made it difficult for some community partners to enter a relationship with non-aboriginal people. This aspect also speaks to the fact that the conceptions of engagement that most people were working to were developed within Western understandings of the university. Academic respondents frequently acknowledged the distortions in power experienced by community partners. Bree also highlighted that using certain methods and approaches, such as the one she had taken in her work on participatory research in homelessness were explicitly about addressing power:

'[name of project] is about shifting the power balances right, and it's about working across those power differences between the researchers and the community...' (76)

Despite there being acknowledgement of such dynamics at the individual level, issues of institutional and symbolic power were evident. One clear aspect of this from my data related to where decisions on what work could go forward and how research processes should work were done on university terms. Sarah, an academic at River university reflected this dynamic when discussing what she saw as the often superficial overlap of university values with those of a community organisation:

'but problems come I think in the way those [values] are operationalised and particularly when you are working in a very big institution... it's about power isn't it, and it's about hierarchies...' (210)

Alice at Island University illustrated this disjuncture when discussing her work with First Nations' communities. She explained she often needed to 'translate' what they had decided on together *'into the kinds of things the institution is looking for'* (402).

Whilst this recognises a difference for partners in terms of aligning what they do together to their respective contexts, this dynamic also points to what is considered valuable from this co-work. In this case, what is valuable has to be translated or changed to meet institutional needs, potentially undermining the collaborative process as these needs take precedence.

Laila, a community partner from River place also experienced the university having the power to say what goes. In Laila's case she experienced the university having the power to 'name' and choose who could get involved, and who would remain excluded from a city-wide partnership supporting BME access to further education.

My analysis suggests that 'gatekeeping' was something that academic partners experienced in relation to community. This referred to how access to or reputation with communities was in part influenced through particular people, individually or as part of an organisation. Here Lisa is reflecting on the role of her organisation in enabling the neighbourhood development project she worked on with Island University to happen:

'I don't think the university would have been invited into [name's] living room... So [community agency's] ability to bring people out I think it quite unique... In the relationship between the university and us, the community piece has that in spades'
(161)

Although Lisa doesn't report this in a way that highlights an obvious power relationship, the fact that she identifies that this work could not happen without them indicates the important and influential role her agency play.

In another take on gatekeeping, Alice at Island University identified what she considered to be '*strong power*' aspects operating in Indigenous communities when discussing her counselling curriculum development work with First Nation's communities.

'In some cases they say that – 'well you know if you don't want to do it in the traditional way then we are not going to pay any attention to you' – which is a little bit problematic....' (553)

This related to how Alice perceived some of her partner communities to have a negative view of education and the university. As a result, they were not always supportive of the aims of the counselling degree and were vocal in their opposition. Alice said this influenced some people's opinion on whether the curriculum could be of value to them, or whether it would be 'accepted' in their community.

Duration and Pace

How long people had worked together and the 'pace' at which relationships and activity developed was a repeat feature of my data. These issues had a clear bearing on how people approached developing relationships and how they could be sustained.

Most participants reported their associations with each other as long term, either because they had been, or they intended them to be. This commitment was a basic foundation of what some respondents understood by co-work, rather than as Sarah at River University identified, '*superficially moving on*' (128) when your project has finished or things don't work.

The phases that some collaborations could move through over time also had a bearing on how people saw the longevity of their relationships. Some partners had funding to do project work over several years. This was in contrast to others, who had to continually seek funding for new/different project work over time, such as Lisa describes below:

'... when you start one project that it leads to something else... we couldn't achieve all of the objectives from the [project] first go around, we felt we needed to try another component and so that led to the [name of project]' (Lisa, 268)

The final project report produced for their first phase of work was an important resource in setting the agenda with other stakeholders for their continued work. These phases were also the result of the difference between individual academics maintaining contacts with organisations where personnel changes were possible - Cara for example has been in a collaborative relationship with Sonia's organisation for the past 15 years. Sonia however had only been working there about 18 months at the time of interview. Alice at Island University mentioned the difficulty of retaining long term relationships with the same people in organisations when staff changes were often subject to uncertainties of funding or people moving on. In the UK, Ross also cited the funding climate as a reason that partners were often changing. These mis-matches in duration may also have impacted on the discussions I had with people, as it would impact on their reflections on the same project.

Connected with duration was the pace of how relationships and work developed; and how much time people had to give over to collaborative activities. Nearly all participants touched on the time it takes to build community-university relationships. Both academic and community respondents acknowledged that relationship building can be a slow process and certainly takes longer than non-collaborative academic research. Here, Alice at Island University highlights the evolving and changing nature of collaboration which can only happen over time:

'...So that kind of continual negotiation and renegotiation and acknowledgement, and that takes a lot of time. It does take a lot of time' (517)

What my data also re-enforced was how this relationship building process contrasts with 'institutional pace', which is generally quicker, clearly organised over an academic year and demands outputs quickly. In addition, institutional life seemed to require not just quick turnaround but high output and this was often seen as in tension with 'community' work. This culture sits in contrast with the work discussed in my case studies, which prioritised relational activities.

Some community respondents made the point that they would like things to go more slowly. This was often due to their need to learn about working with a university in

this way, as for many it was a new prospect for them. Cassie spoke about the university as a *'monolithic'* institution and so developing a relationship between her women's shelter NGO and the university meant she was *'nervous about the weight of academia'* (99). Community partners also often had lots of other competing accountabilities which meant they couldn't always be flexible and had challenges in prioritising this sort of work within their daily activities. Tasha, a research manager at Island University shared the following example of a recent meeting she had attended:

'...it's like that community person is late because they deal with a caseload of 200 and 3 of them are suicidal that week and you know... so they're late'
(315)

That community partners often found themselves responsible for engaging a wider community in the research also took additional time to organise and do.

Characterising Collaboration

The dynamics of collaboration that respondents identified as being important included trust, reciprocity and mutual benefit. My data also shows that some people talked about not just a commitment to the relationship but a responsibility for what people were doing and who they were doing it with. This was also accompanied by the presence of emotions and talked about in the context of 'care' for each other and the building of friendships. That collaborations should be characterised by these elements illustrates the investment people made in relationships, but also suggests that such relationships could more clearly reflect the everyday experiences and outlook of respondents and this was interwoven with their understandings of research and activism.

Trust was a repeat feature of how people described their relationships. It was seen as important to allow partners to develop a clear understanding of their objectives and the context different partners were working in. Trusting relationships were able to hold sensitive and emergent information. They also meant that collaborators could be

more certain about being involved with activities that would be of value for their organisation or practice setting, based on their previous experiences.

In the quote below, Sarah at River University identifies the place of trust in developing good relationships, as distinct from less engaged network connections:

'It's quite easy to exist I think in a City in any place or any space where you kind of think you are engaging with everybody but actually what you've got are a very particular set of networks.... [Some] with organisations in a really deep and meaningful way, not on a short-term project basis. It has to be on a basis where there is a level of trust and a long-term level of trust' (Sarah, 41)

Sarah goes on to highlight another aspect of how trust worked in relationships, and how crucial maintaining trust was. This was also about taking responsibility for ensuring the relational and trusting nature of the work was done with integrity. She identified a context in her institution where people are pushed to 'give up' their contacts to others in a department when they needed to evidence external relationships. Her issue with this approach was that different people approaching the same partners might not act or think in the same way as her and risk damaging the relationship.

Taking responsibility for 'protecting' relationships, not for your own gain, but to honour the trust people developed also relates to the characteristics of reciprocity. Reciprocity was demonstrated through the attention people paid to working in clear and equitable ways in order to develop good outcomes for all partners. A feature of reciprocity was considering other partners' needs alongside your own. This was sometimes formalised through documents such as a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). As Claire, who works with Sarah from her community base explained at the outset of our interview:

'So we have a memorandum of understanding with [River] University as you probably know. Which is,

you know, everybody is very committed to doing things rather than just talking about them' (1)

What Claire identifies here is the importance she places on action and the process followed to commit to outcomes which meet their needs and objectives. In developing the MoU partners had to discuss and negotiate their needs, as well as understanding or appreciating those of their partners.

The basic premise of shared or mutual benefit is consistent with the relational approach demonstrated in my data. It was important for partners to pay attention to how their shared objectives got met, but also how that could make sense in their respective practice contexts. It was also important that these characteristics were often underpinned by shared values. From Lisa's point of view these were a strong signal that people were working in common and highlights the place of mutual benefit:

'...for me, in a partnership the values are actually far more important than the mission and vision, because I think you can be working on very different things and you know, taking pieces out that suit each of you...' (Lisa, 68)

Respondents in my case studies were a self-selecting sample so it is therefore not surprising that in the main people were engaged in work that would be characterised by 'good practice'. My interpretation of the data suggests that developing these characteristics required conscious and dynamic attention to the processes of collaboration.

Responsibility and Relational Accountability

Responsibility for each other as highlighted in Sarah's example earlier was particularly important in projects that were working on sensitive topics or issues. These were examples where respondents needed to be responsible for the wellbeing of those involved. Abby, a community researcher in the Indigenous histories project at Island University talked about this in relation to how the group of young people she

was working with were uncovering the stories of their relatives who had survived the residential school system:

'we did a lot of sharing circles too when we were all together we would just kind of like go around and talk about, just make sure everyone was ok. There was a lot of safety in that way, and support with each other' (139)

Academics taking responsibility for how people experienced the research process also appeared to be connected to the accountability they demonstrated to their research collaborators. Cara, at Island University, talked about a project she was involved in with aboriginal women who had experienced sexual violence:

'I am trying to approach it in a good way³⁶ ... that I can at least in some ways, maybe not ensure the safety, but at least maybe enhance the cultural safety of that research' (162)

Ideas of responsibility and commitment particularly to each other were also interpreted within an Indigenous research paradigm through ideas of 'relational accountability'.³⁷ This approach was evidenced with Indigenous respondents or those working on Indigenous issues.

³⁶ Working in a 'good way' is a common Indigenous expression used to denote participation that honors tradition and spirit. See: <http://ahrnets.ca/files/data/3/2011/08/Indigenous%20Worldviews,%20Knowledge,%20and%20Research.PDF>

³⁷ See Wilson (1998), who argues that a researcher should fulfil his or her relationship with the world around him or her, by making careful choices about their work that can be accountable to people, traditions, the earth and spirit.

Sonia discussed this understanding in her work with Aboriginal people living with HIV/Aids:

'That relational accountability and... knowing that communities can come back to us and say 'that wasn't done in a good way' or 'I have an issue with the way this was done'... And I think for communities to be able to say to us that they feel comfortable with us... I mean that is our purpose right – to hear their voice, to have their input, to have their – what they're saying...' (594)

This approach included being mindful that people were recognised and supported to say how they felt about their experiences and for this to have carry weight in how the collaboration happened. This is one example where activities and relationships carried out in such a way were establishing a dialogue between different groups. Here, such a dialogue could include different modes of expression, experience and understanding, as this collaboration worked across the university, those with lived experience and paid staff in a community agency.

The examples from my data where collaborations contained a *'huge relational component...'* brought with it relationships that extended to *'becoming part of each other's lives'* (Cara, 189). There were examples across both fieldwork sites where people's relationships extended to developing friendships with some of their partners. Lisa at Island place for example reflected on this in our interview:

'...the relationship extends beyond a professional relationship and all of a sudden you become friends'
(556)

Friendship was also important to Ross at River University because he saw it as a signifier of trust:

*'well I think friendships are important – and yeah,
and building up trust' (202)*

The place of relational connections to each other's lives and the emergence of friendships also suggests that the characteristics outlined above have emerged from people's everyday realities. This suggests that it is important that the practices underpinning engagement could incorporate people's backgrounds, values, politics, and use of conceptual ideas. In this way, a more complete picture of the actors involved emerged, rather than potentially more artificial renderings that limit who is who. This is significant as it suggests that it was legitimate for actors to have varied identities and that people placed a value on practice that could more accurately reflect the activities and outlook of their everyday lives. This combination also included recognition of the emotional content of people's experiences (see Barnes, 2012: 160).

How people felt influenced their actions and decisions, and these were also part of what motivated people to engage. It was also the case that some projects were dealing with emotive issues and topics and needed to be able to encompass and respond to these expressions. Edith gave an example from her work with Indigenous communities and language revitalization:

*'...You know because you are navigating academic,
non-academic, the cultural difference here and you
are trying to negotiate loss and so much emotion'
(146)*

Edith brings emotion and emotional expression directly into her understanding of what her engagement work involved and points to how she was faced with finding ways to navigate them. This was not typical of other research work she had done through more traditional academic routes.

The presence of emotion in some of my respondent's experiences wasn't confined to negative or challenging emotional expression. George articulated the place and importance of emotion by discussing how 'outcomes' of engagement could also relate to how people feel:

'You do want something that is of use, but also feeds people in other ways – creativity, enjoyment ...surprise...' (George, 1212)

Locating talk of emotions in relational ways of working was also demonstrated in a few examples in the context of 'care' for each other. Cara's interpretation of this was that she and her partners *have a shared responsibility to care for each other*' (199). Lisa, a community partner at Island place also highlighted that people were working together because they were *'interested in each other and they care about each other'* (593).

Cara also raised her concerns about the harm that could arise from not approaching her research in this way, drawing again on an example given above (on p179) of her work with experiences of sexual violence. The following quote suggests that the standard on doing things 'properly' that she mentions below is *with care*:

'I guess my fear is that without the right sort of mind set –that kind of research can be very harmful if it's not done properly' (156)

The characteristics of collaboration demonstrated by my data provide an insight into what is deemed necessary to enable dialogue between groups. This also provides a context where partners maintain a connection over time, as they are invested with each other over and above a project boundary. This provides the potential to sustain or revisit their common agendas, and the transformative potential of their work.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored how people saw themselves in their collaborative work and shown that the lines between academic and activist identities can be blurred. Despite this, distinctions in roles were considered important and reflected the difference in perspective, contribution and capability that collaborations encompassed. Relationships were central to mediating these differences and opening up possibilities

for people to be involved in activities that made a difference to the topics and agendas they had in common.

An important part of my enquiry was to look for evidence that my case studies had objectives that focus on social change. My analysis suggests that many instances of collaboration had explicit social change objectives and that people's activities resulted in outcomes related to these. My data also commonly reflected characteristics of collaborations as trust, reciprocity and mutual benefit. More novel characteristics were responsibility, relational accountability and the presence of emotions and emotional expression. The inclusion of these characteristics in relational working rested on recognition of each other and supported forms of collaborative practice that were closely aligned to people's everyday activities and outlook. The following chapter explores how such practices of engagement relate to the ways in which knowledges are understood, represented and made use of in collaborations.

Chapter 8

Locating Knowledge in Community-University Collaborations

Introduction

This chapter sets out how community and university actors understood, represented and made use of different forms of knowledge in their case study collaborations. My findings demonstrate how people talked about knowledge and the communities and systems that such perspectives were located within. I also include examples of how different knowledges are valued and seen as important in meeting complex and interconnected issues of social justice.

This chapter demonstrates how participants validated and legitimised different ways of knowing. They do so principally through dialogic and experiential means, beyond academic norms of research, which traditionally marginalise or exclude such perspectives. In particular, I draw on theories of democratic deliberation to explore how normative ideals documented through the theory and practice of deliberative democracy have resonance with the types of dialogic spaces developed through participation in case study collaborations. I also use the concept of cognitive justice which points me to consider how different contributions, perspectives and discourses of knowledge can be recognised in different configurations. By looking at how people are making sense of this landscape, this chapter considers not just the ways in which these knowledges are recognised, but what factors influence whether they count towards the development of questions and answers to social and community activity towards social change.

This chapter demonstrates that collaborative practices underpinned by deliberative characteristics support the possibility of epistemological and practical (re)arrangements in terms of what gets done with respect to knowledge. I also begin to illustrate how the treatment and use of different forms of knowledge in my case studies can provide evidence that they are connected to a trajectory of self-determination for community and social actors. This chapter also highlights data that indicates that the problematic domination of certain forms and types of knowledge that could preclude such an outcome remains evident within some of these collaborations.

Exploring Knowledge

Research participants reflected a plural understanding of knowledge – discussing it as skills, expertise, understanding, wisdom, intellect and empowerment, and traditional, hybrid, cross-cultural, and connected to privilege and power. As expected, there were clear distinctions identified between understandings of knowledge as academic research and other forms of knowledge which were labelled variously as ‘lay’, ‘local’, or ‘vernacular’. My data also demonstrated some respondents’ experiences of the suppression and marginalisation of non-academic forms of knowledge and the communities and actors that generate them.

Describing Knowledges

My interpretation of the data indicates that participants shared varied definitions of ‘knowledge’ and suggests that two broad categories of ‘academic research’ and ‘experiential’ forms of knowledge were identified. Academic research was presented by Marissa (academic) at River University as an uncontested version of knowledge that assumed an absolute way of knowing, describing it as:

‘based on empirically verifiable fact...’ (109)

Lauren (academic), also at River University reflected a diversity of ways of categorising knowledges, which represented more contested forms:

*‘... ‘expert’ knowledge and
‘lay/local/Indigenous/vernacular’ knowledge –
different terms are used’ (359)*

It is not immediately clear whether Lauren is aligning academic ways of knowing with her use of the term ‘expert’ or if this refers to knowledge derived through professional contexts that can draw on both a research evidence base and expertise derived through practice.

Despite the presence of this broad dichotomy, my data showed that both academic and community respondents mentioned knowledge as drawn from sources as diverse as their memories of an event, the survival of injustice and traditions in their communities, as well as that held in academic databases and codified within academic

systems of meaning. Drawing on these diverse sources, people gave contrasting accounts of what they thought contributed to their collaborative exchanges.

Cassie, a community partner at a women's housing NGO in Island Place emphasised her 'practical experience' and embedded knowledge of community issues:

'I think I bring two things, I think I bring experience... um, the hands and feet practical experience of getting things done in the community and the issues that we face... but I also think I bring questions... I'm not afraid to ask my questions I guess' (159)

Sarah (academic) based at River University talked about her contribution in terms of theory and academic study. However, there was no hierarchy implied in her view, as she recognised the value of different knowledges in her work:

'I am there bringing the knowledges...developed through academic study or through the experience I have in education etc... But they are no more valuable than the knowledges that are coming from other parts...' (63)

Lauren, also an academic at River University identified her interdisciplinary background in science and art as informing her perspective and she suggested that these experiences made her better able to recognise different ways of knowing and gave her '*an empathy to different types of knowledge*' (491). This highlighted a further dimension of understanding 'academic knowledge', pointing to the difference within disciplines that have different traditions and assumptions about how we come to know.

This take on what different actors brought to collaboration reinforced the difference between their positions as inside and outside of the academy. However, Cassie, unlike Sarah and Lauren expressed uncertainty about her contributions, suggesting less confidence in what she had to offer in these collaborative encounters. One explanation for this is that some community partners may not be used to thinking of themselves as having a valuable contribution to collaboration from a knowledge

perspective since what is assumed as knowledge in academic settings is often presented as uncontested and universal. Community based Rae offered a more confident view of her contributions to collaborative work with academics but indicated that it had taken her some time to reach this point. She explicitly drew on her experiences of marginalisation as a source of experience:

'I've realised what I have to offer you know, this community, is my experience of you know, surviving through the injustice of a system that is not functioning...' (Rae, 25)

People were also clear about the need for a relationship identifying knowledge in collaborations, and doing something with them. Luca, interviewed in his role as an academic at Island place linked knowledge use to achieving social change:

'...because you can produce knowledge and you can theorise, but if you're actually going to make change in something that you want society to change, it has to produce some action' (198)

Claire from a community organisation in River place also identified the imperative for knowledge to be put into action to achieve social change:

'...It is not enough just to sit around talking ideas – we have to do stuff and try them in the real world with real people. And it has to ... we have to set out the intention of trying to do something positive in that...' (124)

Neither Luca nor Claire make a distinction between *what* knowledge is useful, or the source and form of the contribution. Instead, their quotes reflect the intention behind the purpose of their collaboration to be tied to action. Both also emphasise a connection to society or the 'real world', indicating that this is a key explanation for why you would incorporate and use knowledge from different paradigms.

'New Knowledge'/'Old Knowledge'...

I was interested to understand how and whether people thought they would develop 'new' knowledges from their collaborations in forms that might be understood as breaking from traditional research paradigms. Yet few respondents mentioned this explicitly. My analysis demonstrates only a few examples where respondents talked about what they perceived as *new knowledges* as an outcome from collaboration.

Cassie (community) at Island place identified one of the only direct examples of new knowledge production, in this case tied to an output – a diagram, that went on to be used in other publications – developed from a piece of research that included the voices of service users of a women's shelter:

'there was the creation of new knowledge and I think of that diagram that we developed, that was new knowledge – and it came as a result of working together and having that perspective...' (265)

This visual representation, developed between academic and community partners may have enabled people to identify how their different knowledges contributed to a specific output. It may have also aided their understanding of the relationship of different forms of knowledge to each other, and in that way actually be able to see that the resulting combination was 'new' to all contributors.

People's response to the idea of 'new' knowledge more commonly prompted general reflections. Some like academic Edith (academic) based at Island University shared a general view that in working together, you can't import practice – you can only build new, joint ways of approaching a topic or issue. In her experience it was precisely the different kinds of knowledge that a collaboration could produce that supported this; *'requiring elements from everybody's experience and understandings'* (396). Another take on 'new' came from respondents who considered a blurring of the boundaries of who 'holds' what knowledge to represent the possibility of hybridity. In fact, Alice (academic) at Island University thought *'a blended way – a hybrid way'* (736) was a good way to view knowledge in her work because it recognised that people needed to live in the present, in a *'hybrid world'* (740). However, Justin (academic) at Island University disagreed with such terminology:

'It's not hybrid – like it's not something that's in-between and not quite one or the other I don't think – I think we have to think of it as a new form... that is built from and continually being re-built from these different kinds of, if you like, knowledges... Like I think the problem for me with 'hybrid' is the idea is that it's not something of its own' (459)

What Justin introduces here is the idea of discussing the knowledge generated from collaborative practices as in fact a new form of knowledge creation, one that has its own system of value and meaning and underlying practices.

The setting or context within which knowledge was being developed or shared appeared to be relevant in determining what people thought of as 'new' knowledge. In the quote below, Sarah (academic) at River University captured this in her explanation:

'...if we are saying that actually you are working with a different organisation, is that just new knowledge anyway because you are working with a different set of people in a different context with different ideas. What is new? So if you are sort of at the academic kind [sic] of the idea of new knowledge that's in a published paper and peer reviewed etc... then ok maybe it's not immediately...' (665)

The reflection that knowledge developed in collaborations might not be new in the academic world, also connects to a point Sonia (community) at Island place made in identifying the imperative on research to generate novel information. This point reflects the way academics are constantly encouraged to demonstrate how they have broken 'new ground' with their research.

However, in her collaboration Sonia also called attention to the 'old' – knowledge she views as already existing – but excluded or ignored in mainstream understandings and practices of research:

'I think with anything right, when you know you're talking about academia we always want to create this new knowledge. I think we create new knowledge but I think we – sometimes we have to re-iterate old knowledge...' (615)

This is also a reference to Indigenous elders' knowledge, reported separately by Island place community partners Sonia and Abby who described elders as 'knowledge keepers' in their communities. From a Western perspective, the idea of 'old' knowledge or 'keepers' suggests a static, fixed view of what knowledge might be which contrasts with the academic value of 'discovery'. Yet, this also speaks to a particular cultural grounding that values and recognises the maintenance of tradition and an oral custom. This raises an additional tension when considering how Indigenous paradigms, well documented as being denied and marginalised in non-Indigenous worldviews, intersect with a knowledge producing institution such as a university that has maintained this dynamic.

...New Understandings

What my analysis of empirical data suggests is that study participants conceived of 'new knowledge' as *new understandings* made possible through collaboration. These understandings gave rise to new approaches or perspectives that contributed to addressing the issues and agendas people were interested in.

Some participants suggested that paying attention to different perspectives and ways of knowing could generate new thinking or insights. Rae (community) at Island place thought that engagement of this type could give the university *'fresh eyes of [sic] social justice issues...'* (144). This was accompanied in many cases by shifts in orientation or perspective to an issue. In the quote below, Alice (academic) at Island University indicates that accessing other perspectives could open up people's way of thinking and offer them permission and a basis for looking at something differently:

'So I would see people's orientation begin to shift when they can say – 'oh well alright I don't only have to look at it that way, I could look at it this way too' (429)

Recognising other knowledges also connected people to new possibilities for their work. Marissa (academic) at River University talked about a project with a community artist where they swapped information between archives, one located in the community and the other in the university library:

'She shared her archival research with me... then I could add more archival stuff for her and we may re-present that theatre production...' (306)

These case studies provided examples of recognition and exchange both of perspectives and knowledges. My findings suggest different sources and forms of knowledge were validated through dialogic and experiential processes. Dialogue features through my analysis as a system of validation, but also as a basis for communication, and the latter is discussed in the section below on p196. Dialogue as a system of validation is illustrated by an example shared by Cara, an academic at Island University, where she and her partners had been involved in influencing national level policy decisions around aboriginal health research:

'Because we collaborate, we've been able to sit on committees together... and um, really influence their policies around um, supporting [name's] research among aboriginal peoples...' (308)

Here Cara is describing a process underpinned by dialogue amongst different stakeholders that extend beyond her direct research partnership. She identifies her collaborative work as a key aspect of accessing and influencing in such spaces, and it is the presence of multiple ways of knowing reflected in this collaboration which she suggests carries weight.

Validation of ways of knowing through experiential means is illustrated through an example from Rae, a community based activist in Island place. She talked about how her work had a bearing on how others looked at the issue of street homelessness:

'I would bring them down to the streets and literally let them walk a day in the life of a homeless person... For the nurses it was 'oh my god, now I see' how the policies of municipal government

*impact the homeless... and the impact of standing on
the side[walk], for 18 hours a day...’ (313)*

This example clearly suggests a re-reading of a ‘known’ phenomena, by in this case the ‘committee’ and the nursing students in a way that suggests recognition of the individual or community’s system of value and meaning in a wider context.

Contested Knowledges

An important component of my data concerns the injustice connected to the suppression and marginalisation of alternative knowledges and the communities and actors that generate them. These were characterised as subject to different systems of value and meaning that were particularly incompatible with dominant understandings of academic research. This was clearly illustrated with respect to Indigenous ways of knowing and in these cases was compounded by a legacy of negative ‘research’ experiences that took approaches to people and knowledge that didn’t reflect Indigenous realities.

Sonia (community) at Island place, in discussing what she saw as the disjuncture between research processes and her lived experience in Indigenous communities, pointed out where research processes could be particularly problematic and at odds with Indigenous way of knowing and cultural approaches to knowledge:

*‘They [elders] don’t start out ‘point a to point b’ you
don’t always get your answer. You have to make
sense of it yourself’ (568)*

Her point is that research processes typically analyse and reify data in the development of knowledge which is presented in a very linear way – ‘point a to point b’. She discussed the difficulties she had undertaking her Masters degree as an Indigenous student when for her analysis meant *‘tearing somebody’s story apart’* (536). She didn’t feel she had a choice in order to meet the criteria of ‘research’ as expected by her university. She did however point out that her one act of resistance was to include the full transcripts from interviews with women she had spoken to for her studies as part of the introduction to her thesis – an act she describes as very difficult to negotiate with her institution as again it deviated from the norm. She offered this experience as one example where research methods and approaches made

it difficult to engage Indigenous people and issues in research processes because they didn't take account of that community's very different cultural and epistemological context.

In addition, Sonia's capacity as a knower was only respected when it intersected with academic values and norms, and in this way she was forced to navigate a dual identity to be successful in the academy. In her current collaborative work with Cara (academic), their respective knowledge of Indigenous people has a positive bearing on mobilising research *'through culturally appropriate forms of practice (such as a potlatch³⁸)* (499) which gives it greater legitimacy with the community who will make use of it. From Sonia's point of view, this is crucial in successfully building the capacity of peer researchers with lived experience of HIV/Aids in aboriginal communities.

My case studies also highlight a methodological point in how Indigenous understandings were recognised and incorporated in determining social justice agendas within collaborations. Some collaborators were working within a distinct paradigm of Indigenous research. These approaches were examples of decolonising approaches to research which have involved the development of, for example, ethics protocols that focus on 'Ownership, Control, Access and Possession' (OCAP).

In the UK, the context is different but there were some parallels to be drawn between distinguishing forms of 'professional' or 'experiential' knowledge in the generation of research outcomes. For example, Ross (academic) at River University talked about his work with a community health organisation that required an evaluation of their services. He understood his role to be that of the 'expert' invited in to conduct the evaluation. In this way, he approached the project as the person who could determine what evaluation was, and why it was important for the organisation. He felt that because some of the staff in the organisation demonstrated some resistance to his work, that they didn't share his positioning:

'...You also learn about the culture [within the third sector] that resists evaluation and data monitoring and all that, because there is real suspicion...' (337)

³⁸ A Potlatch is a 'gift-giving' feast practiced by the Indigenous peoples of the Pacific Northwest Coast of Canada. It is now used as a common form of gathering to celebrate, share and perform.

Taking an approach that focused more on what he knew and had to offer had potentially discounted the perspectives of people expert in their area of service delivery. There may be other explanations for this resistance, including that community organisations often have data collection fatigue, or in uncertain funding climates they may have been legitimately concerned about their service and how the organisation was spending money.

My interpretation of the data shows that forms of knowledge were frequently represented differently from each other – inscribed with different perspectives, understandings and values – but observable in relation to each other and considered as having a role to play in meeting the agendas of academic and community actors. This occurred as both the ‘gathering’ of resources to address an issue, but also that the use of such a configuration could lead to ‘new’ insights, solutions or ways of conceptualising certain topics. In both cases, these implied some shifts in perspectives and processes about how knowledge was generated that could reflect different ways of knowing that were valued and legitimated in practice outside of the dominant paradigm of research. My data also provides some examples where contested knowledges continue to be marginalised based on assumptions and norms within universities of what counts as legitimate knowledge.

The next section considers how deliberative approaches could support the presence and use of different knowledge in collaborations.

The Deliberative Basis of Collaborations

In order to understand the participative context within which people’s ways of knowing were recognised and legitimised, my analysis adopted a deliberative lens. My findings show an emphasis on dialogue between participants was significant and that the deliberative norm of authenticity – which theoretically relates to conditions free from unequal distributions of power –was interpreted by academics as acting genuinely in relationships and contending with established power inequities in order to do so.

This section explores how dialogue and authenticity were relevant features in case studies and that deliberation could be a deciding factor in the visibility and legitimation of different ways of knowing.

Dialogue

When considered through a deliberative lens, my data offers evidence of a connection between the presence of normative principles of inclusion, commitment and accessibility and the presence of dialogue and exchange in the space of collaboration. Dialogue between participants was identified both through formal practical arrangements such as a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), and informal examples of how co-work was supported. A number of projects also worked through advisory committees or steering groups that encompassed stakeholders from varied backgrounds.

Community based Lisa at Island place outlined the purpose of a MoU between her community agency and a team at Island University:

'For us, we start with that sort of large picture, Memorandum of Understanding... we created a three year understanding, that really was very broad in our objectives...' (62)

In this quote, Lisa describes the objectives developed as 'broad', and this implies that the MoU was seen as a guiding document, to frame, rather than explicitly specify the activities of their work together. Lisa also said in our interview that she did not feel priority was given by either partner to re-visit the MoU with any urgency after their initial work together was completed. This suggests that adequate dialogue was established through other means, or that partners were avoiding addressing a lack of dialogue directly.

A commitment to developing and sustaining dialogue as a part of a deliberative practice was also important to building relationships into the long term. Claire (community) at River place for example reflected on the aspirations for the collaboration in which she was involved, also based on a MoU signed with her academic partner (Sarah) at the beginning of their co-work:

'I would like to see [River University]... co-designing a five-year program of research – or at least a framework for that – for 10 years' (Claire, 339)

Claire also saw this as a way of including different perspectives in deciding what research could look like in their partnership, rather than these definitions belonging to the university.

In other examples, work was often less codified but attention to dialogue as a basis for communication could be identified through participants' activities. The examples below are from two different projects at Island place which both focused on building relationships in order for project work to happen. In the first, Alice (academic) at Island University is talking about going away with her community colleagues to a week-long 'retreat' when they started their work together on an Indigenous counselling programme:

'we went away for a retreat and we came up with these values and principles, which came from the community' (160)

Alice identified the retreat as a place where the guiding principles for their work and the content of the programme were developed. In the second example, Abby (community) also based in Island place recounted her work on the 'Reclaiming Indigenous Histories' project:

'I was working with Indigenous youth that were my age um, so we created like a really intimate like tight knit group when we were working together...' (45)

Although the nature and characteristics of this work can only be interpreted through this talk, both these examples suggest that partners were seeking dialogic spaces as a normative means of communication in their work together. In Abby's case she also referenced close and bonded relationships, which she also connected to feelings of cultural safety.

In a UK based case study – Local Knowledge in the Natural Environment – Lauren discussed emotions and vulnerabilities as part of the dialogue in a focus group that involved residents in a geographic area affected by flooding:

'Community voices in particular, particularly in situations like this where this is a lot of suffering and

people are having a bad time. You know actually some of these discussions need to be had afterwards...' (541)

However, Lauren's use of language in this quote attempts to re-locate emotion away from the main business of the project. In doing so she displays a personal distance from the feelings expressed. This also infers that there is no place for emotion in this particular research process. By taking this position, she effectively excludes knowledge where it draws from these dimensions.

By way of contrast, Rae offered an insight into how connections to emotionality in research might re-locate what determines value in whose or what knowledges count. She recounted that she tells her academic partners *'only you in your heart have the solutions'* (41). In doing so she is asking them to bring more than the 'head' to their work and explicitly connect with emotionality. In Chapter 9 I reflect further on the presence and inclusion of emotional expressions in engaged research practice.

Dialogue also rested on accessibility - that is, enabling the contribution of multiple voices and respecting others' deliberative capacity. In the quote below, Edith (academic) offers a relevant example:

'...we all learned... that if we made it clear what the issues were, then we could talk about them, and if we talked about them we could find a way of working them out. It didn't always work right away, it didn't always work... but more often than not naming it allowed us to talk about it, allowed us to find a way of working with it, so I think that's a good way forward' (243)

Here the presence of dialogue allowed for the value and intention of involving all participants as experts and decision makers in an equitable way to be debated and responded to. This example also serves to demonstrate an ethical approach that suggests a responsibility to the actors in this project, and a commitment to sharing power in terms of determining ways to work effectively.

In a further example, from the ‘Participatory research on homelessness’ project at Island place, Rae described part of their methodology as follows:

*‘We handed out cameras to the people on the streets,
we had community gatherings, to talk about
whatever the community was seeing at that point’
(359)*

So here, people with lived experience of homelessness were contributing to research in collaboration with academics and others. Through dialogue, for example in interpreting the images that were taken, street homeless people’s ways of knowing were accepted as central to exploring issues on the street.

The findings presented above are particularly important in considering how characteristics of participation in deliberative processes can have epistemological implications. Dialogue could encompass different forms of communication and provide a basis for recognition of a range of knowledge contributions, some of which are based in alternative epistemologies. Drawing attention to emotionality, values and beliefs, as well as cognition, requires not just sound participative practices but also a relational and situated ethics and respect for others’ deliberative capacity. My analysis suggests that in many case studies, these dimensions were coming together in a single process.

Authenticity

Alongside an emphasis on dialogue, my analysis explored how people talked about authenticity in their relationships. Authenticity as described in the deliberative literature relates to those practices and approaches that are ‘free’ from the distortions of unequal power.³⁹ In analysis, my findings show how authenticity was understood as both drawing attention to issues of power, but also mentioned by academic respondents as related to ‘being authentic’ – that is being genuine, consistent and accountable in their co-work with respect to including and valuing the knowledge of others. My analysis suggests an explicit assumption on the part of academic respondents that this work could not be delivered without a basic appreciation of

³⁹ See Cohen (1997) who argues that ideal deliberation includes being free from authority or any prior norms or requirements. He suggests that such unequal power would be obtained through something like economic wealth or the support of interest groups.

approaches that would attend to issues of power in practice and the inclusion of other perspectives and voices.

Edith (academic) at Island University described how she saw the backdrop of engagement in her discipline:

'So I know some of my colleagues in (department) who work with endangered languages... they see themselves as 'empowering' community members... well no, and in fact if that's what you think you are doing you shouldn't really be doing it' (202)

What Edith is highlighting is her opposition to the dominant idea that the role of academic research in her discipline is to help needy communities. Such an approach sets up dynamics of power over who can determine what help is needed, and who has the expertise to meet this.

Related to this, Bree (academic) at Island place was alert to the *'differences in power but [that] there's not always the same power inequities'* (73) in collaborative working. This suggests something of a 'gradient' of power, where different academic and community actors may be situated differently according to variations in their economic, symbolic and knowledge capital. In Bree's case for example, she offered the contrast in experience of working with the Chief Executive (CE) of a large health centre on an evaluation and developing a needle exchange project with service users in clinical settings. In doing so, she critically engaged with issues of power and an understanding of her position in the dominant scheme of things. In this case she also suggests she sees herself as less powerful than the CE – alluding to the possibility that work with the Chief Executive relied in part on his recognition and acceptance of her knowledge and experience as credible and relevant to make their project happen.

Beyond questions of power, authenticity was also related to what some academic respondents articulated as necessary to underpin the relational emphasis of their work. This was viewed as a commitment and accountability to engagement practices which connected to the reality of how power impacted the process of co-working.

Cara (academic) at Island University for example didn't think she was doing anything extraordinary in her practice saying *'I'm not trying to be collaborative – that is just*

part of the way I think' (120). This suggests that the values and experiences she brings to deliberations are part of her identity as a researcher and not cultivated or drawn on separately.

Sarah (academic) at River University tied authenticity to the idea of 'being genuine' through an example where in her opinion academic colleagues had made less effort to understand or view engagement as a relational activity. She recalled an experience where a colleague was at a meeting with a community organisation and asked what they should call the organisations' members '*and this woman [community] looked at me and went 'um... we call them people'...* (786).

She goes on to reflect:

'... I suppose it's about removing those barriers isn't it – what are we actually talking about? Not the pretence, not the kind of way we use that language, not the systems la la la, how do you get rid of that stuff to be able to have a meaningful conversation really' (Sarah, 790)

This point of view suggests that academics need to take an active approach to addressing the established boundaries and barriers that obscure the reality of working relationally.

Legitimacy and Knowledge Use

My analysis suggests that the deliberative norms of dialogue and authenticity were significant in people's collaborations. The context this provided for the recognition and use of different forms of knowledge suggest that deliberation could be a deciding factor in the visibility and legitimation of different ways of knowing. In other words, where my analysis indicated that projects sought to work through deliberation, those projects also demonstrated ways in which diverse knowledges were recognised and valued. These examples show how deliberation can serve as a source of legitimacy for diverse knowledges in systems where that is not currently the norm.

In envisioning a time when community knowledges would enjoy legitimacy as the norm, Rae put forward a transformative future for her relationships with the university:

'My first instinct would be to say, in 10 years' time the existence of you know, the community based relationship would be continuing and that it wouldn't be so focused on, because it would be at the level of acceptance. So it fade[s] into our everyday life. You know we would soon say, what was life like before this happened? It would be hard to imagine life without this community relationship...' (484)

In an example of this from an academic viewpoint Marissa at River University shared her reflection that her experience of engaging with different community groups and issues *'forces you to ask new questions'* (220) and that these experiences:

'...made [sic] me think of new ways to maybe present and disseminate and possibly even derive knowledge – for example, through my... teaching' (288)

My analysis of this intersection of knowledge and participation has provided examples of the potential for transformation in the value placed on multiple knowledges. This includes approaches characterised by deliberative norms that can encompass more than one defining characteristic of knowledge and suggests an active process of participation, rather than retaining fixed views based on assumptions of actors and their ways of knowing. The final section of this chapter now considers what factors influenced the relationship between different ways of knowing.

Whose Knowledge Counts?

My findings so far suggest that respondents valued a range of contributions and experiences in addressing the issues they were connected with. They also offer examples of how deliberative practices could offer recognition to, and inclusion of,

different forms of knowing and experience. What I have not specifically addressed thus far is how these multiple knowledges were then included or excluded in processes of research and knowledge creation. This is particularly of interest when looking at my findings through the lens of ‘cognitive justice’, which suggests that different discourses of knowledge should be in dialogue with each other. Drawing on the findings developed above, I now explore three types of practice with respect to how knowledge is recognised, valued and used that can be summarised from the experiences shared by respondents. These are presented below as empirical descriptions that characterise different dynamics between different forms of knowledge in engagement activities. I use specific case study examples to illustrate them.

1. *The application of theory*

The first type is where knowledge is applied from the ‘expert’ institution to the waiting ‘lay’ community. This results in an impersonal or distanced relationship between the two with respect to knowledge and is demonstrated in examples where existing research knowledge about a topic, developed within a traditional academic framework was transferred to community settings. The example I use to illustrate this here was from an interview with Lisa, the main community partner to the Neighbourhood Development Project.

This project used collaborative mapping techniques based on ideas of asset based community development to support the making of neighbourhood plans. The project was considered successful by Lisa, primarily because it followed rigorous research principles and because it provided ‘*a really strong tool*’ (491) for their work and activities with residents. In this collaboration the community partners were the recipients of knowledge that they then undertook to translate and mobilise in community settings where the mapping activities were happening.

This produced a dynamic where the community partner maintained their understanding of the university as the expert, and my analysis suggests this was further reflected in the reality that the authorship of the initial project report was written by and from the perspective of the university partners. The positioning of the university as ‘expert’ was referred to a number of times in interview and was

presented as a contributing factor to the success of the project from Lisa's perspective:

*Again kind of like the university being there as you know, 'the academic', this is how we do it...' (460)
...but just also from that perspective from knowing that if [name] has given it to us as an idea, we know it's successful' (464)*

Theoretically this can be understood through the idea of scientific hierarchisation, which argues that the view of what counts as 'scientific' knowledge is to the potential disqualification of other knowledges. Although there is no clear evidence to suggest that other knowledges were actively marginalised in this collaboration, it is notable that the contributions from the community agency in this case study were limited to providing access to neighbourhoods for work to be carried out.

This example points to the fact that academic ways of knowing were valued here, and deemed to offer something beyond the knowledge base that Lisa's organisation could draw on for their project. This view is connected to the perceived legitimacy the agency had because residents would see that the university was involved.

With respect to knowledge, this implies that to gain the perceived benefits of engagement with the caché of the university meant aligning with the dominant discourse to both get some legitimacy in the current 'dominant' order and get work done. For example, Lisa spoke about needing to change '*the community standards of what it means to follow academic rigour in a research environment*' (386), rather than working in ways where those standards might have been re-drawn within the community context. One reason for this could be that this may reflect prior cultural assumptions within that community setting about what is desirable or possible to achieve (see Jassanof, 2008) in generating rigorous knowledge. These benefits included for example being offered '*theoretical backup*' (426) to their working practices.

A counter discourse was present in this example. Lisa was clear that she didn't see her organisation as being the '*poor little community member*' (107). This was in part

due to the donor links her organisation has to the university, and that she identified the organisation as also having something to offer the university.

'...[name of agency] opens doors for the university, I think in ways that the university couldn't do by itself... I really you know, and it might be pompous to say but, I don't think the university would have been invited into George's living room and served the wine and the cookies' (156)

This perspective may have influenced how the partners actually worked together, and indicates that collaboration was necessary to achieve the aims of the project. It also serves to illustrate an interesting disjuncture between the very personal, and intimate positioning of 'George's living room' and 'the university', which without naming or discussing individuals or relationships was represented impersonally in Lisa's account.

Through discussion of this project, Lisa felt that there was an equal balance of reciprocity, and even *'of power in some ways'* (107) particularly concerning financial resource, but with respect to knowledge there is little evidence of how this translated at an epistemological level. These findings are an example of where the binary between who was who and therefore assumptions about who had meaningful and useful knowledge to apply to an issue remained quite fixed. It was harder to find evidence for different ways of knowing featuring in the substance of this collaboration. As a result, community knowledge and ways of knowing were effectively ignored or un-included. While this appeared to be the case between the main partners, the collaborative mapping approach they used as a tool in neighbourhoods was a participatory exercise, where residents were seen as knowledge holders. Despite this, my analysis suggests that the locus of legitimacy for what knowledge was counted seems to sit with the 'impersonal' university. I was unable to interview a university partner from this project and so cannot determine whether this point of view would be supported.

2. The dominant discourse of research

The second type of practice is where dominant discourses of research persist despite collaborative activity. This results in scenarios where different groups participate

together, but academic norms effectively discount other forms of knowledge. The example I use to illustrate this was my interview with Marissa, an academic at River University. She spoke both about the 'BME Heritage Project' and more generally about her work in community histories particularly related to BME communities and slavery.

Marissa identified much of her work as seeking to strengthen and contribute to histories of slavery and black communities in River place. She said that her opportunities to work on projects often came from finding ways to mobilise her own research interests and questions, and that she was often approached by community activists and organisations to initiate pieces of work. In this range of activities, she saw her role in part as giving visibility to these issues through fora such as community radio, advising on pamphlets and giving lots of talks:

'I'm always giving talks or doing workshops with various groups in [River place]. And you know, radio broadcasts and things.' (Marissa, 54)

Marissa positioned herself as highly supportive of community issues, particularly as she was willing to get involved in a range of activities. As Marissa made mention of a number of different projects in interview, I'm unable to say whether community participants in these instances would agree or have a different perspective on whether this work was supportive to them. Laila, who Marissa worked with on the BME Heritage Project, agreed that the project supported some BME communities to explore their history and gave some attention to a previously more hidden issue. However, this was not attributed directly to the university's involvement, but more to the wider partnership.

Marissa reflected an awareness of her academic privilege and responsibility in her role within the university involved in this work. For example, she highlighted the importance of establishing trust, acknowledging that *'it's very easy to rip people off...'* (75) and that the research should be a *'mutual interaction'* (92). These elements corresponded to the social justice values she expressed, framing her research as to *'challenge silences and complacency in people's civic identity'* (312) and the way they do history. She also discussed the dilemma she often faces with:

'serving the needs of the community – often vulnerable community groups – and writing uncritical celebratory history, and my role as an academic is to give nuanced and critical judgements about things....' (94)

Here Marissa signifies a dominant, and fixed view of what research should constitute and the values that underpin it – nuance and critical judgement. And this potentially excludes other possibilities of what history can be. Of course, versions of what history can be are also likely to be contested within the university – and so the community-university dimension is not the only possibility for dispute over what constitutes historical knowledge. But this quote also indicates a discourse of community as 'often vulnerable', a potential misrecognition which could re-enforce asymmetries in power relationships that further position Marissa as a decision maker on what is valid knowledge.

These points are further demonstrated in the following short example, which concerns two African-Caribbean activists Marissa worked with who had been appointed by the City museum as community consultants to develop a slavery trail in River place. At this time Marissa was leading a 'historical advisory board' for the museum. In her account, she says that the two activists had no grasp of *'historical process...'* and were therefore *'...writing ideologically driven nonsense really...'* (104). It was because of this that she became involved *'in this colonialist position of being the 'corrector''* (105) to introduce the women to library resources and archive material to support their work. Whilst Marissa demonstrates a degree of reflexivity and a sense of irony about her role (as a white academic) in supporting these women given the subject, there is no suggestion that this had any influence on what she saw as legitimate historical knowledge. Her motivation for supporting these activists was to ensure the development of an outcome (in this case a slavery trail) that would meet norms of academic value:

'...that was based on empirically verifiable fact. And so, I thought that was a good use of my academic expertise without lording it over. Because they had stuff about oral tradition that was useful to

hear too. They had an outreach, you know they had contacts in terms of reaching people that I wouldn't have had so, it was mutual – you had to respect everyone for their strengths' (109)

Again, without insight as to the experience from the activists' point of view, I can't say if they agree with this presentation of the project. What is clear is that this example provides some evidence of a disconnection between the values Marissa has applied in participation and values applied in knowledge creation. What this may be more of an illustration of is a collaboration of 'convenience', and one that does not particularly alter the trajectory of Marissa's research role.

The result of this adherence to an academic standard of what constitutes knowledge within a dominant discourse of research means Marissa has gone as far as engaging with others and their ways of knowing and then discounting them. This is further illustrated by the denial of recognition of the activists' knowledge claims with respect to history - recognising them as she does here only for their connections to others and using language that distances herself from these 'other' ways. This is somewhat paradoxical given Marissa's commitment to the topic area, underpinned by values of social justice, and that there is clear representation of the idea that engagement exposes you to new or different ways of seeing and understanding the world.

3. Transforming the discourse of research

The third type of dynamic is where collaborations transform the discourse of research through using inclusive, dialogic principles with respect to the configuration and use of multiple knowledges. In these examples, projects develop a narrative of both forms of recognition for actors' knowledge claims. They also point to the redistributive practices implied for such configurations to count towards social and community agendas. The example I use to illustrate this was from an interview with Edith, the lead academic in the 'Reviving Indigenous Languages' project at Island place and field notes from a presentation given by Edith and one of her community partners Donna.

The project began when Edith was approached by an elder of a local community:

'we talked a lot about what would work and what wouldn't... he gave me direction and I went and tried to respond to that... it seemed to make sense to bring the two communities together' (75-82)

From Edith's perspective, the collaboration was characterised from the beginning by a highly reflexive and discursive approach, though I did not get the opportunity to talk to the elder mentioned to know if this was shared.

I did hear Edith and one of her other community partners Donna talk about this work at a presentation. Together they agreed that the relationship had been based on 'respect, honesty and a measure of love' for each other and the content of what they were doing together. Framed by the presence of these characteristics, this case study shows evidence that epistemologically the vision and knowledge of those marginalised were also central to the research process. Here Edith continued to explain her meetings with the elder:

'it started out that [name] and I met and talked about it, and then I went to my - I tried to find various funding sources... I found out these things and then I went [back] and talked to him... and said 'should we do this together?' 'how would you like to do it?' and you know, we just talked a lot about what would work and what wouldn't...' (69)

Co-developing solutions and then taking responsibility for taking them back to their respective communities came to be a feature of their project as it went on. This relied on high levels of dialogue, and on people like Donna who could also bridge the university and community worlds.

From their presentation, Donna in particular emphasised that from an Indigenous point of view it was important that communities should exercise control over information related to their knowledge and heritage. These types and the dialogic

nature of the project beginnings indicate evidence of a deliberative process, which carried weight in how the work went forward.

The original partnership grew to include another local community who were working on the same issue and so different groups in the partnership also talked to each other:

'So, from the very, very beginning it was people around tables, drinking tea and talking about how are we going to do this. And then sending materials back and forth and getting everybody's input and making sure that everybody's concerns were met'
(Edith, 88)

This quote illustrates that lots of different people in the project were considered as knowers and no one system of knowledge was privileged over another. Because of this, Edith says:

'I learned to think of myself as one part of the picture – rather than the 'expert' and the one in control' (pers comm)

She also felt that these processes allowed those involved to begin creating *'knowledge and we created experience and we created ways to talk'* (226).

Donna however highlights some early reluctance on the part of some community members because of the suggestion of what might happen to their information (about their languages and culture). They were concerned about it being written down and digitised. She says people were wary about interacting with 'the university' and it was important for people to have the opportunity to meet face to face. Donna said to Edith that people 'want to look at you, understand you, look in your eyes' (pers comm). This is an explicit recognition of the importance of getting beyond the 'impersonal' university and connecting to real people.

However, the presence and use of multiple knowledges that were constituted and drawn from the community of production meant that Edith faced complex processes of epistemic negotiation:

'You know, you are navigating academic, non-academic, the cultural difference here and you are trying to negotiate loss and so much emotion around language and identity and going to community meetings where people, where elders would get up and talk about the residential schools, and cry in these meetings because of what they had lots and hadn't taught their grandchildren the language and you know, it was emotionally draining' (Edith, 146)

The presence of emotional experiences and expressions and the implication of care for those in the process are evident here. Edith's commitment to the relationships in this project supported her perspective that *'We are all human beings – this has to be more important than anything else we do'* (pers comm). In this way, by situating herself as being 'human first' she has further blurred the boundaries between her role and skills as a researcher and is re-locating herself to listen, navigate and respond to this context. In doing so, she has explicitly prioritised dealing with what emotions and emotionality might unlock in collaborative work. As mentioned in Chapter 7, Edith expressed exhaustion with the responsibility she felt for supporting the work in this way but remained committed.

The deliberative processes that supported community and university actors to work together in this project enabled concrete experience to be the main criteria for legitimacy of people's knowledge claims. Ideas of what research was had to be re-thought with this in mind in order for the project to keep going. In this project, knowledge creation – in the form of new ways of looking at things as well as new information, was distributed across all actors involved in the collaboration and could encompass a range of different types and ways of knowing.

This section has considered three different practices that illustrate the ways in which knowledges were involved or excluded in the process of research or 'new' knowledge creation. Whilst they develop something of a spectrum that reflects differences in knowledge hierarchy or pluralism, I don't suggest these distinctions align with the extent to which social changes may be achieved. These three types reflect differing degrees of connectivity between academic and community actors and serve to suggest

that the relationship between participation and knowledge production cannot be assumed.

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that respondents shared a plural understanding of knowledge, though the systems and knowers they were located within were sometimes contested. However, my data suggests that academic and community partners found different perspectives helpful in their work towards social change. In many cases this was supported by positions that could encompass processes of negotiation and acknowledgement of the recognition and inclusion of diverse ways of knowing. The presence of deliberative norms of dialogue and authenticity supported these processes, and proved significant in identifying the place of dialogue as a basis for communication between diverse groups, and authenticity in contending with established power dynamics which might preclude such an outcome.

Deliberative principles then have also enabled people's participation in determining not just the presentation of their ways of knowing, but also to some extent the conditions of their action in developing questions and mobilising the answers in support of their agendas of social change. This was particularly evidenced through examples where people's concrete experience was recognised as the basis for their knowledge claim and that knowledges carried weight in decision-making. The features of the more transformative practices this implies also provide some evidence that they can be connected to a trajectory of both self-development and self-determination (following Young, 2000) for community and social actors. The presence of such a trajectory indicates that conditions for social justice can be met through certain arrangements in community-university collaborations.

In the following chapter – my discussion now turns to an exploration of what these findings, and those developed in Chapter 7 might mean for reflecting on the main aspects of my research enquiry, including how I suggest cognitive justice can be made use of in community-university collaborations.

Chapter 9

Knowledge, Power & Participation in Community-University Engagement

Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings developed in chapters 7 & 8 as they relate to the literature I presented on engagement, knowledge and participation in chapters 2, 3 & 4. I aim to demonstrate how my findings make a contribution to our understanding of how knowledge is used, contested and negotiated in community-university collaborations but also the significance of the way in which people work together, and the relationship between cognitive justice and social justice at a theoretical level.

I begin by expanding on respondents' understandings of what they were doing together, and argue that a critical perspective on discourses of engagement is required, to unmask rather than obscure power relations that have implications for the extent to which claims to social justice can be made about these collaborations. I then explore the dimensions of collaboration that framed people's work with each other, picking out the relational, but also emotional components that were significant to people's co-work. The next section concentrates on interpreting how people understood knowledge in their collaborative practice and the factors that influenced the relationship between diverse knowledges. I also reflect on the ways in which knowledge co-production was valued and used by community and social actors in activities beyond the 'space' of engagement per se.

The final section of the chapter considers the empirical evidence for cognitive justice. I argue its significance to the theory and practice of community-university engagement, through three considerations: the participative conditions for cognitive justice, the extent to which it can be considered central to social justice, and engagement activities themselves being cognitively just.

Understanding Community-University Collaborations

The aim of my research was to explore what happens when community and university partners collaborate over topics of shared interest and how in these encounters

different way of knowing are understood, shared and used. Participants in my case studies were working on topics such as homelessness, Indigenous language revitalisation and youth unemployment. All case studies reflected broader social change and justice themes – including marginalised people and their ways of knowing – and put lived experience at the centre of a process for making changes to policy or community action. In all examples respondents were or had been involved in what they would consider collaborations. These implied that they were both willing to work with academic or community partners respectively and to some degree identified this as a useful way to meet their objectives. University and community and social actors all had implicit intentions of social change in their work together and in some cases social change was also an explicit objective.

There is a risk however, that my empirical data gives the impression that collaborations looked unproblematic – especially as I spoke to willing, and in most cases ‘workable’ collaborations – and didn’t hear from all sides. Nevertheless, the research identifies implicit themes of power and privilege, which appeared to have tangible effects on collaborative work. The first of these relates to the points I made in Chapters 5 & 6 about access to participants. In some cases, people were unwilling to pass on contacts or accept my invitation to participate. I cannot be certain why this was the case. Power and privilege were present in case studies and acted both on how collaborative working happened and, as presented in Chapter 8, knowledge production and use. For example, previous negative experiences with academics were a factor in whether a community partner chose to get involved in research. Thus, an absence of negative reporting cannot be assumed to indicate power relationships did not impact co-working.

The sections that follow begin to demonstrate where my data aligns with and enhances our understanding of the key conceptual ideas in my thesis. I begin with the relationship between universities and community social actors mediated through ideas of engagement.

The Big Picture

The first way to reflect further on the relationship between universities and community and social actors is to return to how participants made sense of their experiences. As I demonstrated in Chapter 2, debates on the role and purpose of higher education in relation to society have occupied academic imaginations for centuries and the question of what role universities can or should play in relation to the communities in which they are situated has endured. My findings suggest that three key ideas were important to interpreting this role. These were ‘the caché of the university’, ‘public accountability’ and ‘doing things differently’. These three ideas can be thought of as a frame of reference ‘a conceptual backcloth against which our utterances can be interpreted’ (Burr, 2003: 66) and thus I make use of the concept of discourse developed in Chapter 3 here. I did not set out to conduct a discourse analysis, but using the concept of discourse in relation to these key ideas draws attention to the way in which they were constituted, and to the possibilities that stem from their discursive practices for understanding community-university engagement further.

‘The caché of the university’ and ‘public accountability’ were commonly related to community partners’ motivations for participation and academics’ understandings of the purpose of engagement in mediating this relationship. For some community participants, it was important to access the resources and reputation of the university, for example in order to persuade others to get involved in projects. This access is often reported as one of the benefits of engagement to community partners (see for example Banks, Armstrong et al, 2013; Weerts, 2005). Public accountability was both a motivation for participants to ‘do’ engagement and a context for why universities would act on this agenda, or what people expected of them. In Chapter 2, I suggested that particularly in the UK, the notion of the university as a ‘public good’ was related to contemporary policy agendas that influence universities to actively demonstrate the value of the knowledge they produce. However, I also problematised this with respect to definitions of the public good, noting that such definitions appear incompatible with changes that position universities as providers in an education market. Public accountability in my data was a term more commonly referenced by participants in both fieldwork settings to capture an awareness on the part of

academics that they had responsibilities attached to being publically funded, and by community partners as what they expected of universities for the same reason. Participants discussed motivations for working together that in all cases could be traced to personal values located within a wider context of factors such as institutional or funding imperatives, as well as more altruistic notions of the common good.

The third idea – ‘doing things differently’ – is drawn from the characteristics and practices that people associated with their engagement work, such as challenging the status quo, recognising diverse knowers and a fluid understanding of identities. Many were using methods, approaches, and in some cases epistemologies, that mirrored and reflected what Harding (1991) would suggest produce more complete and less distorted social analyses and resulted in outcomes that could be mobilised in pursuit of social change agendas. I reflect further on this in the section on ‘relational practices of engagement’ on p219.

People’s understanding of engagement was further impacted by their locations. In both fieldwork sites, River and Island University had visible commitments to engaging with outside partners, and in both cases had committed institutional resources to this agenda. Both universities were also signatories to national or international manifestos expressing their engagement missions and intention. Whilst this helped set a context for engagement and with it an expectation for academics to act on this agenda, as highlighted in Chapter 7, these missions were interpreted and acted on differently. In Chapter 2, I offered a brief overview of the patterns of development of engagement work in both fieldwork countries, noting the policy trend for public engagement in the UK, and forms of Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) in Canada. In both fieldwork sites respondents expressed values and intentions that encompassed personal motivation and reflected public policy. However, my data suggests that in the UK, these practices were seen as more specialist. Academic respondents in River University felt they were outside of the mainstream of their institution by doing collaborative research, and thus the methods and underpinning ideas were also seen as markedly different to other forms of academic practice. They were also subject to highly individual interpretation that in some cases suggested a difference between their stated intentions and their underlying practices. For instance, in two examples in River Place, academics used the

terminology and practice of partnership working, but analysis suggests they still maintained their expert status, which resulted in inequities in decision-making and the possibility of diverse knowledges being represented in knowledge production. Rather than imply that partnership must require equal status of actors, I suggest that this was problematic from a perspective of cognitive justice because power dynamics were unaddressed, particularly with respect to knowledge in these cases.

These three ideas reflect aspirational calls for the role of universities in relation to communities and social justice that are evident in the literature on community-university collaboration (See Escrigas et al, 2009; Gaventa & Bivens, 2014; Hall, Tandon & Tremblay, 2015; Vessuri, 2008). The second way I reflect on this relationship, then, is to think about what my data has to say about whether such aspirations are being met in practice. This literature considers how universities as knowledge producing institutions can (or should) be an increasing pivotal force in the struggle for social justice. Chapter 2 highlighted that such conceptions are linked to modes of practice that consider the inclusion of diverse communities and their ways of knowing (Armstrong & Banks, 2011; Boser, 2006; Chiu, 2006; Harding, 1987; Savan & Sider, 2003) and as such stood apart from other possible constructions that maintain communities as passive recipients of knowledge, or as actors in its mobilisation rather than construction.

Much of my empirical data can be interpreted within the discourse of engagement as it pertains to change and transformation, and one that calls for a disruption to the status quo of universities, knowledge production and use. However, my data highlighted two aspects of this agenda that have implications for it to be 'transformational', beyond the local impact of individual projects. One was the degree to which engagement 'work' had permeated the deeper structural setup of higher education in either fieldwork site. The second was that collaborations remained subject to a mix of asymmetries and issues of inclusion and power in practice, and particularly with respect to knowledge. This leads to two points of note. The first is a tension between this work being a marginal activity in institutions, both in terms of literature and in practice. This is notable through the language used to describe such activity institutionally as 'third' or 'extension', and this could be read as at odds with the practices of trying to re-situate and give primacy to engagement as a

route to solving complex social issues. My case study data indicates that some academic respondents felt they were outside of the mainstream of their institution by doing engagement, despite the university making claims to supporting engagement in their strategic missions. Others found themselves in positions where they had to actively mediate between their engagement activity and institutional needs, suggesting that in fact the two were quite separate. For example, they felt they had to translate or represent their involvement in collaborative research using the normative language of knowledge exchange that, they suggested, was understood by the university to maintain academics as the expert – rather than in terms of the collaboration they generated with their partners. Whilst I do not suggest that academics should not fulfil institutional needs, in these cases the ‘translation’ was required because the academic needed to justify what they were doing against doing other forms of ‘traditional’ research. This was not uniformly the case. In Island Place for example, one academic whose research was based on CBPR had just been promoted, and another led a research centre where participatory approaches were central. This same person had also recently been given an award that recognised her engagement work. Hall, Tandon & Tremblay (2015) demonstrate significant variation in support for community-based research in their global survey, as patterns of development have been uneven. And one of the findings from this survey is the importance of institutions doing what they claim to do, rather than risk paying lip service to the engagement agenda.

Examples from my data indicate the extent to which doing engagement was accepted symbolically in the institution and how that was experienced in terms of practical and structural support for academics and their partners. My empirical data have reinforced that even within a discourse of ‘doing things differently’ we cannot assume that transformative oriented engagement is a homogenous act, or that the aspirations towards social justice it contains are met. I would thus argue that for such aspirations to be realised requires better specification of the form and type of engagement that people should pursue. This would mean bringing clarity to the discourse of engagement for transformation; acknowledging its potential as well as limitations, and a requirement that scrutiny is brought to the context, espoused and applied values of such endeavours. This requires contending with, rather than ignoring, important questions of privilege and power. That involves, for example, maintaining a critical

engagement with scholarship, addressing questions of who is involved, why that was the case and what are the implications for a particular project.

I next turn to consider the way in which university and community actors were working together in more detail within the understandings suggested above. I primarily focus on the relational and emotional dimensions to their co-work, as they were significant in my case studies.

A Relational Practice of Engagement

How university and community actors worked together was of core interest to my research enquiry. I mentioned in Chapter 2 that people collaborating together over research or social issues was not a new phenomenon. There is much in the extant literature that suggests what is generally accepted to be good practice in this domain, specific features of which include trust, mutual benefit and establishing shared languages. The development of relationships is often recognised as important (see for example: Boser, 2006; Hart, Madisson & Wolff, 2007; Savan & Sider, 2003; Wright et al, 2011). Respondents in my research agreed that relationships were significant. My data reflected elements of this good practice in the ways people worked together but also provided a picture of relationships that encompassed expressions of emotion, care and commitment to people as well as the project. They also included features of responsibility and accountability. Thus, a focus on relationships from my data connects with current research theory and practice in this area but goes further particularly with respect to emotion and responsibility.

The significance of emotions within collaborative fora, such as that represented through community-university activity has been discussed in literature on deliberative democracy. Barnes (2008a, 2008b, 2012) in particular has elucidated aspects of emotion and care connected to how people approach and take decisions in relation to issues that concern them. What this scholarship demonstrates is that the acceptance of emotions as a legitimate element of dialogue is closely connected to adequate recognition of people and their ways of knowing. In this way, how people make sense of and express their opinions and contributions can be done in ways that make sense to them, rather than requiring them to act or speak in a particular way that does not reflect, acknowledge or accommodate their experiences (Barnes, 2008b: 477).

In my case studies, forms of emotional expression were not uniform. They included loss and grief in relation to First Nations' language erasure and the residential school system; fear and uncertainty about the loaning of personal artefacts of Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) people to an archive of black history; and personal suffering in large flooding events. Some respondents also expressed emotion about the process of collaboration they had been involved in. These were personal reflections and included feelings of cultural safety, exhaustion and excitement. These were only shared in reflection through interview, and so I am unable to say whether these latter expressions were components of people's collaborative work with each other.

How emotions were treated within collaborative work ranged from being central to the response and practice of the research, to being noticed but then distanced from processes of research. In these latter examples, by not contending with emotions and emotional expression forms of engagement were potentially excluding those who were most affected by an issue. This is an important point as Visvanathan suggests everyone should have the right to have a say on the 'science' that affects their lives. This implies that adequate ways to include a diverse range of knowing and expression need to be addressed. This also relies on an accurate understanding of the multiple systems of meaning held by people involved (Dumlao & Janke 2012). I return to the role of relationships in these processes of recognition below.

Barnes (2008b) also highlights that emotional expressions emphasise the significance of the issues that are the substance of debate. Doing so generates a better understanding of what is important to people and indicates normative ways in which they might meet, talk and deliberate in everyday contexts. For example, case studies that reported greater attention to what was important to people in everyday contexts were more likely to establish meaningful dialogue between different people. Thus in the Reviving Indigenous Languages project in Island Place extensive time was spent in the early stages understanding people's issues, but also exploring norms and requirements in terms of meetings and the ways in which people wanted to talk (collectively). Through such processes, my analysis suggests that people were able to communicate and share how they felt about the project and its subject, revealing their enthusiasm and their concerns. The extent to which emotional expressions were accepted as a legitimate part of the dialogue in a project such as this appeared to be

connected to other dimensions of people's relationships. Here, the accountability demonstrated by those involved not just to the outcomes of the collaboration, but also to the people and places concerned was key to realising the inclusion of multiple forms of expression. The way accountability was realised reflected responsibility towards the emotional significance of issues to those involved.

In an Indigenous First Nation's worldview the concept of 'relational accountability' is useful here. Relational accountability is understood as respect for, and taking care of, all one's relations (Wilson & Wilson, 1998). This includes not only family and community, but also the intricate web of all living organisms, and as such people are responsible to an intricate web of relationships (Kajner et al, 2011). This is based on the idea that how we come to know is informed by everything around us – not just each other but 'all of creation' (Wilson 2001: 177) and thus we are bound in relational ways to this knowledge. Reimer et al (2015) suggest that one cannot make meaning without also recognising the larger patterns and relationships that are integral to developing understanding of an issue, such as access to medical care.

As Indigenous scholar Sean Wilson has argued, relationships *are* our reality (2008), and my findings suggest that for participants, the relational dimension of their experiences was critical in developing questions and answers to issues of social justice. It was important that participants found approaches to 'research' that were not separated from everyday actions and understandings; which in the sense of relational accountability above means incorporating meanings and understandings of the context within which the research is taking place.

In Western literatures, a number of scholars have considered the importance of everyday modes of communication and practice and how these might be important in ensuring the inclusion of diverse groups. Iris Marion Young (2000) suggests 'greetings' in processes of deliberative democracy as one of three ways attention can be better paid to this⁴⁰, referring to the acknowledgement of the presence and point of view of diverse actors. Banks et al (2013) consider a situated 'everyday ethics' more suited to processes of collaborative research; similarly, Barnes (2012) on her work

⁴⁰ Young suggests Greeting, Rhetoric & Narrative as aspects of communication with important functions in furthering deliberation. See Young, 2000: 57-77).

with care ethics calls for a situated and contextualised response to the practices people are engaged in (see also Barnes & Henwood, 2015). These ideas resonate with my findings with respect to the promotion of dialogue between participants as a source of inclusion as developed in Chapter 7. They suggest that different types of knowledge, for example about experiences of homelessness, are specific to certain circumstances and relationships, such as between a housing worker and someone seeking accommodation. Promoting a dialogical approach that allows people a voice through which to name their world (Goodson & Phillimore, 2012), is thus a way of also developing information as part of that specific contextual relationship, rather than thinking about how information can be applied, perhaps generically to a particular circumstance of issues. These ideas assert the importance of social relations in determining the scope and approach of research and inclusion of diverse knowers.

Prioritising social relations was demonstrated in examples from case studies where participants discussed approaches to relationship building, most of which fell outside of the processes of the 'research' itself (for example, attending each other's events to support the other in their activities). Some academic respondents emphasised the importance of learning relevant cultural norms, such as the Potlatch (see p194) in making decisions about how their relationships and research could be developed. I have interpreted this as individuals taking into account more than just getting the work done and developing and demonstrating an awareness and responsibility not just to the product or outcome of research but to the people involved. Following Chambers (1995), openness demonstrated by some academic participants to their enquiry and how it was addressed could be seen as an example of the 'reversals' he argues are required to put other realities first. In an example of what would be required to achieve this, community partner Rae talked about the necessity for academics to draw on the 'head' and 'heart' (see p198) in their collaborative work. In doing so, Rae drew attention to not just what is valued in choosing to work on an issue, but also that the need for emotions, relationships and dialogue are aspects that promote ideas of relational accountability.

With respect to research, Maori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2014) argues for the beginnings or seemingly unimportant moments of welcome between those involved in research. These elements then also act as forms of acknowledgement that play a role

in processes of recognition, much like that suggested by Young's work on greeting. As Tuhiwai Smith goes on to say this 'particular ritual recognises the humanity, the spirituality, the genealogy, the sacred power of the individual and the group or community' (p16). Kajner et al (2012) suggest that scholars should accept the responsibility of relational accountability and they argue that this in fact promotes a dialectical interplay that opens up an ethical space of interaction. In an example of a case study where Indigenous and non-Indigenous people were collaborating, Edith describes how she responded to the challenge of taking on and being accountable to a range of people and ideas within and outside of her academic context. She indicated that to do so required her to suppress her own identity as an academic but rested on valuing, recognising and respecting the different accountabilities she developed through the project. An example from an Indigenous academic came from Cara who spoke of taking direction from elders to ensure her choices and actions were informed by more than just her perspective.

I have begun to explicitly draw on the ideas of Indigenous scholars here, and continue to do so throughout my discussion. Although largely absent from my earlier theoretical work, my case studies caused me to consider the idea of Indigenous knowledge per se, thus I see it as important to be drawing from such ideas to discuss and interpret my findings.

Values, Identity and Positionality

I have suggested in Chapter 7 and above that the legitimate inclusion of emotions and emotional components to people and topics within a relational approach to collaboration can lead to a 'personalising' of practice and method. This is, rather than a departure from more positivist research framings, a closer reflection of how we act in the social world. Thinking in this way also opens up new possibilities for how research is done. For example, Sprain & Carcasson (2013) introduce the idea of 'passionate impartiality' in their work on democratic engagement. They argue that we should not ask researchers to set aside their passions for cultivating change or become detached from the communities they support. A broader understanding of what it is to 'do' research is also reflected in Indigenous understandings of using the 'head and heart' in engaged scholarship. Kajner et al (2012) argue for the inclusion of more than just what we know to be part of research and what is taken for granted,

but also to commit to a process of self-reflection that incorporates spiritual and emotional aspects of individual experience such that *'when scholars have engaged at the level of the heart, the responsibility for change sits equally on their shoulders'* (p261).

These aspects relate to individual positionalities, and a significant part of how people discussed relationality was connected to how they saw themselves in collaborations, through what I have termed their 'frame of experience' – by which I mean those factors that contributed to the positions and decisions they took in their co-work. I have noted that some of the participants in my research did not identify themselves as *either academic or community member*. Identities are fluid and multi-layered and my findings suggest that this disruption of binary distinctions impacted decisions about processes of co-working, such as values, commitment and responsibility. Banks et al (2013) emphasise the value-based nature of 'community based research' and this is inherently linked to those practicing such methods.

In all cases in my research, respondents could trace back a family or community based connection to what they were interested in and why they approached their collaboration in a particular way. This included often-repeated values of cooperation, mutuality, trust, respect and commitment. In some cases, as outlined in Chapter 8, respondents explicitly acknowledged that working in collaborative ways was just 'who they were', and so they did not see anything unusual to their approach.

What mattered to people then was reflected in their positionality. One of the consequences of these more fluid identities between categories of researcher and researched were that it promoted roles in common. It meant resisting assumptions about 'who does what', and therefore avoiding the re-enforcement of inequitable ideas, roles and identities in research and knowledge production. For example, in the case of a participatory research project on homelessness, street homeless people, nursing students, community activists and academics were all researchers in their project. However, street homeless people's perspectives were privileged in data collection and analysis through the use of visual methods.

Feminist scholars have already given us ideas as to how we might treat binary dichotomies not as oppositions but rather as co-operative endeavours for constructing selves through collective relational systems of action and interaction (Stanley and Wise, 2002: 195). My data demonstrate that collaborative practices that blurred rather than reinforced boundaries and gave primacy to social relations supported the development of a more collective identity in relation to an issue. For example, in one case study, Indigenous people living with HIV/Aids became peer researchers in their communities to address stigma. Academics, community organisations and individuals collectively used what they knew to support the issue as a collective, rather than adopting clear positions of researcher and researched or academic and community. People played different roles, but they shared their objective and prioritised how their relationships worked to achieve it.

My data also demonstrated that people often made personal connections to each other, in contrast to the more impersonal dynamics of traditional research relationships. For example, one academic described an outcome of collaboration as being that she and her collaborator were now part of each other's lives, indicating that the relationship and commitments to each other and the issue would remain. Another had volunteered for 10 years with one of the organisations she also had a research relationship with. Such ongoing relationships were not evident in every collaboration. But in case studies where there was evidence of a blurring of boundaries it did appear to be the case that collaborations were built around who people were, rather than what position they occupied in terms of being 'inside' or 'outside' the university. Enabling different voices to be heard could give rise to different forms of knowledge that took all experiences into account (see Tanesini, 1999).

The evidence that all respondents could identify a motivation for engagement that could be traced back to wanting to make a difference, through family, community or political experiences demonstrated the extent to which people were engaged in a personal endeavour. In their recent work in this area, Gaventa & Bivens (2014) suggest that some researchers involved in engagement practices began to see research itself as a political act, and themselves as political actors who are deeply embedded as part of struggles for social justice. Yet there was little evidence for this in my research. In fact, participants didn't seem to consider how 'radical' an act they were

involved in – even though they identified clear points of divergence from the status quo. In most cases researchers when asked were not keen to adopt an ‘activist’ label. This was not to suggest that they did not appreciate or were not aware of their positioning in relation to issues of justice. What seemed more prevalent were academics articulating a positive sense of activism, and even prior or current examples, but still choosing to distance their research role from this. For example, Edith at Island University made reference to her previous activist background with Amnesty International as a student and considered herself to have an ‘activist personality’. However, in our interview she chose to describe herself as an ally to communities she was working with on language revitalisation, and did not want to attach an activist label to that work. In another example a researcher who also did voluntary work in the area she researches maintained a separation between the two. It was not clear through interview why people felt this way. One possibility is that, as other respondents indicated, the way they thought collaborative research was viewed in their institution was not always wholly supportive or clear. Therefore, they may be choosing not to adopt positions they think highlight this. This would represent a slight paradox however as my findings indicate it is precisely this articulation of positionality with respect to collaborative relationships, which makes work of this type more possible.

My findings have identified that relationships were significant and central to people’s collaborations. My data demonstrates that important dimensions to this included emotional expressions and accountability to the topic and to each other. I also suggest that these elements contributed to a fluid, decentered notion of expertise (following Leach & Scoones, 2005), which proved important in the recognition of diverse groups and their ways of knowing in research. The centrality of relationships and understandings of accountability in my data were thus also significant with respect to what was considered legitimate knowledge. How this was understood, used and negotiated in these processes is what I turn to next.

Knowledge & Participation

This section considers how my findings can be interpreted in relation to how knowledge was understood in my case studies. I discuss how the plural way knowledge was understood contributed to the development of ‘new’ knowledge. I

also look reflect on the way in which knowledges were in relationship to each other in practice through my case studies. I suggest that these relationships illustrate the degree to which collaborations could reflect epistemic plurality and representation through people's participation. I also give consideration to how the relationship between power, knowledge and social justice might be understood differently in both fieldwork contexts. I further explore these findings with respect to cognitive justice in the section that follows this discussion.

One of my research questions was whether collaborations produced new knowledge. My data showed some evidence of this where knowledge was defined by understandings of a topic influenced by contributions from those not visible in traditional research processes. New knowledge was also interpreted by one respondent as the knowledge produced collaboratively as a new, hybrid form. This suggested such knowledge would have its own system of value, meaning and underlying practice, combining those perspectives that contributed to it (i.e. practice and academic knowledge). However, literature relating to Indigenous knowledges rejects the idea of hybridity, arguing that such knowledge would no longer be recognisable once removed from its context in this way (see Agrawal, 2002; Berkes, 2009). The identification of 'hybrid knowledge' was not a view advanced by any other respondent.

More clearly in evidence were examples of *new configurations* of knowledge that resulted in a process where people were thinking differently about a topic, reflecting multiple contributions and perspectives and new methods or approaches that enabled them. In line with Santos' work this could be read in terms of 'ecologies' of knowledge, where within these configurations, a new relationship between scientific and other kinds of knowledge is created (2006: 21). My data show different questions were being asked about known phenomena, or the questions were being asked in a different way because wider perspectives were being brought to bear. Where new configurations were present, these examples were characterised by the inclusion of different epistemologies and voices of those marginalised in 'traditional' research processes, as well as using experience as a criterion for knowledge claims. The data also provides some evidence of people's access to knowledge that was previously

only accessible to elites, for example, data on youth employment that was informing policy responses.

Some knowledge was seen to be valuable because of how it could be mobilised in efforts for change related to civil society activity. In Chapter 4 I distinguished my understandings of how community-university work might offer a thread between participants defining their interests, their activities as part of civil society, the state and the public sphere. As I note near the end of this chapter I cannot claim to have evidenced change as a result of my data, only to reflect what was inferred or suggested through what people discussed. This is in large part because my conversations with participants were in the main focused on people's practices. However, there were some reported examples that appear to show a connection between how people collaborating in forms of engagement used the knowledge produced in other connected spaces. For example, research on homelessness was mobilised as part of a campaign with City stakeholders to influence policy. In another project, research outcomes were used to make a case for policy changes to social prescribing and in a project focused on lay knowledge of flooding events developed resident's experiences into a set of guidance for local agencies.

Whilst the nature of participation outlined in Chapters 7 & 8 provided an enabling context for the epistemic inclusion or plurality of diverse groups, there were in some cases examples of what Young (2000: 55) would term 'internal exclusion' scenarios where people lacked effective opportunities to influence the thinking of others even when they had access to fora and procedures of decision making. For example, in the Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) Heritage project research, local BME communities were invited to place their artefacts in archives, but had no say on how or where they would be represented. In the Indigenous curriculum project, issues with the fixed nature of modules and university structures mean that partners could only deliberate within certain parameters about how content could fit within these.

What also became clear in my data were a series of examples that demonstrated a disjuncture between how people were participating with each other, and the extent to which different ways of knowing were included or excluded in processes of knowledge production. So it was entirely possible to have a steering group of

different academic and community partners talking about, for example, youth employment, but the experience, suggestions or inputs of community representatives were overlooked, dismissed or ignored in favour of academic explanations. Such a dynamic has been similarly highlighted by Visvanathan (2005: 84) who recognised ‘empowerment in terms of voice alone’ being inadequate when considering the inclusion of people as knowers in processes of knowledge production and use. This draws attention to the relationship not just between knowledge and power as I demonstrated in Chapter 3, but also how the relationship between knowledge and participation has been relevant to my analysis.

Reflecting on these relationships in my empirical data prompts consideration of how the substantive differences between fieldwork sites impact the recognition and interpretation of the relationship between power, knowledge and social justice. For example, in the Canadian context, through the recognition of a clearly different Indigenous culture from that of the Western culture associated with the university, there is a basis on which it is possible to distinguish different knowledges. Indeed, the concept of cognitive justice was developed in the contrast between Indigenous and Western ways of knowing. By the same token, this visibility also makes it more possible to identify inclusive deliberative practices. In the UK, the basis on which to distinguish difference is perhaps less clear. There are however, significant examples in participatory and emancipatory research in areas such as disability and mental health, where activists, service users and practitioners have argued for a distinct way of knowing required to meet their needs and one which rejects non-disabled academic involvement. However, none of my UK case studies were working in such an area and so my thesis has not explicitly drawn on these articulated distinctions.

However, as my thesis does indicate, the relationship between knowledge, power and participation in different contexts created by the recognition of knowledges linked to other cultures, has had value in interpreting my data. This was not intentional, rather I set out to take an aggregative approach to examples of practice in different places, noting their similarities and differences. As I suggest in Chapter 10, this is an area for possible further study.

This section has highlighted the importance of going ‘beyond recognition’ of groups and their ways of knowing to enable relationships between knowledge and participation that more readily incorporate peoples’ ways of knowing. The final section of this chapter now offers a deeper exploration of this and my other findings through the lens of cognitive justice

Exploring Cognitive Justice

How universities can contribute to social justice through practices of collaborative research requires a better understanding of the interdependencies of different ways of knowing on issues of shared common concern. My thesis has substantively explored the concept of cognitive justice to consider this undertaking in more detail. As I demonstrated in Chapter 3, my interest in cognitive justice as the analytical tool to do this lies in the set of principles it provides that draw attention to questions of knowledge, epistemology and politics.

To re-cap, cognitive justice is based on the following principles (Visvanathan, 1999: 3):

- All forms of knowledge are valid and should co-exist in a dialogic relationship to each other.
- Cognitive justice implies the strengthening of the 'voice' of the defeated and marginalised.
- Traditional knowledges and technologies should not be 'museumized'.
- Every citizen is a scientist. Each layperson is an expert.
- Science should help the common man/woman.
- All competing sciences should be brought together into a positive heuristic for dialogue.

However, making sense of how such principles could relate to practice initially posed a question for my research as, beyond systematic observation of these ideas through my analytical framework, the literature offered little explicit direction.

What the literature more commonly points to is the notion of ‘ecologies’ of knowledge (see Santos, 2003, 2004, 2008), such that plural forms of knowledge are

afforded ‘equality of opportunity’ to make contributions to building more democratic and just societies. Indeed, in this way, and in considering how best to work with cognitive justice as a concept, I reflect the *a priori* claim that different paradigms of knowledge can be brought together in dialogue. However, the necessity to understand in what ways these ideas can be demonstrated in practice suggests that using cognitive justice as an analytical exercise alone is inadequate. Following Eubanks (2011) this also requires consideration of cognitive representation and participation in knowledge making practices. Therefore, I chose to consider these principles of cognitive justice as offering clues about the characteristics of different scenarios where social justice may be an outcome. In this way, we can think about their interpretation *in process* through the intersection of knowledge and participation that is implied in community-university collaborations. This seemed particularly important as the relationship between participation in engaged activities and the epistemological inclusion of people’s ways of knowing can not be assumed.

The case for cognitive justice in practice can be made through the exploration of three features of my data. These are: (1) the participative conditions for cognitive justice; (2) the extent to which cognitive justice can be considered necessary to social justice; and (3) engagement activities/practices themselves being cognitively just. Through this, I point to the value and potential of cognitive justice as a means to understanding how community-university collaborations can be effective at contributing to community and social justice agendas.

(1) In relation to the participative conditions for cognitive justice, my findings point to the necessity of relational practices of engagement and the presence of deliberative characteristics to knowledge creation and use. Participation of this kind had two further hallmarks. One was that individual actors’ identities were fluid or multi-dimensional. The second was the legitimate inclusion of emotional expressions through processes of dialogue. As I discussed earlier in the chapter, this kind of participation resulted in activity that was situated in subjective realities.

In my research, this had implications for the positionality of academic researchers in particular. This is something that has also been discussed by Gaventa & Bivens (2014) in a review of a decade of work of the Citizenship Development Research

Centre at the Institute of Development Studies, UK. They suggest that approaches informed by cognitive justice led researchers to come to understand the multiple roles they played in collaborations. This was in part due to their own roles and beliefs changing through such activities, connected explicitly as they were to agendas of social justice. It is relational processes of collaboration that support the possibility that identities are de-stabilised through these processes. Some participants discussed the mutual transformation implied in these acts, rather than just changes needed for community and social actors. Fraser (1997) highlights that the transformative aim of social justice is not to 'solidify' an identity but to deconstruct the dichotomy concerned so as to destabilise fixed identities. My findings support this view to a degree. But as I discuss below, distinction between actors was still viewed as desirable by some participants as it was precisely the configuration of different ways of knowing and perspectives that enabled people to pursue their interests. Haraway (1988) emphasises distinction in her work, arguing that without it, you risk a relativism that does not have an eye for power.

With attention to practices that focused on inclusion, not just in terms of practical arrangements but also in some cases with respect to communication, as I have demonstrated above, elements of deliberative practices had an impact. Barnes suggests that deliberative practices draw attention to the assumptions we make about 'who has legitimate knowledge... what is the source of such knowledge and what are legitimate ways of contributing to a process of dialogue' (2008a: 9-10). In my research, deliberative principles were in practice through forms of dialogue between actors and could be sources of legitimacy for people's knowledge claims because the characteristics of that dialogue provided a context for their inclusion, recognition, and the value of multiple knowledges. In fact, cognitive justice calls for this dialogic relationship to support the co-existence of knowledges and through the presence of authentic, committed and accessible forms of activity, my research found evidence of practice that could be considered cognitively just.

The forms of practice that could incorporate these various characteristics were also seen by many in my case studies as 'doing things differently', for example in actively challenging the status quo about what research should entail. Searching for new explanations to 'fit' new practices is again highlighted by Gaventa & Bivens (2014)

as they call attention to the new roles and ethics required of research as part of a landscape of cognitive justice. They draw on the case made by Santos (2008); that moving past the monoculture of scientific knowledge opens up epistemic dialogue between various forms and modes of knowledge. Salazar (2011) argues cognitive justice introduces an ethical dimension to practice by questioning precisely a lack of dialogue in many existing approaches. But these connections to the ethical are not confined to discussions of cognitive justice. They are also increasingly demonstrated in emerging thinking from those practicing a range of participative or collaborative forms of research. What this scholarship develops is the need to re-imagine the ethics of partnership working, such that formal procedures are no longer fit for purpose (see Banks et al, 2013) and a situated and relational ethics is required in its place. Ward & Gahagan (2010, 2014) also discuss how they sought to make their shared values on research with older people an explicit part of their work. To do so they drew on an ethic of care⁴¹ framework, which offered context-specific ways of understanding and responding to the ethical challenges of undertaking participatory research such as power differences. Atalas (2006) suggests that practices of this type would also lead to the reconstruction of social discourses that involve the development of concepts, categories and research agendas relevant to local conditions. In this way, greater scrutiny is given to knowledge and power and how the politics of knowledge affects the framing and dynamics of mobilisations, as well as the deployment of information in struggles over meaning and interpretation (Leach & Scoones, 2007). Foucault (1969) sees that an abandonment of historical ‘archaeology’ could have significant consequences for how we approach and understand and give rise to new discourses. Visvanathan (1999) suggests that cognitive justice offers us the option of a dialogic relationship and the presence of such dialogue may be a more realistic and fruitful pursuit in generating an inclusive knowledge base from which actions, imperatives and priorities are shared.

(2): A second consideration in making sense of cognitive justice in my research is the extent to which it can be considered central to social justice. A small group of scholars (Gaventa & Bivens, 2014; Gaventa, 2013; Salazar, 2011; Santos, 2007;

⁴¹ An ethic of care framework sets out interconnected principles of attentiveness, responsibility, competence, responsiveness and trust (Ward & Gahagan, 2012: 183), with respect to care and caring relationships.

Visvanathan, 2009) have already made the link between the need for cognitive justice to be a feature of social justice. Similarly, Hall & Tandon (2013) caution that without it, aspirations of community-university engagement for social justice will not be met.

I have established that relational approaches were important to creating the conditions for cognitive justice. Visvanathan's (1999) principles quoted earlier also contain an emancipatory element, in particular where they suggest 'the strengthening of the 'voice' of the defeated and marginalized'. In addition to this, he assumes the inequality of knowers. In more broadly exploring the links between cognitive and social justice through 'relational' approaches, Giatti et al (2014) conducted a review of 170 papers that had included such approaches to co-work. From this they suggested that ongoing or cyclical approaches to collaborations achieved a higher level of potential dialogue between participants. They connected this to the prospect of empowerment of social actors and legitimate incorporation of subjectivity and diversity. From this they also concluded that cognitive justice is therefore crucial to the achievement of social justice.

In my work, I have located community-university activity in the two paradigms of justice Young (1990, 2000) and Fraser (1997) suggest in their work on political theory. Visvanathan's assumption of the inequality of knowers (see Van der Velden, 2006) sits alongside Young's assumptions on groups marginalised through forms of oppression and dominance to institutional, and in this case, 'scientific' dominance. Evidence from my research suggests that engaging in cognitively just processes goes some way, not just to providing the conditions for including these groups in processes of research, but that recognising their capacity as knowers reflects their self-development. For example, street homeless people in the Participatory Research on Homelessness project were central to deciding the topic and subject matter of a photovoice method. At the same time, principles or assumptions about the achievement of cognitive justice suggest not just affirmative, but transformative remedies (following Fraser, 1997) where the use of different groups' epistemologies has a role in knowledge creation or new insights and solutions. This points to a redistributive outcome, which develops the trajectory of self-development to self-determination for community and social actors. Although I can only interpret this claim from my data, in the same example, as a result of their participation in this

collaboration, some of the street homeless members of the group gained access to accommodation, by being able to draw on references from their participation, and forms of volunteering and work through defining their interests and having skills recognised through the project, for example with woodwork.

Tuhiwai Smith (1999) argues that self-determination in a research agenda can become a goal of social justice that is expressed through and across a wide range of terrains, and that it necessarily involves processes of transformation. In my research, this required the conditions for domination to be challenged by actors who could mobilise an agency in ‘doing things differently’ and suggest and work on their conceptions of change. For example, in the Young People and Employment project, the academic took responsibility for navigating the systems of her institution, which involved subverting some official internal committees to keep the project going forward.

Fraser (1997) cautions against the mutual interferences that can arise when pursuing claims for recognition and redistribution simultaneously by arguing that at the same time as promoting ‘group’ differentiation you tend to undermine it. My research, however, indicates that claims to justice can be made separately or together. This in part rests on the extent to which ways of knowing and the actors that carry them are not just included in framing an enquiry, but that their knowledges also ‘count’ in addressing those problems.

(3) The final feature I briefly explore here is the way in which engagement practices themselves can be cognitively just. The overlaps between democratic theory and contemporary conceptions of community-university engagement that I outlined in Chapter 4 could be understood as more broadly contributing to an arena in which people develop resources, knowledge and capacity for social change (within ideals of equity, access and inclusion for ‘all members of society’). In this way, one could argue that pursuing cognitive justice is only achievable through a socially just process. As Gaventa & Bivens (2014) noted in their work on the production of democratic knowledge – the theme of the work becomes its methodology as well. Sibley (1995) argues that coming to new perspectives can be made difficult by the habit of looking for confirmation of existing theories and methods. However, my thesis has suggested forms of practice that can contest dominant understandings of

science and knowledge production and in doing so make it more possible to pay attention to epistemic pluralism. Cognitive justice demands recognition of knowledges, not only as methods but as ways of life (Visvanathan, 2009), and on this point my findings make a connection. For Visvanathan (ibid) this is an expression that knowledge is embedded in, and cannot be abstracted from, everyday practices. This also suggests that methods or the knowledge they produce should also not be unrecognisable to those who participate.

In line with critical feminist and Indigenous perspectives on the social world, these ideas demand that the location of knowledge be contextual and recognised, situated and subjective. This relates to the descriptions of relational accountability I developed above. Geertz (1983: 61) argues that this requires adequate ontological and epistemological descriptions that can explain social phenomena through ‘local frames of awareness’. ‘Doing’ cognitive justice thus requires new arrangements between researchers and researched which also brings with it ethical and methodological considerations. Hence, to achieve cognitive justice requires including much more than recognising different forms of knowledge in ensuring effective ways of working together. Forms of engagement must also accommodate breaks in institutional and social assumptions about knowledges in order to (following Fraser, 1997) correct inequitable outcomes precisely by restructuring the generative underlying framework. However, as I discussed earlier in this chapter, the ability of people to collaborate and practice in this way is still subject to the institutional context within which such work can take place.

My findings position cognitive justice as a valuable and important lens through which to view community-university engagement and its relationship to social justice. The exploration above has indicated how cognitive justice draws attention to the inclusion and exclusion of knowers in practice, but also the need to find an adequate or alternative theory or practice that is congruent with ambitions for epistemic plurality and dialogue in forms of community-university engagement.

Conclusion

This chapter has reflected on how my findings can be interpreted with the ideas and conceptual tools I outlined in Chapters 2, 3 and 4. In doing so I have demonstrated conceptual, methodological and practical implications for the field of community-university engagement with respect to cognitive justice. I have drawn attention to how people understood engagement and suggested critical exploration of discourse is necessary to understand the extent to which practices of engagement can relate to social justice. I have also further considered the dimensions to people's collaborations and established that relational approaches to co-working were significant. By considering the relationship between knowledge and participation I indicated the different ways this was demonstrated in my case studies and suggested the value in having explored this in different contexts. The final section of this chapter concentrated on cognitive justice. I suggested that my empirical data has developed two conditions for participative practices to be considered cognitively just – these were the presence of relational and emotional dimensions. Following this I also suggested that practices of this kind did relate to outcomes that could be considered socially just, and thus also held potential that engagement activities themselves could be considered cognitively just.

The following chapter, my conclusion, focuses this further by illuminating my contribution to this debate as well as reflecting on the limitations of my research and indicating future directions for my study.

Chapter 10

Conclusion

My research set out to describe and understand what happens when community and social actors and university academics collaborate over topics of shared interest. As outlined through my background literature, this enquiry was framed within three more specific ideas:

- how people understand what they are doing together;
- how knowledge is used, shared and legitimated and;
- how these encounters are framed with respect to social justice.

In order to disentangle the mix of knowledge, participation and social change implied in the framing of my research enquiry, my conceptual and analytical framework focused on an exploration of deliberative processes of participation and cognitive justice in this landscape. In this final chapter I consider my thesis as a whole in order to reflect on how responding to my research aims and questions has determined my contribution to knowledge in the field. This chapter also considers limitations of my research and possible future directions for further study.

Cognitive Justice as a Normative Idea

On the basis of the discussion developed in Chapter 9, my study has allowed me to answer the three research questions I presented in the introduction to this thesis (Chapter 1), and again in a discussion of methodology (Chapter 5). These questions were concerned with how participants made sense of their experiences, the nature of their collaborative practices and the extent to which the concept of cognitive justice could be understood in the context of community-university engagement. Answering these questions has led me to draw out two distinct ways in which my work makes an original contribution to the domain of engagement, participation and knowledge for social justice. The first is in two parts; extending an understanding of cognitive justice as it pertains to community-university engagement and providing an empirical contribution to the call for new practices and methods for cognitively just dimensions

to collaborations that can lead to socially just engagement. The second concerns the relationship between this research and connections to democratic theories of civic participation and social change. I expand further on these in turn.

My findings affirm the conceptual thinking on the central role of cognitive justice for social justice, and it does so through empirical contribution. One of the aims of my research enquiry has been to explore how developing dialogues of knowledge will better legitimate different ways of knowing and support collective problem solving. Attempting to understand the processes of inclusion and exclusion that were acting on people's knowledge claims posed something of a problem. Issues of knowledge remain underexplored in participatory processes and meant making sense of literatures that are predominantly concerned with knowledge and participation separately. By calling attention to the obvious and inseparable intersection between knowledge and participation I have extended an understanding of cognitive justice that goes 'beyond recognition' of diverse knowledges alone. By considering the interrelationship between cognitive and social justice I have also suggested the compatibility of engagement that pays attention to cognitive justice with theories of justice as advanced by Fraser and Young.

Thus, mobilising ideas of cognitive justice in practice (through empirical examples of my work) suggests that were it to be a normative idea that shapes how engagement is thought about, it would be a way in which claims to justice could be understood and evaluated.

By providing empirical examples of how such activity then speaks to questions of cognitive justice further offers a perspective on how universities meet stated ambitions and opportunities in the domain of knowledge democracy, and contend with questions of how they play a role in social justice. My findings suggest that universities should maintain a radical edge with these ideas – going beyond passive forms of engagement which risk commodifying and diverting a discourse which can instead be used to develop real shifts in power with respect to knowledge. As such, I suggest that cognitive justice should be a more normative implication in community-university engagement.

At the time of writing (2016), the UNESCO co-Chairs in Community Based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education, Hall & Tandon have recently published an edited book with Tremblay (2015) based on global perspectives on strengthening community university research partnerships. They claim this publication as the first of its kind, which suggests that the debate about the place and critical terrain of how and in what ways universities can set the conditions for engagement is still emerging. This signals that it is timely to have a contribution to this debate.

My other contribution here is a practice one. My empirical findings have shown the significance of relational and emotional dimensions to research and collaborative practices. This ‘personalising’ of method also has ethical implications by calling attention to the dialogue that underpinned the development of social change outcomes. This dialogue was also in evidence between Western and Indigenous paradigms of knowledge. I join those scholars who already work in these domains to suggest the use of Indigenous knowledge systems can contribute to how we understand and give meaning to collaboration between universities and communities within and beyond collaborations that involve Indigenous people. As Brown & Strega (2005) note in the introduction to their book ‘Research as Resistance’ they were motivated to write it because they could not find the guidance they were looking for to practice research in participatory, political and cross-paradigm ways. Better access to good practice – and indeed a re-thinking of what it constitutes here can help people make decisions in their work, and enable them to be held accountable for research practices claiming to be transformative.

Rabinow (1986) suggests it is important to continue to make dominant understandings of research, knowledge and even accepted research methods as historically peculiar as possible. I draw on this here in order to call attention to how the critical engagement this requires, more commonly used in our understandings of ‘participation’, can also be applied to cognitive representation and thus in knowledge production. I return to the idea of implications for practice in the section that follows.

Before doing so, I reflect briefly on the limitations of the idea of cognitive justice and representation with respect to my findings and conclusions. The first relates to the

potential contradiction in language between ideas of the cognitive within research that has concluded the importance of relationships, emotion and authenticity. The second relates to the use of a concept designed to reflect inequalities between western and non-western ways of knowing across different empirical settings.

Visvanathan (1997, 1999) originated the concept of cognitive justice in the context of debates about the recognition of different sciences, derived from different ways of knowing being connected to livelihoods and survival in Indigenous communities. As the principles of cognitive justice give weight to epistemology it is arguable that he may have been aiming to demarcate and give primacy to people's cognitive contributions in determining their lives. In doing so perhaps inviting a degree of cognitive dissonance within mainstream understandings of science, development and democracy. However, notions of the 'cognitive' are in tension with the feminist and post-structural understandings of the social world I have drawn on in my thesis that reject understandings of knowledge solely on the basis of thought, rationality and 'the mind'. It has also become a clear theme of my data that emotional expressions and dimensions in deliberations between participants are significant in contributing to meaningful dialogue and knowledge production that can make a difference in people's lives. As Visvanathan originally suggests, drawing attention to cognition in the context of people's lives also links to their realities and Gherardi (2015) would argue that the distinction between epistemology and ontology is effectively collapsed when viewing the world this way, in other words, a continual reminder that what we think or know is part of our worlds, not separate from them.

The many dimensions of these realities could be reflected in the different identities on which respondents drew in their collaborations. Different aspects of their identities (academic researcher, indigenous membership, gender, for example) could be a source of different knowledge, information and emotions in constituting the knowledge claims advanced in their collaborations. My use of theories of deliberation has been important in demonstrating the intersection of these elements and locating cognitive justice with respect to different dimensions of communication and knowing. Barnes (2008b) has argued the necessity for deliberation to encompass emotion and ethics as well as cognition and my findings suggest that emotion and

ethics in ‘doing’ cognitive justice are necessary in participatory practices capable of delivering justice.

Whilst the language appears problematic, the value of the concept in the context of community-university engagement is not diminished. What this points towards is the future value of articulating these ideas within the domain of community-university engagement that can better reflect what my findings suggest was significant. Revisiting related ideas such as Fricker’s (2007) work on epistemic injustice⁴² could be one avenue for this, in particular as her work brings implicit connections to the ethical. Epistemic injustice is also congruent with the notions of justice I have argued for with respect to cognitive justice; that is related to recognition, difference and the right to self-determination as advanced by Fraser (1997) & Young (1997, 2000).

The second limitation is to acknowledge my use of a concept designed to reflect inequalities between western and non-western ways of knowing in one empirical setting that reflected this, and another that did not. However, in line with an observation I made in Chapter 8 and reflect again on p246 – I suggest the value of theory originating in different paradigms for making sense of collaborative practices. I would argue that the dissonance this prompts is useful for drawing attention to taken for granted assumptions of the kind Chambers (1995) in particular highlights as problematic in answering questions of whose knowledge counts.

Participative Spaces for Change – Implications & Potential

My findings suggest cognitive justice is significant to understanding the contribution community-university engagement can make to social justice issues. Were cognitive justice to be a normative idea in this domain, from my position as a scholar-practitioner and reflecting on the research developed in this thesis, I suggest here three implications for practice. These relate to how in reality, universities and the actors within them may themselves create the conditions for more cognitively just and therefore arguably transformative forms of engagement.

⁴² Fricker suggest there are two primary forms of epistemic injustice. Testimonial, in which prejudice reduces the credibility of someone’s word, and Hermeneutic, in which groups lack resources to make sense of their own experiences.

Overcoming barriers to relational practice – demonstrating accountability: My findings suggest that relational practice was tied to encompassing emotional expression, much of which was facilitated by blurring the boundaries between academic and community identities. As somebody who works at the intersection of academia and community, I know that the recognition and articulation of personal experiences (where appropriate) and paying attention to shared experience, although perhaps expressed through particular language, can be a powerful way to identify common objectives. A useful example in research comes from Ward & Barnes (2015) in their work with older people, which illustrates the importance of practitioners and researchers being able to recognise and reflect on their personal experiences and perspectives on ageing and old age. Demonstrating accountability can be one way in which to address the barriers to this type of practice. This requires thinking beyond the needs of your project *per se* and relies on adequate connections and understandings of the people and the issue concerned. To do so might involve a commitment to activity, forms of volunteering or events that are in support of your partners. It will mean taking responsibility for investing in relationships, supported through gestures you could associate with forms of friendship or compassion. It should involve making a commitment to learning – different language, ideas and realities – and a willingness to play different roles (e.g. sometimes offering to do whatever job is helpful, rather than restricting yourself to activities associated with ‘academia’). It also comes with a challenge to articulate reciprocity, and finally, and importantly, doing what you say you will do.

Beyond procedural ethics – shared responsibility: By definition, a relational practice brings with it situated ethical considerations. I have drawn on ideas of relational ethics to account for my own positionality to explain my approach to research (see Chapter 5). There is also an increasing literature to guide individuals to think as well as act ethically in participatory research. As Banks et al (2013: 266) highlight, the researcher as an embedded participant in research should be ethical in relationship, emotion and conduct. Responsibilities attached to a particular relationship are also a core tenet of an ethics of care approach (see Tronto, 1993) and Barnes (2008b) has advanced ideas of what deliberating with care might mean for participatory practice. The implication I want to consider here is how a relational, everyday or care ethics can be supported institutionally. In particular, this challenges assumptions in

procedural forms of ethics that the researcher has primary control and responsibility for the research. I suggest this needs to involve at least three things. One is that ethical considerations can be articulated, shared and deliberated in a variety of communicative formats. The second, that review is conducted by the constituency of people affected, and third, that the process allows for a contextualised response, i.e. that the researcher has an additional responsibility to develop an ethical ‘framework in action’ within the community or setting she is part of.

These aspects are predicated on a shared responsibility, not just of the institution to mitigate risk, and/or the researcher in ways of acting and being, but also to and with other collaborators involved in the research. Addressing communicative norms – for example by allowing testimonial or storytelling, over a reliance on written information in gaining ethical approval may allow for the explicit incorporation of emotion. It would also move past the conditions of anonymity, which can constrain relational forms of practice in ethics review processes and the recognition of situated knowledges. Where the responsibility for research, engagement and ethics is shared, processes of review should involve people from across these constituencies in considering and deciding on ethical ‘approval’. Allowing a contextualised response to ethics, i.e. one that can be developed with participants and by definition cannot be pre-approved in the abstract, would require a process of reflexivity, which supports those involved to raise, reflect and decide on at different stages in the research process.

Creating spaces and places for deliberation: The spaces for deliberation suggested as useful to cognitive justice in my findings indicate some important considerations for universities who wish to develop collaborations that genuinely prioritise justice over more self-interested objectives. At an institutional as well as project level universities need to expand their ideas of accountability as public institutions to meet such priorities. Scholars including Watson (2007, 2008), Cuthill (2012) and Hall & Tandon (2015) already emphasise the place and importance of meeting a civic mission as part of what a university is and address questions of to whom universities are accountable and how such accountability might be exercised. I add to these at a more practical level here by including two main points:

- Find out who is doing what in terms of community-university collaboration in order to identify critical masses of interest where experiences and good practice can be shared and developed, new sources of funding can be sought and capacity built.
- Through dialogue amongst scholars and practitioners, develop greater clarity on the purpose and underpinning values of such collaborations. Build on this to develop appropriate institutional practices (such as ethics procedures outlined above, but also systems of co-governance for research). In this context it is important to acknowledge that it is ‘not possible to insulate special discursive arenas from the effects of societal inequality’ (Fraser 1990: 6) and this implies the need to commit to maintaining critical engagement with different stakeholders in relation to questions of whose knowledge counts, but also who gains from such collaborations. (i.e. who is not there).

These points reflect the primacy of dialogue and deliberation and the importance of maintaining time and space within which this can take place. My thesis has not concentrated on official institutional practices that generate this, but clarity of terminology (e.g. with respect to ‘engagement’) and related understandings of how this work adds value to research and teaching were articulated by academics as important.

These three sets of implications all also share a common need to address power, build trust and demonstrate commitment, to which the theory and practice of PAR also offers rich insight. The ability to generate meaningful and transformative outcomes will also be related to the connections between community-university spaces, and the other spaces and places actors inhabit. Visvanathan argues that epistemology is politics – that people should have a say in the ‘science’ that affects their lives. Practices of cognitive justice thus bring with them implicit connections to the political. My findings demonstrate that community-university encounters provided a space that led to the development of knowledge and action that was variously translated into civic contexts. These outcomes could be seen as more closely mirroring knowledge needed by community and social actors engaged in development processes for social change. Leach & Scoones (2005) suggest theories of democracy as a lens for thinking about science, knowledge and engagement between different

perspectives. Following this, my use of aspects of deliberative democracy has contributed to an understanding that these theories are compatible in this domain.

Various authors have now begun to identify overlaps between community-university activity and democratic engagement (Cuthill, 2012; Gaventa & Bivens, 2014; Leach & Scoones, 2005; Visvanathan 1997), and in some senses these are an extension of the conversation over claims to knowledge and truth I first outlined in Chapter 3. Young (2000) argues that civil society cannot succeed in its aims of social change and justice in isolation, and Sibley (1995) reminds us that any attempt for a better integrated and more egalitarian society must include proposals for change in the way academic knowledge is produced. I maintain a case then for community-university encounters to represent a ‘space for change’ within civil society, as I outlined in Chapter 4. This means a space in which actors can build capacity, define their interests and develop knowledge that can be used in deliberations in the public sphere. However, as I turn to in the section below, these particular issues were underexplored in this thesis, and deserve closer attention.

Future Directions for Research

My thesis leaves a rich ground for further study, which can build on the work presented here. I suggest a focus on alignment between ‘research for social change’ and ‘political’ processes as a key next stage. This would fit well with a context where bodies of existing literature are searching for new ways in which democracy can be revitalised (Cornwall & Coelho, 2007) and whether the activity of community-university collaborations could be considered associational (following Young, 2000) as a way to support civil society in the ‘struggle’ of the public sphere.

Another topic for exploration would be to ask further questions about community-university encounters as everyday practices. My data has uncovered much of what people do, and these were a significant way to understand how moves towards social justice could be made in this context. Shove et al’s (2012) approach is to focus on understandings of change – and how sets of practice can generate continually emergent sets of reality which are argued to be relationally located. Viewing community-university engagement this way may help uncover normative aspects of these practices that have implications for methodology. Two strong themes that

emerged from my data that merit further analytical attention are intersectionality with respect to the nature of identity and to continue to explore the importance of emotions and relationality. These are issues that I had not identified for exploration when designing this research. However, they emerged as significant during fieldwork and contributed to my interpretation of data in Chapter 9.

A final possibility is to re-look at how Indigenous knowledges offer concepts and ideas to understand ways of working that respect people and their ways of knowing. I have found the few I accessed for my research to be rich and relevant for understanding relational processes, which could be applicable even where Indigenous knowledge does not exist. They indicate promise for further exploration of the relational and situated basis of the kinds of collaborations represented in my study in a range of different geographical settings.

Whilst my research has met my aim of exploring how community and university partners are working together, it is the case that my research design meant I could only consider these questions on the basis of talk, rather than the opportunity to also systematically observe what people did. This was largely a pragmatic outcome of the time and funding limited nature of my position as a part time research student. This has resulted in a particular analytical view, and a research design that would encompass participant observations as well may have enriched or added to that interpretation. Institutional access to community partner voices in River Place also limited my analysis in terms of hearing community voices. Such voices continue to be under represented in the literature. A further consideration is that I could have chosen to gather empirical data from a single institution. Doing so may have offered a more holistic picture about the context and practice of work under study. However, this would have left me with questions of depth rather than breadth, and it was the range of practices that people were engaged in which was of primary interest. It was also beyond the scope of this thesis to consider the outcomes or longer-term nature of the case studies, and this would provide further investigative ground to extend understandings of the ways in which cognitive and social justice could be interpreted.

Despite these potential limitations, my thesis has added to research on community-university engagement through an empirical exploration of cognitive justice, and

promising connections between the work of community-university collaborations to democratic theories of participation and social change.

Before I conclude, I offer a final reflection on the position from which I have explored ideas and written from in my research. As I outlined in Chapter 5, I am a practitioner of the activities under study as well as an activist in my community. At its end, I find I have approached and carried out this research in a way that was explicitly about and in relationship. I was subjective in my approach and saw personal connections with people in my research as a key way to share and develop knowledge – in this way, subjectivity was a strength. I think I developed new and enduring connections and new ways of thinking about theory and practice, both through what I read, but also by being open to other worldviews and perspectives. I carry this experience, and my findings about how cognitive justice can be enacted back to my practice. I am committed to promoting and facilitating dialogue between different actors, and continuing to challenge the assumptions that we carry with us. The maxim ‘knowledge is power’ is true here, and with the knowledge I have now developed, I seek to make a difference anew.

Conclusion

My thesis represents a committed and critical exploration of issues of knowledge, participation and power in community-university collaborations. In concluding, I still feel that one of the most important questions I am left with is to test and challenge what we mean by engagement and the practices that underpin it. I am proposing that, through critically exploring the discourse of engagement, we should keep a focus on not just the imperative to be in dialogue with one another, but also the mechanisms and spaces we are using to achieve this. In addition, this approach can help us understand where the genuine interest in seeing knowledge production as a shared responsibility of the practitioner and research communities (following Bickel & Hattrupp, 1995: 36) might be realised. What is at stake if we do not bring a more specific lens to this activity is the potential to reproduce injustice in endeavours which many see as progressive and focused on social change. We need to be alert to what Sayer (2011) would call the micro-politics of inequality – what Bourdieu would call ‘soft domination’ (1977).

At a conference I attended for those involved in community-engaged research in 2014, Rajesh Tandon posed the challenge to those there to ‘go beyond a gathering of the faithful’. His point was that we needed to actively work to include underrepresented disciplines and people in the project we were all pursuing together. What this solidified for me were questions about who this ‘movement’ of engagement is driven by and for what purpose. What voices are in it? And which are silenced? These are fundamental considerations for an agenda gathering momentum, answers to which I believe can also be informed by ideas of cognitive justice.

And so, to return to the title of my thesis – Whose knowledge counts? My thesis has elucidated and specified empirical ideas by which to judge possible answers and shows that in doing so cognitive justice, and thus other knowledges in defining and understanding everyday lives, are possible.

Bibliography

- Agrawal, A. (2002) Indigenous knowledge and the politics of classification. *International Social Science Journal*, 54, pp287–297. doi: 10.1111/1468-2451.00382
- Agyeman, G. S. (2008) White Researcher- Black Subjects: Exploring the Challenges of Researching the Marginalised and ‘Invisible’. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 6(1), pp77 -84.
- AHRC. (2013) *Information on Knowledge Exchange for Peer Review College members*. See: <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/.../AHRC.../06-Knowledge-Exchange-Handout.docx> (Accessed January, 2016)
- Allen W., J. Atarua, J. Apgar, G. Harmsworth, & L. Tremblay. (2009) Kia pono te mahi putaiao—doing science in the right spirit. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39(4), pp239-242.
- Altbach, P. G. (2008) Globalization and forces for change in higher education. *International Higher Education*, 50, pp2-4.
- Anderson, R. D. (2004) *European Universities from the Enlightenment to 1914*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Appadurai, A. (2000) Grassroots globalization and the research imagination. *Public culture*, 12(1), pp1-19.
- Aranda, K., & Hart, A. (2015) Resilient moves: Tinkering with practice theory to generate new ways of thinking about using resilience. *Health*, 19(4), pp355-371.
- Argote, L., & Ingram, P. (2000) Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 82(1), pp150-169.
- Armstrong, A. and Banks, S. (2011) ‘Co-inquiry and related participatory and action approaches to community-based research’, *Centre for Social Justice and Community Action*, Durham University, Durham.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969) A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of planners*, 35(4), 216-224.
- Asen, R. (1999). Toward a Normative Conception of Difference in Public Deliberation". *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 25 (Winter), pp115–129
- Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) (2001) *Engagement as a Core Value for the University: A Consultation Document*. London: ACU
- Atalas, S. F. 2006. *Alternative Discourses in Asian Social Science: Responses to Eurocentrism*. New Delhi, India: Sage Publications.
- Banks, S., & Shenton, F. (2001) Regenerating neighbourhoods: a critical look at the role of community capacity building. *Local Economy*, 16(4), pp286-298.

- Banks, S., Armstrong, A., Carter, K., Graham, H., Hayward, P., Henry, A., Holland, T., Holmes, C., Lee, A., McNulty, A. and Moore, N., 2013 Everyday ethics in community-based participatory research. *Contemporary Social Science*, 8(3), pp.263-277.
- Barinaga, E., & Parker, P. S. (2013) Community-engaged scholarship: Creating participative spaces for transformative politics. *Tamara Journal of Critical Organisation Inquiry*, 11(4), p5.
- Barker, D. (2004) The Scholarship of Engagement – A Taxonomy of Five Emerging Practices. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 9(2), pp123-137.
- Barnes, B. (2013) *Scientific Knowledge and Sociological Theory*. Routledge.
- Barnes, M. (2008a) *Deliberating with Care: Ethics and Knowledge in the Making of Social Policies*. Inaugural Lecture: University of Brighton, 24th April, 2008.
- Barnes, M. (2008b) Passionate participation: Emotional experiences and expressions in deliberative forums. *Critical social policy*, 28(4), pp461-481.
- Barnes, M. (1999) Users as citizens: collective action and the local governance of welfare. *Social Policy & Administration*, 33(1), pp73-90.
- Barnes, M. (2012) *Care in everyday life: An ethic of care in practice*. Policy Press.
- Barnes, M., & Cotterell, P. (Eds) (2012) *Critical perspectives on user involvement*. Policy Press.
- Barnes, M., & Henwood, F. (2015) Inform with care: ethics and information in care for people with dementia. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 9(2), pp147-163.
- Barnes, M., & Prior, D. (Eds) (2009) *Subversive citizens: power, agency and resistance in public services*. Policy Press.
- Barnes, M., Newman, J., & Sullivan, H. (2006) Discursive arenas: deliberation and the constitution of identity in public participation at a lower level. *Social Movement Studies*, 5(3), pp193-207.
- Barnes, M., Newman, J., & Sullivan, H. C. (2007). *Power, participation and political renewal: case studies in public participation*. Policy Press.
- Barnes, M., Newman, J., Knops, A. and Sullivan, H. (2003) Constituting the public for public participation. *Public Administration*, 81(2), pp379-399.
- Barnett, R. (2014) *Thinking and rethinking the university: The selected works of Ronald Barnett*. Routledge.
- Benneworth, P., Conway, C., Charles, D., Humphrey, L., & Younger, P. (2009) *Characterising modes of university engagement with wider society: A literature review and survey of best practice*. See: www.tufts.edu/talloiresnetwork/downloads/Characterisingmodesofuniversityengagementwithwidersociety.pdf (Accessed September, 2013)

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966) *The social construction of knowledge: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. NY: *Doubleday*.

Bergold, J., & Thomas, S. (2012) Participatory Research Methods: A Methodological Approach in Motion. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 3(1). See: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1801/3334> (Accessed February, 2016)

Berkes, F. (2008) *Sacred Ecology. Traditional ecological knowledge and management systems*. Routledge

Berkes, F. (2009) Indigenous ways of knowing and the study of environmental change. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39(4), pp151-156.

Berman, H. (1999) IN Stein, P. *Roman Law in European History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bibbings, L. S. (2006) Widening participation and higher education. *Journal of Law and Society*, 33(1), pp74-91.

Bickel, W. E., & Hatrup, R. A. (1995) Teachers and researchers in collaboration: Reflections on the process. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(1), 35-62.

Bidwell, N., & Winscheirs-Theophilus, H. (2015) *At the Intersection of Indigenous and Traditional Knowledge and Technology Design*. Informing Science Press.

Billig, M. (2001) Discursive, rhetorical and ideological messages. *Discourse theory and practice*, pp210-221.

Billis, D. (Eds.). (2010) *Hybrid organizations and the third sector: Challenges for practice, theory and policy*. Palgrave Macmillan.

BIS, (2015) *Fulfilling our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice*. See: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/474266/BIS-15-623-fulfilling-our-potential-teaching-excellence-social-mobility-and-student-choice-accessible.pdf (Accessed February, 2016)

Bivens, F., Haffenden, J, & Hall, B. (2015) Knowledge, Higher Education and the Institutionalization of Community-University Research Partnerships, IN Hall, B., Tandon, R. & Tremblay, C. (Eds), *Strengthening Community University Research Partnerships: Global Perspectives*. UVIC.

Boothroyd, P., Fryer, M., & Exchange, D. L. (2004, December) Mainstreaming social engagement in higher education: benefits, challenges, and successes. In *Colloquium on Research and Higher Education Policy: 'Knowledge, Access and Governance: Strategies for Change'*, UNESCO, Paris pp. 1-2.

Borg, M., Karlsson, B., Hesook, S., & McCormack, B. (2012) Opening up for many voices in knowledge construction. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 13(1), Art. 1, See: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs120117> (Accessed February, 2016)

- Boser, S. (2006) Ethics and power in community-campus partnerships for research. *Action Research*, 4(1), 9-21.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice translated by R. Nice*. Cambridge.
- Bourner, T. (2010) A Compatible Partnership? Student-community engagement and traditional university education. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, Vol 3, pp139–154.
- Boven, K., & Morohashi, J. (2002) *Best practices using indigenous knowledge*. The Hague: Nuffic.
- Boyer, E.L. (1996) The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1(1), pp11-20.
- Boyle, J., Ghosh, S., Hess, C., Kranich, N., Levine, P., Lougee, W. P., & Waters, D. (2007) Understanding Knowledge as a Commons: From Theory to Practice. IN Hess, C. et al. (Eds).
- Brady, G., Brown, G., & Wilson, C. (2012) Young mother's experiential knowledge and the research process. IN Barnes, M., & Cotterell, P. (Eds) (2012) *Critical perspectives on user involvement*. Policy Press.
- Brennan, J. (2008) Higher education and social change. *Higher Education*, 56(3), pp381-393.
- Brooks, A. (2006) Feminist Standpoint Epistemology. Building Knowledge and Empowerment Through Women's Lived Experience. IN Leavy, P. & Hesse-Biber, S. N. (Eds) (2006), *Feminist Research Practice: A Primer*, Sage Publications: New York
- Brown, L., & Strega, S. (2005) *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches*. Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Brown, L., Ochoka J., de Grosbois, S., & Hall, B. L. (2015) Kamúcwkahla: Canadian Approaches to Community-University Research Partnerships. IN Hall, B., Tandon, R. & Tremblay, C. (Eds), *Strengthening Community University Research Partnerships: Global Perspectives*. UVIC.
- Browne, K. (2007) *Count Me In Too. LGBT Lives in Brighton & Hove Initial Findings: Academic Report*. University of Brighton.
- Bryman, A. (2004) *Social Research Methods*. (2nd Ed.) New York: Oxford University Press.
- Burnaby, B. (1996), Language Policies in Canada: An Overview, IN M. Herriman & B. Burnaby (eds.), *Language Policy in English-Dominant Countries: Six Case Studies*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, England.
- Burr, V. (1995) *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Burr, V. (2003) *Social Constructionism*. (2nd Ed). Hove: Routledge.
- Callaway, H. (1992) Ethnography and experience. *Anthropology and autobiography*, 29, p29.

Canada Education Association. (2014) Two–Eyed Seeing. Creating a new liminal space in education. *Canada Education*, vol 55(2), see: <http://www.cea-ace.ca/education-canada/article/two-eyed-seeing> (Accessed January, 2016)

Canadian Federation of Students. (2013) *Funding for Aboriginal Students*. See: <http://dev.cfswpnetwork.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/71/2015/07/Factsheet-2013-11-AboriginalEd-EN.pdf> (Accessed January, 2016)

Carnegie (n.d) Carnegie Classifications of Institutions of Higher Educaiton. see: <http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/> (Accessed February, 2016)

Chambers, R. (1983) *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. Longman Inc.

Chambers, R. (1991) *Scientist or resource-poor farmer: whose knowledge counts?* Crop Protection for resource-poor farmers. Sussex, November 1991. IDS. See: <http://dev.opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/bitstream/handle/123456789/254/rc418.pdf?sequence=2> (Accessed April, 2016)

Chambers, R. (1995) Poverty and livelihoods: whose reality counts?. *Environment and urbanization*, 7(1), 173-204.

Chambers R. (1998) Beyond “Whose reality counts?” New methods we now need? 1. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies*, 4(2), 279-301.

Chartier, R. (1991) *The cultural origins of the French Revolution*. Duke University Press.

Chatterton, P. (2000) The cultural role of universities in the community: revisiting the university-community debate. *Environment and Planning A*, 32(1), pp165-182.

Chiu, L. F. (2006) Critical reflection More than nuts and bolts. *Action Research*, 4(2), pp183-203.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1995) *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cohen, J. (1997) Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy. IN Bohman J. &William, R. (Eds) *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*. MIT Press.

Colfer, C. J. P. (1995) *Who counts most in sustainable forest management?* (No. CIFOR Working Paper no. 7, p. 16p).

Collins, H. M., & Evans, R. (2002) The third wave of science studies: studies of expertise and experience. *Social studies of science*, 32(2), pp235-296.

Collins, P. H. (1990) *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Hyman.

Connell, R. (2007) *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Cambridge: Polity.

- Cook, T. (2012) Where participatory approaches meet pragmatism in funded (health) research: The challenge of finding meaningful spaces. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 13(1), Art. 18, see: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1201187> (Accessed February, 2016).
- Cooke, M. (2000) Five arguments for deliberative democracy. *Political studies*, 48(5), pp947-969.
- Cornwall, A. (2008) Unpacking 'Participation': models, meanings and practices. *Community Development Journal*, 43(3), pp269-283.
- Cornwall, A. (Eds) (2011) *The Participation Reader*. Zed Books.
- Cornwall, A., & Coehlo, V.S., (2006) *Spaces for Change. The Politics of Citizen Participation in New Democratic Arenas*. Zed Books.
- Cotterell, P., & Morris, C. (2012) The capacity, impact and challenge of service users' experiential knowledge. IN Barnes, M., & Cotterell, P. (Eds) (2012) *Critical perspectives on user involvement*. Policy Press.
- Count Me In Too Action Group, (2007) *Initial Findings LGBT Community Report*. University of Brighton.
- Creese, G., & Frisby, W. (Eds) (2011) *Feminist community research: Case studies and methodologies*. UBC Press.
- Cuthill, M. (2010) Working together: A methodological case study of 'engaged scholarship'. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, 3, pp20-37.
- Cuthill, M. (2012). A "Civic Mission" for the University: Engaged Scholarship and Community-Based Participatory Research. In *Higher Education and Civic Engagement* (pp. 81-99). Palgrave Macmillan US.
- David, M. Parry, G. Vignoles, A. Hayward, G. Williams, J. Crozier, G. Hockings, C. and Alison Fuller, A. (2008) *Widening Participation in Higher Education. A Commentary by the Teaching and Learning Research Programme*. London: TLRP/ESRC. See: <http://www.tlrp.org/pub/documents/HEcomm.pdf> (Accessed January, 2016)
- Davies, C., Hart, A., Eryigit-Madzwamuse, S., Stubbs, C., Aumann, K., Aranda, K., & Heaver, B., (forthcoming) Communities of practice in community-university engagement: Supporting co-productive resilience research & practice IN MacDonald., J. & Cater-Steel, A. *Communities of Practice in Community-University Engagement: Supporting the development of coproductive resilience research & practice*. Springer.
- Davies, S. R. (2013). Constituting public engagement: Meanings and genealogies of PEST in two UK studies. *Science Communication*, 1075547013478203.
- Deakin, N. and Taylor, M. (2001) Citizenship, Civil Society and Governance, Paper presented at the Social Economy Conference, Trento (Italy), December 14-16, 2001.
- Deem, R. (2002) The Knowledge Worker and the Divided University. Inaugural Lecture, Graduate School of Education, University of Bristol.

- Delvaux, B., & Schoenaers, F. (2012) Knowledge, local actors and public action. *Policy and Society*. 31(2), 105-117.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1998) *Strategies of qualitative research*. Sage
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds) (2005) *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Sage.
- Devine-Wright, P. (2005) Local aspects of UK renewable energy development: exploring public beliefs and policy implications. *Local Environment*, 10(1), pp57-69.
- Dittmer, J. (2009) Textual and Discourse Analysis. In: DeLyser, D., Herbert, S., Aitken, S., Crang, M., & McDowell, L. (Eds). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative geography*. Sage,
- Dryzek & Neimeyer (2012) *What is Deliberative Democracy?* See: <http://deldem.weblogs.anu.edu.au/2012/02/15/what-is-deliberative-democracy/> (Accessed November, 2015)
- Dryzek, J. S. (2000). *Deliberative democracy and beyond: liberals, critics, contestations* (Vol. 1). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duffy, J., & McKeever, B. (2012) Looking out from the middle: influencing policy change through user involvement. IN Barnes, M., & Cotterell, P. (Eds) (2012) *Critical perspectives on user involvement*. Policy Press.
- Duggan, K., & Kagan, C., (2007) *We Don't Believe You Want a Genuine Partnership': Universities Work with Communities*. Research Institute for Health & Social Change, Manchester Metropolitan University.
- Dumlao, R. J., & Janke, E. M. (2012) Using Relational Dialectics to Address Differences in Community-Campus Partnerships. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(2), pp151-175.
- Duncan, S., & Manners, P. (2014) Research Engagement in the UK: Evolving Policy and Practice. IN Munck, R., McIlrath, L., Hall, B. & Tandon, R. *Higher Education and Community-Based Research. Creating a Global Vision*. Palgrave
- Duncan, S., & Manners, P. (2015) Community-University Research Partnerships: United Kingdom. IN Hall, B., Tandon, R. & Tremblay, C. (Eds), *Strengthening Community University Research Partnerships: Global Perspectives*. UVIC.
- Eden, S. (1996) Public participation in environmental policy: considering scientific, counter-scientific and non-scientific contributions. *Public Understanding of Science*, 5(3), pp183-204.
- Edwards, M. (2009) *Civil society*. Polity.
- Ellen, R., & Harris, H. (1997) *Concepts of indigenous environmental knowledge in scientific and development literature – a critical assessment*. UK: APFT Project
- Ellis, C. (2007) Telling Secrets, Revealing Lives. Relational Ethics in Research With Intimate Others. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(1), pp 3-29.

- Ellis, S. C. (2005) Meaningful Consideration? A Review of Traditional Knowledge in Environmental Decision Making. *Artic*, 58 (1), pp66–77.
- Elton, L. (2008) Collegiality and Complexity: Humboldt's Relevance to British Universities Today. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(3), pp224-236.
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). Processing fieldnotes: Coding and memoing. *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*, pp142-168.
- Epstein, S. (1996) *Impure Science: Aids, Activism and the Politics of Knowledge*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Escrigas, C. (2008) “Forward” IN GUNi *Higher Education in the World 3*. Palgrave Mcmillan: London
- Escrigas, C., & Lobera, J. (2009). Introduction: New dynamics for social responsibility. *Higher education at a time of transformation: New dynamics for social responsibility, GUNI Series on the Social Commitment of Universities*, 1-16.
- Escrigas, C., Sanchez, J.G., Hall, B. L, & Tandon R. (2014) Editor’s introduction: Knowledge, engagement and higher education contributing to social change. IN GUNi (Eds). *Higher Education in the World 5 (Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Contributing to Social Change)*. Pp xxxi –xxxix. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Etmanski, C., Hall, B., & Dawson, T. (Eds) (2014) *Learning & teaching community based research. Linking pedagogy to practice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Eubanks, V. (2011) *Digital dead end: Fighting for social justice in the information age*. MIT Press.
- Facer, K., Manners, P., Agusita, E. (2012) *Towards a knowledge base for university-public engagement: sharing knowledge, building insight, taking action*. Bristol, UK: National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement.
- Feyerabend, P. K. (1988) Knowledge and the role of theories. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 18(2), p157.
- Fischer, F. (2000). *Citizens, experts, and the environment: The politics of local knowledge*. Duke University Press.
- Fischer, F. (2003) *Reframing public policy: Discursive politics and deliberative practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fischer, F. (2005) Are scientists irrational? Risk assessment in practical reason. IN Leach, M., Scoones, I., & Wynne, B. (Eds) (2005) *Science and citizens: globalization and the challenge of engagement*. Zed books.
- Fisher, C. B. (2006) *Paper Three: Relational Ethics and Research with Vulnerable Populations*. Online Ethics Center for Engineering 6/27/2006 National Academy of Engineering. See: www.onlineethics.org/Topics/RespResearch/ResResources/nbacindex/mindex/mpaper3.aspx (Accessed February, 2016)

- Fishkin, J. S. (1991) *Democracy and deliberation: New directions for democratic reform*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Flick, U. (2002). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. (2nd Ed.) London: Sage.
- Flick, U. (2007). *Designing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
- Flick, U. (2009). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. (4th Ed.) NY, London: Sage.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006) Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research, *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 219-245
- Foucault, M. (1969) *Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1978) *The history of sexuality: An introduction. Vol. 1*. New York: Vintage.
- Fraser, N. (1990) Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social text*, (25/26), pp56-80.
- Fraser, N. (1996) *Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation*. The Tanner Lectures on Human Values. Stanford University, April 30–May 2, 1996. See: <http://tannerlectures.utah.edu/documents/a-to-z/f/Fraser98.pdf> (Accessed January, 2016)
- Fraser, N. (1997) *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the 'postsocialist' condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Fraser, N. (2000) Rethinking recognition. *New left review*, pp107-120.
- Fraser, N. (2001) *Social Justice in the Knowledge Society: Redistribution, Recognition and Participation*. Beitrag zum Kongress "Gut zu Wissen", Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, 5/2001. See: <http://wissensgesellschaft.org/themen/orientierung/socialjustice.pdf> (Accessed January, 2016)
- Fraser, N. (2007) Reframing justice in a globalizing world. *Global inequality*, 252-271.
- Frazer, E. (2000) Communitarianism. IN Browning, G., Halcli, A., & Webster, F. (Eds) *Understanding contemporary society: Theories of the present*. Sage.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, (trans. Myra Bergman Ramos) New York: Continuum.
- Fricke, M. (2007) *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. New York: Oxford.
- Frijhoff, W. (1996) Chapter 2 'patterns'. IN *A History of the University in Europe Vol II*. Pp 43 - 106 (edited by Hilde De Ridder-Symoens) Cambridge University press.
- Frost, S. E. (1946) *Masterworks of Philosophy*. Doubleday & Company.
- Gamson, W. A. (1992). *Talking politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gascoigne, J. (2002) *Cambridge in the Age of the Enlightenment: Science, Religion and Politics from the Restoration to the French Revolution*. Cambridge University Press.

Gaventa, J. (2006a) *Triumph, Deficit or Contestation? Deepening the 'Deepening Democracy' Debate*, IDS Working Paper 264, Brighton: IDS

Gaventa, J. (2006b). Finding the spaces for change: a power analysis. *IDS bulletin*, 37(6), pp23-33.

Gaventa, J. (2009). *Power Pack: Understanding Power for Social Change*. See: www.powercube.net (Accessed September, 2015)

Gaventa, J. (2013) From Development to Transformation: Citizen Engagement for Social and Cognitive Justice – given at CASAE/CASID Conference University of Victoria June 5 2013

Gaventa, J., & Bivens, F. (2014) 'Knowledge democracy, cognitive justice, and the role of universities.' IN *Higher Education in the World 5: Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Contributing to Social Change*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York

Gaventa, J., & Cornwall, A. (2008) Power and knowledge. IN *The Sage handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice*, 172-189.

Geertz, C. (1983) *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. Basic Books.

Gelmon, S. B., Holland, B. A., Seifer, S. D., Shinnamon, A., & Connors, K. (1998) Community-university partnerships for mutual learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 5, pp97-107.

Gerhardinger, L. C., Godoy, E. A., & Jones, P. J. (2009) Local ecological knowledge and the management of marine protected areas in Brazil. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 52(3), pp154-165.

Gessner, S., Parker, A., & Michel, K. (2014) *Language Nest Handbook for B.C. First Nations Communities*. First People's Cultural Council.

Geuna, A. (1999). *The economics of knowledge production: funding and the structure of university research*. E. Elgar.

Gheradi, S. (2015) To start practice theorizing anew: The contribution of the concepts of agencement and formativeness. *Organization*. 21, 2015.

Giatti, L.L., et al. (2014) Dialectic Approaches and Public Policy Interactions for Social, Environmental and Health Problems: Challenges for Health Promotion across Territorial Scales. *Health*, 6, pp607-615.

Gibson, W., & Brown, A. (2009) *Working with qualitative data*. Sage.

Giddens, A. (1982) *Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third way: the renewal of social democracy*. London: Polity press

Gieryn, T. F. (1999) *Cultural boundaries of science: Credibility on the line*. University of Chicago Press.

- Gilchrist, A. (2003) Community Development in the UK--Possibilities and Paradoxes. *Community Development Journal*, 38(1), pp16-25.
- Gillham, B. (2000) *Case study research methods*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Gillies, D. (2000) *Philosophical theories of probability*. Psychology Press.
- Goddard, J. (2009) *Re-inventing the Civic University*. London: NESTA.
- Gomm, R. et al (Eds) (2000) *Case study method: Key issues, key texts*. Sage.
- Goodman, K. S., Calfee, R. C., & Goodman, Y. M. (2013) *Whose knowledge counts in government literacy policies?: Why expertise matters*. Routledge.
- Goodson, L., & Phillimore, J. (2012) *Community research for participation: From theory to method*. Policy Press.
- Grene, M. G. (1969) *Toward a unity of knowledge*. International Universities Press.
- Gross, P. R. & Norman Levitt. (1994) *Higher Superstition: The Academic Left and its Quarrels with Science*. JHU Press.
- Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. F. (2004) *Why Deliberative Democracy?* New Jersey: Princeton University Press
- Hage, M., Leroy, P., & Petersen, A. C. (2010) Stakeholder participation in environmental knowledge production. *Futures*, 42(3), pp254-264.
- Halfpenny, P., & Reid, M. (2002) Research on the voluntary sector: An overview. *Policy & Politics*, 30(4), pp533-550.
- Hall, B. (2011) Towards a Knowledge Democracy Movement: Contemporary Trends in Community University Research Partnerships. *Special Issue of Rizoma Freireano on Global Developments in Community University Research Partnerships*, 9. See: <http://www.rizoma-freireano.org/index.php/towards-a-knowledge-democracy-movement-contemporary-trends-in-community-university-research-partnerships--budd-l-hall> (Accessed January, 2016)
- Hall, B. L. (2005) In from the Cold? Reflections on Participatory Research from 1970-2005. *Convergence*, 38(1), pp5-24.
- Hall, B., & Dragne, C. (2008) The Role of Higher Education for Human & Social Development in the USA & Canada. IN *Higher Education in the World 3*. Taylor, P. (Ed). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hall, B., & Tandon, R. (2014) *No more enclosures: knowledge democracy and social transformation*. See <https://www.opendemocracy.net/transformation/budd-hall-rajesh-tandon/no-more-enclosures-knowledge-democracy-and-social-transformation> (Accessed January, 2016)
- Hall, B., & Tandon, R. (2015) Introduction. IN Hall, B., Tandon, R. & Tremblay, C. (Eds), *Strengthening Community University Research Partnerships: Global Perspectives*. UVIC.
- Hall, B., Tandon, R., & Tremblay, C., (Eds) (2015) *Strengthening Community University Research Partnerships: Global Perspectives*. UVIC.

- Hamilton, D. (1980) Some contrasting assumptions about case study research and survey analysis. *Towards a science of the singular*, pp76-92.
- Haraway, D. (1988) Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist studies*, 14(3), pp575-599.
- Harding, S. G. (1987) *Feminism and methodology: Social science issues*. Indiana University Press.
- Harding, S. G. (1991) *Whose science? Whose knowledge?: Thinking from women's lives*. Cornell University Press.
- Harkavy, I. (2006) The role of universities in advancing citizenship and social justice in the 21st century. *Education, citizenship and social justice*, 1(1), pp5-37.
- Hart, A. & Millican, J. (2011) Community university partnership research in practice at the University of Brighton, England: processes and pitfalls. *Rizoma Freireano*, 9, pp1-15.
- Hart, A., Maddison, E. and Wolff, D. (2007) 'Introduction.' IN *Community University Partnerships in Practice*. Hart, Maddison and Wolff (Eds). Niace. Pp 3-8.
- Hart, A., Northmore, S., & Gerhardt, C. (2008) Briefing paper: Auditing, benchmarking and evaluating public engagement. *National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement Research Synthesis*, (1).
- Hartwig, M. (Ed) (2007) *Dictionary of Critical Realism*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Hayward, C. R. (1998) De-facing power. *Polity*, 31(1), 1–22.
- Hickey, S., & Mohan, G. (2005) Relocating participation within a radical politics of development. *Development and change*, 36(2), pp237-262.
- Higgs, J., Andresen, L., & Fish, D. (2004) Practice knowledge-its nature, sources and contexts. *Developing practice knowledge for health professionals*, pp51-69.
- Hoffman, L. M. (1989) *The politics of knowledge: Activist movements in medicine and planning*. SUNY Press.
- Hook, D. (2001) The 'disorders of discourse'. *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, (97), pp41-68.
- Horowitz C.R., Robinson M., Seifer S. (2009) Community-based participatory research from the margin to the mainstream: Are researchers prepared? *Circulation*, 119(19), pp2633-2642.
- Hoy, D. C. (1986) Power, repression, progress: Foucault, Lukes, and the Frankfurt school. IN Foucault, M., & Hoy, D. C. *Foucault: a critical reader*.
- International Council for Science. (2002) *Science and Traditional Knowledge*. Report from the ICSU Study Group on Science and Traditional Knowledge. See: <http://www.icsu.org/publications/reports-and-reviews/science-traditional-knowledge/Science-traditional-knowledge.pdf> (Accessed February, 2016)

- Israel, B.A., Schulz, A.J., Parker, E.A. & Becker, A.B. (1998) Review of community-based research: assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 19, pp173-202.
- Jaggar, Alison M. (1997) Love and knowledge: Emotion in feminist epistemology. IN Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires (Eds.), *Feminisms* (pp. 188–193). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Jasanoff, S. (2008) Speaking honestly to power. *Am Sci*, 6(3), p240.
- Jasanoff, S., Colwell, R., Dresselhaus, M. S., & Goldman, R. D. (1997) Conversations with the community: AAAS at the millennium. *Science*, 278(5346), 2066.
- Jolivéte, A. J. (2015) Research Justice: Radical love as a strategy for social transformation. *Research Justice: Methodologies for Social Change*, 5.
- Jones, G. A. (2014) An introduction to higher education in Canada. *Higher education across nations*, 1, pp1-38.
- Joranson, K. (2008) Indigenous knowledge and the knowledge commons. *The International Information & Library Review*, 40(1), pp64-72.
- Kajner, T., Fletcher, F., & Makokis, P. (2011) Balancing head and heart: The importance of relational accountability in community-university partnerships. *Innovative Higher Education*, 37(4), pp257-270.
- Kant, I. (1908) Critique of pure reason. 1781. *Modern Classical Philosophers, Cambridge, MA: Houghton Mifflin*, 370-456.
- Kapitan, L. (2012) Educating the future practitioner of art therapy. *Art Therapy*, 29(4), pp148-149.
- Karran, T. (2009) Academic freedom in Europe: reviewing UNESCO's recommendation. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 57(2), 191-215.
- Kelly, G. J., Luke, A., & Green, J. (2008) What counts as knowledge in educational settings: Disciplinary knowledge, assessment, and curriculum. *Review of Research in Education*, 32(1), vii-x.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2005) Communicative action and the public sphere. *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, 3, 559-603.
- Kinsella, W. J. (2002). Problematizing the distinction between expert and lay knowledge. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 10(2), pp191-207.
- Koertge, N. (Ed.). (1998) *A house built on sand: Exposing postmodernist myths about science* (Vol. 322). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kors, A. C. (2003) *Encyclopaedia of Enlightenment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koster, R., Baccar, K., & Lemelin, R. H. (2012) Moving from research ON, to research WITH and FOR Indigenous communities: A critical reflection on community-based

participatory research. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien*, 56(2), pp195-210.

Kraak, A. (1999). Western science, power and the marginalisation of indigenous modes of knowledge production. Interpretative minutes of the discussion held on 'Debates about Knowledge: Developing Country Perspectives'.

Lacewing, M. (2009) *Philosophy for A2: Unit 3: Key Themes in Philosophy*. Routledge.

Laing, S. and Maddison, E., (2007) The Cupp Model in Context. IN *Community University Partnerships in Practice*. Hart, Maddison and Wolff (Eds). Niace. Pp 8-21.

Leach, M. & Scoones, I. (2007) *Mobilising Citizens: Social Movements and the Politics of Knowledge*. IDS Working Paper, 276. IDS

Leach, M., & Scoones, I. (2005) Science and citizenship in a global context. IN Leach, M., Scoones, I., & Wynne, B. (Eds) (2005) *Science and citizens: globalization and the challenge of engagement*. Zed books.

Leach, M., Scoones, I., & Wynne, B. (Eds) (2005) *Science and citizens: globalization and the challenge of engagement*. Zed books.

Lerner, R. M., & Simon, L. A. K. (Eds.). (1998) *University-community collaborations for the twenty-first century: Out-reach scholarship for youth and families*. New York: Garland.

Letherby, G. (2003) *Feminist Research in Theory & Practice*. Open University Press

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E.G. (2000) 'The Only Generalization is: There is No Generalization' IN Gomm, R. et al, (Eds) *Case study method: Key issues, key texts*. Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985) *Naturalistic inquiry* (Vol. 75). Sage.

Lowndes, V., & Sullivan, H. (2004) Like a horse and carriage or a fish on a bicycle: how well do local partnerships and public participation go together? *Local government studies*, 30(1), pp51-73.

Martínez-Bascuñán, M. (2014) Why Should We Think of Structural Injustice when Speaking about Culture? IN Vieten, U (Eds) *Revisiting Iris Marion Young on Normalisation, Inclusion and Democracy*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Maurrasse, D. (2001) *Beyond the campus: How colleges and universities form partnerships with their communities*. Routledge.

Maynard, M. (1994) *Researching Women's Lives from a Feminist Perspective*. Taylor Francis.

McIlrath, L., & Lyons, A. (Eds) (2012) *Higher Education and Civic Engagement. Comparative Perspectives*. Palgrave.

McIntyre, A. (2008) *Participatory action research* (Vol. 52). Sage Publications.

McKinley, S., & Yiannoullou, S. (2012) Changing minds: unleashing the potential of mental health service users – a critical perspective on current models of service user involvement and their impact on wellbeing and ‘recovery’. IN Barnes, M., & Cotterell, P. (Eds) *Critical perspectives on user involvement*. Policy Press.

McQuillan, M. (2012) *Social Mobility, the very idea*. See: <http://www.wonkhe.com/2012/10/19/social-mobility-the-very-idea/> (Accessed September, 2013)

Milbourne, L. (2009) Remodelling the Third Sector: Advancing collaboration or competition in community-based initiatives? *Journal of Social Policy*, 38(02), pp277-297.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A.M. (1994) *Qualitative data analysis*. (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, J & Glassner, B. (2004) ‘The “inside” and the “outside”. Finding realities in interviews’ in Silverman, D. *Qualitative Research. Theory, method and practice*. (2nd Ed). Pp125-139. Sage.

Mouffe, C. (1999) Deliberative democracy or agonistic pluralism? *Social research*, pp745-758.

Mouffe, C. (2005) *The return of the political* (Vol. 8). Verso.

Nanda, M. (2003) *Prophets facing backwards: Postmodern critiques of science and Hindu Nationalism in India*. Rutgers: Rutgers University Press.

Nash, R. (1990) Bourdieu on education and social and cultural reproduction. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 11(4), pp431-447.

National Household Survey (NHS). (2011) Statistics Canada. See: <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E> (Accessed February, 2016)

NCCPE (n.d) What is Public Engagement? See: <http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/explore-it/what-public-engagement> (Accessed February, 2016)

Neave, G. (2000) *The Universities' Responsibilities to Society: International Perspectives. Issues in Higher Education Series*. Elsevier Science, Ltd.

Nelkin, D. (1987) AIDS and the social sciences: review of useful knowledge and research needs. *Review of Infectious Diseases*, 9(5), pp980-986.

Neuman, W. L. (2003) *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Allyn & Bacon.

Newitt, M. (2007) Angola in Historical Context. pp. 19-92. In: P. Chabal and Nuno Vidal (Eds) *Angola: The weight of History*. C. Hurst & Co. Ltd, London.

Nicholls, R. (2009) Research and Indigenous participation: critical reflexive methods. *International journal of social research methodology*, 12(2), 117-126.

Nickols, F. (2012) The Knowledge in Knowledge Management. See: http://www.nickols.us/Knowledge_in_KM.htm (Accessed January, 2016)

Nussbaum, M. C. (2006). Education and democratic citizenship: Capabilities and quality education. *Journal of human development*, 7(3), pp385-395.

Oakley, A. (1979) *From here to maternity: Becoming a mother*. Penguin.

ODE (2010) 'Knowledge'. IN *Oxford Dictionary of English*, 3rd Ed. Oxford University Press.

Odora Hoppers, C. A. (2009) Education, culture and society in a globalizing world: Implications for comparative and international education. *Compare*, 39(5), pp601-614.

Odora Hoppers, C. A. (2015) THINK PIECE: Cognitive justice and integration without duress: The future of development education – perspectives from the South. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 7(2). See: <https://ioepress.co.uk/journals/international-journal-of-development-education-and-global-learning/> (Accessed February, 2016).

OFFA (n.d) Quick Facts. See: <https://www.offa.org.uk/press/quick-facts/> (Accessed January, 2016)

Okin, S. M. (1989) *Justice, gender, and the family*. New York: Basic Books.

Ostrom, E., & Hess, C. (2007) Private and common property rights. *Indiana University, Bloomington: School of Public & Environmental Affairs Research Paper*, (2008-11), 01.

Parkinson, J. (2006) *Deliberating in the real world: problems of legitimacy in deliberative democracy*. Oxford University Press.

Peloquin, C., & Berkes, F. (2009) Local knowledge, subsistence harvests, and social-ecological complexity in James Bay. *Human Ecology*, 37(5), p533-545.

Pettegrew, J. (2000) *A Pragmatist's progress? Richard Rorty and American intellectual history*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Polanyi, M., & Knowledge, P. (1958) Towards a post-critical Philosophy. *Personal Knowledge*. Routledge.

Potter, J. (2004). 'Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk' in Silverman, D. *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. (2nd Ed.) pp200-221. Sage.

Rabinow, P. (1986) Representations are social facts: Modernity and post-modernity in anthropology. *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*, pp234-61.

Rabinow, P. (1991) *The Foucault reader*. London: Penguin.

Raffles, H. (2002) Intimate knowledge. *International Social Science Journal*. 54(173), pp325 – 335.

Ragin, Charles C. (1992) 'Casing' and the Process of Social Inquiry, IN Ragin, Charles C. and Becker, Howard S. (eds), *What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. pp. 217-226. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rawls, J. (1971) *A Theory of Justice*. Oxford University Press.

- Reason, P. & Heron, J. (1995) Co-operative Inquiry. IN Harre, R., Smith, J. & Van Lagenhove, L. (Eds) *Rethinking in Psychology*. Sage.
- Reckwitz, A. (2002) Toward a theory of social practices a development in culturalist theorizing. *European journal of social theory*, 5(2), pp243-263.
- Regan, P. (2010) *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*. UBC Press.
- Reimer, L., Schmitz, C.L., Janke, E. M., Askerov, A. Strahl, B. T., Matyok, T. G. (2015) *Transformative Change: An Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies*. Lexington Books.
- Riecken, T., Strong-Wilson, T., Conibear, F., Corrine, M., & Riecken, J. (2004) Connecting, speaking, listening: Toward an ethics of voice with/in participatory action research. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 6(1), Art. 25, See: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0501260> (Accessed December, 2011)
- Riger, S. (1992) Epistemological debates, feminist voices: Science, social values, and the study of women. *American psychologist*, 47(6), p730.
- Robins, S. (2005) *Rights passages from 'near death to 'new life': AIDS activism and treatment testimonies in South Africa*. IDS Working Paper 251. IDS
- Robinson, R. et al (2012) *How can universities support disadvantaged communities?* Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Ross, G.W. (1896) *The Universities of Canada; their history and organization*. Toronto: Warwick Bros & Rutter.
- Rousseau, J. J. (1972) *Du contrat social*. Clarendon Press.
- Rowe, R., & Shepherd, M. (2002) Public participation in the new NHS: No closer to citizen control? *Social Policy & Administration*, 36(3), pp275-290.
- Ruegg, W. (1996). IN *A history of the University in Europe Vol II* (edited by Hilde De Ridder-Symoens) Cambridge University press.
- Rutter, D., Manley, C., Weaver, T., Crawford, M. J., & Fulop, N. (2004) Patients or partners? Case studies of user involvement in the planning and delivery of adult mental health services in London. *Social Science & Medicine*, 58(10), pp1973-1984.
- Salamon, L. M., & Anheier, H. K. (1992) In search of the non-profit sector. I: The question of definitions. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 3(2), pp125-151.
- Salazar, J. F. (2011) The Mediations of climate change: museums as citizens' media. *museum and society*, 9(2), pp123-135.
- Santos, B. (2004) A Critique of Lazy Reason: against the Waste of Experience. IN Wallerstein, I. (Ed) *The Modern World System in the Longue Durée*. Paradigm Publishers
- Santos, B. (2006) *The Rise of the Global Left: The World Social Forum and beyond*. Zed Books

Santos, B. (Eds) (2007) *Cognitive justice in a global world: prudent knowledges for a decent life*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Santos, B. (Eds) (2008) *Another Knowledge is Possible. Beyond Northern Epistemologies*. Verso.

Savan, B., & Sider, D. (2003) Contrasting approaches to community-based research and a case study of community sustainability in Toronto, Canada. *Local Environment*, 8(3), pp303-316.

Sayer, A. (1992) Radical geography and Marxist political economy: towards a re-evaluation. *Progress in Human Geography*, 16(3), pp343-360.

Sayer, A. (2011) *Why things matter to people: Social science, values and ethical life*. Cambridge University Press.

Schroeder, K. (1997) Participatory Action Research in a Traditional Academic Setting: Lessons from the Canada-Asia Partnership. *Convergence*, 30(4), pp41-49.

Schwartz, B., & Sharpe, K. (2010) *Practical wisdom: The right way to do the right thing*. Penguin.

Serres, M. (1997) *The troubadour of knowledge*. University of Michigan Press.

Shavelson, R. J. (1988) *Statistical reasoning for the behavioral sciences*. Allyn & Bacon.

Shove, E., Pantzar, M., & Watson, M. (2012) *The dynamics of social practice: everyday life and how it changes*. Sage Publications.

Sibley, D. (1995) *Geographies of exclusion: Society and difference in the West*. Psychology Press.

Simons, H. (1996) The paradox of case study. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 26(2), pp225-240.

Sjoberg, G., Williams, N., Vaughan, T., & Sjoberg, A. (1991) The case study approach in social research. IN Feagin, J. R., Orum, A. M., & Sjoberg, G. (Eds) *A Case for the Case Study*. UNC Press Books

Smith, G., & Wales, C. (2000) Citizens' juries and deliberative democracy. *Political studies*, 48(1), pp51-65.

Smith, L. T. (1999) *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed books.

Sprain, L., & Carcasson, M. (2013) Democratic engagement through the ethic of passionate impartiality. *Tamara Journal of Critical Organisation Inquiry*, 11(4), p13.

Stake, R. (2000) 'The Case Study Method in Social Inquiry' in Gomm, R. et al, (Eds) *Case study method: Key issues, key texts*. pp19-26. Sage.

Standing, H., & Taylor, P. (2007) Whose knowledge counts? Development studies institutions and power relations in a globalised world. *IDS Bulletin*, 38(2), 79-85.

Staniszewska, S., Mockford, C., Gibson, A., Herron-Marx, S., & Putz, R. (2012) Moving forward: understanding the negative experiences and impacts of patient and public involvement in health service planning, development and evaluation. IN Barnes, M., & Cotterell, P. (Eds) (2012) *Critical perspectives on user involvement*. Policy Press.

Stanley, L., & Wise, S. (2002) *Breaking out again: Feminist ontology and epistemology*. Routledge.

Stengers, I. (2007) Beyond the Great Divide: Becoming Civilized? IN Santos, B. (Eds) (2007) *Cognitive justice in a global world: prudent knowledges for a decent life*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Stewart, M. (2001) Whose evidence counts? An exploration of health professionals' perceptions of evidence-based practice, focusing on the maternity services. *Midwifery*, 17(4), 279-288.

Stiglitz, J. E. (1999) Knowledge as a global public good. *Global public goods*, 1(9), pp308-326.

Strand, K. J. (2000) Community Based Research as Pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Vol 7, pp85-96.

Strand, K. J. with Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003) Principles of Best Practice for Community-Based Research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9(3), pp5-15.

Sudsawad, P. (2007) Knowledge translation: Introduction to models, strategies, and measures. *Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, National Center for the Dissemination of Disability Research*.

Sullivan, H., & Skelcher, C. (2002) *Working across boundaries: collaboration in public services*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Survivors History Group. (2012) Survivors History Group takes a critical look at historians. IN Barnes, M., & Cotterell, P. (Eds) (2012) *Critical perspectives on user involvement*. Policy Press.

Swartz, D. (1997) *Culture and Power. The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: Chicago University Press

Tandon, R. (2008) Civil Engagement in Higher Education and its Role in Human and Social Development. IN *Higher Education in the World 3*. Taylor, P. (Ed). Palgrave Macmillan.

Taylor, M. (2000) Communities in the lead: power, organisational capacity and social capital. *Urban Studies*, 37(5/6), p1019.

Taylor, M. (2007) Community participation in the real world: opportunities and pitfalls in new governance spaces. *Urban studies*, 44(2), pp297-317.

Taylor, M. (2012) The changing fortunes of community. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 3(1), pp15-34.

Thomas, F. W. (1944) IN Marshall, J. (1951; 1975 reprint), *Taxila*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

Tremblay, C. (2015) Global Trends in Community-University Research Partnerships. IN Hall, B., Tandon, R., & Tremblay, C., (Eds) (2015) *Strengthening Community University Research Partnerships: Global Perspectives*. UVIC.

Tronto, J. C. (1993) *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. Psychology Press.

Trow, M. (2005) Reflections on the Transition from Elite to Mass to Universal Access: Forms and Phases of Higher Education in Modern Societies since WWII. IN *International Handbook of Higher Education*. Altbach, P. (Ed). Kluwer.

Trumbull, D. J., Bonney, R., Bascom, D., & Cabral, A. (2000) Thinking scientifically during participation in a citizen-science project. *Science Education*, 84(2), pp265-275.

Truth & Reconciliation Commission (TRC). (2015) *Honouring the truth, reconciling for the future: summary of the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. See:

http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Honouring_the_Truth_Reconciling_for_the_Future_July_23_2015.pdf (Accessed February, 2016).

Turner, S. (1994) *The social theory of practices: Tradition, tacit knowledge, and presuppositions*. University of Chicago Press.

UKCPN. (n.d) About the UK Community Partner Network. See: <http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/work-with-us/community-partner-network/about-ukcpn> (Accessed January, 2016)

UNESCO (1998). *Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century Vision and Action. Final Report*. Paris, 5–9 October 1998.

Universities Canada. (2013) Indigenous Education. Our Position. See: <http://www.univcan.ca/issues/indigenous-education/> (Accessed January, 2016).

Universities Canada. (n.d) Facts and Stats. See: <http://www.univcan.ca/universities/facts-and-stats/> (Accessed January, 2016).

Van der Velden, M. (2006) A case for cognitive justice. *Unpublished paper. Online*. www.globalagenda.org/file/24 (Accessed August, 2015).

Vessuri, H. (2008) The role of research in higher education: Implications and challenges for an active contribution to human and social development. In: *Higher education in the world 3: New challenges and emerging roles for human and social development*, pp119-129.

Visvanathan, S. (1997) *A Carnival For Science: Essays on Science, Technology, and Development*. Oxford University Press.

Visvanathan, S. (1999) 1.4 ‘Cognitive justice’ as possible solution. IN Kraak, A. (1999) Western science, power and the marginalisation of indigenous modes of knowledge production. *Interpretative minutes of the discussion held on Debates about Knowledge: Developing Country Perspectives*.

Visvanathan, S. (2005) Knowledge, justice and democracy. IN Leach, M., Scoones, I. & Wynne, B. *Science and Citizens: Globalization and the challenge of engagement*. Zed Books.

Visvanathan, S. (2006) Alternative science. *Theory, culture & society*, 23(2-3), 164-169.

Visvanathan, S. (2007) An Invitation to a Science War. IN Santos, B. (Eds) (2007) *Cognitive justice in a global world: prudent knowledges for a decent life*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Visvanathan, S. (2009) The search for cognitive justice. In *Knowledge in question: A symposium on interrogating knowledge and questioning science*.

Wakeling, P. (2013) Social mobility in and beyond higher education: Achievements and challenges. *Higher Education Academy conference*. March 2013. Manchester.

Ward, L., & Barnes, M. (2015) Transforming Practice with Older People through an Ethic of Care. *British Journal of Social Work*, bcv029.

Ward, L., & Gahagan, B. (2010) Crossing the divide between theory and practice: research and an ethic of care. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, vol 4, pp210-216.

Ward, L., & Gahagan, B. (2012) Involving older people in research: empowering engagement? IN Barnes, M., & Cotterell, P. (Eds) (2012) *Critical perspectives on user involvement*. Policy Press.

Warren, M. Slikkerveer, J. and Brokenska, D. (Eds) (1995) *The cultural Dimensions of development*. Intermediate Technology publications.

Watermeyer, R. (2011) Challenges for university engagement in the UK: Towards a public academe? *Higher Education Quarterly*, 65(4), pp386-410.

Watson, D. (2003, July) Universities and civic engagement: a critique and a prospectus. In *Keynote Address given at the 2nd 'Inside Out' Conference on the Civic Role of Universities, Brighton, UK*.

Watson, D. (2007) *Managing civic and community engagement*. Open University Press.

Watson, D. (2008) The university in the modern world Ten lessons of civic and community engagement. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 3(1), pp43-55.

Watson, D. (2012) *Misunderstanding Modern Higher Education: Eight 'category Mistakes'*. Oxford: HEPI.

Watson, D., Hollister, R., & Stroud, S. E. (2011) *The engaged university*. Routledge.

Weerts, D. J. (2005) Facilitating knowledge flow in community-university partnerships. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 10(3), pp23-38.

Wellcome Trust. (2006) *Science and the Public: A review of science communication and public attitudes to science in Britain*. See: <http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/About-us/Publications/Reports/Public-engagement/WTD003420.htm> (Accessed January, 2016).

Wilson, A. C. (Eds) (2004) Special Issue: The Recovery of Indigenous Knowledge. *The American Indian Quarterly*. Vol 28, no. 3 & 4. Summer/Fall.

Wilson, S. (2001) What is Indigenous research methodology? *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 25(1), pp175-179.

Wilson, S. (2008) *Research Is Ceremony. Indigenous Research Methods*. Fernwood.

Wilson, S., & Wilson, P. (1998) Relational accountability to all our relations. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 22(2), p155.

Young, I. M. (1990) *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton.

Young, I. M. (1995) Polity and Group Difference. IN Beiner, R. (Ed) *Theorizing Citizenship*. State University of New York Press.

Young, I. M. (1997) *Intersecting voices: Dilemmas of gender, political philosophy, and policy*. Princeton University Press.

Young, I. M. (2000) *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zlotkowski, E. (1998) *Successful Service-Learning Programs. New Models of Excellence in Higher Education*. Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Appendix 1: Topic Guide for Semi-Structured Interviews

Date and time of Interview:

Location:

Interview ID number:

Researcher Notes:

Explain format of interview

Re-iterate confidentiality and agree an identity

Any questions/clarifications before proceeding?

About Respondent

1. Tell me about you
 - a. History of experiences in community/social movement action
 - b. How do you identify yourself (as an academic and an activist?) (do you have a 'primary role'?)
 - c. Why are you part of this collaboration?
 - d. What role do you play?

Collaboration

1. Tell me about your collaboration
 - a. Duration
 - b. Description of how you work together (including norms of your working relationship)
 - c. What were the conditions for your working together to happen?
 - d. What experiences do you draw on to enable your involvement?
 - e. What words would you use to describe your work together?
 - f. Areas of convergence and divergence
2. What would you say is the main focus of your collaboration?
 - a. How did this get defined?
 - b. How closely does this match or represent the needs/interests of the people you work with?
 - c. Would you change it? If so, to what?
3. What are the main outcomes of your collaboration?
 - a. How do you translate these collaborative outcomes back to your individual practice?
 - b. Do you feel these outcomes help to advance the needs/interests of the people you work with? If so, how?
 - c. How do these outcomes differ from other collaborations you may have been involved in?

Knowledges, experiences, practices and identity (KEPI)

4. How would you describe the knowledge(s)/experiences/practices you bring to this collaboration?

- a. Do you think it is important to use different sources of KEPI? Why?
 - b. How is this reflected in the research or action approach you take together?
 - c. Are there any tensions that arise in doing this?
 - d. Do you see your collaboration as a mixture of practical and intellectual acts? A 'diverse community of problems solving'?
5. How do you negotiate the stereotypes or traditions surrounding these different sources of KEP from your perspective?
- a. Your knowledge identity within the collaboration
 - b. How do you determine what counts as a significant problem (that needs addressing)
 - c. Use of different language or approaches
 - d. What concepts or ideas do you draw on? (brokers/3rd space?)
6. Can you provide any examples of how this knowledge has been used, challenged or changed as a result of your collaboration?
- a. Would you identify any 'new' KEP that has come out of your collaborations?
 - b. Where 'new' or combined KEP has been an outcome, do you think this has enhanced your collaborative and individual capacity to meet your organisational goals?

Motivation

7. Why did you decide to get involved in this collaboration?
(Individual/organisational/other)
- a. Why was the knowledge or practice you developed together so useful to you?
 - b. Would you do it again?
8. How do you see this collaboration as different to the other types of work you might get engaged with?
9. Do you think your collaboration makes a contribution to any particular development, justice or social change agendas?
10. What would you change about the way you work together from your perspective?

Legacies

11. What do you think are the 'longer lasting' outcomes of your collaboration?
- a. Which of these might be relevant for future collaborations you might engage in/other people might engage in with you?
12. What for you is the most important legacy of this type of work?
13. How would you describe this to other people who were interested in collaborating in this way?
14. How do you think community-university interactions can contribute to supporting community and social actors in their social change goals?

Any questions/topics we haven't touched on that you would like to discuss?

Appendix 2: List of Respondents in Guided Conversations

Island Place

Who	Types of work
Cassie Director of Women's Housing NGO	Cassie was involved in a research partnership with the university some years ago on women and housing. She remained connected with the community engagement team after that to maintain research opportunities, and have access to information that could influence policy
Justin Researcher,	Justin is a historian and had a leadership role in the university's community engagement team in 2006 He has run a native field school, on reserve for 15 years and practices engaged scholarship with various indigenous communities. He responds frequently to indigenous treaty group requests for information on land rights.
Lara A Local Councillor and director of a Microlending charity	Lara previously worked as a part-time community researcher at Site 1 university – employed by their community engagement team. She has been a partner to initiatives that followed from the Neighbourhood Development Project Case study
Linda Director of the Island Place community engagement team	Linda has a background in social work research and her interests include Aboriginal governance and community practice, liberatory research methods and child welfare. She now leads the community engagement team.
Luca Lecturer	Luca teaches on sustainable food systems. His PhD worked with indigenous communities on issues of sustainability and he is involved in food systems work with multiple stakeholders within and outside the university
Melinda Lecturer	Melinda teaches anthropology and supports student projects on community based issues including most recently homelessness. She also discussed her personal activism which has included arranging talks and debates on university premises.
Meredith Former Director of a large community agency	Meredith has been involved in providing funding to many community based organisations in her former Director role and sat on a university committee for community engagement. Before she retired, she was involved in overseeing the start up of The Neighbourhood Development Project, which was her first formal partnership with the university.
Milly Operational Director of the Island Place community engagement team	Milly is responsible for establishing and supporting engaged research and student engagement at the university. Before her post in the university, Milly had a long career in the NGO sector.
Rachael Director,	Rachael is responsible for establishing engaged research and teaching at a regional university across their different campus

Community Based Research Institute at another regional university	sites.
Tasha Research Unit Manager - but would also identify her values as community based	Tasha is based within the university where she oversees the delivery of a range of research related to children and young people. She coordinates partnerships, develops funding bids and builds capacity with youth researchers to co-deliver projects. Tasha had a community based background, before her university role, working in the women, homelessness and poverty sectors.

River Place

Who	Types of work
Dorothy Co-ordinator: Public and Community Engagement	Dorothy co-ordinates community and public engagement at the university. Her role involves working across the institution to embed public engagement and help community and other organisations to work with the university's staff and students.