

UNIVERSITIES, COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT, AND DEMOCRATIC
SOCIAL SCIENCE

ALAN BOURKE

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN SOCIOLOGY
YORK UNIVERSITY
TORONTO, ONTARIO

April 2015

© Alan Bourke, 2015

Abstract

The purpose of this dissertation is to identify and compare differences between institutional conceptualizations of community engagement with the understanding and practices of faculty engaged in community-based research (CBR), and analyze the implications of these differences. The study contrasts the model of community engagement that is being promoted by universities and the granting agencies (specifically the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada) with what community-engaged researchers experience it to be, with a view to developing an analysis of the relationship between individuals and the political economy of research in which they work.

In Canada, universities are being encouraged by the federal government to assume greater responsibility for economic development and to translate knowledge into products and services for the market—while at the same time being tasked to work with communities in alleviating the social and economic excesses of the market. Drawing upon a qualitative, interview-based research design, my main line of argument is that there is a contradiction regarding the democratization of knowledge production between universities and communities that the institutionalization of community engagement promises—and the aligning of this process of knowledge production with market-driven forces and outcomes. The concern addressed in the dissertation is that the emancipatory intentions of community-based research are being co-opted by the entrepreneurial and managerial ethos influencing and structuring the "doing" of research. Such developments necessitate an interrogation of the institutional contexts in which participatory and community-engaged research are becoming positioned within the market-driven and performance-based governance of university research.

Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge the members of my committee, Lorna Erwin, Penni Stewart, and Eric Mykhalovskiy for their support and contribution throughout the dissertation process. In particular, I would like to extend a special thanks to Lorna Erwin for her endless patience and encouragement. I would like to acknowledge the early contribution of Janice Newson and Brian Singer, and a special thanks as well to Ratiba Hadj Moussa for her guidance during the early stages of the process. I would like to thank Richard Wellen and Natalie Coulter for the contribution they made during the defense of the dissertation, and I very gratefully acknowledge the contribution of my external examiner, Janice Drakich, who provided valuable insight and commentary on my finalized draft. Thanks as well to Audrey Tokiwa in the graduate program in sociology for her help and assistance throughout the completion of my PhD.

Thanks also to my family who were, at all times, immense in their support of my studies and in helping me see it all through to the end. In particular, I would like to thank Irena and Sivan for their unwavering support. The dissertation was as much a test of their endurance and patience as it was mine. I truly could not have completed it without their support.

Table of contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the study.....	1
Contribution to knowledge.....	2
Background and context of community engagement.....	3
Critiquing community engagement.....	4
Definition of key terms.....	6
Overview of the research questions.....	7
Organization of the dissertation.....	9
Chapter Two: Mapping the Literature.....	11
Conceptualizing community engagement.....	11
The "renewal" of community engagement.....	13
Three dimensions of community engagement.....	16
Community-based experiential learning.....	16
Community-based continuing education.....	17
Community-based research (CBR).....	18
The methodological principles of CBR and their significance.....	18
Democratic research engagement.....	21
Institutionalizing community engagement.....	22
The institutionalization of community-engagement in Canadian universities.....	23
Shifting conceptualizations of community engagement.....	27
Community engagement and the knowledge democracy movement.....	28
Roadblocks to community engagement.....	32
Community engagement in international perspective.....	31
A political economy of community engagement.....	39
Community-based research at a crossroads.....	44
Co-opting community-engaged research.....	49
Community engagement and research capitalism.....	54
Forward to the next chapter.....	57
Chapter Three: Methods and Methodology.....	58
Interview sample selection.....	59
Limitations of purposive sampling.....	60
Respondents identified from the literature.....	64

Respondents familiar with the funding landscape.....	61
Developing the sample.....	62
Finalizing the sample.....	63
Limitations of the sample.....	65
Sample differences in university sample.....	68
Sample differences in disciplinary field.....	69
Differences in types of research projects.....	70
Gender and language differences in the sample.....	71
Sample size in comparative context.....	72
Conducting the interviews.....	73
Interview questions.....	75
The interview process.....	76
Ethical concerns in the interview process.....	77
Making sense of the data.....	78
Challenges in thematic analysis.....	80
Documents.....	81
How the documents inform the analysis.....	83
Community-engagement as "discourse".....	84
Chapter Four: Unpacking the "Black Box" of Community Engagement.....	87
A new generation of community-engaged researchers.....	90
"Who or what is going to constitute the community?".....	93
Respondent understandings' of community.....	95
Out in the open? Snapshots of community engagement in Canadian universities.....	97
What does this snapshot of community engagement tell us?	100
Respondent perceptions of community engagement in Canadian universities.....	103
Is there a growing discourse of community engagement?	107
"There are definitely some pretty serious conversations going on".....	110
Are we living in an era of the bureaucratization of CBR?	112
Community-engagement and research funding.....	117
The Community-University Research Alliance (CURA) program.....	120
The CURA program and the funding landscape.....	125
What are the implications of the cancellation of the CURA program?	130
Forward to the next chapter.....	135
Chapter Five: Structuring Community Engagement.....	138
"They want you to have a grant... whether you need it or not".....	141
"Everyone who works here is expected to go and find ways to bring money in".	145
"There are people... they'll apply for whatever is going!".....	149
Co-opting community-based methodologies.....	153

"We're all part of these discourse makers... to get funding"	157
"Boss texts" and the structuring of community-engaged research.....	161
"SSHRC wanted structure whereas this is all about process".....	165
"They all seem to be experiments of five years".....	169
"All of their funding was cut to shreds"	173
A political economy of community engagement.....	175
"Picking up the pieces the state has dropped"	178
Forward to the next chapter.....	182
Chapter Six: Regulating Community Engagement.....	184
"The university doesn't want to be seen to be engaged in activism".....	186
"There is an emerging space for engaged scholarship in the university but...."...	189
"You're really penalizing yourself... there is no question that you are"	192
The intensification of the academic labour of community engagement.....	197
"I feel like I'm just sprinting to get the grants that I need..."	199
"Writing papers is really all that is counted..."	202
"Universities want to be engaged in the safe ways and not in the activist ways"	205
"There needs to be a shift in what we value..."	210
Chapter Seven: Concluding Remarks.....	214
Summary of the study.....	214
Revisiting the research questions.....	215
Continuity and change in the research relations between "town and gown".....	216
Limitations of the study.....	218
Continuing the conversation.....	219
Final reflections.....	222
Bibliography.....	223
Appendix A: Faculty portraits.....	243
Appendix B: University profiles.....	254
Appendix C: Interview questions.....	264
Appendix E: Informed consent form.....	266
Appendix F: Topic description.....	267
Appendix G: Glossary of terms.....	268
Appendix H: List of acronyms.....	271

Chapter 1: Introduction

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to identify and compare differences between institutional conceptualizations of community engagement with the understanding and practices of faculty engaged in community-based research (CBR), and analyze the implications of these differences. In contrasting the model of community engagement that is being promoted by universities and the granting agencies (specifically the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada) with what community-engaged researchers experience it to be, the overarching rationale of the dissertation is to draw upon the experience of community-based scholars with a view to developing an analysis of the relationship between individuals and the political economy of research in which they work. In order to accomplish this, I have conducted a qualitative, interview-based study with community-based scholars about their perceptions of the changing landscape of community-engaged research in Canada.

My main line of argument is that there is a contradiction regarding the democratization of knowledge production between universities and communities that the institutionalization of community engagement promises—and the aligning of this process of knowledge production with market-driven forces and outcomes. My concern is that the emancipatory intentions of community-based research are being co-opted by the entrepreneurial and managerial ethos influencing and structuring the "doing" of research. In my view, such developments necessitate an interrogation of the institutional contexts in which participatory and community-engaged

research are becoming positioned within the market-driven and performance-based governance of university research.

Contribution to knowledge

The dissertation brings together, builds upon, and extends two sets of literature. First, there is an extensive body of literature (both Canadian and international in scope) addressing the difficulties faced by researchers pursuing an agenda of community-engaged scholarship. Drawing largely upon case studies detailing the successes and failures of community-university research partnerships, this literature typically has an applied orientation in focusing on research best practices and principles (Hall & Tremblay, 2012; Hart, Maddison, & Wolff, 2008; Holland, 2005a, 2005b; Van De Ven, 2007). I expand upon this literature by exploring how scholars committed to bridging the divide between "town and gown" through the use of community-based research methodologies are experiencing the increasing institutional acceptance of community engagement in Canadian universities.

A second body of literature explores issues pertaining to the restructuring of higher education and to the growth and development of what is variously referred to as "academic capitalism" (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) or "research capitalism" (Coleman & Kamboureli, 2011; Jordan, 2003; Peacock, 2013). Scholars writing on the Canadian context have explored the importance of research grants to Canadian universities and have found that market-driven behaviours are increasingly becoming embedded in research practice (Grant & Drakich, 2010; Polster, 2007). I expand upon this literature by exploring the extent to which this is true of scholars involved in community-engaged research. According to Dempsey (2010, p. 362), for example, the movement toward community-university research engagement has developed in the

context of the economic restructuring of higher education and discussions on the social relevance of universities. In Canada, universities are being encouraged by the federal government to assume greater responsibility for economic development and to translate knowledge into products and services for the market—while at the same time being tasked to work with communities in alleviating the social and economic excesses of the market.

The contribution to knowledge that the dissertation makes (as developed in detail in my literature review) is to extend and build upon both these sets of literature by looking at the shifting political economy of community engagement. As such, the dissertation is a theoretical-empirical exploration of community-engaged research in the context of the political economy of university restructuring. This necessitates moving beyond the micro-politics of the research encounter to interrogate the overall political nature of the research. In doing so, the dissertation forms part of a tradition in sociological inquiry in exploring the overall political aims and effects of research and knowledge production (Burawoy, 2005; Denzin, Lincoln, & Giardina, 2004; Frampton, Kinsman, Thompson, & Tilleczek, 2006; Smith, 1990).¹

Background and context of community engagement

¹ Denzin, Lincoln, and Giardina (2004) chart the emergence of a conservative turn in research methodology that emphasizes evidence-based "gold standards" of reliability and validity. Central to this development has been the influence of the new "public accountability" that turns the experiential dimension of qualitative inquiry into the "the handmaiden of a technocratic, globalizing managerialism" (p. 772).

Two developments in the research landscape contextualize my area of study. First, community-based research (CBR) has emerged as a particular focal point for community engagement since the late 1990s (Graham, 2014; Hall, 2009, p. 4). Traditionally a "methodology of the margins" (Jordan, 2003), community-based scholars conceptualize CBR as a means to democratically reconstruct the links between "town and gown" in potentially more equitable and beneficial ways. In describing the movement toward a "knowledge democracy" Hall (2009, 2011) addresses how community-engaged research can strengthen the institutional democracy of the university by holding research accountable to a wide range of social and community objectives that extend beyond the economic. There are now more scholars than ever before, Hall claims, entering the academy with a commitment to addressing social and economic inequalities.

The second development has been the growth in importance of community engagement for universities and the granting councils. Beginning in the late 1990s, the Canadian federal government began to significantly increase funding support for community-university research collaborations. By the late 2000s, community-engaged research had become "one of the strongest trends cutting across our university campuses these days [and a] critical strategic choice for public investment" (Hall, 2009). The Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences (CFHSS) has also emphasized community engagement (along with relevance and knowledge mobilization) as one of its three key priorities in its strategic plan for 2011-2015. Having become a "hot topic" (Fryer, 2012) in Canadian universities, community engagement is increasingly becoming part of university institutional plans and supported by the federal government through the funding opportunities of the Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada (SSHRC).

Critiquing community engagement

The dissertation is an attempt to operationalize a form of immanent critique of discourses of community engagement by exploring how individuals committed to community-based research are experiencing its institutionalization in universities and the granting councils (specifically SSHRC). As characterized by Mykhalovskiy et al. (2008; see also Antonio, 1981; Curtis, 2014), immanent critique explores tensions and/or contradictions present within authoritative (institutional) knowledge claims. Furthermore, immanent critique explores how claims internal to a particular discourse are being experienced by those either partly or wholly excluded from their formulation.

An important part of the approach I have taken in the dissertation is the identification of claims made about the institutionalization of community engagement through a reliance on the experiences and perspectives of (predominantly) community-engaged scholars. As such, my analysis of the effects of institutional (university) and organizational (granting agency) policy changes in the landscape of community engagement is not based upon interviews with the authorities making them (university administrators and SSHRC personnel). At the same time, my approach is one that contends that the claims made by such authorities are embedded in texts (e.g., university white papers and research council policy statements on community engagement). Learning about these claims, therefore, becomes a matter of orienting to the texts that carry and communicate such claims. In this sense, immanent critique is dialogic insofar as it seeks to converse with its critical targets (Cruikshank, 2003). In effect, I contend that institutionalized conceptualizations of community engagement are self-referential given the extent to which the enveloping political economy of university research is either absent or

vaguely gestured to. In light of this, I have situated my approach in the context of the neo-liberal restructuring of higher education and changes in federal research funding.

Definition of key terms

The study uses a number of specific terms and phrases. *Community engagement* involves universities forming partnerships with external communities in order to generate "mutually beneficial and socially responsive knowledge, leading to enhanced economic, social and cultural developments" (Peacock, 2013, p. 311). *Community engagement scholarship* is a specific conception of faculty work that connects the intellectual assets of the institution (e.g., faculty expertise and research capacity) to public issues such as community, social, cultural, human, and economic development. Through engaged forms of teaching and research, faculty apply their academic expertise to public purposes, as a way of contributing to the fulfilment of the core mission of the institution (Holland, 2005b). *Community-based research (CBR)* is a collaborative research undertaking between academic and community members. According to Strand et al. (2003), CBR seeks to "democratise knowledge creation by validating multiple sources of knowledge and promoting the use of multiple methods of discovery and dissemination. The goal of CBR is social action (broadly defined) for the purpose of achieving (directly or indirectly) social change and social justice" (p. 5). The *institutionalization of community engagement* refers to the application of institutional (university) and organizational (granting council) resources to address and solve challenges facing communities (in both local and global settings) through collaboration with those communities (Sandmann, 2008, p. 98). Finally, I follow Schensul (2002) in defining the *democraticisation of research* as "first and foremost a process of increasing the accessibility of marginalized communities to the tools of the social sciences" (p.

191). This understanding of community engagement as a democratic process, which foregrounds both the research and social justice components, is central to my analysis and discussion.

Overview of the research questions

The study is framed by three question areas, each of which is intended to address a gap in the literature. Each question explores a different aspect of the overarching rationale of the dissertation and has been developed following a review of the literature. Below, I specify what each question is and provide a brief description of its rationale.

(1) How does the promotion and understanding of community engagement in university and research council policy compare to the understanding and practice of community-engaged researchers?

The literature documents how community engagement has moved closer to mainstream acceptance since the late 1990s. With this question, I explore how researchers understand community and what understandings and conceptualizations of community engagement are being promoted by universities. My intention is to map the driving forces and motivations behind the movement towards community engagement and explore respondents' perceptions of this movement. What actual changes have taken place in the research landscape of community-engaged research and what are respondents' perceptions as to how and why these changes have taken place? The rationale behind the question is to provoke a discussion of the similarities and differences between individual and institutional understandings of community engagement and community-based research (CBR), with a view to identifying key points of tension and contradiction.

(2) It has been clearly documented in the literature that research grants have become increasingly important to Canadian universities, but to what extent, and in what ways, have research grants become important to community-based scholars?

A key factor influencing the movement toward community engagement since the late 1990s has been the availability of increased funding opportunities for community-based research (CBR) (Chopyak & Levesque, 2002; Community-Based Research, 2009; Flicker, Savan, Kolenda, & Mildenberger, 2008). More broadly, the growing importance of research grants to universities has been documented in the literature (Grant & Drakich, 2010; Polster, 2007). With this question, I identify some key developments that highlight the importance of research grants for community-engaged scholars and address what the effects of these changes have been. How have these developments impacted upon the promotion and understandings of community engagement addressed in my first question? The rationale of this question is to explore the shifting political economy of the funding landscape for community engagement and respondents' perceptions of the changes that have taken place.

(3) What difficulties do community-based scholars encounter when seeking to enhance the academic credibility of their research and support its institutionalization in the university—albeit without sacrificing the essentially democratic and collaborative character of the community-engaged research process?

A recurring theme in the literature is that many community-based scholars identify as advocates and/or activists, insofar as they seek to conduct research democratically with their community partners for the purposes of achieving social change (Jordan, 2003; Strand et al., 2003; Winter, Wiseman, & Muirhead, 2006). This question addresses the extent to which this identification is compatible with institutional understandings and conceptualizations of

community engagement. How is the "renewal" of community engagement being accompanied by a re-visioning of what it means to be a scholar committed to the scholarship of engagement and of what community-based researchers perceive to be the role of the "engaged university"? What difficulties do they encounter and what compromises are they willing and/or compelled to make? The rationale of this question is to explore the challenges researchers face when attempting to maintain the *raison d'être* of community-based research—as a methodological orientation which strives to empower marginalized communities.

Organization of the dissertation

The dissertation is organized in seven chapters. This introductory chapter identifies the area of inquiry and addresses the significance of the study and the contribution it makes. Chapter two clarifies the conceptualization of community engagement I will use throughout the dissertation. I describe in detail what I mean by the "institutionalization of community engagement" and situate it in relation to some key debates on community engagement. Chapter three outlines the methods and methodological orientation of the dissertation and I discuss in detail the interview sample selection criteria, and the interview process. These chapters are followed by three chapters in which I present my research findings. Chapter four addresses the conceptualizations of community engagement held by individuals and institutions. I begin by describing how community-engaged scholars understand community and provide a "snapshot" of how Canadian universities have taken up community engagement. This is followed by an overview of how, and to what effects, the Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada (SSHRC) has integrated a community-engaged mandate into its program architecture. Building upon this, and in light of the central role that SSHRC has played, chapter five explores the

growing importance attached to research funding for community-engaged researchers. Beginning by addressing the increasing funding pressures that scholars are experiencing, this chapter explores the extent to which the nature and structure of the funding has a "structuring" effect on the research process. Building upon the shifting political economy of community engagement as addressed in chapter five, chapter six addresses how the institutionalization of community engagement is leading to functional and normative changes in what it is that community-engaged researchers do. This chapter explores how community-based scholars are compelled to operate strategically in a research landscape that continues to systematically differentiate between the research, teaching, and service functions of the scholar. Concluding comments and suggestions for further study are made in chapter seven.

Chapter 2: Mapping the Literature

Drawing upon Canadian and international literature, this chapter maps out some of the key trends in community-university research engagement and establishes the context within which the presentation of my research findings is to be understood. First, the conceptualization of community engagement and the institutionalization of community engagement are clarified. Second, I discuss the democratic potential of community-engaged research and situate it in relation to the enveloping political economy of the research landscape. Third, the economic and market-driven processes that influence the institutionalization of community-engaged research, as well as the managerial and market-driven practices they give rise to with regard to community-based scholars, are addressed.

Conceptualizing engaged scholarship

Community-engagement can be generally subsumed under the general idea of "engaged scholarship". As defined by Holland (2005a),

Engaged scholarship is a specific conception of faculty work that connects the intellectual assets of the institution (i.e., faculty expertise) to public issues such as community, social, cultural, human and economic development. Through engaged forms of teaching and research, faculty apply their academic expertise to public purposes, as a way of contributing to the fulfilment of the core mission of the institution.

There is a rich tradition of engaged scholarship in the social sciences (Lynd, 1939; O'Connor, 2007). The importance of publically-engaged sociology, for example, is a recurring theme in the history of the discipline (Becker, 1967; McClung Lee, 1976; Gans, 1989; Jurik, 2004; Feagin & Vera, 2001). Michael Burawoy (2004, p. 109; see also Burawoy, 2005) has positioned public sociology as a means by which "to bring sociology to publics beyond the academy, promoting dialogue about issues that affect the fate of society". Burawoy has called for public sociology to be established as an institutional force in universities and for a renewal in the modes of civic engagement between universities and their respective publics. In particular, he seeks to reclaim the potential of a civic-oriented and socially-engaged program of sociological practice (2005, p. 6). In doing so, he distinguishes between "traditional" and "organic" public sociologies. Whereas traditional public sociology includes scholarship and professional activities that are driven by the interests and priorities of the discipline, organic sociology is a collaborative approach between researcher and community practitioner/ participant that takes place in a "process of mutual education" (Burawoy, 2005, p. 7-8).² Willis, Anders, and Stoeker (2012, p. 286) suggest that

² Burawoy's presidential speech on public sociology at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association in 2004 was followed by intense debate in the academic community regarding the institutional viability and disciplinary potential of public sociology.

A number of scholarly journals devoted special issues to the debate (see *Social Forces* (2004), *Social Problems* (2004), *British Journal of Sociology* (2005), *Critical Sociology* (2005)), *American Sociologist* (2007), *Sociology* (2007), and the *Canadian Journal of Sociology* (2009)), as well as in three edited volumes of note (Blau & Iyall-Smith, 2006; Clawson et al., 2007; Nichols, 2007).

community-engaged scholarship can act as a key building block for public sociology—and suggest that promoting opportunities for community engagement and bolstering the institutional culture supporting it are essential (see also Morton, Dolton, Maher, & Pennell, 2012).

In anthropology, Borofsky (2004) and Rylko, Singer, and Van-Willigen (2008) have called for a renewed program of publically-engaged scholarship that seeks to effect social and political change (see also Beck & Maida, 2013; Hale, 2008; Low & Merry, 2010; Susser, 2010). According to Hale (2008, p. 97), politically-engaged anthropological research is a method by which to "affirm a political alignment with an organized group of people in struggle and allow dialogue with them to shape each phase of the process". Conceptualized in this way, scholars who foreground the public and/or political component of research have a double commitment (and thus a dual form of accountability)—to academia, and to a social struggle that includes but also moves beyond the university setting. This commitment is also seen in the Canadian tradition of activist political ethnography as developed by George Smith (1990). Smith aimed to develop an insider's knowledge of "ruling regimes" based on the everyday struggles of social movements—a form of collaborative knowledge production explicitly designed for activism (see Frampton, Kinsman, Thompson, & Tilleczek, 2006).

The "renewal" of community engagement

There has been a renewal of interest in the scholarship of community engagement in the U.S. and Canada since the mid-1990s (Barker, 2004; Hall et al., 2012; Jackson, 2010; Moore &

Ward, 2010; Wenger, Hawkins, & Seifer, 2012).³ In a definition provided by the Carnegie Foundation, "community engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 2015)⁴. This model definition highlights the key principles of collaboration, mutuality, and exchange that are central to the "best practice" of community-university engagement between "town and gown".⁵

The Carnegie Foundation drew upon Ernest Boyer's (former president of the Carnegie Foundation) (1996) call for higher education to reaffirm its historic commitment to what he termed the "scholarship of engagement". In particular, Boyer called for scholarly engagement

³ Engaged scholarship can range from individual faculty-community partnerships supported by universities, to university-wide partnerships involving interdisciplinary collaborations across faculties, to multi-institutional partnerships involving a number of different universities.

⁴ Founded in 1905, the U.S. based Carnegie Foundation For the Advancement of Teaching and Learning is an independent research and policy centre committed to the advancement of community-engaged teaching and learning:

http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php

⁵ Recent examples of works focused on principles of "best practice" for engaged scholarship (the first two with Canadian scholars closely involved) include *Knowledge, democracy and action: Community-university research partnerships in global perspectives* (Hall, Jackson, Fontan, & Lass, 2013), *Learning and teaching community-based research: Linking pedagogy to practice* (Etmanski, Hall, & Dawson, 2014), and *Democracy in motion: Evaluating the practice and impact of deliberative civic engagement* (Nabatchi, 2012).

with disadvantaged communities beyond the university campus (Barinaga & Parker, 2013, p. 6). The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities subsequently called upon its members to "go beyond outreach and service to 'engagement'" (Carr, 1999)—and suggested shifting the traditional mission focus of the university from research, teaching, and service to "discovery, learning, and engagement" (Office of Community-Based Research, 2009, p. 15). This move beyond an outreach and service model of engagement marked a key shift in the how community engagement came to be conceptualized from the late 1990s (Barker, 2004).

The scholarship of engagement has subsequently emerged to become a much more multifaceted term and has been used to refer to a wide range of initiatives centred on community outreach, public service, civic engagement, community engagement, and community-based participatory research (Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2010; Fallis, 2014; Hart, Maddison, & Wolff, 2008). Dempsey defines campus-community engagements as demonstrating a commitment to "collaborative forms of organizing and typically involve under-resourced and marginalised communities" (2010, p. 360). On this basis, it has been argued that the contribution that universities can and should make to building capacity in marginalised communities through research engagement needs to extend beyond the limitations of a traditional outreach model (Gaffikin & Morrissey, 2008, p. 100).

It should be noted that research engagement is not synonymous with research partnership. According to Hall et al., (2011, p. 3)—whereas partnership entails a form of sharing of resources within existing institutional arrangements, engagement requires attention be directed to changing these institutional arrangements. Notwithstanding this, the variety of forms that engagement can assume means that attempts to capture what is intended by the "scholarship of engagement" have become bogged down in what Barker (2004) calls "taxonomic inconsistency" (p. 123) and what

Sandmann (2008) calls "definitional anarchy" (p. 91). For this reason, I will now draw upon Jackson (2008) and discuss the three main areas of community engagement before presenting the specific conceptualization that will inform my discussion.

Three dimensions of community engagement

Jackson (2008) highlights three main dimensions of community-university engagement in what he calls the community-university-engagement (CUE) factor. The CUE factor refers to the interchange of community-based experiential learning (or community service learning (CSL)), community-based continuing education, and community-based research. In this model, Jackson evokes the historical purpose of the university in terms of its service, teaching, and research functions. Although it should be noted that the areas described by Jackson are by no means mutually exclusive—given that they can overlap in many different ways—I will briefly describe each one in turn.

Community-based experiential learning. Community service experiential learning (or service learning) is often used as part of a community-engaged research project. Such activities may include a field-based practicum or co-operative study/ work placement. Fryer (2013) details how community service learning (CSL) emerged as a prominent force in Canada in the late 1990s following funding support from the J.W. McConnell Family Foundation.⁶ CSL continues to be a prominent feature of Canadian universities and there are now more than 30 post-

⁶ Established in 1937 as a private family foundation, the founding purpose of the foundation is "to improve the quality of life in Canada by building communities that help people develop their potential and contribute to the common good" (<http://www.mcconnellfoundation.ca/en>).

secondary institutions across Canada with service learning programs. This model of engagement is promoted by the Canadian Alliance for Community Service Learning (<http://communityservicelearning.ca>) which holds a bi-annual conference.⁷ Community-based service learning has been most thoroughly institutionalized in Quebec. A notable example is the service aux collectivités (SAC) at L'Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM). What distinguishes service from engagement is that the latter entails more than a one-way transfer of knowledge and expertise from the university to the community (Peacock, 2013, p. 311).

Community-based continuing education. Continuing education describes a broad spectrum of post-secondary learning programs and activities and is typically associated with adult and professional training. Such programs tend to be focused on connecting educational practice to policy. For example, the Carleton Centre for Social Innovation (<http://www6.carleton.ca/3ci/>) aims to involve community leaders, policymakers, business executives, trade unionists, and community-engaged scholars in building "action-oriented knowledge that will empower communities to build better lives for their citizens". Notwithstanding its rich tradition in Canada, Hall (2009, p. 7) has observed a steady decline in institutional support for continuing education.

⁷ There has been a growing emphasis placed upon how service-learning programs can deepen students' understandings of global issues through lessons learned in local contexts (Keith, 2005). These discussions focus on what students need to know about global affairs and what types of curriculum and pedagogy can best accomplish such ends (Lewis & Neisenbaum, 2005).

Community-based research (CBR). In a definition used by the University of Victoria-based Institute for Studies and Innovation in Community-University Engagement (previously the Office of Community-Based Research), community-based research is described as,

a collaborative enterprise between academic and community members. CBR seeks to democratize knowledge creation by validating multiple sources of knowledge and promoting the use of multiple methods of discovery and dissemination. The goal of CBR is social action (broadly defined) for the purpose of achieving (directly or indirectly) social change and social justice (quoted in Strand et al., 2003).

This description of CBR emphasizes the democratic aspect of community engagement. In this, I follow Schensul (2002) in defining the democratization of research as "first and foremost a process of increasing the accessibility of marginalized communities to the tools of the social sciences" (p. 191). This area of community engagement, which foregrounds both the research and social justice component, is the focus of my dissertation. The analysis explores the extent to which community-based scholars consider the democratization of research to be a reality. The following section presents a more specific conceptualization of CBR and highlights some key points of contention.

The methodological principles of CBR and their significance

Community-based research encompasses a spectrum of approaches that range from consultation between academic and community partners at the beginning of a research project (what I characterize as "thin" engagement) to modalities of engagement in which both parties are involved in all phases of the process ("thick" engagement). Such approaches range from attempts to re-conceptualise the "disengaged" university as community resource in encouraging the

participation of disadvantaged groups, to stressing the responsibility the university has in producing socially relevant and economically beneficial research. In a definition often referenced in the literature, Israel et al., (1998, p. 176-7) define community-based research as drawing upon "constructivist and critical theoretical perspectives that address some of the criticisms of positivist science. Specific research methods are determined by the purpose of the study, how the information is to be used, the context and setting, the theoretical perspectives—including "local" theory, the applicability of measurement tools, and the input of community participants." As a democratic approach to research, this definition by Israel et al. highlights how CBR adopts not only an explicitly normative methodological commitment with regard to the co-design of research between scholars and those in the community, but also a specific epistemological stance in regard to how knowledge is seen as a process of co-creation between participants.

The democratization of research practice that CBR implies can be approached in two complimentary ways—first, through the strengthening of citizen involvement in all stages of the research process, and second—through democratising research practice by conducting research specifically directed to community needs. In both cases, and in contrast to the more typical "out-reach" focus of community-based service learning or continuing education, CBR is characterized by a focus that allows for the reciprocal "in-reach" of the community to the university. From the outset, it should be noted that CBR is far from a unified approach, but rather encourages the use of a spectrum of research instruments and techniques as opposed to being a specific methodological orientation in itself (Wallerstein & Duran, 2003). Typically drawing upon action research-oriented (AR) and participatory action research (PAR) methods, the past two decades have witnessed the emergence of a vibrant subculture of partnerships in Canada and the U.S. between academically trained researchers and communities with the explicit purpose of

conducting CBR to address community needs (Lutz & Neis, 2008; Minkler, 2005; Schensul, Berg, & Williamson, 2008). Notwithstanding the current salience of community-based research (CBR), there remains considerable conceptual confusion which tends to collapse traditions of AR and PAR into a unitary approach, often resulting in studies identifying as PAR when in practice they are closer in conceptualization and operationalization to the methodological and epistemological principles of AR (see Barker, 2004, p. 130; Brydon-Miller, Greenwood, & Maguire, 2003 p. 12; Khan & Chovancel, 2010; Khanlou & Peter, 2005, p. 2339; Jordan, 2003, p. 187).

The conflation between the methodological principles of AR and PAR is significant because the political leanings and democratic intentions of AR differ considerably from those of PAR—particularly in terms of the role of community actors in the design of research, the location of power in the research process, the forms of knowledge creation aspired to, and the ultimate goals of the research. Crucially, the pragmatic and policy-orientated impulse typical of AR stands in contrast to the more radical and transformative intentions of PAR—with AR effectively serving to alleviate rather than eradicate the inefficiencies and inequities of the status quo. According to Barinaga & Parker (2013, p. 5), Lewin's conceptualization of AR laid the groundwork for collaborative approaches to system change but offered "no critique or analysis of the broader societal structures of power that embed such change." Furthermore, Carroll claims that without a firm commitment to democratic empowerment, "action research becomes little more than a sophisticated form of social regulation" (Carroll, 2006, p. 241). I highlight this difference as it is significant with regard to debates on the institutionalization of CBR in the form of research council funding opportunities and university institutional policy. Before addressing

this, it is useful to consider how Stanton's (2008) differentiation between purpose, process, and products provides a deeper conceptualization of CBR.

Democratic research engagement

Community-based scholars aim to work with communities in addressing their social and/or economic needs. The exact purpose typically depends upon the priorities and values driving those involved in the research. In modalities of community-based research that draw upon action research (AR), the purpose may be to work with those in the community in order to identify and then implement evidence-based policy or program change. Alternatively, it may be conducted for purposes of assessment or evaluation. Models of community-based research that draw more upon the Freirian tradition of participatory action research (PAR) are generally more committed to transformative social change and tend to have a more clearly articulated political and activist agenda.

It is neither possible nor desirable to treat the purpose of CBR independently of the processes of research engagement. By "process" I am referring to the nature of the working relationship that exists between community-based scholars and those in the community. In theory, CBR processes are designed to be iterative and responsive to the needs of community participants. In this, they differ from more unidirectional forms of university outreach such as community-based learning or continuing education. As has been well documented in the literature, the research process can be characterized as much by conflict as consensus. Notwithstanding agreement in the purpose of a research project, the process may be inequitable, exploitative, or lack the meaningful participation of community groups. In their study of CBR in Canada, Flicker and Savan (2006, p. 26) concluded that academics continue to dominate most areas of the research process, with community members consistently being cited as the least

involved. A question I will address in the presentation of my findings is whether the institutionalization of community engagement alleviates or exacerbates this imbalance.

The focus on purpose and process must be supplemented by a focus on the outcomes or "products" of the engagement. The intended outcomes of the research may be program assessment, policy recommendations, consciousness-raising, or an attempt to instigate transformative social change. This raises the question of what evaluative criteria can be used to ensure that the research achieves this aim. Is the desired end an advance in knowledge? Does the research lead to action? (Stanton, 2008, p. 27). Beyond traditional concerns—such as establishing the scientific credibility of the research and pressures experienced by scholars with regard to publication expectations—an emergent issue in recent debates on community-based research is how to "measure" the outcomes or impact of community-based research. For example, the professional obligation of faculty to create publishable results is often more easily achieved than more diffuse goals such as alleviating poverty or combating a lack of accessibility in education. As community engagement becomes institutionalized in Canadian universities, the emphasis is increasingly placed upon communicating or "mobilizing" the "products" of community engaged research (Hall & Tremblay, p. 2012; Jackson, 2010). By way of contrast, for many community-based scholars the "outcome" of the research can be as much about creating a relationship or bridge with those in the community and/or consciousness-raising around a particular issue. Such concerns will no doubt continue to be a prominent feature in debates on CBR—and particularly so in light of the institutionalization of community engagement.

Institutionalizing community engagement

Sandmann identifies the institutionalization of community-engagement in universities as the development of institutional frameworks that identify and support community engagement as a scholarly function—and as the application of institutional (university) resources to address and solve challenges facing communities (in both local and global settings) through collaboration with those communities (2008, p. 98; see also Ostrande, 2004). Examples of the movement towards the institutionalization of community engagement are evident in how it has increasingly become the focus of university strategic plans and mission statements, an increase in calls for partnered research, and the increasing allocation of funding and resources for community-based research activities and knowledge translation or knowledge mobilisation activities.

The institutionalization of community-engagement in Canadian universities. In Canada, community-based research (CBR) has emerged as a particular focus of community engagement since the late 1990s (Flicker & Savan, 2006; Hall, 2009; Lutz & Neiz, 2008; Vaillancourt, 2005; Wenger, Hawkins, & Seifer, 2012). At this time, funding agencies and universities were beginning to acknowledge and value the benefits and outcomes of collaborative, community-based research—particularly with regard to what Chopyak and Levesque (2002) described as its potential to leverage outcomes from previously "untapped" community resources. Characterized by Chopyak and Levesque as illustrative of a "new mode of knowledge production" (p. 205), community-based research (CBR) is described as potentially playing a central role in bridging the divide between universities and communities. Claiming that Canadian and U.S. based funding institutions are finally beginning to recognize the value of collaborative research when conducted beyond the university-industry-government "triple helix"

Chopyak and Levesque effectively place CBR in a continuum with research partnerships between industry, universities, and government (2002, p. 205). Situated firmly within this market-driven framework of understanding, they note how funding agencies around the world have increasingly begun to add such research orientations to their established repertoire of approaches to community development.⁸ Although they situate these developments as occurring in the context of cutbacks in federal education funding in the early to mid-1990s, their analysis is limited to a series of policy recommendations for how to best institutionalize CBR in the university system.

Described by Lall (2009) as the first survey of community-based researchers in Canada, Flicker et al. (2006) offer a "snapshot of CBR in Canada" and note how major national and international funding bodies have increasingly begun to mandate community participation in the research they fund (p. 9). Their survey primarily focuses on the barriers that hinder the institutionalization of CBR in universities. These include such issues as the lack of funding for CBR, the lack of recognition accorded CBR in the tenure and promotion process, and the scepticism on behalf of the academic mainstream regarding the methodological and/or scientific rigour of community-based methodologies (Flicker et al., 2006, p. 29). Their focus is squarely on how to remove these barriers in order to better capitalize upon the strengths of CBR so as to more effectively advance evidence-based policy and program reforms.

Among those most actively promoting the institutionalization of community-engaged research in Canada is the Institute for Studies and Innovation in Community-University Engagement of the University (ISICUE) of Victoria's Research Partnerships and Knowledge

⁸ SSHRC's annual report of 1997-1998 described community-university collaborations as "essentially a new type of research" conducted jointly with "user groups" in the community.

Mobilization (RPKM) unit (previously known as the Office of Community-Based Research). Their report *The Funding and Development of Community University Research Partnerships in Canada* (2009) provides the most comprehensive mapping of the sources and types of funding available for community-university research partnerships in Canada. In documenting a wide range of initiatives, the report concludes that "we now have an emerging space for the systematic sharing of [community-based research] experiences that did not exist in recent years" (p. 13).

Working out of the University of Victoria, Lall (2009) provides a comprehensive overview of the national and international institutional support structures available for community-university partnerships. Such literature clearly documents the range of faculty-driven initiatives and institutional mechanisms that have developed in universities with the explicit mandate of facilitating greater dialogue between universities and communities.⁹ Lall's work is useful in highlighting how the interest in community engaged research is also a prominent trend internationally (see Association of Commonwealth Universities, 2001). At a later point in this chapter, I will draw upon some of the international literature on community engagement in order to better explicate trends in the Canadian context. Other notable focal points for community-engaged research in Canada include the bi-annual Community-University Expositions (<http://cuexpo2013.ca>), the Community-Based Research Canada Network (founded in 2008)

⁹ Examples include the Harris Centre at Memorial University, the Trent Centre for Community Education, the Institute for CBR at Vancouver Island University, the Community University Partnership Program at the University of Alberta, the Centre for Community-Based Research in Kitchener, Ontario, the Centre for Community Service, Learning and Action at Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, and the Service aux collectivités at UQAM, Quebec.

(<http://communityresearchcanada.ca/>), and the University of Guelph-based Institute for Community-Engaged Scholarship founded in 2009 (<http://www.theresearchshop.ca/>).¹⁰

The availability of larger scale funding options in Canada has prompted Roche (2008) to suggest that "we are at an important juncture for CBR. Having acquired this degree of visibility, the approach is at a new point in its evolution—on the cusp of mainstream acceptance" (p. 7). One implication of this move toward the mainstream is that knowledge production and use becomes more democratic due to the fact that knowledge users external to universities (e.g., various community and civil society constituencies) are increasingly becoming more centrally involved in the co-design and co-production of knowledge. As claimed by Chopyak and Levesque (2002), this makes it relevant and beneficial in the context of its application for those directly connected with its eventual utilization. In reaching out to civil society groups, what has become clear is that contemporary models of CBR have begun to transcend their traditional context of implementation as localized community engagement or as modes of action-oriented or participatory research which do not bring into focus wider economic processes. In particular, it is

¹⁰ Based out of the University of Guelph, the Community Engaged Scholarship Partnership (<http://www.cescholarship.ca/>) was initiated to transform university policies and practices so as to better recognize and reward community-engaged scholarship in tenure and promotion. The eight universities working together on the initiative (20 universities initially expressed interest) include Memorial University, University of Alberta, University of Calgary, University of Guelph, University of Regina, University of Saskatchewan, University of Victoria, and York University. In the U.S. the Campus Community Partnerships for Health (CCPH) have created a set of guidelines for tenure review committees on how to incorporate engaged scholarship in tenure and promotion. See: http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/CES_RPT_Package.pdf

difficult to address the growing importance of community-engaged research without situating it in the context of the growth in importance of research grants to universities.

Shifting conceptualizations of community engagement

There has been a clear renewal of interest in community-based research and engaged scholarship in Canada, particularly as detailed in the literature by Vaillancourt (2005), Flicker & Savan (2006), Shragge et al. (2006), Flicker et al. (2009), B. Hall (2009), E. Hall (2010), P. Hall et al. (2011), Lall (2009), and the Office of Community-Based Research (2009). What has intensified in recent years is that contemporary interest in community engagement is now clearly evident in university administrations (as seen in university mission statements), organizations that represent universities (such as the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada [AUCC]),¹¹ and the federal government (as represented by SSHRC).

The Governor General of Canada, David Johnson, recently initiated a national scan of community-university collaborations in order to develop institutional strategies to increase the range, scope, and impact of such collaborations. The resulting report (One World Inc., 2012) concludes by stating that Canada is at "a critical point in its evolution of a continuum of development of community based research and community university research partnerships ... these investments if better resourced and coordinated could create a major advantage for the nation to advance its knowledge-based economy, society, and education system" (2009, p. 45).

¹¹ As articulated in their Momentum Report of 2008, the AUCC initiated a "new narrative" for universities that involved, in part, developing connections between universities and their communities. In 2013, the AUCC launched a webpage and video that highlights AUCC member institutions' engagement: <http://www.aucc.ca/canadian-universities/community-engagement/>

The "critical point" of interest in community engagement mentioned in this report reflects a number of decisive shifts in the landscape of higher education which are serving to both enable and constrain the nature and structure of CBR engagement. According to Dempsey (2010, p. 362), community-university research engagement has developed (globally) in the context of the economic restructuring of higher education and discussions on the social relevance of universities. It is in the context of ongoing economic instability and rising education costs that universities are increasingly experiencing pressure to demonstrate their "relevance" to various publics. I will discuss this at a later point with regard to the changing political economy of the research landscape.

Community engagement and the knowledge democracy movement

A leading figure in the advancement of community-engaged scholarship—both in Canada and internationally—is Budd Hall at the University of Victoria. Hall is director of the Victoria-based Office of Community-Based Research (OCBR) and UNESCO co-chair in Community-Based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education. Hall sees universities as the single most accessible and underutilized resource available for community change—and sees community engagement as representing a "critical strategic choice for public investment" (2009, p. 6). Quoting Cristina Escrigas, Executive Director of the Global University Network for Innovation [GUNI], Hall claims that it is time to "review and reconsider the interchange of values between university and society ... we need to rethink the social relevance of universities" (quoted in Hall, 2011). It is in this changing context that Hall has documented the development of community engagement as a democratic and collaborative movement between universities and communities.

Hall's work fits within an emerging community-based researcher initiated movement advancing and promoting the potential emergence of what he calls a knowledge democracy movement. Hall (2009, 2011; Hall & Tremblay, 2012) has chronicled the emergence of "new discourses, practices, and structures for knowledge mobilization, engaged scholarship, community-based research, and community-university research partnerships". He identifies a shift in the use of language around community engagement—in that university personnel and administrations are talking about it a lot more than they used to. Hall describes this trend as global in nature as universities around the world attempt to increase the impact of their presence in the communities in which they are located (see Munck, McQuillan, & Ozarowska, 2012; Bourke, 2013). Noting how community and/or civic engagement has become a salient feature of university strategic plans, Hall charts the movement toward the institutionalization of community engagement in Canadian universities—through the creation of Vice-Presidents for engagement in universities, offices of community outreach and community engagement, knowledge mobilization (KMb) units, and various partnership initiatives.¹²

¹² International examples include the U.S. based Campus Compact's *Wingspread Declaration on Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University* (1999), the UK's *The Engaged University: Manifesto for Public Engagement* (2010), Australia's *Charter and Principles of University Community Engagement*, the Association of Commonwealth Universities' (ACU) consultation document *Engagement as a Core Value for the University*, and the Talloires Network's *Declaration on the Civic Roles and Social Responsibilities of Higher Education* (2005).

Hall offers some perceptive insight into the driving forces behind this movement, the potential opportunities and dangers, and the possibility of realizing a liberatory and transformative research practice in the tradition of Paulo Freire (Hall, 2011). Evoking the critical pedagogical approach of participatory action research (PAR), Hall (2009) suggests that using university resources to create "imaginative partnership structures" has the potential to make a significant impact on communities in addressing such issues as homelessness, food security, health, education, and a wide range of pressing social issues. Hall outlines how community engagement can bolster the institutional democracy of the university in holding research accountable to a range of social and community objectives that extend beyond the economic. He presents some compelling evidence, of both national and international initiatives, to support his argument that knowledge production is becoming more democratic—in a manner that is similar to Schensul's (2010) discussion regarding the democratic potential of "third sector science." In this view, changes in the nature and structure of the research funding landscape have opened up new possibilities and strategies for community-based researchers and engaged scholarship.

Hall has been involved in advancing two key initiatives which exemplify the "emergence of a new architecture of knowledge" (Hall & Tremblay, 2012). One is the notion of a "knowledge commons" (<http://knowledgecommons.ning.com/>). According to Hall, the knowledge commons is a "conceptual space where the boundaries between diverse locations of knowledge creation, forms of knowledge and uses of knowledge are diminished in the interest of knowledge strategies for the application of complex economic and social issues that confront us in Canada and around the world" (2011). Watson (2008) suggests that a wide range of actors are coalescing around the idea that universities have a role to play—not only in fostering democratic communities—but also in nurturing "participatory development on a global scale" (p. 53).

Community-engaged scholars and community-based research (CBR) are held to play a key role in the knowledge commons, according to Hall. In essence, the knowledge commons is conceptualized as a space where universities can be more socially responsive and civically engaged. In one of the contributions to *The Exchange University*, a volume of essays by Canadian scholars addressing the corporatization of the academy, Summers (2008) notes how the increasing commercialization of knowledge has eroded the "knowledge commons" and, like Hall, sees faculty as playing a significant role in its possible revitalization. Encouraging public participation in the production of scholarly knowledge is likewise seen by Barker (2004, p. 125) as an attempt to reverse—or at least ameliorate—this movement toward the "corporate campus."¹³

The other initiative that Hall is involved with is the Canadian-led Global Alliance for Community Engaged Research (GACER) (<http://www.gacer.org/>). Designed with "common global purpose" of using knowledge and research partnerships to achieve "democratic social and environmental changes and justice, particularly among the most vulnerable people and place in the world" (GACER, 2008), this initiative is an explicitly normative attempt to nurture such an orientation in a globally networked manner.¹⁴ Schensul (2002) defines the democratization of

¹³ Peters (2007, p. ix) highlights the administrative discourse enveloping discourses of the use and relevance of the university, one borrowed from the corporate sector and emphasizing value for money, added-value, cost-efficiency, resource allocation, benefits and outcomes, performance indicators, and so on.

¹⁴ Drawing upon the support of 1,000 universities and civil society organisations from around the world, the GACER agreement is a statement of principles and aspirations on the part of the major networking organisations in the field of community-engaged scholarship, including the

CBR knowledge as "first and foremost a process of increasing the accessibility of marginalized communities to the tools of the social sciences (p. 191). Arguably, the GACER initiative exemplifies this trend.

Roadblocks to community engagement

Many obstacles remain to the mainstream institutional acceptance of community-engaged research. The strength of much of the (predominantly applied) literature on community-based research lies in identifying and suggesting solutions toward such obstacles. The roadblocks to the institutionalization of community engagement include the historical divide between "town and gown," the poor status traditionally accorded community-based scholarship, the tendency of academic departments to operate in disciplinary "silos," and an academic rewards culture that privileges individual achievement over that of collaboration (Gaffikin & Morrissey, 2008, p. 101). Although advocates of engaged scholarship are optimistic with regard to advancing the knowledge democracy movement (see Ostrander, 2004), less attention has been directed to situating such shifts in relation to the political economy of research, both nationally and internationally.

In a review of research collaborations between universities and civil society organizations (CSOs), Holmes and Scoones (quoted in Gall, Millot, and Neubauer, 2009, p. 88) suggest that while "there has been [an] important emphasis on the development of participatory methods in both Northern and Southern settings, there has been less reflection on how these are located

Living Knowledge Network, the Community-Campus Partnership for Health (U.S.), Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), Sub-Saharan Participatory Research Network (Senegal), International Green Mapping Network (U.S.), and others.

within broader policy processes and how those involved in participatory events are linked to wider policy networks and processes of social change." In particular, there is an emerging tension between how community-based scholars conceptualize and experience what it is that they do, and how community engagement is being conceptualized and positioned in policy documents as it becomes institutionalized in Canadian universities and research council funding opportunities. Commenting on the U.S. context, Doberneck, Glass, and Schweitzer (2010, p. 6) suggest that the generalized way in which engaged scholarship is described institutionally often does not resonate with many faculty members.

One area in which this tension is becoming evident is the requirement to measure the impact and outcomes of community-engaged research. There is a growing body of literature that has attempted to assess or evaluate the "impact" of community-engaged research and scholarship (Phipps & Shapson, 2009). Roche (2008) identifies initiatives that attempt to translate findings into "research with impact" as an area where community-based research (CBR) is at greatest risk. Although community-based researchers typically emphasize the importance of the research process, the shift towards assessing research impact emphasizes measuring research "products." Whereas community-based scholars see the *raison d'être* of their practice as advancing social justice and social change (particularly when conceptualized in terms of the Freirian tradition of PAR), institutional (university) and organizational (research council) conceptualizations of community engagement are generally framed more in terms of policy recommendations and program change (as is more typical of the Lewinian tradition of action research)¹⁵. The result is a

¹⁵ According to Lewin (1948, p. 202-3), "The research needed for social practice can best be characterized as research for social management or social engineering. It is a type of action-

contradiction between the principles of engaged scholarship held by individuals committed to community-based research practice—and the enveloping political economy of university research.

Hall makes what I consider to be a crucial distinction between the (global) knowledge democracy movement and that of the knowledge economy. Whereas the knowledge economy connects knowledge production and skills development to capitalist production and the use of digital technologies, the knowledge democracy movement (or knowledge movement) refers to an "action-oriented formation that recognizes, gives visibility to and strengthens the knowledge that is created in the context of, as Marx said, people trying to 'change the world'" (Hall, 2011). To this end, Hall remains cognizant of how market forces, operating through the notion of the "knowledge economy," threaten to disrupt the movement toward the realization of a knowledge democracy. Hall also suggests that the treatment of such issues as social justice and sustainability cannot be treated separately from market forces (2009, p. 7). My reading of this is that community engagement is being pulled in both directions. The decisive contradiction is that Canadian universities are being encouraged by the federal government to assume greater responsibility for economic development and to translate knowledge into products and services for the market—while at the same time being tasked to work with communities in alleviating the social and economic excesses of the market.

While it would be erroneous to suggest there to be a direct link between the influence of market forces and the growth of community engagement in universities, there is a growing body

research, a comparative research on the conditions and effects of various forms of social action, and research leading to social action".

of literature focused on the international context which is attempting to address the intersection between the two. It remains to be seen whether community-engaged research will further democratize the production of knowledge between universities and their communities, or become complicit in advancing the entrepreneurial role of universities eager to capitalise upon community resources. Before focusing more specifically on the relationship between community-based researchers and the political economy of research in which they work, it is important to address some key themes which emerge from some of the international literature on community engagement.

Community engagement in international perspective

Documenting community-university engagement strategies in nine Australian universities, Winter, Wiseman, and Muirhead (2006) suggest that the emergence of the knowledge economy has placed new pressures on universities to demonstrate their social and economic contribution. Highlighting the contemporary importance of the "increasing internationalization of higher education and the rhetoric around global knowledge economies," they situate such initiatives in a context in which traditional conceptualizations of community have transcended a focus on the local and regional in becoming more global in scope (p. 120). Within this logic, focusing on research that is applicable and utilitarian is one way that universities and academics can "maintain their relevance in a knowledge society" (Winter et al., 2006, p. 217). While this poses significant challenges for conceptualizing the role that universities now play in nurturing democratic citizenship, they also suggest that the question of how community engagement "fits within the current economic rationalist policy framework" needs to be considered.

Conceptualized in this way, Winter et al. (2006) claim that "community engagement" has thus become an effective (and essentially co-opted) marketing technique of universities. As a result, the agenda of democratic citizenship is transformed from being one of citizenship focused on social change to an "active citizenship that merges with entrepreneurialism" (p. 224). Winter and colleagues also suggest that community engagement needs to go beyond contributing to social and economic infrastructure to include supporting equity, diversity, and education for democratic citizenship through strategies of community engagement. Situating his analysis of the Australian Alliance of Community-Engaged Universities' (AUCEA) position paper on community engagement firmly within a critique of neoliberal governance, Peacock (2012, p. 322) notes how the discursive construction of university-community engagement is thus more likely to "resonate with and speak to business and industry interests than non-governmental organisations seeking non-profit or more socially just and democratic outcomes."

The alignment of community engagement with an entrepreneurial ethos is also evident in Rooney's (2005) description of the activities of Campus Compact. A U.S. based coalition of 1,100 college and university presidents dedicated to advancing campus-community linkages, Campus Compact has explicitly situated its mandate as bridging "town and gown" in the knowledge economy. Rooney documents how Harvard, MIT, and Brown have produced "economic impact" statements for their respective institutions and describes how the eight largest universities in the Greater Boston region have published a document entitled "Engines of Collective Growth" which charts their collective impact in this regard. Rooney (2005) suggests that the heightening economic impacts of higher education, including those of community-engaged outreach activities, are "natural by-products of the knowledge economy." As universities around the world experience pressure to reconsider their social and economic role in

society, and their relation to various community stakeholders, discourses of the knowledge economy can be seen to have cut across national, regional, and continental boundaries in assuming a global potency (Olssen & Peters, 2005; Robertson, 2010; Shore & Taitz, 2012). The Council of Ontario Universities (2013), for example, has recently characterized entrepreneurship as having moved from the "margins to the mainstream of university education" (p. 1). Commenting upon this, Harvey and Szeman (2014) note how the majority of universities in Ontario now list "entrepreneurship" as a core value in their strategic mandates.

Founding director of the U.S. based Institute for Community Research (ICR), Schensul (2010) observes how market forces have shifted the focus of universities away from engagement with civil society and suggests that the increasing entrepreneurial focus of universities calls for a renewed focus on community-engaged scholarship. Schensul conceptualizes community-based scholarship as "third sector science," the methodological orientation of which is action research (AR). According to Schensul, the production of (social) scientific knowledge in a non-traditional and community-based manner, with an emphasis upon "the role of public and marginalized voices of the north and the south," is central to a more democratic research process (2010, p. 314). Echoing the views of Budd Hall on the knowledge democracy movement, Schensul (2010) describes how the increased degree of collaboration between national and international community-based research networks is leading to the creation of a "global knowledge exchange system" (p. 312). A similar argument is made by Greenwood & Levin (2003) regarding the potential of action research methodologies to democratically "reconstruct" the relationship between communities and universities on more equitable terms.

Situating their discussion of community engagement in the context of the increasing market-like orientation of higher education, Benneworth and Jongbloed (2010) suggest that the

emphasis on the commercial benefits of university research is redefining the "social contract" between universities and society. The problem this raises is that as higher education institutions "become increasingly dependent on market decisions and metric allocations rather than block grants [they] face an increasingly complicated choice of which stakeholders' interests to prioritise and how to reconcile contradictory interests" (Benneworth and Jongbloed, 2010, p. 570).

Although writing on international trends, Benneworth and Jongbloed draw upon evidence from the Canadian context. They discuss how, from the late-1990s, the Canadian federal government began to reinvest in universities, albeit on the specific precondition that increased funding be tied to a greater focus on societal and economic benefits.¹⁶ According to Benneworth and Jongbloed (2010), what emerged "from a lengthy discussion period was an agreement for universities to treble their societal impacts over a 5 year period in response to a doubling of funding" (pp. 573-574). Commenting upon how SSHRC has been active in countering the

¹⁶ It is important to place this development in the context of the budget cuts and period of sustained underfunding experienced by Canadian universities in the early to mid-1990s. For example, total federal spending on transfers to post-secondary education fell by 50 per cent between 1980-2000 (Ministry of Advanced Education, Training & Technology (1999), quoted in Newson & Polster (2002, p. 61)). In the mid-1990s, federal support for core university budget operations was reduced by \$10.6 billion over 4 years (Polster, 2007, p. 601). In total, the provinces lost \$14 billion (Shanahan & Jones, 2007). Shanahan and Jones (2007) detail how the budget deficit led to tuition increases, a decrease in university operating grants, and of how performance indicators were attached to a portion of institutional funding. In sum, Shanahan and Jones (2007) detail how fiscal restraint became the driving force behind the rationalization and planning of post-secondary education.

marginalization of the social sciences and humanities through a range of initiatives designed to demonstrate the value and benefit of the research it funds, Benneworth and Jongbloed (2010) discuss how the Community-University Research Alliance (CURA) program was launched precisely with this notion of "societal impact" in mind. In doing so, they discuss how the CURA program was conceived on a "relatively large scale" by Canadian standards, and particularly so in light of the preceding period of chronic underfunding in the early to mid-1990s (2010, p. 573). Given the importance attached to the CURA program by those I interviewed, and the extent to which it has been cited in the literature, I return to it in more detail in the next chapter.¹⁷

A political economy of community engagement

What the above literature highlights is the changing political economy of university research and its impact upon community-university engaged research. A political economy approach—conceived as a broad, multidisciplinary framework that studies the inter-relations of democratic processes and market forces—is useful for addressing the changing nature and structure of community-university partnerships. The utility of this approach lies in exploring how global shifts in research and funding policy are having transformative and decisive effects on the

¹⁷ It is also important to note what the effects of these cuts were for Canada's research councils and how they responded. A key development throughout the 1990s was the growth in interest in research partnerships. As support for researcher-initiated research fell throughout the early to mid-1990s, support for targeted and partnered research increased (Newson & Polster, 2001, p. 61). Across all three granting councils, federal support for strategic and partnership research grew at a faster rate than researcher-initiated research (Polster, 2004, p. 179).

university landscape (Rhoads & Torres, 2006). In particular, this approach helps to theoretically explicate contemporary modalities of community engagement within the context of the market and the idea of the knowledge economy—as it is in this manner that community-based research (CBR) has gained traction as a "research strategy of choice" (Roche, 2006, p. 2).

Peters (2003) suggests that only those who approach these issues from a political economy perspective come close to questioning the effects of the reorganization of research upon the performance of institutions and individuals. Agreeing with Peters (2007, p. 105), my view is that the extent to which the concept of the knowledge economy has become an educational policy template for many Western governments since the mid-1990s necessitates an interrogation of the market-driven contexts within which participatory and community-engaged research have become positioned within university modes of research governance. As I previously noted, Hall has acknowledged how market forces—operating through the workings of the knowledge economy—threaten to disrupt the movement towards a knowledge democracy.

Such concerns align with a wider body of critical scholarship focused on the marketization of the university.¹⁸ According to Slaughter & Leslie (1997, p. 2), as universities

¹⁸ In their widely-read book *Academic Capitalism*, Slaughter and Leslie (1997) present a comparative study of public policy in the United States, Australia, the United Kingdom, and Canada. Defining academic capitalism as "institutional and professorial market or market-like efforts to secure external moneys" (1997, p. 8), their main argument is that the decrease in block grants has prompted universities to seek out alternative sources of revenue generation. Newson and her various collaborators have effectively chronicled changes in the nature and structure of Canadian university organization and governance in the past 30 years. In *The University Means Business* (1988), Buchbinder and Newson focused on how throughout the 1980s university

have adopted market-driven models of governance, academics have become "state-subsidized entrepreneurs." Canadian universities have been more resistant to the pressures of commercialization, claim Slaughter and Leslie, primarily due to their decentralized nature and relative autonomy from government interference. Fuelled by federal funding initiatives implemented since late 1990s—Canadian academic institutions have increasingly engaged in market-like activities. During this time period, Grant and Drakich (2010, p. 21) describe how the federal government's commitment to "research innovation as a key driver of the knowledge economy, has been massive, affecting institutions and individuals in profound ways."¹⁹

research policy shifted to a market-oriented and commercially-based conceptualization of research. For example, the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 is seen as a starting point for intellectual property regimes and commercialization in research and development. The 1980s thus saw a significant increase in research collaborations between universities and industry. A decade later, in *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*, Currie and Newson (1998) presented an edited volume of essays addressing how managerialism, accountability, and privatization have altered the governance structure of universities.

¹⁹ Federal government funding declined from the early 1990s to 1998. Following the elimination of the deficit in 1997, the federal government began to reinvest in universities—and specifically in their research function. As this is described by Shanahan and Jones (2007), the federal government "shifted from simply sponsoring research activity, to providing major support for institutional and human resource research infrastructure." Although federal funding more than doubled between the years 1999-2004, it grew at a much slower rate of 11.3% between 2005 and 2011. In total, federal government cash transfers, measured as a proportion of GDP, declined by 50% during the period 1992-2013 (Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2013).

Shanahan and Jones (2007) describe how accountability frameworks and, by extension, university conduct and activities have increasingly come to be infused with market principles. The implications of these shifts at the institutional level has entailed "more targets to be met, more funds to be matched, more partners to be found, and more accountability plans to be submitted, as the government expands its mechanisms of control" (Shanahan & Jones, 2007). The relevance of these debates to community engagement is raised by Jones et al., (2012) in the claim that the "well documented rise of managerialism and regimes of accountability within and across national post-secondary systems" is decisively shaping conceptualizations of "relevance" and the social responsibility mandate of the university to society. Hall (2009) suggests that community engagement can strengthen the institutional democracy of the university in holding research accountable to a range of social and community objectives—but does holding research accountable to the community risk compliance with that same logic of accountability?

Highlighting such trends and issues is important, I believe, as the benefit of community-engaged research is increasingly positioned in terms of its practical utility wherein collaboration, participation, and engagement are tied to research deliverables, outcomes, and products.²⁰ I claim

²⁰ In her 1995 CSAA Presidential Address (1995), Newson claimed that the social sciences are being positioned alongside the natural sciences in that their use is seen as promoting economic growth and technological innovation. Newson cites the increase in SSHRC's targeted research programs which require researchers to partner with the "end-user" clients of research. Fuelled by the budget cuts of the mid-1990s, SSHRC thus began to follow the lead of NSERC in not only developing programs as a means of distributing funding but also in "narrowing the purposes of research to serve particular uses as they are defined by particular clients" (Newson 1995). Noting how the language of research outcomes, accountability, tracking, and products were becoming

that it is important to address how the economic and market-driven processes influencing the institutional and organisational relationships that frame the institutionalization of community-engaged research, as well as the managerial and market-driven practices they give rise to, inevitably impacts upon the nature of the research produced. In describing the "stake-holder society"—Jongbloed, Enders, and Salerno (2008, p. 313) note that "the growing chorus of universities as economic engines has elevated the debate beyond rhetoric and into the realm of policy action." Their concern is "an engaged university [may] be a driver of innovation but it may also be one that fosters the commoditization of higher education, placing the private character of higher education above the public good" (pp. 304-5).

Benneworth and Jongbloed (2010) suggest that "valorisation" is at the centre of debates on the future of academic research. In their view, "valorisation encompasses all activities that contribute to ensuring that the outcomes of scientific knowledge add value beyond the scientific domain" (p. 567). They claim that, despite the "rhetoric around valorisation through engagement with community stakeholders, there is no evidence to suggest that community engagement has taken the step analogous to that taken by commercialization" (p. 582). Rather, there is a need for the users of the knowledge of the social sciences and humanities to be "taken much more seriously as research users, partners, and ultimately stakeholders" (Benneworth & Jongbloed, 2010, p. 585). The contradiction that they identify is that although the valorisation of knowledge is intended to be broader than the commercialization of knowledge, it remains framed by "the rise of the hegemonic discourse of academic capitalism ... viewing academics as capitalists in the

embedded in SSHRC funding policy at this time, the value of Newson's work lies in how she highlights the positioning of the social sciences in the context of economic restructuring of higher education.

public sector" (p. 568). Finally, the expectation that universities be held accountable to social and economic needs in delivering more efficient "value for money" research has been influenced by the advent of the "new public managerialism (NPM)" (Robertson, 2010, p. 194; Benneworth, 2013). Emphasizing cost-cutting measures and institutional accountability by encouraging universities to pursue strategic and external partnership support, the NPM has been indicative of a neoliberal shift in social policy that reflects an ideological belief in the virtue and power of the free market.²¹

Community engagement at a crossroads

The issues raised in the literature and the implications for community-based research are twofold. On the one hand, as Winter et al. (2006) claim, community engagement "may temper neo-liberal policy through citizen engagement" (pp. 222-223). This is similar to the view expressed by Vaillancourt (2006), Hall (2009), Schensul (2010), and Mandell, King, Weiser, Preston, Kim, Luxton, Din, and Silver (2013) with regard to the democratic potential of community-based research. Mandell et al. (2013) suggest the "redemptive power" of community-university research partnerships can be found in their potential to offer resistance to "stale social policies." In other words, community-engaged research may very well help to bridge the divide between "town and gown" as community-based scholars become "problem-solving policy

²¹ As described by Benneworth (2013), "what the new public management seeks to do, however imperfectly, is to move beyond a situation where public bodies have no incentives or resources to innovate. This is achieved by placing bodies in a competition with other bodies for resources, and rewarding those institutions which achieve the best performance" (p. 311).

entrepreneurs" (Mandell, 2013, p. 8). As previously discussed, Hall takes this a step forward in his discussion of the knowledge democracy movement.

On the other hand, such engagement is vulnerable to being co-opted by a market-driven and entrepreneurial agenda in which the responsibility of the state is increasingly being downloaded to local and regional communities (Fallis, 2014; Jordan, 2003; Peacock, 2013). Writing on participatory action research, Cahill (2007, p. 269) suggests that the "rhetoric of participation has been appropriated in the neoliberal discursive emphasis on 'personal responsibility'." The issues such authors suggest is the one I have previously raised—that of reconciling the responsibility the university is seen to have in producing economically beneficial outcomes for the market while simultaneously being tasked with alleviating the excesses of the workings of the market.

Jordan (2003, p. 195) has claimed that participatory and community-based methodologies have moved from being marginal academic pursuits to gaining a degree of mainstream acceptance in ways that are potentially "antithetical to both [their] founding principles and traditions." Contrary to their points of origin, many paradigms of community-based research (of both action-oriented and participatory approaches) continue to be instigated from within the university, thereby largely facilitating the means by which conceptualizations of "engagement" and "collaboration" ultimately become operationalised. Jordan claims that the type of participatory research that community-based research typifies has gradually experienced a blunting of its critical and transformative potential as it moves from the margins of academic research practice closer to the mainstream. According to Flicker and Savan (2006, p. 27), the degree of participation varies so widely between projects that using the term CBR may well be

serving to obscure instances when the degree of participation is essentially rhetorical or tokenistic.

A more recent trend has been the "scaling up" of community-based research as practitioners increasingly seek to apply lessons learned in local settings to a global context. Watson (2008) claims that there is momentum behind the idea that universities should contribute to promoting democratic communities as well as participatory development on a global scale. The Knowledge Commons (KC) and GACER initiatives testify to this development. Yet, in an insightful overview of the historical and conceptual roots of community-based participatory methodologies, Wallerstein and Duran (2003) suggest that the scaling-up of community-based research is problematic given that so much depends upon relationship building and commitment at the local level. In particular, a major challenge lies in the potential limits of CBR "given the realities of globalization, the imposition of Western cultural and economic hegemony on the rest of the world, and the difficulties for local communities in making meaningful change" (Wallerstein & Duran, 2003, p. 44). As Singh (2007, p. 60) further notes, such endeavours may end up shaping the content of engagement in ways that prioritise the agendas of powerful stakeholders whose mandate is one of economic growth and national competitiveness, while minimizing those situated in the community spaces of civil society and whose priorities lie with achieving greater democratic inclusion and the advancement of social justice.

In the field of science and technology studies, Ansley and Gaventa (1997, p. 47) were among the first to note that participatory methods typically located at the margins of the academic mainstream were beginning to be embraced by such global institutions as the World Bank. While they claim that this is part of the democratization of research, Santos (2006, p. 87) suggests that the university is being transformed into a "global institution of action-research at

the service of global capitalism." In addition, D'Souza (2005) claims the knowledge produced in research partnerships with various communities is being used to advance "global governance in the wake of growing discontent over development and economic policy (p. 32). The fear is that, as Canadian scholars Brown and Stega (2006, p. 22) claim, universities may be reduced to being "think-tanks for knowledge production culminating in research methodologies, extractive in nature, which serve industry and business."²²

Writing in the context of the UK, Bunyan (2013, pp. 119-120) notes how "partnership" and "empowerment" operate as narratives "shaping assumptions about the nature of social change and the respective roles of the state, market and third sector" and have contributed to the depoliticizing of third sector practice. Echoing Bunyan (2013), I suggest that the danger for CBR is the incorporatization of community-based organisations into structures that redirect their activities away from the contestation of economic policy and issues of social justice—and

²² From the World Bank, to the IMF, to a range of NGOs, "participation" has become a required and ubiquitous component of evaluation, assessment, appraisal, and training (Bowd, Özerdem, & Getachew Kassa, 2010; Cooke & Kothari, 2001). Such transnational actors now routinely use the language of community development and participation in their operations—with the World Bank, in particular, devoting considerable energy to "participatory development" through such initiatives as the Comprehensive Development Framework, the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, and through joint programs such as the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) (World Bank, 1999; Robertson & Dale, 2008). Yet, as stated by Brydon-Miller, Greenwood, and Maguire (2003, p. 24) "while promoting participatory and action-oriented processes in the field, many development agencies remain hierarchical, rigid institutions with little sense of how to operate democratically and inclusively."

toward local service provision and policy recommendations. In this changing context, Drakich, Grant, and Stewart (2002) highlight how accountability initiatives in universities have been considerably less advanced when it has come to addressing the under-representation of marginalized and disadvantaged groups. In this, community-university research partnerships are positioned as "relevant" to society, and yet are increasingly constrained by the circumscribed economic and political spaces they are being shaped to inhabit. As Jongbloed, Enders, and Salerno (2008, p. 318) have noted, universities' quest for excellence has been gradually augmented, perhaps has even been overtaken, by their striving for relevance. Ostensibly committed to increasing community capacity and advancing the cause of social justice, participatory research partnerships are indicative of the manner in which such concepts as community, participation, and engagement are increasingly being operationalised within the ideological parameters of the market.²³

Writing in the context of community-university research partnerships, Shragge et al. (2006) situate such developments within the wider context of the neoliberal "re-discovery" of community by government, one which pushes community organizations into depoliticized roles wherein they act as veritable subcontractors for the state in delivering community-level services.

²³ Readings (1996) has critiqued how universities have come to use the language of "excellence" and "relevance" in an attempt to differentiate themselves through the market-driven logic that has taken hold in higher education. According to Readings (p. 12), "university mission statements, like their publicity brochures, share two distinctive features nowadays. On the one hand, they all claim that theirs is a unique educational institution. On the other hand, they all go on to describe this uniqueness in exactly the same way."

Dippo (2005, p. 91) suggests that community-university partnerships thus begin to work as a "neo-conservative fantasy" in which welfare mechanisms are gradually replaced by a culture of volunteerism at community level. In fact, the very conditions facilitating the possibility of successful community empowerment are themselves premised upon the prior existence of social and political networks conducive toward such empowerment. As such, community organizations who are able to draw upon existing social capital are better positioned to capitalize upon collaborative projects, whereas those without remain marginalized and without voice. As pointed out by Dewar (2005), such an approach invariably denies community planning assistance to those most in need of it. Miraftab (2004) argues that neoliberal discourse thus operates as an "authorizing narrative" linking the language of community empowerment and democratic participation in order to further the effects of its governance. Once the weapons of critique wielded by community activists, such concepts as "empowerment" and "inclusion" have now become the de-radicalized tools of the neoliberal trade.

Writing more broadly on the shifting historical role of the university in society, Delanty (2001, p. 112) suggests that the penetration of market principles into the domain of knowledge production amounts to the uncritical embrace of new managerial practices which coalesce to shape the "democratic" and "engaged" character of research. How community-based researchers may be subject to these managerial practices is a question I address in the following section.

Co-opting community-engaged research

Beyond exploring transformations in the nature and structure of community-university strategies of stakeholder engagement, what is typically missing from such accounts is how such changes are being experienced by community-based researchers (Moore & Ward, 2010).

Mirroring questions posed by Jongbloed, Enders, and Salerno (2008), is it the case that community-engaged researchers face an increasingly complicated choice of which stakeholders' interests to prioritise? How do they reconcile contradictory interests between institutional expectations and community expectations? In building upon the discussion of community engagement outlined above, I intend to use my interview data to explore a relatively unexamined aspect of research activity in Canadian universities. While there is a growing body of literature in Canada (and globally) on how best to advance the efficacy of community-engaged scholarship in applied settings, the positioning of such research activity in the context of the economic restructuring of the funding landscape has been a relatively unexplored area

Polster's work on the importance of research grants to Canadian universities makes it clear that the standing of researchers in their university (be they in the natural or social sciences) is increasingly based upon the relative financial contribution they make to it (Polster, 2007, p. 609).²⁴ In new and potentially problematic ways, claims Polster, the individual performance of

²⁴ I have found the work of Polster to be useful in establishing the context in which Canadian universities operate—while also providing valuable insight into some of the reasons why community engagement has been so readily taken up by universities. Polster's doctoral dissertation focuses on the changing social relations of Canada's three research councils (1994). She identifies two decisive shifts in research council funding policy. One is the increased centrality of university-based research to federal economic policy—as evident in the awarding of overall responsibility for the three granting councils to Industry Canada. The second development is the increasing presence of external influence into university policy-making decisions. According to Polster (2004, p. 182), both these shifts have promoted closer ties between universities and industry, advanced problem-based and team-based research activity,

researchers becomes tied to the overall performance of the university in a manner which leaves no researcher or institution untouched. The main point here is that the funding trends Polster explores shift the "gaze or orientation of all Canadian universities, encouraging them to take developments within the national university system into consideration in determining their future course" (2002, p. 202). A criticism I have of the applied literature on community-based research is that the focus on principles of "best practice" fails to adequately acknowledge how such practices are contextualized by these wider social and economic forces. For example, Neis (2010, p. 248) fears that community-university research partnerships have played the role of a "Trojan horse" in academe, muting criticism of the corporatization of the university. I believe that any discussion of research funding in Canada—even of the relatively modest funds allocated by SSHRC for community-engaged research—cannot be considered in isolation from these broader shifts. As Fisher and Rubenson (1998, p. 92) note, the increasingly permeable boundary between academic and corporate interests has been paralleled by a rise in the rhetoric of "community responsibility." Furthermore, Mandell et al. (2013) suggest that community-based, participatory methods are increasingly being co-opted to serve the interests of state and corporations.

In her critique of the increasing commercialisation and corporatization of the Canadian university, Polster (2002) highlights the service mission of the university and its obligation to be "equally attentive to the needs of a variety of social groups" (p. 289). Researchers involved in

and increased the commercialization of research and knowledge. Clearly evident in the "hard sciences" in relation to debates on intellectual property rights, Polster notes how the commercialization of knowledge produced in the social sciences and humanities was becoming "a growing concern of governments and others eager to 'capture the benefits' of university research" (2000, p. 23).

community-engaged research have typically done so due to a commitment to this obligation to the community. Indeed, as the literature has shown, they have often been marginalized in the academy as a result. In describing the transformed social and economic context for research, Polster raises the question of "rather than doing work simply because it seems necessary or valuable, faculty may be increasingly motivated to choose or design research projects based on how likely they are to be funded" (2002, p. 289). Describing how such funding imperatives impact upon those who work with community groups, Polster draws upon interview data to describe how several of her respondents referred to the growing disenchantment of their "community-oriented" colleagues (2007, p. 619). In their reflective piece on the nature of social work faculty, Canadian scholars Wehbi and Turcotte (2007) detail how the broader neoliberal climate means that academics are faced with the "choice" of abandoning community generated projects for ones that will be more fundable by traditional research grants and, therefore, more beneficial to their career trajectories.

As funding shifts towards more strategic and partnership initiatives, Polster fears that it may become more difficult for researchers to willingly pursue research questions that benefit disadvantaged groups who lack the organizational capacity to sponsor academic work (2004, p. 190; 2007, p. 611).²⁵ It is also worth noting that Polster (2005, p. 11) considers these changes to be not merely additive—in that they are additions to the traditional model of the university—but rather that they are transformative in that they are likely to radically reshape post-secondary

²⁵ Writing in *Academic Affairs*, Dufresne, (2010) suggests that "under pressure from government, SSHRC has morphed from a being a conduit for curiosity-based research to a conduit for collaborative projects that favour research of 'strategic importance'."

culture, governance, and the allocation of resources. Polster (2004, p. 186; 2007, p. 613) conjectures that academics "may also shift their own research foci in order to position themselves to link into strategic programs and avoid having their access to resources reduced." The result is that "academics may become less responsive to social groups and social needs which are more difficult to deliver or are less recognised as having value." The result of decisive structural changes in the nature of research funding, according to Polster (2004, p. 193; Newson & Polster, 2010), are possible functional and normative changes in the nature of Canadian university research and what it is that scholars do.

Polster (2007, p. 607) offers some evidential support for this. Based upon interviews with 25 university and government personnel, she has identified three ways in which researchers have responded to these changes in the nature and workings of the research landscape. One is compliance, as researchers figure out how to play by the new rules of the game. The second is withdrawal, a response more typical of senior scholars with less to lose by not applying for grants. Most infrequent is the third strategy—that of actively resisting and seeking to effect changes in funding policy. But is it the case that those involved in community-based research are adopting entrepreneurial strategies by which to advance their careers? Is it the case, as Currie (1998, p. 6) has previously warned, that the infusion of market values into the academy may lead to a shift from "scholar to entrepreneur" as academics became ever more strategic in their academic pursuits? Is it the case that micro-practices of compliance can occur alongside those of co-optation and/ or resistance? What types of scrutiny and pressures are community-based researchers exposed to given that their work is typically distant from a clearly identifiable commercialization-driven or market-oriented application?

Newson and Polster (2001, p. 58) claim that the erosion of academic autonomy is "incremental, consequential, and contingent. It includes micro-practices adopted by individual academics as they 'manage' their careers and intellectual commitments, as well as the collective practices of academic units and whole institutions as they shape and re-shape their priorities." Junior faculty are particularly vulnerable in this climate of scrutiny and managerialism as it shapes their emerging professional identities as "entrepreneurial academics" (Newson & Polster 2001, p. 60). In their case study of education faculty at the University of Ottawa, Chan & Fisher (2008) note that scholars are internalizing the logic of performance and enterprise culture. Can the same be said of community-based researchers? In their contribution to *The Exchange University*, Dillabough and Acker (2008) examined policy changes in teacher education and found an increasingly entrepreneurial emphasis in a field that has traditionally espoused an ethos of community engagement.

Community engagement and research capitalism

Commenting upon the reorganization of academic research in the "new economy," Jones et al. (2007) raise the question of how "we know surprisingly little of how all of these changes and pressures are experienced by faculty, librarians, and other academic workers within the university. While there is a handful of Canadian scholars in this area, there is a tremendous need for further study of academic work in Canada". Echoing Polster's (2007) concern that the public service mission of the university is being undermined, the result of these changes may be institutional "mission confusion" (Jongbloed, Enders, & Salerno 2008). According to Fesenfest (2010, p. 485), the importance of research dollars is distorting the institutional mission of the university and "the line increasingly blurs the requirement that universities serve a higher

purpose and in many ways research dollars alter the very composition of its faculty." It is this context that Polster (2007, p. 603) has described the emergence of a "new survivalism" in Canadian universities, one that is reverberating through all levels of academe. Changes in the research landscape, she argues, suggest a "new context, and a new state of mind, in which institutions and individuals are simultaneously more at risk and more open to new opportunities for advancement that they have been before." Researchers and academic institutions are seeking to remain "competitive" by responding as effectively as possible to "the perceived and actual desires of the granting councils and the federal government" (Polster, 2007, p. 606).²⁶

In focusing my dissertation more specifically on the social sciences, I am responding to a comment made by Polster (2007) that changes in the nature and structure of research funding may be more keenly felt in those areas (such as the social science and humanities) that have not traditionally experienced as much pressure to obtain research grants. This contention has found support in Coleman and Kamboureli's research (2011). Charting how SSHRC has nurtured "a new collective culture of 'research entrepreneurship'" they describe how faculty in the social

²⁶ The importance of research has also encouraged universities to invest more in research centres and units, which tend to be less expensive to operate than individual faculties and departments and more effective in terms of generating and managing grants. In Canada, a variety of programs and policies have been implemented to advance this agenda—most notably, substantial increases in "strategic" targeted research, investment in the National Centres of Excellence program (a tri-council initiative), the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and Canada Research Chairs (CRC) program, a range of initiatives centred on the commercialization of knowledge (Industry Canada), and a range of initiatives by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (Polster, 2007).

sciences are now under constant pressure to apply for grants (2011, p. xviii). Accordingly, the pressure placed upon individuals and institutions to attract funds has shifted the focus from a "broader academic capitalism to what we are calling *research capitalism*" (Coleman & Kamboureli, 2011, p. xvi). Such pressures are being now keenly felt in those areas of the humanities and social sciences that do not fit neatly into a "discovery-for-application" model of research practice. The result is a decline in "institutional democracy" (Polster, 2007, p. 614) as universities become more selective and strategic in responding to societal concerns. There is a clear discrepancy here with how proponents of community-engaged research—and those promoting the idea of the knowledge democracy—proclaim the possibility of achieving the opposite. There is a tension between the democratization of knowledge production in the university that the institutionalization of community engagement as a scholarly function promises, and the aligning of this process of knowledge production with market forces and outcomes. I argue that it is within this context that contemporary conceptualizations of community-university engagement must be understood.

While the work of Newson and Polster provides strong evidence for the expansion and entrenchment of the managerialism that has been developing in Canadian universities since the late 1980s, it remains occasionally exploratory and speculative. That being said, it also serves the crucial purpose of establishing a platform for others to build upon. Indeed, Polster explicitly situates her work as an invitation to do so, given that her approach is to explore "only tendencies and potentialities—not full blown trends or realities" (2007, p. 616). A more concentrated study on a key trend in the Canadian university landscape—that of the institutionalization of community-engagement—could reveal more about how such changes are being experienced by researchers.

Forward to the next chapter

To conclude this chapter, I will briefly restate two lines of inquiry. On the one hand, there are those who believe that community-university research engagement offers the possibility of "reconstructing" the links between community and campus in potentially more equitable and beneficial ways. Chan and Fisher (2008, p. 45) note that a university's commitment to revenue generation could also include "commitments to increased access for underserved populations and expansion of equity opportunities for women." Such views suggest there to be an increase in "institutional democracy" and possible advancement of the idea of the knowledge democracy movement (Hall, 2009; Schensul, 2010). On the other hand, there are those who fear that such collaborations risk being co-opted by market forces and the enveloping climate of research capitalism (Coleman & Kamboureli, 2011; Jordan, 2003; Peacock, 2013). These lines of inquiry provide the context for the discussion and analysis I present over the course of three findings chapters.

Chapter 3: Methods and Methodology

This chapter provides an overview of my methods of data collection and discussion of methodology. The research design is qualitative in approach and the primary method of data collection is interviews. I draw extensively upon my interview data in the following three findings chapters. I also draw upon a selection of documents relevant to community-engaged research in Canada—such as university mission and policy statements, funding descriptions, and research council policy statements and documents. These documents are used to contextualize the interview data in the presentation of the findings. First, the criteria used in the selection of the interview sample are discussed. Differences in the sample are described and an overview of the respondents is provided. Second, the interview process and some ethical concerns are discussed. Third, I describe how I made sense of my data using a thematic analysis and highlight some challenges arising from this approach. Fourth, documents drawn upon in the analysis are discussed. I conclude with some comments on what it means to reflect upon the language and "discourse" of community engagement.

The chapter is supplemented by two appendices which provide additional contextual information on my respondents and the universities they are faculty members of. *Appendix A: Faculty Portraits* describes the scholarly and research activities of the respondents in the form of a brief faculty biography. *Appendix B: University Profiles* includes a description of the community-engaged research activities of the universities my respondents are affiliated with, including some details of relevant reports and institutional mission statements. Additional

appendices include *Appendix C: Interview Questions*, *Appendix D: Informed Consent Form* and *Appendix E: Description of Research Topic for Respondents*.

Interview sample selection

In my introduction to the dissertation, I claim that a relatively unexplored question is how scholars committed to community-based research are experiencing the institutionalization of community engagement. Beyond exploring the transformations in the nature and structure of community-university strategies of stakeholder engagement that I address in my literature review—what is typically missing from such accounts is how such changes are being experienced by community-based researchers. In seeking answers to my research questions, my first task was to identify individuals who could act as informants. It is important that there be common ground amongst the sample of respondents with regard to their interest and knowledge of my research topic, but also that they bring a range of different perspectives to bear on my research questions. My intention was to select a variety of respondents with expertise on a range of issues pertaining to the research landscape of community-engaged research. In total, I interviewed 35 respondents affiliated with ten different universities.

Participants were chosen for the study using a purposive sampling method. The basic claim of purposive sampling is that participants are selected to fit the purposes of the study. While all sampling in qualitative research can be said to be purposive, in the sense that information-rich participants are selected purposefully to fit the needs of the study (Coyne, 1997, p. 627), purposive (or non-probability) sampling takes this a step further in selecting participants based on specific criteria. This form of "criterion sampling" involves selecting informants who meet a particular criterion and who have characteristics relevant to the research (Patton, 2001).

Central to purposive sampling is the idea that the social location of the participant is important, and that a well-placed informant will often advance the research far better than a random sample (Palys, 2008). The rationale behind a purposive sampling strategy is the assumption, based upon a theoretical understanding of the topic being studied, that certain categories of individuals may hold important and insightful perspectives on the questions under investigation (Robinson, 2014). Seeking appropriate informants, however, requires preparation as the researcher must have knowledge of the area under investigation before sampling the targeted population in order to find knowledgeable and reliable participants (Tongco, 2007, p.151). This approach also acknowledges that, as the study progresses, new categories may be discovered which would lead the researcher to modify the sampling process and seek additional participants (Coyne, 1997).

Limitations of purposive sampling. Purposive sampling can be accused of researcher bias and subjective judgment because informants may be chosen out of convenience or as a result of interviewee snowballing (i.e., through the recommendation of previous participants). In addition, the researcher must be cognizant of possible biases on the part of the chosen participants. However, this subjective component of purposive sampling is only a disadvantage when selection criteria are poorly conceived and in cases where the selected interview sample have not been based on clear criteria. In my study, the sample is not intended to be representative of all community-engaged scholars. Rather, participants were carefully and deliberately chosen due to the information and/or knowledge (based on their social location) they are able to bring to bear on the research questions. Below, I provide an overview of how my sample selection criteria developed.

Respondents identified from the literature. My knowledge of the literature and of developments in the field of community-engaged research helped me to identify potential informants. A number of scholars (seven) included in the final sample have published critical and/or reflexive work commenting upon the state of health of community-engaged and/or community-based research in the Canadian context. Typically, such scholars are active participants in a number of collaborative and/or community-based research projects with long-standing ties to a broad range of community groups, organizations, and agencies. The interest they have in community-engaged research beyond their own specific research areas, and the fact that such respondents are cognizant of key trends and issues impacting the research landscape, make them ideal interview candidates for my project. In drawing upon the literature, therefore, I am building upon and seeking to extend the probability sampling technique that informs the work of Flicker and Savan (2006) in their survey of CBR scholars in Canada.

Respondents familiar with the funding landscape. Given the importance of looking at the effects of shifts in the funding landscape to my research topic, I sought to interview scholars with an established track record of involvement in funded community-engaged research and familiarity with the application process. Not only would such interview candidates have knowledge specific to the workings of the grant system—they would potentially have knowledge and insight specific to key trends and issues with regard to the funding landscape more generally.

The SSHRC awards database was my first point of departure when identifying potential interviewees. This makes sense in light of the central role that the CURA program played in the institutionalization of community engagement in Canadian universities. I searched through the SSHRC awards database for CURAs funded between 1998-2010 and—following the renewal of

SSHRC's program architecture in 2010—the database for the awards of research partnership grants from 2011-2013. The database provides records of applicants who received a CURA grants/ CURA development grants—and Partnership Grants/ Partnership Development Grants²⁷. My final sample includes seven individuals who have been principle investigators of CURA research projects—and several others listed on the SSHRC CURA award results as either co-investigators (six) or collaborators (eight). Included are respondents who applied in the first round of CURA grants in 1998-1999, as well as respondents who applied in the final round.

Following the renewal of their funding programs in 2010, SSHRC introduced priority areas for their research partnership grants (which were not present in the CURA program). In light of this, I modified my selection to secure a more balanced sample of respondents that includes at least one scholar working in each of the priority areas. Although all scholars included in the final sample have obtained funding of some sort, there is a wide range of experience in terms of frequency and amount of funding received. Some are or have been principle investigators of CURA and/or SSHRC Research Partnership projects, whereas others have experience of obtaining more modest amounts of funding from a range of sources.

²⁷ The SSHRC Program Architectural Renewal in 2010 transformed the existing granting structure into new funding streams recognizing collaborative and interdisciplinary research. Throughout its funding architecture, SSHRC seeks an equitable distribution of awarded funds across provinces. There is some variation in terms of provincial priorities due largely to the geographic, demographic, and economic specificities of different parts of Canada. In all interviews, I asked informants to comment upon the extent to which they thought key issues and trends impacting community-engagement varied between provinces and across Canada.

Developing the sample

Important as it is to speak with individuals who have knowledge and experience of the funding landscape, my intention was not solely to procure a sample of candidates with successful track records of applying for and obtaining funding—but rather to secure a purposive sample illustrative of a broader spectrum of experiences. I went about this in a number of ways.

First, I interviewed a number of individuals involved with and knowledgeable about key initiatives focused on community-engaged research in the Canadian context—such as the Ottawa-based pan-institutional network *Community-Based Research Canada* (CBRC), the Guelph-based *Institute for Community-Engaged Scholarship* (ICES), the pan-institutional knowledge mobilization unit *Research Impact* (RI), and the University of Victoria-based *Institute for Studies and Innovation in Community-University Engagement* (ISICUE) (formerly known as the Office of Community-Based Research). The final sample includes one respondent centrally involved in each of these initiatives—although several other respondents are more loosely affiliated.

Second, I attended and participated in the launch of the pan-Canadian *Knowledge Commons Summit* held on June 2nd at the L'Université du Québec à Montréal in 2010 (<http://knowledgecommons.ning.com/>). Events such as the *Knowledge Commons* were important in shaping my focus early on in the research process as it gave me opportunity to speak with a broad spectrum of researchers in a more informal setting. In attendance at the launch were a diverse group of approximately 120 individuals ranging from (predominantly) university-based community-engaged scholars—but also research council representatives, members of civil society organizations (CSOs), representatives of university administrations and members of the

public. I later interviewed one respondent with a central involvement in organizing this initiative, although I also had a number of useful and informative informal conversations with attendees (including participation in "break-away" discussion groups).

Third, I regularly attended any events relevant to community-based research and/or knowledge mobilization in the greater Toronto area—and later sought to interview a number of community-based scholars participating in these events. Such opportunities also illustrate the occasionally serendipitous nature of the research process. For example, following my attendance at a seminar on connecting research with communities, I scheduled an interview with an individual working in the area of knowledge mobilization (Paul). This interview led to an introduction to the senior research officer (Laura) for the social sciences and humanities—and an interview with this individual concluded with an invitation to attend an internationally broadcast "webinar" on civil society research engagement. The webinar, which included research officers from the social sciences and humanities faculties, provided an opportunity to sit in on a post-webinar debate with research officers about developments in the field regarding possible future directions for their university-based researchers.

Fourth, a number of interviews (five) were conducted following the recommendation of a previous interviewee. Methodologically, this introduced an element of "snow-balling" into the research sample selection.

I also reviewed the content of relevant conference websites, on-line community-based websites, and subscribed to a number of relevant networking sites such as the *Toronto Community Based Research Network* (<http://torontocbr.ning.com/>) and the *Knowledge Commons* forum. It was through these strategies that I came to realize that—although the majority of those in my sample selection are based in three universities in Toronto (University of Toronto, York

University, and Ryerson University)—their experiences are generally commensurate with broader Canadian trends regarding community engagement. While there are differences between provinces in terms of specific research areas as determined by demographic characteristics, rural/ urban specificities, and prevailing jobs/ industries markets, and so on, my intention was to interview a purposive, rather than comprehensive, selection of community-engaged scholars. My interest is in exploring broader trends in the research landscape as opposed to the specificities of the actual research my interviewees conduct—and there is little in my research findings to indicate there to be significant differences with regard to broader trends.

Finalizing the sample

Following the identification of approximately 50 potential respondents as based on the criteria outlined above, I obtained additional information by looking at university faculty websites and/or any on-line presence an interviewee had. These more detailed and specific searches revealed potential respondents to be active participants in a range of academic and non-academic activities that addressed the theme of community-engagement in a variety of ways—such as publications, conferences, seminars, public talks, and a range of other university and community events. These on-line biographical details indicate that several interviewees have extensive experience working in the civil society sector, in municipal or provincial government and/or as community advocates or activists. Several respondents are or were directors and/ or chairs of research units and, therefore, seemingly well positioned to speak knowledgeably on broad shifts in the research landscape. I eventually narrowed the list to 40 before conducting 35 interviews (details of the interview process are below). I am confident I have recruited a sample

of informants able to comment with authority on the various twists and turns in the Canadian funding landscape that are central to my research focus.

Limitations of the sample

My interest in interviewing scholars with a history of involvement in the practice and politics of funded collaborative research projects led me to focus on (predominantly) tenured faculty members. Although SSHRC funding is open to non-tenured and non-tenure track faculty, it is generally the case that those most experienced and knowledgeable on the topics I am interested in are tenured—most typically at the level of associate professor (see Mendygral, Omari, Trost, & Vu, 2012, p. 12). The final sample is composed of 23 women and 12 men, including four at the level of assistant professor, 19 at the level of associate professor, eight at level of professor (including one at the level of emeritus). Four individuals worked in non-academic positions. Of these, two were directors of research institutes, one works in the field of knowledge mobilization and one in research administration.

By limiting my focus to community-engaged scholars in the social sciences (and as I address in my literature review) I am responding to a comment made by Polster (2007) that changes in the nature and structure of research funding may be more keenly felt in those areas (such as the social sciences) that have not traditionally experienced as much pressure to obtain such funding. Scholars working in the social sciences also tend to be amongst those most committed to bridging the divide between "town and gown." My focus on the social sciences rather than humanities reflects their prominence in statistics for funding awards. In terms of discipline cluster, 114 out of 151 applications for partnership grants in 2011-2012 were made from the social sciences (75.5%) —of which 16 received awards (a success rate of 14%). This

compares with 21 applications made from humanities (13.9%) of which five awards were made (a success rate of 23.8%). Interdisciplinary applications totaled 16 (10.6%) of which 4 received awards (a success rate of 25%). In the funding year 2012-2013, 67 out of the 100 applications (67%) were made from the social sciences, ten of which received awards (a success rate of 14.9%). This compares with 21 applications made from humanities (13.9%) of which five awards were made (a success rate of 23.8%). Interdisciplinary applications totaled 12 (12%) of which five received awards (a success rate of 41.6%). The overall funding success rate was 20%.

Finally, I did not conduct any interviews with scholars working in universities in Quebec. This is due to the fact that community engagement, particularly with regard to traditions of service-learning and research on the social economy, first began to be institutionalized in Quebec in the early 1970s and is relatively well documented in the literature (Bussi eres, Dumais, Fontan, Lapierre, Shields, Sutton, & Vaillancourt, 2008; Hall & MacPherson, 2011; Graham, 2014; Vaillancourt, 2005). As documented by Vaillancourt (2005, p. 65), since 1972 UQAM has adopted an approach of academics working in partnership with community agencies and organizations (e.g., labour, women's groups, NGOs) when conducting research and training. In 1979, L'Universit e du Qu ebec   Montreal (UQAM) adopted its corporate policy of providing "community services" whereby community services officially became the "third component" of academic work along with research and teaching (Graham, 2014). Given this existing acceptance of community engagement, the Quebec experience has some distinctive aspects that set it apart when compared to the "renewal" and institutionalization of community engagement currently taking place in universities in other parts of Canada. Nevertheless, I did avail of the opportunity to become more familiar with the nature of community engagement in Quebec by attending and participating in the launch of the *Knowledge Commons* initiative at UQAM in June 2010.

Sample differences in university sample. The ten institutional affiliations of the respondents break down as follows—a total of 12 scholars worked at York University (Toronto), six at the University of Toronto, four at Ryerson University (Toronto), three at the University of British Columbia, two at the University of Victoria (British Columbia), and one a-piece at Memorial University (Newfoundland), Wilfrid Laurier (Waterloo, Ontario), the University of Guelph (Guelph), Carleton University (Ottawa), and McMaster University (Hamilton). One interview was conducted with a director of research at a community-based institute in Toronto, and two were conducted with individuals working in research administration at York University.

Eleven interviews were conducted with scholars working in universities outside of the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) in order to broaden the range of the sample and to counter any potential Toronto-centric focus. Universities in Ontario (mostly in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA)) dominate the sample—for two reasons. First, Clark et al. (2009) argue that the advent of the research university, and accompanying financial pressures placed on universities to obtain research grants, have been more intensely felt by universities in Ontario than elsewhere. According to the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Expert Consultation Paper (2012), 43% of all research conducted in Canadian universities takes place in Ontario. Second, educational institutions in Ontario dominate in terms of the overall number of applications for SSHRC partnership grants. Of the applications received by SSHRC in 2011-2012, 52 out of 151 grant applications were from Ontario (34.5% of all applications) and ten were funded—a success rate of 19.2% (compared with an overall success rate of 16.6%). The following year, 2012-2013, 40

applications were received from applicants in Ontario (40% of all grant applications) and ten were funded—a success rate of 25% (an overall success rate of 20%).²⁸

Sample differences in disciplinary field. Scholars working in education, social work, and health related-fields of study feature prominently in the sample, being disciplinary areas most typically involved in community-engaged activities. According to Wade and Demb (2009, p. 11), faculty socialized into community and/or service-orientated fields of the social sciences are far more likely to engage in community-engaged scholarship (including service-learning) than faculty in the hard sciences, the humanities, and those working in areas of business and economics. The disciplinary areas of those interviewed breaks down as follows—education (eight), social work (six), sociology (three), health studies (three), politics and public administration (three), environmental studies (two), and one in each of psychology, political science, geography, child and youth studies, and community and regional planning.

These areas are also relatively representative of the distribution of recent rounds of research funding awards for SSHRC Research Partnership grants. In terms of application disciplines in 2011-2012, 20 applications were made from scholars working in faculties of education (two funded), eight in social work (three funded), 13 in sociology (two funded), 13 in

²⁸ Ontario universities were also well presented in the award of partnership development grants. In 2011-2012, 61 out of 153 applications (39.8%) were awarded in institutions in Ontario, 21 of which received a development grant for their partnership (a success rate of 34.4% compared to the overall success rate of 36.9%). This compares with 24 applications from universities in British Columbia (15.6%) of which eight were successful (a success rate of 33.3%). Universities in Quebec made 26 applications (16.9%), 14 of which were funded (a success rate of 53.8%).

environmental/ urban studies (four funded), nine in psychology (one funded), 13 in economics (one funded), and 16 applications were interdisciplinary (four funded). The following year, in 2012-2013, 12 applications were made from scholars working in faculties of education (two funded), nine in sociology (two funded), two in psychology (none funded), two in social work (none funded), seven in environmental/ urban studies (none funded), three in economics (one funded), and 12 applications were interdisciplinary (five funded). My specific interest in interviewing scholars who incorporate a social justice orientation in their work also explains the dominance of fields of education, social work, and health.²⁹

Differences in types of research projects. Respondents differ in terms of the types of research projects they are involved with. Several respondents are involved in direct community action projects that involve working closely with disadvantaged social groups. Others are more engaged in network and/or research capacity building activities at the institutional and/or organizational level and some are involved in both types of projects—although it should be noted that the different kinds of projects that respondents are involved with are by no means mutually exclusive. For example, participation in a CBR project with a grassroots, activist agenda is not incompatible with participation in the development of a research network that aims to build

²⁹ When looking at the figures for partnership development grants in 2011-2012, applications from partnerships in education were dominant (18), followed by interdisciplinary studies (16), urban and environmental studies (16), political science (15), and sociology or social work (10). In 2012-2013, applications from partnerships in education were dominant (29), followed by interdisciplinary studies (nine), urban and environmental studies (17), and sociology or social work (16).

research capacity and advance the institutional standing of community engagement in universities. What largely unifies the activities of respondents is the interest they have in advancing the democratic potential of community-engaged research, a challenge they address in a variety of ways.

In the presentation of my research findings, I include some detail of the various types of research projects my respondents are typically involved in, in order to better contextualize their perceptions of the research landscape. Given my overall interest in broad trends in community engagement, these details typically emphasize the general approach of respondents to their research rather than the specific nature of their research projects. This approach is reflected in the types of questions I asked respondents during interviews (see Appendix C) in that respondents were asked about general trends in the research landscape rather than the specific nature of their research.

Gender and language differences in the sample. There are more women (23) than men (12) in the sample. To a large extent, this is illustrative of broader trends in community-engaged scholarship. The Community-Based Research Canada (CBRC) network has an executive membership currently consisting of seven women and one man—and Mryer (2013) points out that the six founders of the Canadian Alliance for Community Service Learning (CACSL) are women and that the current steering committee is composed entirely of women. In terms of the literature, Wade and Demb (2009) and Antonio, Astin, and Cress (2010) have noted that women and faculty of colour are more likely to participate in community-engaged research activities than white faculty. Not only are women over-represented when compared to men, Wade and Demb (2009) point out that women are far more likely than men to teach a course that includes a

community-engaged or service learning component, and O'Meara (2002) found that 90% of faculty involved in service learning were women.

My sample is a little more balanced in terms of its gender composition. To this end, it should be noted that these gender differences are much less pronounced when looking at recent successful applicants for SSHRC research partnership grants. For example—of 157 applications to partnership development grants in 2012-2013, 73 (46.5%) were female (30 received a development grant), 83 (52.8%) were male (28 received a grant), and one was unknown. This entailed a success rate of 41.1% for women and 33.7% for men. Out of 153 applicants the previous year 2011-2012, 53 (47.7%) were female and 80 (52.3%) were male—leading to a success rate of 46.6% for women and 47.5% for men.

Finally, all my respondents spoke English as their primary language. This generally reflects the dominance of English as the first language in those making grant applications. In 2011-2012, the main application language was English in 141 out of 153 applications (92.1% overall). In 2012-2013, 133 out of 157 applications were made in English (84.7% overall).

Sample size in comparative context. The sample size is comparable to a number of complementary studies that help to contextualize and inform my approach. Focusing on the emergence of bonds of solidarity in the research process, Ritchie and Rigano (2007) interviewed 24 U.S. based academic researchers in an interpretive analysis of the collaborative research experiences of qualitative researchers from two contrasting research teams in North America and Australia. Addressing the institutional uptake of community engagement in American universities, Moore and Ward (2010) interviewed twenty community-focused faculty members at fifteen research-focused universities in the U.S. Although they comment briefly upon the rhetoric

versus the reality of community engagement, their study is largely focused on how to best advance its institutionalization by changing university policies and practices so as to better recognize and reward community-engaged scholarship. In the Canadian context, Polster (2007) conducted 25 interviews with academics, graduate students, university administrators, and government officials to explore the importance of research grants to universities. Also in Canada, Dzisah (2010) interviewed 14 academics in the hard sciences to explore their mindset regarding working directly with industrial partners and the "capitalization of knowledge."

I found Grant and Drakich's (2009) analysis of the Canada Research Chair program to be a useful point of reference. Grant and Drakich explore the relatively unexamined aspect of how individual academics are experiencing the changing research landscape. Using what they describe as a "person-oriented" approach, they conducted 60 interviews with Canada Research Chairs. Their analysis is directed to the "intersection of the personal and the social structural" (2009). My interest in linking the experience of my respondents with the enveloping political economy of the landscape of community-engaged research is comparable in approach.

Conducting the interviews

Requests for an interview were conducted by email or phone but also in person where opportunity arose. It quickly became apparent that my topic was one that researchers are willing and eager to discuss (see Appendix E). Responses varied from outright enthusiasm to clear indication of interest. Out of 40 individuals contacted, one declined—recently retired, the individual suggested I contact the person who had replaced them as principle investigator of a large collaborative project they had initiated (this individual failed to reply to my request for an interview). In total, three individuals failed to respond at all (all University of Toronto scholars),

and two expressed interest but the interviews could not be scheduled due to timing and workload issues. Following the completion of each interview, I offered to share the research findings with each individual.

The majority of the face-to-face interviews took place at the desk of those interviewed, occasionally in an adjoining conference room or, depending on the preference of the interviewee, in a less formal environment such as a cafe. Ten interviews took place over the phone. The interviews lasted between 50-120 minutes, although the vast majority took approximately 60 minutes. All interviews began with a brief overview of my research area and question topics followed by an explanation of the purpose of the ethical consent form. A brief description of my research project was always forwarded in advance. One individual requested an e-mailed copy of the questions in advance. On two occasions, an interviewee requested additional clarification about the precise nature of the project following my verbal description of it. When necessary, respondents were contacted afterwards by email or by phone if a point of clarification was required. All respondents indicated a willingness to take part in a further conversation if requested.

Six preliminary interviews were conducted with scholars involved in community-engaged research at my home institution. This made sense as York University has been actively positioning itself as an "engaged university" (see the entry for York in Appendix B on *University Profiles*). The data collected during these preliminary interviews seemed promising and encouraged me to conduct an additional five interviews with York scholars—some of which were based on the recommendation of a previous respondent. Ten interviews were conducted with scholars at the other two universities in Toronto—Ryerson (four interviews) and the University of Toronto (six interviews). One interview was conducted with the director of a

research and policy institute in Toronto—and an additional two with individuals working in research administration at my home institution. This made sense as these two universities (along with York University) coexist within the same geographical region and yet offer contrasting institutional mandates and approaches to community engagement. Following these interviews, I conducted an additional 11 interviews with scholars based in universities in different cities in Canada.

Interview questions

Using a semi-structured interview approach, interviewees were invited to comment on a range of issues with regard to my research focus. A sample question guide is provided in *Appendix C: Interview Questions*. Given that I had familiarized myself with the work and activities of each respondent before the interview, I occasionally tailored specific questions a little for individuals depending on their experience of working in a particular context. Not only did I find this approach to be beneficial in building a rapport with respondents, it also facilitated a more focused and rewarding discussion in the limited time available.

I approached the development of the interview guide as a process of selecting frameworks, perspectives, and categories which served to address a range of interlocking aspects of the overarching research questions. Adapted from the approach taken by Cole & Knowles (1993)—categories of technical, procedural, ethical, and political issues initially guided the interview design. For instance, technical questions sought factual information on specific initiatives or particular institutional policies, whereas procedural questions sought to explore specific aspects of the research or funding process. Other questions invited respondents to reflect upon what they perceived to be the effects of shifts in the research landscape and their potential

implications. Broadly, questions focused on the respondent's perceptions of the following four areas: (1) The overall "state of health" of the practice of community-engaged research. (2) Key trends and developments with regard to funding bodies and institutional uptake of community engagement. (3) Challenges and roadblocks to community-engaged scholarship, and (4) the response of scholars to shifts in the research landscape.

The interview process

Using interviews to conduct an immanent critique of community engagement potentially runs the risk of organizing the claims of participants in a teleological manner—that is, in ways that simply confirm a negative appraisal of the institutionalization of community engagement (Mykhalovskiy et al., 2008, p. 200). Anticipating this, I undertook a number of strategies to counter this risk. First, I ensured variation in the sample, a strategy accomplished through the purposive selection of a range of informants (as detailed previously). Second, I chose an interviewing technique and style that encouraged participants to speak as freely as possible about their experiences. For example, interviews typically began with general, open-ended questions exploring informants' views on key trends in community engagement. Interviews then proceeded to explore aspects of these initial responses, variously and to different degrees touching upon the format of my interview questions. Positioning the interview process as an iterative, dialogical, and dynamic encounter—this approach was intended to draw upon the repertoire of knowledge that the interviewees possess with regard to their respective disciplinary fields and research specializations.

Throughout the interviews, I drew upon a form of "active interviewing" as characterized by Holstein and Gubrium (1997). In attempting to bring the research agenda to bear in a dialogic

and non-directive manner, Holstein and Gubrium (1997) suggest that the aim of the interviewer "is not to dictate interpretation, but to provide an environment conducive to the production of the range and complexity of meanings that address relevant issues, and not be confined to predetermined agendas" (p. 123). In practice, this involves the interviewer "intentionally provoke(ing) responses by indicating, even suggesting, narrative positions, resources, orientations and precedents" (Holstein & Gubrium, 1997, p. 123). In doing so, I occasionally drew upon narrative positions or orientations raised in previous interviews, or which emerged from the literature, as a way to provoke further discussion with respondents on the topics at hand.

With this in mind, the questions formulated in the original sample guide were sometimes posed in declarative, argumentative, or interrogative form. In a sense, this involves acknowledging the reflexive positioning of the interviewer as the co-creator of the interview narrative in which a particular interpretation is ultimately "negotiated" with the respondent. Ritchie and Rigano (2006, p. 135) suggest active interviewing to be an interpretive process in which meaning is co-constructed between interviewer and respondent.

Ethical concerns in the interview process. The interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed shortly after the interview took place. In line with the Tri-Council Code of Ethics, all interviews were conducted with an assurance of confidentiality (see *Appendix D: Consent Form*). I have used a pseudonym for each respondent. In the presentation of the interview data, and particularly in the *Faculty Portraits* appendix, I have tried to provide as much detail as possible regarding the social location of my informants without revealing their identity. When in doubt, I have erred on the side of caution and omitted details which might make it easy to identify respondents (I have taken out details of their institutional affiliation). In practice, this

approach provides respondents with an assurance of confidentiality, albeit without a guarantee of absolute anonymity. I communicated this to respondents before the commencement of each interview and stated that I would contact them at a future point if I had any doubt as to the assurance of confidentiality. This aspect of the interview process generally went smoothly given that nearly all respondents (being researchers themselves) were familiar with the ethical consent form process. Only one respondent expressed concern about the assurance of anonymity—requesting that their views were "off the record" and should not to be quoted.

Making sense of the data

Following transcription of the interviews, I conducted a thematic analysis of the transcripts in order to identify and record prominent and recurring patterns and themes with regard to the question areas (Boyatzis, 1998). Thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analyzing, and discussing patterns and themes in relation to data—essentially an interpretative process of "meaning-making" in which key themes and sub-themes are identified and assigned codes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). I consider this approach to be a good one for my topic as it asserts the active role that the researcher plays in identifying patterns and key themes. The approach affords a greater degree of theoretical and analytical freedom as opposed to a more inductive "grounded-theory" orientation to the interview data (Reissman, 2008). Prior to conducting the interviews I had some themes in mind which I thought might occur in my interview transcripts, as based upon my review of the literature and other relevant studies (McRae, 2009). The analysis confirmed some of these while also generating a range of new themes. In conducting the thematic analysis, the importance of a theme is not necessarily dependent on how often it occurs or how long respondents spend talking about it—but more so

whether it captures something important in relation to the overall research topic and questions (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The quotes selected for inclusion in the presentation of my findings and analysis highlight general patterns and key themes as opposed to being representative of the actual distribution of key themes (in terms of how many respondents spoke on specific issues and how frequently specific themes occurred).

After I had organized the information gathered in interviews according to key themes and sub-themes, I began to make sense of the data by asking a series of questions. What information relates directly to the research questions? What main points or themes relating to respondents' experiences appear? What new ideas or themes are identified? Gradually, my orientation to the data became that of sensitizing my analysis to how interviewees address key themes and alternately comply with, co-opt, or resist key trends and shifts with regard to the research landscape. An example of this is the case of a community-based scholar who dislikes what they perceive to be the overly formalistic language of research "partnership"—preferring instead to speak of research "collaboration"—and yet uses the language of partnership when dealing with funding agencies and the university administration. This suggests that a combination of co-optation and resistance often co-exist in how a particular discourse is mobilized—insofar as the language of "partnership" is co-opted for the purposes of a grant application but dropped shortly afterwards. As much as possible, I tried to sensitize my analysis to these kinds of strategies in the interview narratives. This is not so much an attempt to explore the subjective interpretations of respondents in regard to key issues and trends—but rather an attempt to attend to the broader context that assists in shaping "personal" accounts (Reissman, 2008).

Challenges in thematic analysis. A challenge when conducting the interviews lay in trying not to introduce pre-determined categories or narrative positions for interviewees to potentially replicate—while taking care to note how such categories or positions were introduced, addressed, and discussed by interviewees themselves (Mykhalovskiy & McCoy, 2002, p. 26). In particular, I am interested in exploring the contradictions between individual and institutional conceptualizations of community engagement. Following Grant & Drakich (2009), this acknowledges the intersection between levels of the personal and the social-structural. To this end, interviewee perceptions are situated in terms similar to Gramsci's characterization of the social subject as a "composite personality"—in which the "multi-faceted nature of consciousness is not an individual but collective phenomenon, a consequence of the relationship between the "self" and the ideological discourses which compose the cultural terrain of a society" (Hall, 1996, p. 433). As stated by Chiapello and Fairclough (2002, pp. 193-194)—"social actors acting within any field or organization produce representations of other practices, as well as ("reflexive") representations of their own practice in the course of their activity and different social actors will represent them differently according to how they are positioned within fields or organizations." As such, they draw our attention to how individual perceptions are illustrative of the enveloping institutional and/or organizational context. This can be seen in discussions focused on the purpose and process of community-engaged research—particularly in terms of what interviewees perceive it to mean to themselves, their university administrations, SSHRC, the federal government, the public, and so on.

Documents

I consulted a number of documents as part of the research process which influenced and helped to contextualize the analysis of my interview data. These range from university mission statements and white papers on community engagement to research council policy statements and funding descriptions. I was particularly interested in how these documents and policy statements position and conceptualize community-engagement—and how such positioning frames the value of community engagement through the utilization of the language of relevance, accountability, benefit, and so on. I am interested in exploring how such framing supports the institutionalization of community engagement by providing a formalized and legitimizing framework for the allocation and distribution of funding and resources. The findings chapters (particularly chapter 4) compare the individual conceptualizations of community-engaged research which emerge from the interviews with these institutional/ organizational conceptualizations.

Several of the documents are research council documents, including a selection of SSHRC annual reports dating from 1998-2013, Strategic Plans (e.g., *Knowledge Council: SSHRC 2006-2011* (2005), *Framing Our Direction 2010-2012* (2010)), program and funding descriptions (such as SSHRC's CURA program), commissioned reports and evaluations (e.g., CURA reports) and various press releases. SSHRC documents present a homogenous and somewhat monolithic view of the research landscape in which antagonistic elements are downplayed or excluded. As such, I am cognizant of the tendency to write particular documents for specific audiences and that this influences the framing of key issues and topics.

Documents on the "scaling-up" of community-engaged research include the *Global Alliance of Community-Engaged Research* (GACER 2008), *Community-Engaged Research: a*

Step Forward—as drafted by the Forum for a New World Governance (see Lobera, 2009). These texts gesture to how emergent conceptualizations of community-engaged research are becoming "re-contextualized" in global contexts.

In addition to the interviews and documents described above, I draw on material from a range of supplementary sources, namely—list-serves and mailing lists (the Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) and Institute for Studies and Innovation in Community-University Engagement (ISICUE) mailing lists and websites were particularly useful). I also draw upon the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) archives (dating back to 1995), trade magazines (e.g., *University Affairs*—the public relations periodical of the Association of University and Colleges Canada (AUCC)), conference calls and websites (including the occasional "webinar" and podcast), news media (primarily Canadian)—as well as a range of websites run by institutions and agencies concerned with community-university research, community-based research, knowledge mobilization, and so on.

As much as I have drawn upon these additional sources of information and news, a more exhaustive and systematic mapping of their content exceeds both the scope and necessity of my focus. These sources provide continuous and ongoing sources of immersion in the research and policy climate and allow me to keep track of "trending" issues and developments. Drawing upon such additional sources expands the range of communicative modalities within which the key themes pertinent to my dissertation are textured.

How the documents inform the analysis. The approach I have taken when drawing on these documents switches between a focus on practices of the *structuring* of community engagement (i.e., the structuring of research practices through how it is described and framed)

and a focus on the research *strategies* employed by community-engaged scholars in either complying with, co-opting, or resisting such structuring. For example, the institutionalization of community engagement in universities and funding opportunities provides a formalized "structure" for researchers—albeit one in which community-engagement is described in certain ways and tied to certain outcomes and which scholars then respond to. In the following chapters, I make reference to the "discourse" of community-engagement. I am interested in the ways in which, and to what effects, the language of community engagement is evoked by individuals and institutions. If, as I claim in the following chapter, the language of community-engagement has become more important and salient than before, attention to it as discourse directs the analysis to how it is "carried" and "mobilized."

Fairclough (1993) notes how in educational settings—considerable pressure is now placed upon researchers and educators to envelop existing activities and relationships in new discursive practices. Drawing our attention to the discursive dimension of changes in universities via what Fairclough (1993, p. 143) refers to as the "restructuring of the order of discourse" in universities, students become "clients," course modules and curricula become "packages," and research "subjects" become (re)positioned as "partners" and so on. In likewise manner, the structuring of community-university engagement entails a parallel structuring of knowledge and social practices—in which community "partners" are positioned into roles as the "end-users" and "beneficiaries" of such research. Framed by a critique of neo-liberalism in higher education, Peacock's (2013) analysis of the Australian Alliance of Community-Engaged Universities' (AUCEA) position paper on community engagement does something similar in addressing the discursively constructed equivalence between the language of community engagement and that of social inclusion. The challenge for my analysis is to explore how this structuring impacts upon

the "doing" of community-engaged research. In the final sections below, I provide some detail on how I use the term discourse and its connection with practice and ideology.

Community-engagement as "discourse"

The notion of discourse operates in two ways. First, in a manner that focuses on language in a largely synchronic sense—that is, in regard to words chosen, tense usage, grammar, syntax, and so on. In this view, discourse is primarily used in terms of designating various linguistic processes regarding language usage and normalization in which the properties of a "text" (e.g., an interview transcript or federal document) can be regarded as traces in the production of meaning and as cues in an ongoing process of interpretation (Fairclough, 1989, p. 20). Forms of "discourse analysis" draw upon this orientation to discourse—depending upon the nature of the research question, the intent behind the inquiry, and the desired outcomes of the research. While "discourse" has been used by linguists to denote single or groups of utterances or texts (as in the first usage described above), "discourse analysis" has been used to make explicit the connections between language use, interpretive processes, and the broader social and political context—particularly as utilized by Fairclough (1993, 2005).

I have drawn upon aspects of this usage of discourse as it helps sensitize my analysis to the "productive" contexts in which the language of community-engagement is used. Universities are increasingly positioning themselves as community or civically engaged—albeit with the intention of producing certain effects (i.e., the reasoning being that because they are community engaged they are producing "relevant" and "useful" knowledge). Linking language usage to the broader social and political context in this way serves to illustrate what may be informing institutional and/or organizational conceptualizations of community engagement—and brings my

analysis closer to an understanding of the enveloping political economy of community engagement.

Second, discourse has been used in a more expansive and diachronic sense to refer to the historical context in which knowledge is produced and structured—that is, in terms of addressing what is "thinkable" or "do-able" in a given context. This alludes to the productive capacity of discourse as a "regulated practice" (Foucault, 1971) which, in turn, helps me to understand how community-engaged research is being structured. In this view, discourse is "productive" in the sense that "a discursive structure can be detected because of the systematicity of the ideas, opinions, concepts, ways of thinking and behaving which are formed within a particular context" (Mills, 2004, p. 15). Epistemologically, this approach assumes a critical realism with regard to how respondents are held to produce utterances in situated and embodied ways—albeit in a manner dependent upon social structures and material practices in order to do so (Curtis, 2014; Fairclough, 2005; Fairclough, Corteze, & Adrizzone, 2007, p. 13). This approach helps to connect the personal with the social-structural.

I have drawn upon this second usage insofar as it connects the usage of the language of community engagement (and its mobilization through discourse) and the possible effects of this discourse in terms of research practice. To this end, I have used the notion of discourse as a "thinking tool" for my analysis and as a means by which to investigate the "growing discourse" of community-engagement. This is to acknowledge how the language of "community engagement" has become associated with various strategies of change "and therefore with particular interested representations and imaginaries of change whose epistemological and practical value may be difficult to unravel from their rhetorical value (and perhaps their ideological value)" (Fairclough, 2005, p. 8). A focus of the first findings chapter (four) is to

untangle the rhetoric of community engagement (e.g., "imaginaries of change") from the reality as experienced by those who "do" community-engaged research. In this sense, the institutionalization of community engagement attempts to delimit the parameters of the possible—and attempts to steer action in a particular direction congruent with such discourse. As argued by Jordan (2003), the general effect of such ideological processes may be to assimilate and reconstitute participatory research methodologies within existing forms of social organization which conserves rather than contests existent relations of ruling.

What should be apparent from this discussion is that discourse operates at a range of different levels and can be seen to exert a range of different effects depending upon the level and mode of analysis selected. While it is possible to identify over-arching discourses (e.g., broad espousals of "community engagement" and "social responsibility"), it is also possible to identify more specific discourses which operate at a lower level of analysis (e.g., "community-based research" and "knowledge mobilization). I am interested in drawing upon my interview data to explore how these different levels interconnect and the extent to which they are re-contextualized within each other.

Chapter 4: Unpacking the “Black Box” of Community Engagement

It’s going on all over. I don’t think there is a single institution in the country that isn’t aware of community engagement. How many white papers are there? There must be at least seven universities that have come forward and said that this is our strategy, or focus, or whatever (Hannah, community-based researcher)

There are a lot of things that are unspoken in the world of community-based research (Niamh, Director of a community-based agency)

This chapter describes how community engagement is being positioned in university and research council policies—and explores how these conceptualizations compare or differ with the experience of those who do community-based research. In the analysis of my interview data, I am interested in gaining an understanding of what it means to be a community-based researcher in the changing context outlined in my literature review. A key point of discussion in the literature review is that community engagement is at a crossroads. The decisive contradiction is between the democratization of knowledge production in the university that the institutionalization of community engagement promises, and the aligning of knowledge production with market-driven and entrepreneurial outcomes. In effect, how does the espousal of community engagement in university mission statements and as promoted through research council policy compare with the experience of those who “do” community-based research?

The chapter is not an opening up of the complexities involved in the actual practice of community-engaged research. As I detail in the literature review, such interrogation of the "best practice" of research has been well-covered in the literature. Instead, the key focus of the chapter is on the institutional cooptation and governance of community-engaged research in the context of the political economy of the research landscape. I argue that processes influencing the institutionalization of community-engaged research have acted to depoliticize and neutralize what can be achieved with such research, and that there has been more overall continuity than change in the political economy of the research landscape.

In exploring institutionalized discourses of community engagement, I draw partly upon Latour's (1987) conceptualization of the "black box." Originating in the context of science and technology studies and actor-network theory (ANT) (Callon & Latour, 1981; Cresswell, 2009; Latour, 1994; Winner, 1993), the black box metaphor has been applied in the context of public management (Thomson & Perry, 2006), policy discourse analysis (Pohle, 2013), social movement analysis (Kitts, 2000), and analyzes of student engagement in higher education (Hatch, 2012). In his application of the metaphor, Latour argues that science, treated as a "black box," needs to be studied "in action" or "in the making." In Canada, institutionalized discourses of community engagement in the context of the social sciences have recently or are currently being developed by a number of universities, and can thus be considered "in the making." Given the existing wealth of literature and case studies exploring its practice, the "doing" of community-engaged research is not a black box per se. Instead, I claim that the context of the political economy of the research landscape, within which such practice occurs, is a black box in need of "analytical decomposition" (Hustinx & Denk, 2009).

With regard to university institutional discourse, I claim that the perceived benefits of community engagement at the level of its purpose are taken for granted. The result is the "discourse structuration" of community engagement in the form of particular institutional arrangements. These arrangements, in my view, amount to a black box in need of critical interrogation. I suggest that opening the black box of the political economy of community engagement can shed light on the contradictions that result when individual and institutional understandings of community engagement come together in the form of institutionalized discourses and arrangements—particularly in light of claims by Latour (1994) that black boxes are never "fully closed," and Cressman's claim (2009, p. 7) that they always remain "leaky." As such, I use the "black box" metaphor as an analytical device, as a way of thinking about the empirical exploration of institutionalized discourses of community engagement and how they compare and/or differ with individual conceptualizations.

Respondents identified three drivers in explaining why and how the movement towards the institutionalization of community engagement is happening, and I have used these drivers to look at how the different actors involved conceptualize community engagement. First, I describe the emergence of a new generation of community-engaged scholars who have been active in pushing their universities and the funding agencies to become more socially responsive and community-engaged. I discuss the implications of their understandings of community. Second, I provide a non-exhaustive "snapshot" detailing how the sample of ten universities to which my interviewees are affiliated describe community engagement. I draw upon institutional mission statements, university publications specifically addressing community engagement, and any key initiatives which provide institutional support for community-engaged research. I spend the bulk of this section discussing respondent perceptions of how universities have taken up the language

of community engagement, and the extent to which they consider the changes that have taken place to be rhetorical or actual. Third, I describe how the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), the main funding source for the social sciences in Canada, conceptualizes research partnerships between communities and universities.³⁰ In particular, I focus on the program which epitomizes how the council has taken up community engagement, the Community-University Research Alliance (CURA) program. Respondents' perceptions of the program, its origins, its role, and influence in shaping the landscape of community-engaged research, as well as the implications of its cancellation, are discussed.

A new generation of community-engaged researchers

I began interviews by asking respondents what trends and developments they saw in relation to community engagement in Canada. Irrespective of the type of institution or province where the respondent worked, there was unanimous agreement in the interviews that community engagement is a prominent trend in many Canadian universities. In explaining why this may have been the case, respondents cite what they perceive to be a growth in the numbers of scholars committed to community-engaged research who have entered the academy since the late 1990s and early 2000s as a key factor behind the growth in community engagement in universities. For example, the period 1998-2005 witnessed the hiring of 20,000 new faculty members in Canadian universities—with more than 50% of these new hires in the social sciences

³⁰ Almost two thirds of all university research money in Canada come from government—with the majority of this channelled through the three federal granting councils (CAUT, 2010).

Twenty per cent of research conducted in universities is in the social sciences and humanities, 40% in health fields, and 40% in science and engineering (AUCC, 2008, p. 27)

and humanities. A Governor General commissioned report (One World Inc., 2011, p. 5) cites the "tremendous influx" of young faculty (55% of all faculty members have been hired since 2000) who have brought with them a desire to "make a difference" through working collaboratively with community groups. In my interview sample, approximately 10 of those interviewed were hired in their current jobs since 2000.

This influx of scholars is described by Adam, a professor in community development with almost 40 years of experience of community-based research, as bringing with them a strong sense of civic engagement and social responsibility. Drawing upon the Freirian tradition of participatory action research, Adam has participated in a wide range of community-engagement projects in local, national, and international settings throughout his career and is deeply committed to building institutional capacity for community-engaged scholars. More recently, he has devoted his energies to building local, national, and international networks linking scholars involved in community-university research partnerships. Increasingly, Adam suggests, scholars are entering the academy with experience of working in community and civil society organizations. According to Adam, these are scholars,

Who would like to see their work and who understand their work within the framework of a knowledge democracy—within a framework, largely speaking, of the reduction of inequalities, social justice, and sustainability and things like that. We would like to be able to teach and do our research in a way that is consistent with our values and our aspirations in order to make a contribution to a better place.

Identifying with this commitment, Adam suggests a model of engaged scholarship that is deeply normative in its commitment to advancing social change and to the building of what he speaks of

as a knowledge democracy. Crucially, Adam suggests the mutuality, rather than differentiation, of the teaching and research components of the scholarship of engagement.

Many of my respondents identify not only as community-based scholars and academics—but also as activists and/or advocates for social change. Some seek to achieve social change through a transformative practice of community-based participatory action research (PAR). Others situate their work in terms of its policy relevance and practical applicability and closer to the tradition of action research (AR). To a certain degree, the growing numbers of such scholars explains the shift in the perceived institutional value of community engagement and why it is now a prominent discourse in universities. Granted, there is wide variation in terms of field of study and in the type of research that scholars do—just as there is wide variation with regard to the type of social change scholars seek to achieve. To some extent, this is the result of different understandings respondents have of both "community" and "community engagement."

I address in the literature review how the variety of forms that community engagement can assume means that attempts to capture what is intended by the scholarship of engagement have become mired in "definitional anarchy" (Sandmann, 2008). Such definitional ambiguity contrasts noticeably with how the word "community" is used. In her study of a community-engagement initiative at the University of North Carolina, Dempsey (2010) notes that the growing interest in exploring the organizational dynamics of community engagement needs to be accompanied by the recognition that such frameworks risk replicating a relatively uncritical and overly-simplified conceptualization of "community." Before addressing the meanings that my respondents attach to "community engagement" and how these meanings compare or differ with institutional conceptualization—is the question of how my respondents understand "community."

"Who or what is going to constitute the community?"

The difficulty of identifying who is the "community" is a point raised by Stephen, a professor of education whose research involves working to increase educational access and equity for marginalized youth in urban areas, many of whom come from immigrant backgrounds. Employing the tools of critical ethnography, action research, and policy analysis in his research, Stephen works closely with schools and community agencies adjacent to his university. Commenting on the "community" in community-engaged research, he observes,

One thing which I'm not really sure about with this kind of work is who or what is going to constitute the community? Are we talking about community organizations? The researcher is going to have to think through what is meant by working with the community with the understanding that community is always going to be one of these problematic notions, a fluid notion that is going to be difficult to get hold of.

Stephen's observation can be read as an attempt to resist relying upon an overly simplified conceptualization of community. Implied in his comments is the view that when people talk about the "community," they are not necessarily talking about (in his experience) marginalized youth directly, but rather the schools and/ or community organizations and agencies that represent them.

This point is also raised by Ayala, an associate professor in social work with similar research interests to Stephen in youth development in disadvantaged communities. Wary of replicating a singular and simplified community "voice," Ayala employs an explicitly dialogic approach in her research—one that seeks to engage as much as possible with the various "communities" her work brings her into contact with (e.g., residents, researchers, community workers, policy-makers, and so on) through the use of diverse CBR methodologies and channels

of communication (e.g., ranging from presentations to community events). Ayala observes that "people often assume that the agencies are the community. So you have people working for the agency who are the community. And, yes, that's one part of the community but remember, most of those [people] often don't live where they work." Community organizations and agencies may play a vital role in articulating and giving that voice a platform, she claims, but they remain just "one part" of the wider community.

Other respondents stress how understandings of community are fraught with unspoken assumptions. Niamh is the research director of a non-profit, community-based research and policy institute in an urban setting and participates in many projects between community and university partners addressing a wide range of social and health issues. Commenting on the widely differing understandings of whom or what the community is, Niamh reflects on the role her institute plays in community-university partnerships:

Some of the university partners we have, well, they sort of view us as their "community partner" and for some of the community agencies that we partner with, they see us as much more "academic" because a number of people on staff have PhDs and things like that. So we're in that weird middle zone. ... When I first started here I had a secret list of things that would be a source of frustration for me ... a list of words and phrases in the CBR world that people don't articulate well enough, or that they don't define what they mean by it. So who is the community and what does engagement mean? I think that in much of the CBR world there is this really limited notion of who are the appropriate communities that CBR gets used for, or otherwise it's somehow not genuine or it shouldn't be necessarily considered as valid research.

Niamh's reference to there being limited notions of "appropriate communities" speaks to a tension that runs through many of the interview narratives—one that shapes how many researchers understand both the nature of "community" and, by extension, community engagement. In being seen as representing both the "community" and the "academic" partner, however, Niamh's comments illustrate how fluid and "difficult to get hold of" (as Stephen puts it) the concept of community can be. As her comments illustrate, this is particularly the case in funded research partnerships. Commenting upon what he perceives to be the increasing levels of accountability required by funders, Stephen claims that "one of the reasons for the accountability measures is that funders want to know what is meant by community." In his view, the requirement that the community be a clearly identifiable entity arguably leads to a set of assumptions that over-simplify the complexity of who the "community" is. The growing importance of research grants to both researchers and universities, and their role and influence in shaping the landscape of community engagement, is a theme I address later in this chapter and particularly the next. Below, I present a more specific reading of my respondents' understanding of community, one that will provide the basis for my discussion of respondents' understandings of community engagement in universities.

Respondent understandings' of community

Respondents hold nuanced understandings of community. On the one hand, there are the specific community groups that researchers work with—such as homeless youth, people living with HIV/AIDS, immigrant women, and so on. During interviews, most respondents made occasional reference to the specific community and/or social groups they work with as a way to illustrate how they generally understand community engagement. Such specific and localized

"thick" understandings of community, rooted in personal interactions and shared experiences are also extended by researchers to include the various civil society organizations that represent and connect with the groups respondents work with.

On the other hand, respondents are also sensitized not only to what another respondent, Natasha, referred to as the localized and experiential "social connections" within and between such communities—but also to the broader social and political context they are situated in. Interested in how research can be used as a vehicle for social change and activism, Natasha works in the area of community-based participatory health and often with scholars located in different disciplines and universities. While some of her CBR work is conducted in localized and small-scale settings, she recognizes how her research aligns with a broader agenda of community and social activism that extends beyond such settings. Such "thin" conceptualizations of community include a wide range of other community coalitions, networks, and alliances focused on similar causes and issues, and allow researchers such as Natasha to understand and speak more generally of the research or policy "community." An example of this is a researcher named Marius who works specifically with homeless youth, but who is cognizant of how his community-based research connects more generally with homeless advocacy and activism across municipal and provincial boundaries. By no means mutually exclusive, references to what I have characterized as "thick" and "thin" understandings of community are a common theme in interviews.

For many scholars involved in community-based research, however, the "community" is essentially those who lack power and resources, be they marginalized youth, persons with disabilities, immigrant groups, the homeless, and more. Niamh elaborated on her observations (quoted previously) to suggest that the "appropriate" communities for "valid" CBR are typically

perceived to be disadvantaged populations—individuals or groups who benefit from having the researcher speak with or for them. Sophie, for example, refers to community in this sense as being "people with small voices." An associate faculty member in social work, Sophie works with immigrant women and refugees, amongst others, in community-based health focused projects. Drawing on the resources and academic colleagues she has access to as a scholar, Sophie sees her task as researcher, and obligation as scholar, as amplifying the capacity of the community "voice" to be heard. In doing so, she utilizes a range of CBR methodologies, including arts-based approaches, to better engage with her community partners in both an academic and activist capacity.

In sum, while respondents' understandings of community are complex and nuanced, a common thread is that the communities they work with have a shared experience of marginalization or social exclusion—and the task for researchers is to increase the accessibility of marginalized communities to university and funding agency tools and resources so as to better engage with their issues and concerns. What typically unifies many of my respondents is a commitment to socially responsive, civically-engaged scholarship—a commitment typically involving some degree of advocacy and/or activism. The extent to which respondents' understandings compare or differ with institutionalized conceptualizations of community engagement is an area that I address throughout this chapter. In the following section, I look more closely at how universities describe community engagement.

Out in the open? Snapshots of community engagement in Canadian universities

In my sample of ten universities, seven position community, civic, or public engagement as important for their institutional mission while five identify it as a central priority in their

strategic plan. Of the three main areas of community engagement described in Jackson's "CUE" factor, community service-learning (CSL) and community-based research (CBR) are especially prominent in how these universities describe such engagement. These findings are commensurate with a preliminary study of community engagement in Canadian universities conducted by Fryer in 2012. Fryer reviewed the websites of 30 universities that were rated in the top ten categories of McLean's 2013 rankings—and found that 18 of the 30 (72%) made reference to community engagement and ten (40%) explicitly reference it as important to their institutional mission.

A number of key themes emerge from my analysis. First, the language of engagement is taken up by universities in different ways. York University (2010), the University of British Columbia (2012), and Carleton University use "community engagement," the University of Victoria promotes "civic engagement," and Memorial University (Mirza, 2011) do "public engagement." Despite differences in terminology, each of these universities links their social responsibility mandate with the nurturing of a sense of "democratic citizenship" through research partnerships and community engagement. For example, York's Task Force Report *Towards an Engaged University* (2010) describes community engagement as "the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources that address pertinent societal issues, enhance learning and discovery, and strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility."

Second, universities generally define research engagement as being local, regional, national and global in scope. This is particularly evident in descriptions of community-based research and service-learning initiatives which seek to apply lessons learned in local settings to the global context. An example of this is Memorial University's *Public Engagement Framework Document* (201, p. 4), which describes public engagement as a "global movement" in which the

community-university "knowledge community" are committed to addressing local, national, and global needs and opportunities.³¹

Third, when conducted in an inter-disciplinary manner, community-engaged research is positioned as a strategy by which to influence social policy and as a practical way to directly benefit communities. The University of Victoria launched the Institute for Studies and Innovation in Community-University Engagement (ISICUE) in 2013 (previously the Office of Community Based Research) in order to provide "a space for the study and practice of engaged scholarship and interdisciplinary innovation." Using an "innovative structure of joint community and university governance and collaboration ... the Institute will harvest new knowledge that will contribute to solutions of community issues focused on sustainability, public policy development and improved theory and practice." The mandate of the institute is also one of civic engagement, both locally and globally.³²

Fourth, an institutional approach to community-engagement that is practical and policy-oriented requires a means by which to measure the impact of such engagement. Community-engagement is seen to require ongoing institutional support in the form of knowledge translation/knowledge mobilization (KMb) activities. This has become a growth area in community-engaged scholarship and largely focuses on managing the potentially policy relevant "outcomes" and

³¹ Hall et al. (2011, p. 6) cite a phrase used by the University of Victoria in the context of engaged scholarship—"locally relevant but internationally significant."

³² <http://www.uvic.ca/hsd/home/home/research/community/index.php>

"impact" of research. Notable examples include the multi-institutional initiative Research Impact (RI) and the institutional-wide Harris Centre at Memorial University.³³

What does this snapshot of community engagement tell us? First and foremost, community engagement is positioned as integral to the social responsibility mandate of the university. Universities articulate the relevance of community engagement in terms of policy orientation, civic engagement, and growing support for knowledge mobilization (KMb) activities (the latter arising partly in response to funding opportunities offered through the granting

³³ Research Impact (RI) was made possible through a SSHRC Knowledge Impact in Society (KIS) grant made to York University and the University of Victoria in 2006. The initiative was expanded in 2010 to include the University of Saskatchewan, University of Guelph, Le Université du Québec à Montréal and Memorial University. In 2013, Kwantlen Polytechnic University, Wilfrid Laurier University, Carleton University, and Université de Montréal joined. The mandate of the unit is to "ensure that leading-edge academic research is employed by policy-makers and community groups to develop more effective, efficient, and responsive public policies and social program" (<http://www.researchimpact.ca/about/about/index.html>). Memorial's Harris Centre was formed in 2004 to support community engagement through research. Seeking to contribute to regional policy and economic development, its mandate is to foster a "vibrant democracy with informed citizens actively engaged in realizing a prosperous and sustainable society which values individual and collective responsibility for decision-making and development" (<http://www.mun.ca/harriscentre/>).

councils).³⁴ There is significant variation in terms of both the extent to which specific universities are community-engaged and the "types" of community engagement they focus on.³⁵ For example, there is a history of CBR in the Maritimes provinces conducted between universities and the fisheries industry, while researchers located in large metropolitan regions typically focus on issues more specific to those settings. The focus of my discussion lies not with the specificities of what particular researchers or universities are doing, but rather with identifying and exploring the contradictions in the broader political economy of university research within which such community-engaged research is conducted.

Universities advance a broad definition of community engagement that includes research, teaching and service components, one that is open to connecting with a variety of possible community partners, in both local and global settings. As such, the model of community

³⁴ In 2014, the Department of Political Sciences at the University of Victoria held their first summer seminar on the "art of engagement" and specifically its relationship to public policy analysis. The purpose of the course was to apply "different theoretical approaches to the applied craft of policy formation. In this course, students will learn how to assess and evaluate the practice of policy-making with an emphasis on local, regional and national contexts. Students will develop innovative research and communications materials that creatively reflect on the art of citizen and community engagement"

(<http://www.uvic.ca/socialsciences/politicalscience/assets/docs/home/Summer2014flyer.pdf>).

³⁵ Writing in the context of the U.S., Wade and Demb (2009) found the commitment to community engagement is weaker at larger and more prestigious universities—which indicates that participation in community-engagement and service-learning decreases as professional and institutional prestige rises.

engagement being advanced by Canadian universities appears collaborative and democratic, lending weight to the claim by Hall et al. (2011, p. 43) that universities have a key role to play in nurturing the emergence of a "new architecture of knowledge" for the scholarship of engagement. In advancing such a broad definition, I concur with Singh's claim (2007, p. 57) that, in principle, it is preferable to aim at the institutionalization of the most conceptually and contextually nuanced versions of engagement and at weakening its most reductionist forms. Brabant and Braid (2009, p. 61) make a similar point about definitions of "civic engagement," and recommend that institutions adhere to broad and open conceptualizations of civic engagement that best cohere with that specific institution's educational mission and local context. Singh (2007, p. 36) also suggests, however, that such broad models of engagement remain a "black box"—easy to celebrate and advocate for and difficult to contest at the level of purpose or principle. Ultimately, institutionalized espousals of community engagement tell us little about how relationships between "town and gown" are structured at the level of political economy. As Dempsey (2010) cautions, the more the discourse of community engagement is taken up by universities, the more abstract and self-referential the "community" becomes. In light of this, what do community-based scholars think about how universities are taking up community engagement? What is required is an empirical and conceptual unpacking of the "black box" of community engagement at the level of political economy. In the following sections, I address community-based scholars' perceptions of the changes that have been taking place and what they see as the implications of these changes.

This is not to suggest an overly simplistic distinction between "genuine" forms of community engagement versus disingenuous or co-opted institutionalized conceptualizations. Researchers do not necessarily object to, for instance, what universities represent the purpose of

community engagement to be in the broad sense—as they typically agree with the principle of furthering and deepening engagement with communities. Nor is my approach to directly compare different representations of community engagement, as there is a clear sense in which different types of community-engaged discourse exist for different purposes, and insofar as institutions and individuals are accountable to different constituencies. In conducting a thematic analysis of my interview data, I have tried to remain sensitive to the degree of differentiation and specificity that exists between various conceptualizations of community engagement. For example, respondents' views did not form a univocal negative appraisal of the institutionalization of community engagement in universities and the granting councils. Many participants were able to identify positive developments and beneficial ways in which the landscape of community engagement has been improved in light of its uptake by universities and, in particular, by SSHRC. At the same time, it became apparent that many participants are experiencing significant tensions around these changes—and it is these points of tension and contradiction regarding the movement toward community engagement that I take up in the analysis and discussion through a form of immanent critique of the political economy of community engagement.

Respondent perceptions of community engagement in Canadian universities

Respondents are pleased that universities are taking up community engagement because of its potential to stimulate and support community-based researchers in a wide range of initiatives. They spoke of how a driving force behind community engagement is that universities are experiencing pressure from government to become more accountable for the public monies they receive. Frank, a professor in education with experience of having worked in provincial

government in a ministerial capacity on educational leadership and policy, claims that by demonstrating their "relevance" to society, universities are thereby demonstrating that they are good "value for money" to the Canadian public. More recently, he has been involved in a number of initiatives focused on communicating the policy relevance of research through knowledge mobilization (KMb) strategies, "I would say that in all public services there is increasing pressure to be able to provide some evidence that the money the public spends is well spent." This imperative of demonstrating accountability was also emphasized by Paul, a specialist in the management of academic research with a particular focus in knowledge mobilization. Paul works with a wide range of scholars in his role as a "knowledge broker," connecting researchers in his university with partners in the community so as to better inform public policy and professional practice. Commenting on the appeal of community engagement to Canadian universities, he remarked that,

There has been a long-standing drive toward public accountability, and the public want to see something—wants to see a "so-what" return for that investment in the way that they can see a return from investments in public research through commercialization, so they can see new products and services come to the market and, therefore, they can see a benefit to themselves, to their families, their communities, and their workplaces.

Paul comments on how the institutional uptake of community engagement is being influenced by a drive toward public accountability—one that has arisen as both a response and acquiescence to the logic of commercialization. As such, institutional representations of community engagement cannot be considered in isolation from broader trends. To some extent, and understandably, universities respond to this accountability pressure by framing community engagement in the language of social responsibility and relevance. Respondents identify the pressure to be

"relevant" as a driving force behind community engagement white papers, institutional initiatives specifically targeting community engaged activities, and the development of knowledge mobilisation (KMb) units tasked with the mandate of connecting university and community partners.³⁶

Karina, a professor in community and regional planning with a research interest in developing housing strategies in community design that encourage diversity and equity, spoke on this theme. Drawing upon her experience of being involved in numerous large-scale SSHRC-funded research projects (including an Initiative on the New Economy (INE), a Major Collaborative Research Initiative (MCRI), and a CURA in which she was principle investigator), Karina observes that "we're certainly getting a message from government that if you are not doing something relevant then don't bother." This is put even more bluntly by Brian, a professor in education with a research specialization in the history of education policy and schooling, "I think that Harper has just made it so crystal clear that he thinks that what academics do is less than useful."³⁷ Other respondents also identified this message as engendering a change in

³⁶ Jack Lightstone (President and Vice-Chancellor at Brock University in St. Catherine's, Ontario) suggests that universities organize their research efforts not only along traditional (disciplinary-based) lines but also around priority themes identified by communities—the proof of which would be the involvement of private, public, or not-for-profit partners (Globe & Mail, January 7th, 2014).

³⁷ Brian does not conduct CBR but has studied shifts in provincial and federal policy on higher education. Prior to the time of our interview, he had participated in the drafting of his university's institutional plan, a central thrust of which is community engagement.

thinking about community-engaged research. Saidul, a professor in education with a long history of working with non-profits and community organizations in the tradition of social economy research and currently principle investigator of a CURA, suggests that the trend towards community engagement is part of an institutional cultural shift in the perceived value of community-based research. Comparing the research landscape now with the one he first entered in the 1980s, Saidul observes that,

It [community engagement] is commonplace now. I think it's partly a response to funding but I think there has also been a cultural shift. I'm not sure why the cultural shift has occurred to the extent that it has, but it seems to be more encouraged and more accepted that university faculty, in the social sciences in particular, connect themselves and their research to issues that are important and relevant to community organizations.

The perception of a cultural shift is particularly evident in interviews with more senior scholars who possess a greater degree of institutional memory. Speaking of her experience of conducting community-based research in the early 1980s, Naomi, a professor in sociology with a career long involvement in tri-council funded CBR projects recalled "I remember when I started this kind of work that engagement was a kind of liability." Naomi is currently principle investigator on a CURA that uses participatory methodologies to explore the connections between work, environment, and health. Doing CBR was a liability in the 1980s, she claims, due to its perceived lack of scientific rigour and legitimacy.

Naomi's views are similar to those of Justin, a professor in social work. Justin combines qualitative and quantitative research in social policy-oriented and activist research that focuses on community planning and development for disadvantaged groups in urban settings. Working closely with social service providers and political activists, he has been principle investigator in a

number of large scale, tri-council funded projects. Speaking of his first experience of applying for SSHRC funding in the early 1990s for research that utilized a community-based methodology, he recalls

We hid the fact that it was community-based because we assumed that the committees that were set up at the time wouldn't view it as valid research. Whereas now, right, the trend is right out in the open. It is good thing to do that and funders want to have it done.

These comments by Saidul, Naomi, and Justin (and the quote by Hannah that begins this chapter) indicate the extent to which community engaged methodologies have become more accepted in Canadian universities and by funding bodies such as SSHRC. Respondents are able to identify specific funding incentives to evidence this—although most relied on the CURA program as their illustrative example. Given the importance attached to it by respondents, I address the influence of the CURA program later in this chapter. First, I discuss respondent perceptions of how universities are using the language of community engagement.

Is there a "growing discourse" of community engagement?

Larissa, a professor in social work, spoke of the increasing institutional acceptance of community-engagement she sees in Canadian universities. Identifying as an academic and activist, Larissa draws upon participatory action research methods in projects that address issues of child welfare. Below she highlights the importance of the increasing institutional usage of the language of community engagement,

I think that one of the most important developments to me has been the trend towards using the term "community-engaged scholarship" which, I think, is also a re-visioning or a renewing of community-based research and a strengthening of those sorts of things—

but also I would see it as an integration of those things or an attempt to integrate those things, and community-based research, or community service learning, or community-engaged learning, or participatory action research, or whatever—are things which I am seeing as fitting under that umbrella.

What Larissa seems to suggest here is that the increasing usage of the term "community engagement" is being accompanied by a re-conceptualization (what she calls a "re-visioning" or "integration") of what it and related terms mean. In other words, community engagement has become an umbrella term for what were previously loosely inter-connected and under-appreciated fields of academic activity. Such integration is problematic, however, because community engagement and community-based research, although closely related terms, are by no means mutually interchangeable.

Beyond the national context, Hannah, the research director of a community-based agency, also suggests that the institutional acceptance of community engagement has international potency,

It's trending nationally and I would say internationally as well. I just came back from a conference in the U.S. and it's just a growing discourse all around the world—about community engagement, civil society, higher education and social responsibility, and all those sorts of companion ideas, and community-based research is one aspect of that. Hannah's role in her institute is to provide leadership and act as a "knowledge broker" when working to facilitate partnerships. In the above quote, she highlights an important development in that universities—both nationally and internationally—are now openly using the language of

community engagement, particularly in relation to how amenable it is with the themes of social responsibility and civic engagement.³⁸

Lorraine, associate professor of social work, highlights key differences between community-engaged research and community-based research. Lorraine describes how community engagement can range from consultation between academic and community partners at the beginning of a research project (which I characterize as "thin" engagement) to types of engagement in which both parties are involved in all phases of the process ("thick" engagement). A key difference is that community-based research is, by its very definition, necessarily based in the community. Lorraine works with women and families struggling with HIV and homelessness and uses CBR as a means to engage with the experiential dimensions of her community participants. The perception she conveyed in our interview is that the model of community

³⁸ Conferences on community engagement in 2014 and 2015 in Canada include the Community-University Partnerships Conference—*Beyond Engagement: Creating Integration, Innovation and Impact* held at the University of Victoria (May 20-22), the Engagement Scholarship Consortium Conference—*Engaging for Change, Changing for Engagement* in Edmonton (October 5-9), and *Health Resilient Communities: Community Service-Learning and Community Engagement* held in Ottawa (May 28-30). The Community-University Expo, a bi-annual Canadian-led conference designed to showcase exemplars in community-campus partnerships worldwide. The next CU Expo will take place in Ottawa in 2015. The year 2014 also saw the launch of a multi-disciplinary, outreach, and community-engaged focused (peer-reviewed) journal called *The Engaged Scholar Journal* based out of the University of Saskatchewan.

engagement being promoted by universities is "thin" rather than "thick." Respondents spoke of there being a cultural shift and a "growing discourse" of community—and yet for many there remain doubts as to the extent of this shift. As I discuss later in this chapter and the next, this has a lot to do with shifts in the nature and structure of funding and resources. At the same time, many respondents are cognizant of how such "thin" and all-encompassing institutional representations of community engagement are framed in response to accountability measures imposed by the federal government.

"There are definitely some pretty serious conversations going on"

While there is excitement among researchers that universities are now openly using the language of community engagement, a recurring theme in several interviews was a questioning of the extent to which it is rhetorical rather than actual. A researcher in politics and public administration, Vincent's research focuses on the political economy of the labour market, the welfare state, and immigrant settlement policy. He has held numerous research affiliations and in the past has worked with government as a policy adviser. Vincent sees community engagement as a means by which to generate the "evidence-based research" that can be used to effect policy and practitioner decision-making. Commenting on the degree of acceptance of community engagement he sees in universities, he remarks,

I think it is split. I wouldn't say that everybody within academia acknowledges it. But I think there is more acceptance of it within the hierarchy of the university than there used to be and I think there's more acceptance of it by colleagues within the university than there used to be.

Vincent went on to suggest that scepticism persists in the academy about the methodological legitimacy of community-based research, but that the movement is still there. For those engaged in CBR projects, there is a lot of uncertainty as to how decisive the institutional uptake of community engagement will prove to be.

Anna is a professor in educational studies who regularly utilizes CBR and arts-based approach to her research with disadvantaged and disempowered groups—and has been watching the movement toward the institutionalization of community engagement in Canadian universities closely. According to Anna,

There is some development in that universities are, at least rhetorically, paying attention to the work they need to do with communities and then there's the actual changes that are happening. My guess is that most universities that I'm aware of ... community engagement ... I don't know if it's a top priority but it's certainly a central one. So I think the discourse is definitely present. ... It's definitely on the radar and I think there's definitely some pretty serious conversations going on.

Anna differentiates here between the rhetorical changes being proclaimed by universities and the actual changes that may be taking place. Respondents could point to specific initiatives in their institutions that evidenced the uptake of community engagement, and yet many felt that such initiatives are in their infancy with regard to significantly advancing the agenda of community engagement. Differentiating between "community-engaged research" and "community-based research," for example, Hannah questions whether such institutionalization will be respectful of the principles and processes of CBR,

So they [universities] write their white papers, and they have their sessions, and then my concern is that they hire a VP of partnership, who may or may not be grounded in

community-based research, because that's where these principles come from ... but do they care about the governing, do they care about reciprocity ... all those kind of things? I just want to make sure that there is integrity in the process.

What Hannah conveys is a concern about the contradictory conceptualizations of community engagement held by individuals and institutions. Whereas Anna makes a distinction between the "rhetorical" and "actual" effects of the institutional uptake of community engagement, Hannah cites the discrepancy between the purposive "talk" of community-engagement by universities and the methodological processes (the "walk") upon which it is based. A pervasive concern expressed in interviews is this perceived discrepancy between community engagement at the level of purpose and process. As stated by Karina, "my cynical hat says that it is just a way to show that these universities are really contributing. It doesn't necessarily change the way in which the university is run in any way." She added that a key way in which universities are attempting to demonstrate that they are "really contributing" is through attempts to formalize the language of community engagement and to promote themselves accordingly.

Are we living in an era of the bureaucratization of CBR?

Ian, a professor in education, described community-based research as being as much about the collaborative components of teaching and service as it is about the actual research. Ian has a career-long commitment to community-university relations and issues of access and equity in higher education, particularly with regard to teacher and community education. Speaking of the difference he perceives between the terminology of research partnership versus research collaboration, he said "I don't really talk about partnerships. I only talk about partnerships when the people I am talking to need to talk about partnerships. I don't use that word often.

Collaboration, I'm more likely to use." Highlighting a tension between institutional and individual conceptualizations of community engagement, Ian claims that those who "need to talk about partnerships" are funders and university administrations—with "partnership" being, for him, an overly formalistic way of describing what he experiences as a much more informal process of collaborative "coming-togetherness." This sentiment is also evident in Sophie's description of the collaborative dynamics of the research process,

It should start first and foremost with the ambassador of the academy—myself—engaging in community development and simply colliding socially with potential partners, research partners, facilitating workshops, sitting on a board, contributing to a garage sale, God knows what—and then slowly but surely you engage people in a way that seems to be authentic, and then and only then, if there is research to be had, to be discovered, to be engaged, then one should be able to do so, and I think that that actually honours basic community research principles—but it doesn't get played out that way unfortunately in Canada.

For Sophie, the connections forged between researchers and members of the community is a spontaneous and ad hoc process intrinsically resistant to being formally organized in its early stages. Sophie highlights the importance community-based scholars place upon both the research purpose and process, but stresses that it is from the process that the research agenda (purpose) will emerge. Her observation that "it doesn't get played out that way" in Canada, suggests that universities and granting councils seek to define the research purpose in advance of decisions

determining the research process. The concern here is that such decision-making is overly rigid and bureaucratic with regard to how the process of engagement unfolds in practice.³⁹

Irina is an associate professor in environmental studies with research interests in community development and public health, specifically youth and sexual health. Deeply committed to using a range of community-based participatory methodologies, she works closely with community participants while also forging connections with other researchers and allied practitioners who work within an action research framework. Placing contemporary developments regarding community engagement in historical context and expressing concern that the structuring effect of the language used may serve to "contain" the nature of community engagement, Irina claimed,

There have been folks doing feminist research and activist research for a very long time and there have been folks deeply committed to partnering with different communities and you can see the historical roots of activist research back in the 50s, 60s, and the 70s. So is it a whole new way of doing things? I don't know. Is it a whole new lingo to talk about what it is we're doing? Perhaps. Are we living in an era of the bureaucratization of CBR? I would say absolutely. You know, you put a kind of a structure on it, and you put parameters around it, and in a lot of ways you contain it...

³⁹ This has been suggested by Fryer (2012) in an *Academic Affairs* blog she ran between 2012 and 2013 —"I think everyone needs to acknowledge that successful community-university engagement is rooted in personal relationships and that this reality has certain implications."

My reading of Irina's comments is that there is a decisive contradiction between what scholars consider to be the process of community-based research and the institutionalized structures that are emerging to support (and possibly contain it). The concern lies with how the "new lingo" influences and shapes what community-engaged scholarship becomes when conceptualized in institutional mission statements and funding opportunities. There was a clear suggestion in my interview with Irina that the language used by universities and funders is exerting a "structuring effect" upon the nature of the research. As collaborative and democratic sounding in principle institutional descriptions of community engagement would seem to be, there is a contradiction between university proclamations that community engagement is a central priority and the working experience of researchers. This is also apparent in my interview with Ian,

I hear about it, about community-university partnerships, but where they are and what they are I don't know. I'm one of those people who was happy to hear that [his university] has declared itself to be Canada's engaged university (laughs) without bothering to check that anybody else might be doing it. To me, this signals, potentially, a very big shift in the way that the central administration is organizing its priorities, and those of us who are interested in doing community-engaged kind of things ought to be able to point to that and say that now we're expecting some kind of support and resources. It's fine to declare it but unless you are prepared to resource it ... well, these things just don't happen by magic or by act of will.

In contrast to Anna's comment that community engagement is "definitely on the radar" and that there are "some pretty serious conversations going on" in Canadian universities, Ian suggests that the appropriation of the language of community engagement is more rhetorical gesture than sincere commitment (in terms of being backed by a financial commitment) and he questions the

extent to which university resources have shifted accordingly. Ian suggests that community-based researchers are expected to engage in the academic labour of engaged scholarship, albeit without being granted sufficient resources in order to do so. Respondents could easily point to university mission statements and white papers on community engagement, to the fact that community engagement is "trending" nationally and internationally, to the "game-changer" that was the CURA program, and yet there persists a prevailing scepticism regarding the perceived degree of change.

A point I make in the literature review is that the incorporation of the language of community engagement in university policy documents and/ or mission statements must be situated in a context in which universities are experiencing increasing pressure to seek out alternative sources of revenue. While it would be erroneous to suggest that economic restructuring and budget cuts have directly spurred the renewal of university interest in community engagement—the work of such scholars as Jordan (2003), Chan & Fisher (2008), and Polster (2004, 2007) suggests that market-driven behaviours are becoming ever more embedded in all forms of research and scholarly practice. Winter et al. claim that "community engagement" has become an effectively rhetorical (and in their view co-opted) marketing technique of universities (2006, p. 224). In fact, the modest internal allocation (or lack thereof) of resources is one reason many researchers see the institutional uptake of engagement as largely rhetorical.

Respondents are in agreement that the institutional uptake of community engagement has been influenced by the improved funding climate for the research councils evident during the late 1990s and early 2000s. In particular, they suggest that community engagement in Canadian universities cannot be considered in isolation from funding opportunities by the federal

government through the granting councils—specifically through the Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada (SSHRC). For example, in SSHRC's Annual Report of 1997-1998, community-university collaborations were described as being an "essentially new type of research" conducted between university-based researchers and "user groups" in the community. In the next section, I address how community engagement is being taken up and conceptualized by SSHRC and the extent to which the availability of funding may exert a "structuring effect" on research design.

Community engagement and research funding

A report published in 2009 by the Office of Community-Based Research (OCBR) (now the Institute for Studies and Innovation in Community-University Engagement) comprehensively mapped the range and distribution of funding available for community-engaged research in Canada. This report documents the sources and types of funding that have emerged to support community university research partnerships through the research councils, government departments, and foundations and philanthropic funders.⁴⁰ Other reports by Lall (2009) and Mirza (2012) have outlined the range of regional, provincial, and national engagement structures that have emerged to support community-engaged activities since the late 1990s in Canada.

All respondents spoke of the importance of the increase in funding opportunities for

⁴⁰ According to the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences (CFHSS), the number of partner and co-sponsoring organizations included in SSHRC grant applications increased from just less than 100 in 1998 to above 2,220 in 2012. Over half of these were from post-secondary institutions and the not-for-profit sector, 10% were from business, and another 20% from various government agencies (Hewitt, CFHSS, November 22nd, 2012).

community-based research. Irina claims that "I do applied community-based research so this whole thing is kind of good for me. I've seen my opportunities for research funding quadruple in the last five years." Natasha, a researcher in community-based participatory health projects also suggested that funding opportunities are improving,

Certainly, when I first started doing this there were very few funding opportunities. I now see many, many more. So I feel like there are suddenly many more opportunities for community-based research.

Respondents cite the research funding opportunities made available by the federal government for community-engaged research through the Social Science and Humanities Council of Canada (SSHRC), and to a lesser extent the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, as particularly important.⁴¹ Described by the OCBR as representing a "significant explicit funding allocation and structure for community university research partnerships" (2009, p. 19), SSHRC's Community University Research Alliance (CURA) program was the most significant of these

⁴¹ SSHRC receives about 14 % of overall council funding despite covering areas that account for 56% of the total number of graduate students in Canada and 54% of total faculties. According to the Community-Engaged Scholarship Partnership website "The Tri-Council funding agencies have moved aggressively to promote and fund community-based research and knowledge mobilization" (see <http://engagedscholarship.ca/all/>). The Canadian Institute of Health Research (CIHR) was also cited by respondents as influential—with the most notable opportunities available being short-lived sister program to the CURA program, the Community-Based Alliance for Health Research (CAHR) (maximum amount of \$500,000 per annum for up to 5 years) and the HIV/AIDS Community-based Research Program (unspecified amount).

opportunities. Running between 1999 and 2011, the CURA program was used by all respondents as an example epitomizing the movement toward community engagement.

Given the importance attached to the CURA program by respondents, a look at how it influenced SSHRC's approach to community-university research engagement throughout the 2000s is useful. My contention is that the CURA program exemplifies the changes taking place with regard to the institutionalization of community engagement, as well as epitomizing the contradictions of these changes. This is not to suggest that other funding opportunities were not important in advancing community engagement, but rather that the CURA program has been particularly significant.⁴²

It became clear in interviews that the CURA program was illustrative of a marked increase in the value attached to community-engaged research by universities, with the result being that community-engaged research is described in the literature as having come "in from the cold" (Hall, 2005) and by respondents as "definitely on the radar" (Anna) and "out in the open" (Justin). One way in which I consider the CURA program to have been what one of my respondents, Genevieve, referred to as a "game-changer" for community-engaged research in Canada, lies in how it represented a significant allocation of resources for researchers involved in community-engaged research—enabling what respondents described as a program of community-university capacity-building previously lacking (although I would add the claim that such allocation must be understood in light of the chronic underfunding of the early to mid-

⁴² A number of other SSHRC funding programs that have encouraged collaborative research and which have helped to develop the knowledge mobilization mandate of the council include the Initiative on the New Economy (INE), the Strategic Knowledge Clusters (SKC), Public Outreach Grants, Knowledge Impact in Society (KIS), and the Social Economy Strategic Initiative.

1990s). The extent to which it contributed to the development of a democratic practice of community-engagement is a question I will return to in my concluding comments to this chapter.

The Community-University Research Alliance (CURA) program

The CURA program was originally a proposal from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences following consultations with community-based researchers, universities, and community groups. Officially launched in 1998, the program aimed to build alliances between post-secondary institutions and community organizations in order to foster new knowledge, tools, and methods for tackling a wide range of challenges facing communities in the context of globalization.⁴³ The CURA program was not a program specifically for CBR scholars per se—but rather a program that lent itself to a range of collaborative and/or participatory methodologies. Nevertheless, many CBR scholars were drawn to the CURA program as it was one of very few funding opportunities available in the late 1990s and early 2000s for work that utilized a CBR component.⁴⁴

⁴³ The CURA program awarded development grants of up to \$20,000 or full grants of \$200,000 annually for up to five years. The core objectives of the program were 1. Promote the sharing of knowledge, resources and expertise between postsecondary institutions and organizations in the community 2. Reinforce community decision-making and problem-solving capacity 3. Enrich research, teaching methods, and curricula in postsecondary institutions and 4. Enhance students' education and employability by means of diverse opportunities to build their knowledge, expertise and work skills through hands-on research and related experience.

⁴⁴ Chopyak and Levesque (2002, p. 204) cite the influence of the Dutch "science-shop" partnership model. This model brought together universities and communities in a form of

There is a consensus in the interviews that the CURA program granted community-based research considerable legitimacy and acceptance. A professor in environmental studies and the former director of a research institute, Genevieve, has worked as a government adviser and has been active on several non-governmental organizational boards. Reflecting upon the impact of the CURA program, she states,

CURA was a game-changer in Canadian research funding. Once the CURA project came on stream that's when a lot of senior administrators in universities suddenly got interested in partnership research—and it was because of money. They wanted money. So now they see that they have to support, to find people in their university who know how to do it, and they have to encourage them to apply and, you know, they want money.

Genevieve has been successful on a regular basis in securing research grants and is currently conducting research in the field of environmental sustainability as part of a SSHRC Partnership Development Grant. Commenting upon her success in obtaining a CURA in the late 1990s, Genevieve further claimed that "It certainly upped my credibility around here and you had people seeing me as a person who could attract big money." According to Gustav, a scholar in politics and public administration, the introduction of the CURA program clearly marked a moment in which university administrations began to recognise the potential of community

"technological citizenship." Such alliances differed from community-based participatory research insofar as the model is based on a client-expert model and co-generative form of inquiry in which members of the public contribute the problems and questions (Savan & Sider, 2003, p. 307). Given their explicitly problem-solving mandate, science-shop partnerships tend to be relatively short-term in duration (see Farkas (2002) for an overview of Dutch science shops).

engagement to attract money. Prior to joining his department, Gustav worked in government as a policy analyst and has subsequently worked closely with a number of civil society organizations and government bodies on a number of anti-poverty and anti-oppression projects. Identifying as academic, advocate, and activist, Gustav described the CURA program as "an institutional vote in favour of community-based research."

That the CURA program has been an important development in institutionalizing CBR has been documented in the literature (Benneworth & Jongbloed, 2010; Hall & Tremblay, 2012). What has been relatively unexplored has been its influence in shaping the landscape of community-engaged research. Hannah suggested that,

It [CURA] was enormous. I wouldn't be here without the CURA program. I understand that there are funding arrangements in the European Union that would not have happened without the influence of the CURA program. It's not that the CURA program provided all of those things. But it did provide opportunities to have those discussions and so I think the learning was really big.⁴⁵

Respondents were unequivocal that the CURA program has played a key role in advancing the institutionalization of community engaged research in Canadian universities—both practically and symbolically. It was important practically insofar as it represented what respondents considered a significant allocation of funding for community engaged research in a form that made university administrations "sit up and take notice" according to Genevieve. It was also

⁴⁵ The EU funding arrangement Larissa refers to is the Partnerships of Institutions and Citizens for Research (PIRCI), a notable example of an initiative which has sought to replicate the CURA model (Gall, Millot, & Neubauer 2009, p. 4).

important symbolically insofar as it enabled SSHRC to position the research it funds as useful and "relevant."

Michelle, professor of public policy and administration, is well-placed to comment on shifts in the mandate of the research councils. Having served as program director in her program, and as faculty dean, she was also centrally involved in the drafting of her university's strategic plan which has a key emphasis on community engagement. More recently, Michelle has played a central role in a Canada-wide initiative aimed at establishing a network of community-university partnerships that is helping to raise the profile of CBR in Canada. As described by Michelle,

SSHRC has seen an inherent value in this kind of engagement because for one thing they hope that it does have a positive impact on communities and secondly. From a political perspective it enables them to tell a particular story to the government. I think SSHRC is in a constant battle to prove that it is doing things that are relevant and things that have a social impact.

Notwithstanding the relatively modest funding outlay (which I address in the next section), the "success" of the CURA program is referenced in all of SSHRC's annual reports from 1999-2009. Vincent's view is that SSHRC received considerable "bang for their buck" from the CURA program—and that its symbolic value has been disproportionate to what it cost. This is echoed by a report published by the OCBR (2009, p. 44) which claims that the investments made in the CURA program "are small by comparison with its [SSHRC's] overall investment portfolios, but seem to produce disproportionate results in creating knowledge that is then applied to real and dynamic policy and action."

Following two reports on the workings of the CURA program (Barrington, 2004; Kishchuk, 2003), SSHRC began to position community-engaged research as a "rethinking of old

distinctions" and as a breaking down of "disciplinary silos" between solitary and team research, between disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches, and between pure and applied research (SSHRC, 2007, p. 9). This positioning signalled a conceptual shift from the "structuralization" of research (traditional, hierarchical) to its "contextualization" (community-engaged) as SSHRC sought to foster "more robust research cultures and enhanced research environments as they become creative hubs for their surrounding communities" (2007, p. 9). This shift is now evident in descriptions of the funding opportunities for research partnerships in SSHRC's *Connections* funding stream—which places the community engaged and knowledge mobilization (KMb) component of partnered research centre-stage.⁴⁶

There is certainly overlap between the models of community engagement found in university statements and SSHRC initiatives. Conceptually, the model of community engagement being advanced by SSHRC is one which favours interdisciplinary and team-based research that is policy-relevant, practically useful, and locally conducted but globally relevant. As part of the renewal of its funding architecture in the mid-to-late 2000s, SSHRC began

⁴⁶ The *Connections* funding stream ties community-engaged research more closely to the idea of knowledge mobilization. For example, a weakness of the CURA program was cited in a SSHRC evaluation of the program as being the "knowledge dissemination and transfer stage" (see Kishchuk, 2003). This report recommended the need for a "knowledge infrastructure" that includes "knowledge brokers" or "facilitators." A knowledge mobilization (KMb) component was subsequently included in which applicants were required to provide demonstrable ability to involve community organizations at various stages of the research process. In order to further guarantee what SSHRC calls "downstream impact" the partners in each alliance were required to detail how they intended to make their research public and through what initiatives.

developing a research partnerships branch that would "facilitate(s) community-based participatory research of the kind performed by CURAs" (SSHRC Annual Report, 2006-2007). This now forms the central thrust of the SSHRC's focus on research partnerships in the *Connections* funding stream⁴⁷. In light of these developments, Genevieve may have characterized the CURA program as a "game-changer"—but to what extent has this actually been the case?

The CURA program and the funding landscape

The "success" of the CURA program has been widely cited in research council documents as "ground-breaking [and] a tremendous success, praised and imitated in other countries" (SSHRC, 2005, p. 17). Deeming the CURA initiative to be "highly successful" SSHRC focused on integrating the principles of the CURA model into its core program architecture as part of a wider effort to "expand and improve university-community research

⁴⁷ The three funding streams are *Talent*, *Insight*, and *Connection*. The *Connections* program provides funding for research and related activities as carried out by individual scholars, teams of researchers, and their collaborators—including those from the public, private, and not-for-profit sectors. Opportunities include *Connection Grants* (which support KMB initiatives) and *Formal Partnerships* (supporting a wide range of partnerships, including industry-academic initiatives). In the latter funding stream, *Partnership Development Grants* provide support new research and are valued at \$75,000 to \$200,000 over one to three years. *Partnership Grants* provide support to existing formal partnerships and are valued as at \$500,000 to \$2.5 million over four to seven years (http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/umbrella_programs-program_cadre/connection-connexion-eng.aspx).

partnerships [and] to better equip communities to develop local solutions to local issues" (SSHRC, 2005, p. 15).⁴⁸ The CURA program may have exemplified the renewal of interest in community engagement, but to what extent did it represent a significant allocation of resources and funding for community-based research?

Beginning with its first granting cycle in 1998-1999—by 2005 there were 52 CURAs underway accounting for just over 4% of SSHRC's budget. By 2009, over 100 CURAs had been funded. To put this funding allocation into perspective—during the 1999-2008 period SSHRC grants to individual scholars and researchers amounted to \$785 million—a number almost twelve times the funding (\$67 million in expenditures to 2008) allocated to CURAs (OCBR, 2009, p. 20). Viewed as a percentage of SSHRC's budget, the CURA program thus represented a relatively modest allocation of funding. Commenting upon the funding structure of the CURA, Ian states that,

it sounds like a big whack of money but when you really start cutting it down it's not really. When you have to cut it between three institutions and when you're cutting it over five years and when you look at what it is that you have left, it's very paltry. If you're

⁴⁸ Consolidating their focus on partnership, SSHRC created the position of Vice-President of Partnerships in 2006 in order to "strengthen collaboration with policy-makers in government, the private sector, and non-government organizations. These enhanced connections will facilitate evidence-based policy making on a range of contemporary issues and will increase research impact" (SSHRC Annual Report, 2006-2007). In developing their *Connections* funding program, SSHRC announced that they were working "shoulder-to-shoulder with researchers and partners across all sectors of society to fuel innovation, bolster economic recovery, increase resiliency, and enhance Canada's place in the world" (The Hill Times, November 16th, 2009).

talking about one institution working with three communities—then it can make a significant contribution with the stuff that you are able to do, but when you have to keep subdividing and subdividing, it becomes not enough on its own to do anything.

As much as scholars were eager to seize upon the opportunity that the CURA program represented, many remain critical of the workings of the program. Notwithstanding the five year funding time frame, Deirdre similarly problematized what could be achieved with CURA funding in light of long term needs of community-based research projects. Deirdre has been a long-time practitioner of community-based participatory research in the area of health, and was amongst those respondents most vocal in their criticism of how funding for the community-engaged research is structured,

It's not a matter of just funding the building phase. You also have to fund the ongoing phase. You can't just build it and say it will continue all by itself without any additional funding. It doesn't quite work like that!

As much as researchers such as Deirdre welcomed the launch of the CURA program, they were critical of what could be achieved in a direct community action capacity given the lack of funding for the long-term sustainability of the collaboration.

As the CURA program became established,⁴⁹ the competition for council funding intensified. While estimates for the overall success rates in obtaining SSHRC funding lies close to 25 or 30%—85% of eligible applicants for a CURA grant were unable to receive funding (a

⁴⁹ There was no awards made for the program in 2001 as it underwent review.

success rate of just 15%) (OCBR, 2009, p. 20).⁵⁰ Below, Hannah comments upon the success rate of the CURAs in claiming,

The success rate on those early CURA programs was eleven to thirteen percent. There were over one hundred and fifty people who applied for that first grant and you know, confidentially, which I know this is, the program person at that point in time said that a hundred of them were great, but how many did they actually invite to go forward? Eighteen or twenty? So I don't believe that we've got the open door to partnership dollars, I don't. And it is overly competitive still.

There are two ways in which I would contextualize these comments by Hannah. First, the allocation of funding for research partnerships should be placed in the context of the chronic underfunding that characterized the early to mid-1990s.⁵¹ In these terms, the funding situation

⁵⁰ Although 56% of all Canadian university researchers are in the social sciences and humanities, SSHRC received 13.1% of federal government funds in 2010-2011 (CAUT 2013). The overall success rate for SSHRC applicants across all funding programs for 2011-2012 was 28% for male scholars (down from 44% in 2001-2002) and 25% for women (down from 40% in 2001-2002) (CAUT, 2013).

⁵¹ In the early to mid-1990s, a climate of fiscal austerity led to significant declines in levels of federal investment in university research, including cuts to the base budgets of all three research granting councils. CAUT has documented how federal funding declined drastically from the early 1990s until 1998 before more than doubling in the period 1999-2004 (CAUT Almanac of Post-Secondary Education 2012-2013). It was at this time that discussions began regarding the merit and "relevance" of research. For example, the Ontario Council on University Affairs raised the question in 1995 of "should the balance among teaching, research, and community service be

had certainly improved by the end of the 1990s and early 2000s. This would lead Flicker et al. (2008) to acknowledge that the government had responded to the demand for community-based research with significant investments in community-university research partnerships through the granting councils. As suggested by respondents, the CURA program was undoubtedly the most eye-catching of these investments.⁵²

Second—when situated in the broader political economy of research—the investment pales in significance to the money invested by the Federal Government in such programs as the Canada Research Chair (CRC) and Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) —both launched

altered?" Between 1997-2007 the federal investment increased funding overall by 185% at an average rate of 11% per annum. By 2007, this investment had reached an all-time high of \$2.8 billion (AUCC, 2008, p. 15).

⁵² The CURA program was certainly influential internationally. According to a report commissioned by the European Research Framework (ERF) Program as part of their Science in Society activities aimed at promoting the participation of civil society organizations (CSOs) in research collaborations with post-secondary institutions, "the success of such initiatives as CURA is an indicator that government support of community-university partnerships and more generally science and society interactions produces significant social and economic value left unrealized by traditional research modalities" (Gall, Millot, & Neubauer, 2009). In 2005, SSHRC, under then President Marc Renaud, boasted that the council's emphasis on research partnerships and knowledge mobilization meant that they were "leading the way internationally in this field" (quoted in Vaillancourt, 2005, p .77).

two years after the CURA program.⁵³ Writing on this context, Grant and Drakich (2010, p. 21) describe how the federal government's "commitment to research innovation as a key driver of the knowledge economy, has been massive, affecting institutions and individuals in profound ways." What would become more apparent towards the end of the decade is the alignment of community engagement with the language of "social innovation." For example, in 2011 the Governor General of Canada, David Johnson participated in a workshop organized by SSHRC and United Way on post-secondary institutional engagement with the voluntary sector. This event was essentially a "brainstorming session to explore how to tell the story of community-campus collaborations most effectively, and how to position these collaborations as mechanisms to support social innovation" (One World Inc., 2012, p. 4).⁵⁴

What are the implications of the cancellation of the CURA program?

⁵³ The CFI was established in 1997 to award funds to help universities modernize their research infrastructure and was originally awarded \$3.15 billion in federal funds to support continued awards until 2010. Announced in 1999, the CRC program was to be provided with \$900 million over five years to establish and sustain 2,000 research chairs in Canadian universities (Polster, 2002: 184, Grant & Drakich, 2010, p. 22)

⁵⁴ Speaking at the Big Thinking lecture series organized by the Canadian Federation for the Social Sciences and Humanities (CFSSH) on Parliament Hill, David Johnson stated that "we must be as good in social innovation as we are in technological innovation." In this, the role of community-campus collaborations is to help "ensure that social innovation is a key component of Canada's innovation landscape" (The Hill Times, June 25th, 2012).

The importance attached to the CURA program by respondents begs the question of what have been the implications of its cancellation. Respondents were split on this matter. There were those who suggest that SSHRC's *Connections* funding stream for formal research partnerships essentially continues the CURA mandate as part of the streamlining of SSHRC's funding opportunities. In this view, the CURA program is gone in name only and the research partnerships program represents a continuation of the program's mandate. Others have a more negative perception. Commenting upon SSHRC's decision to cut the CURA program as part of its program renewal, Karina said,

I think it's been very successful and they cut it! I think that it was enormously successful but it might have been a little bit too political for them. The CURAs were really intended to do very profound research around social change issues and I think that kind of work might have been kind of threatening!

Karina highlights a difference between institutional and individual conceptualizations of community-engaged research with regard to the political nature of the research agenda. In addition to seeing the CURA program as a way to attract what Gustav called "serious money" community-based scholars also saw it as an opportunity to conduct research on a more equitable, reciprocal, and democratic basis. Genevieve spoke of how "there is a history, a tradition even, of academics using communities as research fodder and I think that the CURAs really mitigated against that to a really important extent." Nevertheless, the perception that the CURA was overly focused on social change, and hence too politicized for the research council, was a point also raised by Naomi,

I think that some of the research that was conducted through CURAs was fairly radical and political and I think that the partnership program is an attempt to shift that. I think it

is a more conservative program, particularly when you add the priority areas. They have been priority areas before but I think that they are having more influence on decisions now. ... Now there is a risk that research funds will get tied to the agenda of narrow groups of people. I think the CURA program actually opened up the research to a broader group of people in important ways. It was a fundamentally democratic program.

In Naomi's view, the current research partnership stream is potentially less democratic than the CURA program had been as the incorporation of priority areas, in her view, exerts a structuring effect on what can be addressed in the program.⁵⁵

Other respondents critiqued the CURA program for what they saw as its significant limitations. For example, Gustav questioned the extent to which community partners, even when

⁵⁵ Despite funding being accessible to all disciplines, areas, themes, and approaches, SSHRC have identified a number of priority areas for extra support, in order to deliver a "more tailored adjudication" of research funds. These areas currently include Aboriginal research; Canadian environmental issues; digital economy; innovation, leadership and prosperity; and Northern communities: towards social and economic prosperity. Polster (2007, p. 606) notes that whereas in the past, university administrators participated as partners in the policy-making process, new federal programs of support have turned administrators into applicants to research funding councils. One consequence of this has been a tendency by university administrations, when renewing their institutional strategic plans, to reflect the priorities of federally mandated strategic research areas. The fact that administrations are also increasingly promoting and educating faculty on the workings of the granting councils invariably positions them as extensions of the research councils themselves.

relatively well-resourced, could engage in research on anything approaching equitable terms. Offering his critique of a CURA project he was involved with at the time of our interview, Gustav remarked that,

you still have a real gap even when it comes to the area of the project design. The community is still very much seen as a resource as opposed to being participatory. ... The people that we have in that CURA are relatively high profile as community representatives, but even when they are actively engaged they are really engaging at a bit of a disadvantage.

Gustav suggests that research continues to be constructed in much the traditional way and raises concerns about the participatory nature of the research process. Echoing Naomi's claim that research tends to get tied to the "agenda of narrow groups of people" Gustav suggests that the political economy of the research encounter is one that disadvantages the community partner.

What I hold these quotes from Karina, Naomi, and Gustav to imply is that shifts in the nature and structure of community-university engagement are leading to a greater concentration of resources (e.g., funding) in the university, a lack of democraticism in the research process (given that the community remains largely a resource to be drawn upon), and a gradual depoliticizing of research purpose.

In the quote below by Larissa, her positive perception regarding the availability of funding opportunities for community-engaged research is tempered by a concern regarding their potential structuring effect. Commenting upon the funding climate, Larissa echoes the view of Irina regarding the bureaucratic "containing" of community-engaged scholarship,

It's certainly better than it ever was and, I think, I'm hoping that that will improve. It's been however many years since CURA was first launched by SSHRC and now we've got

their whole new regime in which they seem to quite like this idea of community engagement. I'm not sure they quite know what it is, but my worry is that the idea [of community engagement] will get co-opted by the bureaucracy and then defined out so that they lose their soul, so to speak.

Throughout my interviews, and as Larissa suggests, respondents could not be certain of the implications of these changes, the reasons for their implementation, or their possible consequences for community-engaged research. Notwithstanding this uncertainty, respondents recognize the relative privilege of the university when compared with the funding opportunities available for community organizations and agencies. For many respondents, the important legacy of the CURA program is the spotlight it helped to shine upon the social responsibility mandate of scholars and the university. Commenting upon this responsibility, Larissa states that,

There's a lot of potential for us to do a lot more. In the university we spend a lot of time whining about cutbacks but we are still extremely wealthy in relation to the non-profit and social service sector and we still have a lot of untapped resources that are misused or underused or underutilized.

I include this point on the wealth of universities relative to that of many communities not to downplay the significance of the concerns expressed by my respondents regarding the structuring of research, or of the competitive nature of the research landscape, but rather because it raises an important issue for community-engaged research. As highlighted by Adam, the "biggest weakness in the Canadian research movement is the underfunding or the lack of sufficient research capacity at the community level." This comment alludes to a common view among respondents that the federal government is dismantling the community-based infrastructure necessary for social change. For example, respondents spoke of the intensifying budgetary

pressures being felt by their community partners—various community agencies and organizations, non-profits, and those engaged in social service provision.⁵⁶ In light of this, the concentration of research capacity in the university works against the democratizing potential of community-engaged scholarship and the movement towards a knowledge democracy. Although the infrastructural support for CBR and knowledge mobilization (KMb) activities in universities is better than it ever has been before, researchers spoke of how such infrastructure and capacity is being decimated at community level at the same time. It is in this shifting funding context, one that is the focus of the next chapter, that the gap between the rhetoric and reality of community engagement being espoused by universities and the federal government becomes most apparent.

Forward to the next chapter

This chapter has addressed how efforts to embed community engagement in the institutional structures of the university, and to establish it as a dominant presence in SSHRC's funding architecture, have raised the profile of community engagement and bolstered the academic legitimacy of a previously marginalized field. Earlier in the chapter, I posed the question of to what extent the CURA program specifically, and increased funding opportunities

⁵⁶ In 2010, SSHRC formalized the level of matching funds required in research partnership grants for its *Insight* and *Connection* funding streams to 35% in cash and/or in-kind contributions over and above the total amount of funding requested by the council as an indicator of institutional and/or partner commitment (SSHRC, 2010). Respondents suggested that this change has placed additional pressures on their community partners, due to either budgetary constraints or an inability to adequately provide an in-kind contribution.

for community-engaged research more generally, represented a "game-changer" for community-engaged research in Canada. In the chapter, I have addressed how the influence of the CURA program is evident in the prominent position now accorded research partnerships in SSHRC's *Connections* funding stream. Furthermore, in a symbolic sense the CURA program has enabled the council to "tell a story" about how the research it funds benefits Canadians. I would argue, therefore, that the institutionalization of community engagement in the form of research partnership funding opportunities, and the growth in the institutional acceptance of such research by universities, represents a decisive shift in the value attached to community-engaged research, by both institutions and individuals.

However, the availability of such funding opportunities has arguably "changed the game" for a relatively small number of community-based researchers. These scholars have been able to involve in their projects a wide range of colleagues and community participants. The result of these connections has been an increase in the building of researcher networks and research collaborations across Canada. As such, a number of respondents have found their research capacity (and institutional standing) significantly increased as a result of (a) successful grant application(s). Universities also benefit from having "successful" CBR scholars in their ranks, insofar as it allows them to demonstrate their commitment to social responsibility. By way of contrast, scholars unsuccessful in their applications experienced considerable frustration with the CURA program, and a number of respondents testified to the demoralizing effects this has had. Whereas my focus in this chapter has been to unpack the "black box" of community engagement at the level of political economy, my focus in the next chapter is to analyse how community-based scholars are experiencing changes in the research landscape with regard to the impact of shifting funding pressures and research expectations. Respondents describe the "renewal" of

community engagement as it becomes institutionalized in Canadian universities, the growth and development of funding opportunities for community-engaged research, and the building of scholarly and institutional networks committed to conducting research democratically with communities. What emerges in chapter four is a disjuncture between institutionalized conceptualizations and of community engagement and how it is being experienced by those who "do" community-engaged research. In addressing the significance of these differences, I offer some insight regarding the context of the broader trends identified in the literature.

Chapter 5: Structuring Community Engagement

It seems to me that there isn't a lot of frank discussion on how SSHRC is rigid and has compromised our ability to be able to engage meaningfully with communities. Nobody

has that conversation because they are afraid to, and why? Because they want to get

funded—and that's the bottom line.

(Sophie, community-based researcher)

Everyone who works here is expected to go and find ways to bring money in.

(Ian, community-based researcher)

During interviews, it became clear that many researchers involved in community-engaged research are taking advantage of the institutional resources and funding opportunities that have become available for community-engaged research. The overarching claim I make in this chapter is that shifts in the nature and structure of the research funding landscape has led to functional and normative changes in what it is that scholars spend their time doing. In this chapter, I sketch out what some of these changes are and discuss the implications of their effects. It has been documented in the literature (Coleman & Kamboureli, 2011; Grant & Drakich, 2010; Polster, 2007) that research grants have become increasingly important to Canadian universities, but to what extent, and in what ways, have they become important to Canadian community-based

scholars? The argument I make in the chapter is that the increasingly competitive and market-driven workings of the university are "trickling down" to community-based scholars.

In doing so, I first explore how shifts in the funding climate have affected community-engaged researchers. I address how participants have responded to the availability of funding opportunities for community-engaged research and the changes they have seen in the research landscape as a result of these opportunities. My findings show that not only do scholars report spending more time than ever before applying for grants (in light of their increased importance for both individuals and institutions), but that seeking grant money has become an expectation of them by their institution. These findings substantiate Polster's claim that the importance of research grants to Canadian universities has led to a shift in how the standing of researchers has become increasingly based on the relative financial contribution they make to it (2007, p. 609). What this implies is that, particularly since the context of the late 1990s, the "performance" of the individual and that of the institution have become connected in ways they previously were not.

Second, I discuss respondents' views on how the nature and structure of funding for community-university research partnerships has shifted and I address the implications of these changes. I argue that the transformative and social change-oriented principles that lie at the heart of community-based research (Flicker & Savan, 2006; Jordan, 2003; Strand et al., 2003) have been neutralized by a disempowering funding application process. An issue I explore in this section is the extent to which the funding categories (e.g., the prioritization of particular themes and the requirement of a knowledge mobilization component) enable or limit the scope of the research. I also address the extent to which compliance within these categories is compatible with a strategy of resistance to those same categories and discourses. Funding categories

structure the work of producing a fundable grant application, to be sure, but what happens once funding is secured? In answering this question, I differentiate between the strategies researchers employ in order to produce a fundable grant application, and what they are able to do once funding has been secured.

Third, I explore respondents' perceptions of shifts in the nature and structure of funding with regard to the enveloping political economy of community engagement. I argue that the political economy of research partnerships has become more divisive than before because of the diminishing capacity of all but the most well-resourced community organizations to equitably participate in research. Although the institutionalization of community engagement as a scholarly function is leading to an "organized structural space" for the scholarship of engagement, I claim it is taking shape in a manner that reinforces, rather than challenges, the divide between universities and communities.

It became apparent in interviews that as much as the "game" may have changed for researchers and institutions, the political economy of research partnerships continues to work to the disadvantage of community participants. The concentration of resources and research capacity in the hands of researchers and institutions, coupled with the erosion of resources and capacity at community level, has been detrimental to the building of a democratic and reciprocal research practice between universities and community organizations. In this, what is happening in Canada is similar to what is happening elsewhere. Commenting on the stalled movement toward community engagement in the American context, for example, Morton et al. (2012) suggest that processes of institutionalization continue to act as conservative forces that

depoliticize or neutralize progressive movements within higher education (p. 6)⁵⁷. My sense from interviews is that—although the movement toward community engagement in Canadian universities continues to gather momentum—researchers are experiencing a similar process of neutralization of their community-based research practice. Notwithstanding the influence of the CURA program in shifting community-engaged research closer to the centre of institutional strategic plans, there has been more overall continuity than change in the political economy of the research landscape. In light of this, the prospect of realizing a knowledge democracy remains embryonic.

"They want you to have a grant, whether you need it or not"

A recurring theme in the interviews is that researchers are being actively encouraged by their institutions to conduct community-engaged research, albeit with accompanying pressure to apply for grants. Although the expectation that scholars compete for funding is not a new development, respondents suggested that it is now being felt in areas that have not previously experienced such pressure.⁵⁸ Christine is a sociology professor and works in the field of health,

⁵⁷ The authors of the *Democratic Engagement White Paper* published by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education lament what they perceive as the stalled movement toward civic engagement on college and university campuses (cited in Morton et al., 2012).

⁵⁸ This echoes claims made by Jordan (2003), Chan and Fisher (2008), and Polster (2004, 2007) that market-driven pressures are becoming ever more embedded in research practice and pervasive throughout the academy—as well as Coleman and Kamboureli's contention that SSHRC has fostered "a new collective culture of 'research entrepreneurship' which places scholars under constant pressure to apply for grants" (2011, p. xviii).

women and health, and health care policy. She has received funding for her research through SSHRC and CIHR and has been involved in a number of large-scale, collaborative research projects that have included a CBR component. Characterizing the institutional uptake of community engagement as a shift in university culture, Christine remarked that,

You can't talk about the shift in culture without also recognizing that the other part of the shift in culture is the pressure on academics to have money. That's one thing that I think is really important. It's really hard to get tenure and promotion without research money—which wasn't true before.

The issue of tenure and promotion is one I address in the following chapter. For now, I will engage with Christine's remark that the shift in academic culture is being accompanied by the increased expectation that scholars attract funding. It is significant that Christine describes this pressure as "part of the shift" toward community engagement as opposed to something operating independently of that shift, as this gestures toward the enveloping context of the importance of research grants to universities. In her interview, Christine spoke of how the pressure comes from the university administration. This is a theme also taken up by Irina, who speaks of how the pressure to apply for funding has become part of the institutional culture of her university,

This university, honestly, couldn't care less about what research you're doing. What they care about is whether you're bringing in dollars, that you're building a reputation, that you're publishing, and that you're supervising students. Whether you're doing that research on chocolate or HIV or creating blue bananas ... they don't care. I mean they care, but they don't really care. The bottom line for a university administrator is all about the bottom line. This university is a great example where you have the central

administration chomping at the bit to get researchers—all researchers on the campus to apply for some kind of funding from the tri-councils. It's apply! Apply! Apply! They want you to have a grant whether you need it or not, whether the research that you are doing needs it or not ... whatever—they just want you to have a grant. So you don't have to apply ... but you kind of have to apply.

Apart from illustrating the importance university administrations attach to research grants, Irina suggests that funding is becoming tied to such traditional academic activities as publishing and supervising students in ways that it previously has not been. She suggests that obtaining research funding is valued more highly than the actual research it makes possible. For her part, Naomi remarked that there is continuous pressure on scholars to apply for grants, "before you've written up what you've studied, you're pushing for another grant. The pressure is always there." Another respondent described the pressure as feeling as if they were trapped in a grant-writing "hamster wheel." What is clear from the comments of Christine, Irina, and Naomi is that applying for funding is now part of the academic labour of all researchers.

A contradictory outcome of this pressure is that researchers are experiencing pressure to apply for funding whether they actually need it for their research purposes or not. Specifically, Irina claims that it is funding from the tri-councils that is prioritized. For community-engaged scholars, this means applying for grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada. For those involved in community-based participatory research in health, it means applying to the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR). British Columbia-based Karina stressed the importance of tri-council funding, "Only the tri-council grants are the ones that are really counted in terms of helping the university and the universities' budget is dependent upon certain kinds of tri-council funding." Karina emphasizes the

importance universities now attach to research grants and the role such funding plays in making up for budgetary shortfalls due to funding cuts and increases in university overhead costs.

⁵⁹Drawing on her experience as program director and academic dean, Michelle provides insight into how this process works and how it impacts upon scholars more generally,

People are now being pressured to apply for funding. Certainly there is that pressure here. Some institutions are really pushing people at a very stage to apply—too early, I think. I think it is possibly well-intentioned and the idea is that if you can get funding then you can do research—and therefore you will be productive and—therefore you and, by extension, your institution will move up on the research barometer. The metrics around research tend to be funding metrics and that’s the driver from an institutional perspective. There is a financial incentive as well as a reputational one. If someone gets funding—well, that has an impact on the research overheads grants. So there are real incentives for institutions to try to push faculty into applying for research funding.

⁵⁹ It was not made entirely clear by respondents how exactly the receipt of tri-council funding makes up for shortfalls in a university’s operating costs. This is partly due to the lack of knowledge that some respondents had as to the workings of the financial intricacies of their university, as well as to some inaccuracies or misunderstandings respondents had regarding the role of SSHRC funding. That said, Karina also noted in her interview that research funds awarded internally by universities to their faculty have become subject to budgetary constraints. In light of this, the perception among respondents seems to be that seeking external funds (from the tri-councils) helps to ameliorate this shortfall. Karina’s comments, and those by Michelle which follow, should be considered in this light.

Michelle provides insight into how the performance of individuals is increasingly tied to the overall performance of the institution. Funding pressures, she suggests, are distributed downwards—from administration to faculties to departments and, inevitably, to individual scholars, with success in obtaining funding tied directly to expectations regarding research productivity (e.g., "if you can get funding then you can do research"). While Michelle acknowledges that there is considerable variation between universities in terms of the extent to which faculty are being pushed to apply, she is nevertheless clear in stating that such pressure has become a dominant trend across Canadian campuses.

"Everyone who works here is expected to go and find ways to bring money in"

In the early years of the CURA program, Ian had successfully applied for and obtained a development grant and this had encouraged him to devote his energies to applying for a full CURA grant. Focused on education, his proposal had aimed to establish a partnership between his university and local grassroots community organizations. Speaking of what he had hoped to achieve with the project, Ian said that "It would have created something that wasn't there before." Recalling his experience of working on his application for full CURA funding, he said

I spent the bulk of a good sabbatical working on the CURA grant and then I spent a good part of a second year revising it and a third year revising and resubmitting, and at a certain point I came to the conclusion that if I had put as much energy as I am putting into this futile search for funding to do what it is that I want to do in the community, I could have been doing it! It doesn't take me anymore time to do what I am doing without funding as it does to chase the funding and I just kind of gave up on it and thought that I just got to find ways to do what I think is important—with or without funding—and if I

continue to say that I can't do it because I don't have any funding for it then I'm going to end up being quite miserable because I'm not doing anything except unsuccessfully going after money.

Ian's experience testifies to the demoralizing and energy-depleting effects of what would be his ultimately unsuccessful attempt to secure funding. Ian spoke of how he later looked at the CURA projects that did receive full funding and noticed that they tended to be of a multi-site and multi-institutional nature—whereas his own grant application had had a much more localized focus. The irony, he later realized, is that he could have been doing the research he wanted to do without the funding—a situation which speaks directly to Irina's remark about scholars applying for funding "whether the research you are doing needs it or not." Not only does Ian's experience illustrate a functional shift with regard to his academic labour (e.g., the hugely time-consuming nature of the application process), it is also indicative of a normative shift with regard to what he felt was expected of him at the time. Ian is cognizant of how the pressure being placed upon scholars to procure funding is fundamentally changing what it is that scholars do,

We've gotten ourselves in to a predicament here where chasing money has become a very big part of what every faculty member is expected to do ... chasing money has become such a big, giant piece of what it is that we do and it plays itself out at every level.

Everyone who works here is expected to go and find ways to bring money in.

Ian is emphatic in stating how pervasive such funding pressures now are—leading to an overall intensification of funding pressures that "plays itself out at every level."

In my interview with Ian, he spoke of how the privilege of being a tenured professor protected him from the threat of being perceived of as "a useless, unproductive and non-contributing member of the university." Implicit in this description, however, is the suggestion

that a productive and contributing faculty member is one who is able to finance his or her research through grants—as it has now become a "big, giant piece of what it is that we do." Ian's challenge was to figure out how to do what he felt was important to him as a scholar in a way that did not rely on funding. In so doing, he was eventually able to view his funding application experience as a personal disappointment rather than a professional failing. It had taken him some time to recognize that the marker of his productivity as a scholar, and the barometer of his career satisfaction were not reducible to, or even tied to, successful grant applications.

There is agreement amongst respondents that funding pressures are compelling scholars to become more entrepreneurial and strategic in their academic pursuits. Taking up the theme that "chasing the money" has become a large part of what is it that scholars do, Sophie remarked,

Professors themselves have become like academic entrepreneurs. I think that the amount of money that you have to have in your pocket—to your Dean and to your peers, especially if you are going up for tenure or whatnot—it is the amount of money that you pull in that somehow renders you a person who is adept at research—but I would respectfully disagree. I think that it is nice to have money. I'm sitting on quite a pile of money myself!

Sophie has found herself in a very different position to that of Ian, as she has been successful in recent years in obtaining funding from a range of sources, including SSHRC. At the same time, she recognizes the entrepreneurial culture that has taken hold in Canadian universities, insofar as she describes professors as having become (rather than becoming) "academic entrepreneurs." In particular, Sophie's comments allude to the extent to which this climate of academic entrepreneurialism can be seen as being the product of institutional culture—one in which

success in obtaining funding, irrespective of the actual research that such money makes possible, is seen as a marker of research "excellence."

Sophie suggested in her interview that not only is funding important practically in terms of the contribution it makes to building research infrastructure and capacity (e.g., the hiring and training of research assistants), but that it is also important symbolically insofar as it accords peer status and somehow renders one "adept at research." The risk is that researchers are increasingly internalizing this entrepreneurial logic and managing their career trajectories accordingly. Commenting on how this ethos of academic entrepreneurialism is being experienced by younger scholars, Ian notes,

The message that you send, that is conveyed to graduate students from the get-go in doctoral programs is—start running now. Start chasing the money now because this is your life and this is your future. It's all about chasing money. There's no other way to be an academic. There's no other way to get a job. Get external funding and you're home free. Do what you need to do to do that. ... I think that at a very fundamental level that that is what chasing money is doing to life in the university ... It saps the life and energy and creativity out of young scholars who are having to constantly turn themselves into pretzels to make themselves into what it is that they aren't. ... I mean, it's a very, very harmful kind of thing that we've set up here.

Ian's views illustrate the extent to which an entrepreneurial logic is becoming embedded in the disciplinary and career socialization of younger scholars, a logic that compels them to be competitive, strategic, and entrepreneurial with regard to the important research and career decisions they make.

"There are people ... they'll apply for whatever is going!"

Daniel is a professor in political science with interests in security studies and international governance and has served as director of a research centre. At the time of our interview, he was vice-president of research for the social sciences and humanities and had participated in the drafting of his university's strategic plan, a key foundation of which is community engagement. Daniel spoke of what he considers to be the over-reliance by Canadian social scientists on research council funding, and SSHRC funding, in particular,

The danger in Canada is that we have too few sources of research funding and I would say one of the major dangers for social scientists is that the vast majority of us are almost entirely dependent on SSHRC. That, I think, is very dangerous. That, I think, is very problematic.⁶⁰

The dependency on SSHRC is problematic, Daniel claims, because SSHRC is subject to the same pressures of accountability with regard to the expenditure of government funds as universities. Daniel continued in his interview to suggest that the pressure on SSHRC—to be able to clearly demonstrate to the federal government that it is funding research that is "useful" and "relevant" to Canadians—is one that filters down to researchers. My reading of the research landscape is similar to that of Daniel, insofar as I agree that SSHRC is under pressure to demonstrate to the government that federally funded research is a public good. To utilize the entrepreneurial language that has come to permeate SSHRC policy statements, there is pressure

⁶⁰ This reliance on research council funding by scholars working in the social sciences and humanities is also suggested by a report issued by the Association of Universities and Colleges Canada (AUCC) (2008, p. 10).

to show a "return on investment" and the "value-added" of research conducted in the social sciences and humanities (e.g., SSHRC, 2005, 2007).

The resulting danger, according to Daniel, is that certain types of research end up becoming prioritized. On the one hand, the introduction of priority areas in SSHRC funding opportunities is seen as a positive development by some respondents because it helps to prioritize hitherto neglected or marginalized fields of study, as well as supporting emerging ones become established.⁶¹ These areas are also potentially compatible with a wide range of community-engaged research areas. On the other hand, respondents are concerned with the potential effects of this prioritization. Vincent observed,

There's no question that this issue [of prioritization] focuses some of the research dollars that does tend to go in certain types of direction. So if you prioritise a particular theme, whatever that theme is, you are going to have researchers who are going to follow the money. Not everyone will do that of course but many people will in fact follow the money. So I think the guidelines and the rules of engagement and the themes that get funded will have an impact.

Vincent suggests that it is difficult to know the extent to which the prioritizing of strategic areas has a direct bearing on the decisions that scholars make with regard to their field of research. With regard to this topic, there is a dimension to my analysis that aligns with Polster's (2007) view that such issues suggest tendencies and potentialities rather than full-blown trends (p. 616). I would also claim that such identification of priority areas is a strategic move by SSHRC in

⁶¹ SSHRC's priority areas currently include 1) Aboriginal research 2) Canadian environmental issues 3) digital economy 4) innovation, leadership and prosperity and 5) Northern communities: towards social and economic prosperity.

order to position itself as "relevant" and accountable for the funding allocation it receives from the federal government (the claim that SSHRC lacks resilience to accusations of irrelevancy was an issue raised by a number of informants). In fact, as much as researchers may co-opt the language of relevance and accountability in order to produce what they consider to be a fundable grant application, so too has SSHRC been careful in framing what it does in order to maintain its legitimacy in the eyes of the federal government.⁶² Nevertheless, a number of respondents were clear in stating that prioritizing strategic areas will inevitably have some degree of impact on the decisions scholars make with regard to their research areas. For example, speaking of how researchers approach the process of putting together a community-engaged grant proposal, Naomi suggests,

It's a huge investment! It's very unlikely that you're going to put in a winning application without a huge investment, so people are either going to be extremely strategic or they're going to be very stupid. They will have to be very strategic and that means that they will have to be watching the winds.

By "watching the winds" Naomi suggests that scholars are being encouraged to be as strategic as possible (i.e., possibly align their research with a priority area) when it comes to deciding their research area given the amount of time and energy required for the grant application process.

⁶² For example, in their Annual Report of 2006-2007, SSHRC (2007, p. 3) stated that "we are determined to do more to enhance recognition, in civil society as in government, of the contributions—past, present, and potential—that social sciences and humanities research makes to Canadian society. While much of this involves working more effectively with the research community to bring forth more evidence, much also involves communicating more effectively what we already know."

Such strategizing may not necessarily be a bad thing in itself, Naomi also noted, if it encourages a well-thought out research agenda that resonates well with a priority area. Once funding is secured, furthermore, Naomi and others suggested that researchers have freedom to get "creative" with how they use their funds. For many, this is the latest manifestation of the long-standing scholarly practice of grant-writing and merely part of "playing the game." The difference from past practice is the degree of importance it has now assumed.

Other respondents are concerned about the problematic influence of the prioritization of specific research areas. Patricia, a professor in education who believes that research should be empowering and social change oriented, provided a clear example of what happens when researchers are "watching the winds" when pursuing funding. Identifying the prioritization of aboriginal research, Patricia said,

What I have noticed without a shadow of a doubt is that there are some scholars and most of the ones I know are in education, who are totally in tune to getting money and they will reframe their work to whatever the topic is and I have to say that current interest in aboriginal education is phenomenal! People who have never looked in that direction are suddenly framing their work as "aboriginal education" or making themselves "experts" in aboriginal education. So definitely the naming of a particular thing and the funding attached to it in some ways draws out the worst in people. It draws out the people who are great grant writers and ambitious and opportunist. ... There are people, I've seen them, I've watched them over the years—they'll apply for whatever is going!

Patricia also spoke of how some scholars know the "right kinds of words" to put in grant proposals. It is not that such scholars do not have an interest in the research area they are seeking funding for (e.g., "aboriginal education")—but rather that they do not have the expertise but are

able to make it look like they do. Laura, a university research officer for the social sciences who works closely with researchers and the granting agencies, offered her thoughts on why this may happen. In suggesting that prioritization of certain themes by the research councils potentially exerts some pressure on the research decisions scholars make, Laura suggests that,

When dollars are earmarked that means they are not in the general pot so that means that those people outside of those fields either feel as though funding is not available to them or they feel pressure to move into areas that they might not otherwise have chosen as their intellectual pursuit. ... The challenges are many and the opportunities so few. So you do see researchers deliberately trying to partner outside of their comfort zone in order to get funding. Certainly we see people working very hard to understand other peoples' disciplines.

Laura suggests that pressure to obtain funding effectively leads to functional shifts in what it is that researchers do, as she sees researchers increasingly straying from their intellectual "comfort zone" in order to better their chances of securing funding. At worst, the scarcity of opportunities "draws out the worst in people," as previously observed by Patricia. Another way in which this has become manifest, according to some respondents, is through the choices that scholars make with regard to their methodological orientation. Beyond issues pertaining to the specificities of the actual research, respondents expressed a concern that community-based research methodologies are being co-opted for the purposes of securing a research grant.

Co-opting community-based methodologies

A number of respondents, particularly those with experience of reviewing grant applications, suggested that the co-optation of the language of community-engagement and associated methodological frameworks became increasingly common since the late 1990s. Irina

made the following observation with regard to the growing popularity of community-based research (CBR) methodologies,

You are seeing, increasingly, people adopting the language, co-opting the language, and saying, okay, now I'm doing CBR and I'm really doing it for the reasons of an action research kind of reasoning—and so now I'm working with the community because there is money there and I want to follow it. I'm now working with the community, and lo and behold my resistance is lowered, and this is so much easier—but maybe they're not actually doing business all that differently! I think there is a danger that if you throw money at something then people may follow the money and change their language but they may not be actually changing anything about the way that they are doing business.

Irina suggests that there is a connection between the funding opportunities that have become available for community-engaged research and the co-optation of participatory methodologies. This emerged as a recurring theme in a number of interviews—of grant applicants dressing up what is essentially a traditional research project in the language of community-based and/or participatory research. Indeed, just as critics claim the institutionalization of community-engagement is more rhetorical than actual, a number of respondents spoke of how they have seen grant applications utilizing what seemed to be a rhetorical rather than actual community-based methodology. For example, situating her comments in the context of the increasing popularity of community-engaged research that developed in the late-1990s, Deirdre made the following observation,

The funding agencies had been looking for ways in which research can be linked more to practice or to policy, and they were favouring more collaborative or partnership type proposals which pushes for more participatory type approaches. I was doing reviews for

grants in the late 1990s and we were receiving some participatory research proposals, and it was tricky because well, I know that there were instances when we received grant proposals that said they were doing participatory processes and they didn't have a clue what they were talking about and their research was not appropriate.

Deirdre suggests a link between the increasingly practical and policy-oriented focus favoured by the funding agencies (she had reviewed grant applications for SSHRC and CIHR) and the occasionally inappropriate utilization of participatory methodologies. As SSHRC consolidated its emphasis on research partnerships through the 2000s, Deirdre was critical of what she observed to be a distinct lack of clarity in how applicants specified their methodological orientation. As a grant reviewer, she claims to have repeatedly seen proposals that had either conflated, or simply confused, action research (AR) with participatory action research (PAR). She claims that this has become more of a trend since the late 1990s. In Deirdre's view, many proposals were essentially traditional research projects that included an essentially tokenistic gesture toward a community-based, participatory methodology. Expanding on her experience of reviewing grant applications in the late 1990s and early 2000s, Deirdre claims that,

The research proposals received would not have necessarily distinguished action research from participatory action research but were arguing that they were PAR or that they were a particular type of CBR research project, when the participation was not obvious in the way that they had designed their research. What they were doing was that they were consulting with some community groups at the beginning—but basically they were running an entire research project and they were just consulting with people at the very beginning.

Deirdre's account alludes to what she perceives to be the difference between (and conflation of) a "thin" model of community-based research dominated by the university partner, and a "thick" model of community-based research, one that is more fully participatory and empowering. In effect, she highlights a practice whereby adding a participatory element to a research design is seen as a way of giving voice to people's experiences.

Deirdre also spoke of the difficulty involved in maintaining a genuinely participatory research project given the lack of capacity that community groups and agencies she worked with had to meaningfully engage in the research process. Commenting on some of the participatory projects she has been involved with, she spoke of how they often came to resemble traditional, non-participatory research projects. As the research project moved beyond the initial stages, according to Deirdre, the participatory component would often "fizzle out" due to the inability of community participants to sustain their commitment.⁶³

Drawing upon her experience as research director of an urban-based research and policy institute, Niamh is also critical of what she perceives to be the widespread and indiscriminate use of the language of participation,

I think that "partnership" and "collaboration"—all of those things—people use that language sort of indiscriminately and they don't articulate what they mean by it. I think the big funding agencies adopting it can be problematic because it just perpetuates that uncertainly.

Prior to our interview, Niamh had conducted a conference call with university-based researchers about a potential partnership and remarked upon the lack of specificity of the language that the

⁶³ I address the lack of community capacity to engage in research in more detail in the section below titled "*All of their funding was cut to shreds.*"

individuals she had spoken with had used: "I felt like I recognized all of the words that people were using but at the end I wasn't too certain of what anybody had said!" Niamh suggests that the adoption of the language of participation by funding agencies and grant applicants is a contributing factor in how it, in turn, prompts applicants to also use (and therefore perpetuate) such language. Beyond the co-optation of participatory methodologies is a concern with the language that grant applicants use. My intention here is to draw attention to the ways in which researchers either comply with or co-opt the language of community engagement—with a view to exploring how such compliance or co-optation shapes the democratic and engaged character of the research.⁶⁴

We're all part of these "discourse makers," to get funding

Some scholars in my study, such as Ayala, were clear in stating that they intentionally and strategically use what another respondent, Patricia, referred to as the "right kinds of words" in their grant applications. For example, Ayala's CURA brings together a broad alliance of community stakeholders in a multi-method, interdisciplinary, and multi-institutional project. In applying for a CURA grant, Ayala describes how she framed her grant application by using the specific language (what she terms "discourse") her actual research sought to contest. Cognizant

⁶⁴ This is a recurrent theme in the literature. For example, Jordan (2003) addresses what he sees as the co-optation of participatory action research (PAR) in neoliberal modes of governance. Writing in the context of the UK, Bunyan (2013) explores how the language of "empowerment" and "partnership" are being used to legitimize state-sanctioned and market-driven policies with regard to the role of the university.

of how words serve to categorize and stigmatize the vulnerable groups she works with, Ayala nonetheless co-opts the language of "marginalization" and "at risk" youth in her proposal in order to pursue a community-engaged agenda of scholarly activism that challenges such categories and stigmas,

One of our goals is to refrain from the negative discourse, but the truth is that if you look at our proposal we talk about linking with youth development in marginalized urban communities—but now that we've been funded we've dropped the "marginalized" part. The truth is that most of what enables us to get funding plays into these stereotypes. If you are developing a program that is not for "at risk" students—and say that you are going to take kids that are doing well—then the likelihood of people being supportive or of it getting it funded is going to be lower. So the whole culture, even within the agencies in the community, they too will play into that. We're all part of these "discourse makers" to get funding.

Ayala's experience illustrates Naomi's observation of the necessity of "watching the winds" in thinking strategically about the kinds of words to use in a grant application. In my view, Ayala's case reveals a two-fold tension. On the one hand, a researcher may comply with the funding requirements stipulated by SSHRC (which I address in the next section as "boss texts") in order to produce a fundable grant application—which is understandable in light of the amount of time necessary to put an application together. On the other hand, it reveals how a certain degree of autonomy can be exercised once funding has been secured (e.g., through dropping the language and, hence, changing the "discourse"). As such, Ayala's example is indicative of how compliance with the categorical framing of research (by playing into the "at-risk" stereotype) can be used in a manner that ultimately strives to empower the community. Researchers may see SSHRC as

setting the terms of the discourse, but the "making" of the discourse remains the site of contestation.

Other respondents acknowledge how using the "right kinds of words" when applying for funding, particularly with regard to priority research areas, can either boost or hamper the prospects of a grant application. Irina recognizes the extent to which her research area chimed with the priority research areas targeted by SSHRC. Speaking of her research interests relative to those of some of her colleagues, Irina said,

I recognize that some of my colleagues do some fascinating and important work but it isn't literally as sexy and which is not likely to attract research dollars. I imagine that if you mention aboriginals, teens, sex, and health, it's not hard to get dollars to blow.

Notwithstanding some intentional exaggeration in her remarks, Irina draws attention to how the topicality (its "sexiness") of the subject matter of a research proposal can be a distinct advantage in grant applications.

The issue of how a research topic is chosen and framed is illustrative of the role and influence that the funding agencies can have. This was a salient theme in interviews in light of SSHRC renewing its funding architecture toward the end of the 2000s.⁶⁵ Reactions to the new

⁶⁵ The three funding streams are *Talent, Insight, and Connection*. The *Connections* program provides funding for research and related activities as carried out by individual scholars, teams of researchers, and their collaborators—including those from the public, private, and not-for-profit sectors. Opportunities include *Connection Grants* (which support KMB initiatives) and *Formal Partnerships* (supporting a wide range of partnerships, including industry-academic initiatives). In the latter funding stream, *Partnership Development Grants* provide support new research and are valued at \$75,000 to \$200,000 over one to three years. *Partnership Grants* provide support to

funding architecture, in which research partnerships were given a central place, are largely positive amongst respondents. Researcher optimism, however, is generally tempered by some degree of caution. It should be noted that the degree of involvement with SSHRC and knowledge of its funding programs varies considerably among those interviewed. Some individuals were deeply engaged with the consultative process when SSHRC revised its funding streams and offered informed speculation as to what the effects the revision may potentially have for researchers. Other scholars engage with the SSHRC website only in order to know what they need to do in order to apply for funding. Less common were those who exhibited either clear disinterest or open disregard for SSHRC.

Clara, a researcher in geography with a research specialization in public policy on housing, homelessness, and social exclusion, was cautiously optimistic about the new architecture. She stated that,

I think the more explicit architecture around partnerships could actually engender some very creative ways of coming together, but I think there are dangers as well in terms of the extent to which academics have had their work shifted in a way that sort of takes away from their own theoretical and empirical interests to address the compromises that are inevitable when you are working with various partners who have their concerns and their issues—and then you have SSHRC rules, and so on. There's a lot that needs to be balanced.

existing formal partnerships and are valued as at \$500,000 to \$2.5 million over four to seven years (http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/umbrella_programs-program_cadre/connection-connexion-eng.aspx).

Clara adopts a mixed-method approach to her research within a collaborative, community-based framework and is currently the principle investigator of a SSHRC Partnership Development Grant. On the one hand, Clara's comments speak to the difficulties extensively addressed in the literature of establishing a working relationship between researchers and community partners—one which inevitably involves addressing the "compromises that are inevitable" in any collaborative research process. On the other hand, and more relevant to the discussion I take up in the next section, is Clara's reference to "SSHRC rules" and the extent to which they structure the nature of research engagement. Although I do think that the revised program architecture could engender some creative forms of collaboration between scholars and community partners, there lies a danger in terms of the extent to which the work that scholars do has shifted in order to achieve the balance that is necessary when research becomes accountable to multiple research partners. To this end, what has not received a lot of attention in discussions on community-engaged research is how funding structures either advance or undermine the democratic potential of the engagement. The challenge presented to scholars is how to support and participate in the institutionalization of community engagement—albeit without sacrificing the democratic intent and collaborative nature of the research process.

"Boss texts" and the structuring of community-engaged research

Commenting upon the application process for SSHRC grants, a number of respondents describe the rules and regulations enveloping the funding application process as overly cumbersome for community partners. A professor in health policy and management, Polina expressed her frustration with having to teach her community partners to use what she characterizes as "totally incomprehensible consent forms" and claims that it "makes a joke of the

whole concept of community-based research." Polina's work focuses, in part, on the intersection between health, disability and human rights. She is critical of the bureaucracy enveloping and impeding the relationship she seeks to forge with community participants. Concern with the ethics of community-based research has been addressed in the literature on the "best practice" of community-engaged research and is not one I develop here. Instead, my concern in this section is to explore how the institutionalization of community-engaged research in granting agencies such as SSHRC is having a "structuring effect" on the research process. Below, Anna details the reasons she chooses to work with her community participants (an activist group for immigrant women) as community "collaborators" rather than as research "partners" in a grant application for a CBR project,

The grant I've got right now is just a strategic research initiative. It's not a partnership grant because, well, I decided to go that way because my partners would not have been able to meet all the criteria, and so I identified them as collaborators. In the process of getting the grant, the women, the activist women I work with, had to go on to the SSHRC website and fill in a SSHRC CV and basically fill in a form about their research contributions (and) the partnership almost crashed there and then! For me to get the grant in order to collaborate with them, SSHRC would only understand who they were when it was translated into the language of an academic ... but that's not who they were! What I ended up doing was getting them to go on the SSHRC website to get a password. I then got them to send me their résumé and all their information and I had to translate everything ... it was an enormous task! It took me weeks to translate what they did as grassroots activists engaged in participatory action research into the language that SSHRC could understand ... So the very categories of information that are required in

these partnerships grants is very unfriendly to grassroots advocacy and grassroots activist groups.

Disempowered from the get-go due to the bureaucratic functioning of the application process, Anna's remarks indicate the lack of research capacity that she feels typifies the day to day workings of many community organizations and agencies. Her comments are also illustrative of the bureaucratization of community engagement that Irina referred to in the previous chapter, in which she spoke of there now being a "whole new lingo" (what Anna refers to as "categories of information") used to describe community-engaged research.

Whereas Irina suggests that formalized ways of talking about community-engaged research by institutional actors (e.g., universities, granting agencies) has a structuring or "containing" effect upon the research, Anna describes the mechanics of the grant application process as being "unfriendly" to her community partners. In effect, a collaborative research project designed to empower her community partners and bolster their research capacity is contained by a disempowering grant application procedure. Commenting on the bureaucratic functioning of the funding mechanisms that scholars struggle to navigate, Anna suggests the following interpretation,

I use the framework of Dorothy Smith all the time when I see some of these moves happening because she talks about what she calls "boss texts"—ruling relations and the way that texts operate to manage and control the everyday. What happens is that you have texts that are created where everybody has to basically answer to the categories in that text. So I would call, for example, some of the SSHRC forms ... when you fill in all the forms—they're the boss texts. It doesn't matter who you are or what you've been doing—you fill in according to their categories. That's what I struggled with when I was

trying to get my grant going ... they are more about management and accountability than about real relationships.

Anna describes how Smith describes "boss" or "governing" texts as texts (or sets of texts) that organize and coordinate social relations between people and groups.⁶⁶ For example, SSHRC's funding descriptions provide a limited repertoire of categories and concepts that applicants are required to follow. In filling out forms as part of the grant application process, individuals are thus compelled to answer to the categories as determined by this institutional discourse. The result, suggests Anna, is a legitimizing or authorizing of certain experience and knowledge(s) and the marginalization or exclusion of others. Anna is cognizant of the effects of the enveloping political economy of the research landscape—citing the emphasis on management and accountability as a driving force behind the bureaucratic functioning of research partnerships rather than where the emphasis should be—on "real relationships."⁶⁷

The issue raised in Anna's comments is the extent to which the "boss texts" of the grant application process structure and limit the democratic reach and potential of the engagement.

⁶⁶ Dorothy Smith recognizes how the language of experiential accounts is deeply permeated and dominated by the discursive logic of social relations and institutional organization (Smith, 2006, p. 129), with these "ruling relations" existing as embodied "forms of consciousness and organization that are objectified in the sense that they are constituted externally to particular people and places" (2006, p. 13).

⁶⁷ Anna's comments also testify to the overall intensification of her academic labour as she assumes responsibility for translating what her community partners do into the "categories of information" required by the funding process. The intensification of academic work is a theme I address in more detail in the following chapter.

Many scholars interviewed for the study typically describe their work as democratic and collaborative in intent, notwithstanding the extent to which the nature of the research funding undermines the workings of the collaboration in practice. However, as much as researchers may utilize the language of funding categories and discourse, they also do so in a manner that is more active co-optation than passive compliance (as Ayala's example in the previous section demonstrates). In this sense, researchers are willing to "dance to the tune of the funder" (as Sophie described it) if it helps them get what they need. For many researchers, such strategies do not diminish the extent to which they describe what it is that they do as democratic and engaged. Granted, funding categories structure the work of producing a fundable grant application, but once funding is secured researchers have considerable freedom given that SSHRC does not have a mandatory reporting mechanism in place to determine how the money has been spent. At the same time, they acknowledge that the issues communities are struggling with impact upon the extent to which their community partners are able to participate in research on equitable grounds—with this being the factor (how the collaboration is structured at the level of political economy) that most critically undermines the democratic potential of this kind of work.

"SSHRC wanted structure whereas this is all about process"

For several respondents, the overly rigid and bureaucratic working of the grant application process has a structuring effect in terms of shaping the form and functioning of the research encounter. Below, Sophie expresses her frustration over what she experiences to be the dictatorial workings of the grant application process,

The problem is that a lot of the work that is being conducted is really regulated and dictated by funding bodies and funding envelopes, and I think that there is more than one

way to engage in community-engaged research. For me, it shouldn't start with the research project by SSHRC or CIHR. It should start, first and foremost, with the ambassador of the academy—myself, engaging in community development and simply colliding socially with potential partners, research partners, facilitating workshops, sitting on a board ... contributing to a garage sale, God knows what, and then slowly but surely engaging people in a way that seems to be authentic—and then and only then if there is research to be had, to be discovered, to be engaged with—then one should be able to do so. I think that that actually honours basic community development principles, but it doesn't play get played out that way unfortunately in Canada.

Sharing Anna's sense of frustration with how SSHRC "rules" privilege structure over process, Sophie is clear in stating how impactful funding mechanisms are with regard to how research takes shape, in how the research agenda is defined, and ultimately operationalized. In suggesting that there is "more than one way to engage" in collaborative research, Sophie suggests that current funding structures are overly regulatory with regard to the requirements of the application procedure—ultimately to the detriment of the research design. For example, the extent of the contradiction between how researchers experience the research process versus the structuring effect of SSHRC expectations is also evident in the following respondent's account. Fatima has a long-standing relationship with an aboriginal community group and speaks of the hurdles encountered when putting together a funding application for a CURA grant,

The biggest one problem was the lack of definition of the research questions and SSHRC wanted to know about how I would create the research questions. I wasn't going to! I would speak of fields, fields that we might look at, or domains ... but no research questions and that was hugely problematic [for SSHRC] because the questions would all

come from the community—it was the community that would have to develop the questions. They would even develop the fields. So SSHRC wanted structure whereas this is all about process.

Fatima works in a department of social work with research specializations in child welfare and aboriginal issues. She has also worked extensively in provincial government in an advocacy capacity for child welfare, and is currently principle investigator of a CURA that looks at family and community wellness in aboriginal communities. She is deeply committed to a research process that honours the principles of reciprocity and mutuality that lie at the heart of the CBR process—principles which call for community participants to be involved in all stages of the research. As her observations indicate, there is a clear discrepancy here with what SSHRC require in terms of structure—the dictate that the research questions be determined in advance of the commencement of the research. Fatima and her partners were ultimately successful in their application, but it took what she describes as a "labour of love" to translate everything they planned to do into a successful application and into what she called "SSHRC-Y language."

I remain cognizant of how many of these frustrations around the funding process originate in a funding climate that is, at least relative to the situation experienced by researchers leading up to the late 1990s, significantly improved. What remains a concern is that the imperative of obtaining research funding has changed what it is that community-engaged researchers spend a lot of their time doing. According to Sophie, researchers increasingly "have to dance to the tune of the funder." In a research landscape where researchers are encouraged to jump on any funding opportunity, she observes that scholars are increasingly hesitant to (as she put it) "bite the hand that feeds them." Sophie recounts her experience of attending meetings between researchers, university administrators, and SSHRC representatives,

We've all been to those meetings [where] they invite the SSHRC representative and we all stand there and we all share the results of the research and whatnot and everybody kind of tip toes around the SSHRC individual even though they may be very nice and engaged. I'm not talking about the individual per se, but what they symbolize, and it seems to me that there isn't a lot of frank discussion on how SSHRC is rigid and has compromised our ability to be able to engage meaningfully with communities. Nobody has that conversation because they are afraid to—and why? Because they want to get funded—and that's the bottom line.

I am reminded at this point of Irina's comment of how "the bottom line for a university administrator... is all about the bottom line." Although community-engaged scholars played an important role in petitioning SSHRC to develop such opportunities as the (now defunct) CURA program, and had consulted with them on how to best engage in community-engaged research, Sophie's comments express frustration, but also anger, at how the importance attached to research grants has come to compromise the ability of community-based scholars to engage meaningfully with communities.

At the same time, I claim that the incorporation of community-engaged research by SSHRC in its funding architecture has happened because, to some degree, the critique levied against conventional academic research for being "disengaged" from communities has been internalized by the council. The result is that research partnerships emphasizing a participatory component have assumed a more central role in the SSHRC's funding mandate. In fact, as much as I have argued that SSHRC (and universities) has taken up community engagement in an overly entrepreneurial manner, with a result being an objectifying funding discourse that neutralizes the social-change orientation of community-based, participatory methodologies, I

also claim that debates on the implications of the institutionalization of community engagement (of which this dissertation forms a part) would not be happening were it not for this internalization (e.g., SSHRC's program response to "disengaged" research).

Furthermore, it is important to note that certain scholarly conventions present in academia, such as the privileging of research over teaching and service, and the status attributed to research publications, for example, also compromise the ability of community-based scholars to meaningfully engage with communities. Such conventions exacerbate the difficulties scholars experience when dealing with what they perceive to be the restrictive nature of SSHRC's funding categories—and operate in a way that is independent from SSHRC given that grant reviewers are drawn from the academic community. In other words, there are expectations within academia (particularly with regard to requirements for tenure and promotion which I address in the next chapter) that have an independence from SSHRC expectations. In the final section below I address the contradiction between the institutionalization of community-engaged research in universities and granting agencies, and the funding structures that undermine the capacity of community-university research partnerships to achieve long-lasting results.

"They all seem to be experiments of five years"

Beyond addressing the effect of how "boss texts" structure the nature of the working relationship between researchers and community participants—another theme that one researcher identifies as a "structural fault" in community engagement is the inability of scholars to do what it is that they set out to do due to the life-span of the funding. For many CBR scholars, the research "outcome" is the building of relationships and "coming-togetherness" (Ian's description) between the community and university that is achieved with the research—one that is not

reducible to being contained by a five-year funding envelop. A frequently cited complaint by respondents is the difficulty of sustaining the linkages they forge with community organizations and agencies given the time-bound nature of the funding. Commenting on how the CURA five-year funding model has now been integrated and formalized in SSHRC funding, Deirdre remarked,

They all seem to be experiments of five years and then you're expected to be able to continue to fund yourself from then on but there are no mechanisms for doing that. There's nothing, so it's impossible. It can't be done! All you can do is to try to apply again for some other ongoing five-year funding thing that includes enough core funding, which is basically just another regular grant competition, and it's not so easy to see how those can be successful on an ongoing basis. Some people have tried to do it but I think it does a disservice to the whole nature of what these partnerships are once they're built. They don't just stay built. It's not a matter of just funding the building phase. You also have to fund the ongoing phase. You can't just build it and say it will continue by itself without any additional funding. It doesn't quite work like that! It's in every case, I think, that groups who have built and used their funding in order set this up then experience real difficulty in keeping it going because the funding is so precarious and very difficult to manage.

In Deirdre's view, the five-year funding model allows for the building of research infrastructure and capacity that then proves difficult to sustain. This theme is also taken up in my interview with Sophie. Responding to my question as to whether it was possible to speak of there being a "renewal" of community engagement in Canadian universities, Sophie stated,

Sure there has been a renewal but let us define and deconstruct what that renewal is. If SSHRC says that you need to build partnerships with the community in order to be able to further your research agenda ... the template is [that] you seek out individuals with whom you think you could work. You propose to them an idea and say well, hey, would you like to do some research with us? And because there is mutuality there, or some democracy, people will set up a research advisory group comprised of almost solely of people in the community ... but what happens after 24 or 26 months, after the funding dries up? What I'm talking about is that that's a one-off, and as democratic and as pie in the sky as that may look like, at the end of the day the researcher goes home with their data and the community goes off and does their thing after the lifespan of the research project is completed—and to me that is morally ambiguous. I think that in every research project there should be some type of sustainability piece and I think that is something that in my opinion is severely lacking.

Although the funding structure sets in motion a democratic model of research collaboration between researchers and community groups, Sophie suggests that the end result often resembles a traditional research "hit and run." Notwithstanding the espousal of social responsibility driving the renewal of community engagement, Sophie describes the structural fault she sees at the core of the funding process as essentially a moral failing.

Other respondents had a different take on what could or should be achieved with the current SSHRC research partnership funding model. Larissa spoke of her involvement in a number of large-scale research partnerships in the following terms,

I've been involved in some of the big ones and I'm right now involved in one of those big partnerships grants that's millions of dollars and they've got everybody and their Uncle

Bob on the network. And the advantages of that are that you do build a national network because you are in touch with other people—and the knowledge mobilisation learning from each other is very, very helpful. So it does that sort of networking thing that is very useful but by the time the money dribbles down to the individual community project there is usually so very little of it left that it's hard to kind of ... it's not very satisfying in a lot of ways compared to a smaller project where you really are working closely with community. So I kind of separate them in my head when it comes to the purpose of those large grants—they really are about developing networks more than they are about doing research. They're about developing networks for knowledge mobilisation and facilitating the cross-pollination of ideas and building that sort of knowledge democracy.

Larissa suggests that large scale funding opportunities are more about the building of the research networks, and mechanisms for knowledge mobilization for universities and scholars, than they are about sustaining a community-university linkage. In effect, the building of these networks and capacity is illustrative of what my informant Adam characterized as the "emerging structural space" of the knowledge democracy. Larissa's concerns, however, also raises the question of whether universities and government are more receptive toward community-based research which involves large-scale research projects over projects that involve direct community action. My view is that large-scale community-engagement projects, which may or may not have a social justice component, are the ones favoured by universities due to the "contribution" they can make to a university's research budget's operating costs. Such projects raise the profile of the university and their standing with the research councils. At the same time, several respondents suggested that projects smaller in scale are more amenable to a direct action or activist agenda, given their more localized and specific nature, but are not as valued by the

university. Granted, both types of projects have a key role to play in the realization of a knowledge democracy. Yet, what respondents suggest to be detrimental to developing the research landscape of community-engaged research is the lack of capacity at community level, a situation which leads not only to an impoverished realization of the knowledge democracy—but arguably one in which the "community" remains a resource to be drawn upon.

"All of their funding was cut to shreds"

Respondents stated that the relative gap in wealth between universities and communities is increasing and that the community agencies and organizations they work with are "continuously expected to do more with less" as described by Vincent. Irina elaborates on this notion of doing more for less and the consequences.

A lot of the non-profits that I work with have fewer and fewer resources to put to anything but core services and are being asked to cut all kinds of other services. So I think that if the neo-liberal strategy that we have been adopting stays the course it could be extremely tricky for social service organizations that really should be thinking about how to develop the knowledge landscape—they are being stripped of their capacities.

The view that cutbacks are stripping all but the most well resourced community organizations of their research capacities was a common theme in interviews. As similarly expressed by Naomi, "If anything, there were many decisions being made by government that have actually decimated the infrastructure that we need in order to really move things forward." The loss of the communities' research capacity was a source of considerable anger and frustration for scholars working with community partners. Elaborating on her comments, Naomi spoke of how the community organizations she works with had "all of their funding was cut to shreds" in recent

years. The direct impact of this loss is a "lack of infrastructure that allows for deep, collaborative learning". For her part, Christine describes how community organizations are now more likely to receive project money rather than infrastructure money—with the result being a lack of capacity to be genuine partners in research beyond the short-term.

Respondents cited a range of ways in which their community partners are disadvantaged as a result of this lack of capacity. Natasha spoke of the difficulty the vast majority of organizations would have in attaining the kind of accreditation necessary to take the lead on a research project.⁶⁸ The increasing dependency of community organizations on universities to obtain ethical clearance for research due to their lack of peer-review capacity was also raised by several respondents. Granted, these issues have been raised in the literature (see Flicker and Savan, 2006; Stanton, 2008). What has received less attention is the Federal Government's increased commitment to funding research partnerships in universities—while at the same time undermining such commitment through capacity-cutting at community level. This contradiction is illustrated by a report commissioned by the Governor General on community-university engagement (One World Inc., 2011). The report concludes by stating that there is "increasing realization that knowledge creation should ideally be a *co-creation* process where communities and academics work together to define the research questions, the methodology and approach,

⁶⁸ As stated in the funding eligibility criteria on the SSHRC website "For most funding opportunities, applicants (principal investigators) must be affiliated with a Canadian postsecondary institution. Researchers not affiliated with a Canadian postsecondary institution are eligible to apply as co-applicants to selected SSHRC funding opportunities and as research collaborators to any SSHRC-supported project" (<http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/apply-demande/index-eng.aspx>).

and the interpretation and use of data" (p. 5). The methodological premises of CBR espouse an ethos of reciprocity and mutuality in exactly these terms, and yet respondents' perceptions were that the erosion of research capacity at the community level was reaching a critical point. In light of what respondents have to say about the impact of these cutbacks, it is difficult to imagine knowledge creation being a genuinely reciprocal process of co-creation between universities and communities.

A political economy of community engagement

Vincent spoke of how changes in the nature of funding mean that the "political economy of the partnership arrangements are often ones that are inherently of some disadvantage to the community." Christine describes changes in the nature and structure of funding and the effect this is having on her community partners as follows,

What government has done actually is a travesty. They have created small pots of money, usually soft money, or what they call research money, or development money, and then organizations apply for it and government will only fund a few and that creates division in communities. It creates conflict and tension in the community. It really is the government driving wedges between people. So people don't like each other ... because they [the funding structures] have set up one organization to do something different from the other organization.

Christine illustrates how the structure of the funding (e.g., different forms of small-scale development money) is one that fosters a climate of competition between organizations rather than a culture of collaboration. Researchers are struggling to build alliances with community partners in this competitive funding climate. Commenting on one symptom of this competitiveness, Ian spoke of how "almost any community organization that I approached had

already been approached by someone else that was interested in community-university partnerships". Ian's observation must be understood in a climate of cuts to the operating budget of many community agencies and organizations—one in which the resulting decline in community capacity entails a shrinking "pool" of potential community organizations with which to partner with. For example, Niamh (director of a relatively well-resourced urban research and policy institute) spoke of the constant interest her institute receives from university-based scholars seeking a "community partner." The effects of this lack of community capacity to meaningfully engage in research, coupled with the need for researchers to find community partners with some degree of research capacity, was raised by Ayala,

It's often easy to just deal with the well-known organizations that, when you partner with them, they just make your life easier because they are set up to partner with. The smaller organizations just don't have that kind of capacity.

Notwithstanding this observation by Ayala, Vincent claims that community organizations remain eager to capitalize upon their academic connections because of the possibility of replenishing their diminishing budgets. He spoke of how community organizations are being "pushed" into research, albeit with significantly less capacity to do so. As such, a number of respondents suggested that the capacity-cutting evident at community level is leading to a shift in the operational mandate of the community organizations that they work with. As described by Irina,

I think organizations are getting more and more sophisticated about the potential of using research, as well as following where the dollars are going. If dollars get stripped away from funding services they are being, in many places, augmented in terms of doing research. If you can't get the dollars to fund your program you might get dollars to do research which might then serve to fund programs. And so some organizations are getting

quite savvy about how to use research dollars to basically continue to fund their core group of activities.

Irina explained this as meaning that community organizations are operating strategically in a research-focused and policy-oriented manner. This was substantiated in an interview I conducted with Niamh who described how her organization has transitioned from being a community-based research institute with some capacity to do community-based research (which used to include some research training for community participants) to a much more explicitly policy-oriented institute,

There's definitely been a shift within the organization away from funding lots of tiny pilot projects to trying to think more strategically about how we're funding external work and trying to move way from being an organization that used to place a great emphasis on using research as a capacity building tool to being much more of a sort of research and policy institute.

Christine aligns shifts in the nature and structure of research council funding with an explicitly pro-business agenda,

I think there's no question that you're supposed to have community-university alliances but in general they [the research councils] don't think of those as being civil society-based, even if they are with civil society organizations, because really they're thinking of business connections and how can we integrate with business. The requirement that they [community partners] have to make a formal financial contribution, or at least a time contribution, eliminates many organizations.

Arguably, this movement towards a pro-business agenda is becoming clear in light of recent developments in the funding landscape. For example, the Government's Economic Action Plan

of 2012 proposed an annual contribution of \$37 million to enhance the research councils' support for industry-academic collaborations, "the granting councils have been increasing their focus on partnerships between post-secondary researchers and companies to target research to business needs and transfer knowledge into economic advantage" (Government of Canada, 2012, p. 73). This involves \$7 million per annum for industry-academic research partnerships for SSHRC.⁶⁹

Picking up the pieces the state has dropped

Community-based researcher Marius shares his observation that community organizations are increasingly "picking up the pieces that the state has dropped." Contextualizing his remarks in the climate of an austerity-focused and fiscally conservative federal government agenda, Marius explains what this means for community organizations,

There's a neo-liberal side to this where you download responsibility for solving problems that actually originate outside of the community. You download the solution to the

⁶⁹ The Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) has been a regular critic of government intrusion into the research landscape. Commenting on how the government since the mid-2000s "has been much more directive than any other government in the past about how (SSHRC and the other granting councils) can spend their money" executive director James Turk describes the allocation of funds for "designated purposes" as a major departure from the past when money was allocated on priorities set by academic peer review and the (social) scientific community (quoted in Butler, Ottawa Citizen, April 2nd, 2014).

community—so they're dealing with poverty, discrimination, inadequate services, you know, and homelessness being the perfect example. It isn't the communities that create homelessness but they are now charged with solving it. The causes and solutions for homelessness lay outside, in many cases, the community, but they are held responsible for dealing with it.

Marius alludes to a contradiction I identify in the literature review. On the one hand, university research is increasingly evaluated in terms of the contribution it can make to developing products for the market and services for the economy. On the other hand, it is tasked with alleviating the excesses of the market (such as growing social inequality). The decisive issue is that the community sector is increasingly burdened with the responsibility of addressing problems in the community through what Marius describes as the rhetoric of "community-based solutions." The contradiction is that they are not being allocated the necessary resources to do so. At the same time, Marius recognizes that the challenges local communities face cannot be addressed in isolation from broader economic and political challenges. As such, utilizing a large-scale, interdisciplinary, and multi-institutional approach that draws upon research networks across Canada is equally important, as it facilitates the sharing of strategies and research.

Irina highlights how shifting health promotion decision-making to the community effectively moves the focus of the *raison d'être* community-engaged research away from one addressing the social determinants of ill health—which she sees as poverty and social inequality. Poverty and inequality do not originate in the community, according to Irina, and yet communities are responsible for addressing the resulting impact on health and well-being. Building on this, Susan, an associate professor in social work, observes that "there's a lot of downloading under the guise of decentralization and, you know, there is sometimes the rhetoric

of shifting the decision-making to the community, which always sounds good, but the resources are not shifting with them." Drawing upon alternative pedagogies and teaching methods, Susan has worked closely with a range of community organizations as both academic and activist on queer issues, disability rights, and social work education. Susan suggests that initiatives designed to "empower" and bolster decision-making capacity at the community level essentially operate as rhetorical gestures disguising the retreat of the state in social service provision. This touches upon on a key debate in some of the literature on community development—that is, the increasing tendency of the language of "partnership" and "empowerment" to shape "assumptions about the nature of social change and the respective roles of the state, market and third sector" (Bunyan, 2013, pp. 119-120). Put simply, community organizations are having their research capacity drastically reduced, while at the same time that capacity is being rhetorically attributed to them. Drawing upon her interest in housing, homelessness, and urban governance, these developments are placed in broader historical context by Clara,

I think it probably links into, to some extent, to a changing understanding of what the state's responsibilities are—if you think of that fairly long-term shift from a sort of welfare state orientation where there was a greater sense of the state being in the lead and taking the lead. Now I'm not saying that it was good and that the results were ideal or positive, but there was a different sense of what the state's responsibilities are. ... I think the feeling now, with the sort of hegemonic ideas about state and about the role of the state, is that the state should not be proactive in that way. The state should be sort of an enabler of communities doing their own thing.

Clara claims that the declining capacity of community organizations to determine their own direction redirects their activities away from critiques of economic policy and social justice

advocacy and towards a more depoliticized and policy-focused orientation. A number of respondents addressed how this lack of capacity was pushing the community agencies they worked with away from advocacy or activist roles. According to Vincent, "advocacy has largely been defunded because it is now all special interest groups—so there's been advocacy chill among organizations because they feel that advocating against governments if they're being funded by those governments ... well, they fear losing their funding." Respondents suggested that a problematic implication of the turn towards research with an explicit policy-focused orientation is that researchers and community organizations become involved in a struggle to try to figure out what they think policy-makers are interested in or looking for. In addition, the perception among respondents is that community organizations spend increasing amounts of time and labour pursuing funding in order to conduct research—labour that leaves them with less time and resources to dedicate to their core mandate of providing services to their community constituents.

For others, there is a questioning of whether the focus on research is even a step in the right direction. On this note, Anna spoke of the concentration of capacity and resources that helps to strengthen the institutionalization of community engagement in universities—while at the same time recognizing that research may not be what her community partners need,

It's ironic, if you want to use that word, that we do have far more money than we used to and possibilities for doing research that is connected with communities. To a certain extent some resources will go to the community, but it is true that communities are really struggling. Many organizations have disappeared because the cuts have been so drastic from the state and then what you have is a situation where you could get some funds coming if you partner with an academic and you're doing some research, but not all of

the issues that community organizations are trying to address or face ... well, is research the thing you need to do? Sometimes I get a bit frustrated with that, even though I'm a researcher, because many communities do not need any more research. We know exactly what the issue is! We know exactly what to do! We need resources to do the work. We don't need money to do more research about the issues!

Although scholars welcome increases in the availability of funding opportunities and resources for community-engaged research, Anna suggests that resources are needed not to conduct more research, but rather to implement changes based upon the findings of research previously conducted.

Notwithstanding this, respondents recognize the central role that SSHRC continues to play in advancing the agenda for community-engaged research. For example, as Brian remarked, "that's why SSHRC is so bloody important because there are not really many other places to go to get support for that kind of work." Concerns about the impact on scholars of these competing conceptualizations of the *raison d'être* of community-based research, and contradictory conceptualizations of research "productivity" are themes addressed in the next chapter.

Forward to the next chapter

This chapter has addressed how shifts in the funding climate have impacted community-based researchers and the extent to which such shifts have compromised their ability to conduct research democratically with communities. I have provided insight into how the individual performances of researchers have become tied to the overall performance of the university. The analysis has explored how market-driven behaviours are becoming ever more embedded in research practice—leading to functional and normative shifts in what it is that researchers do and

what they feel is expected of them. For example, the federal government exerts pressure on universities and the granting councils to produce and fund research that is "relevant" and beneficial to Canada—and this pressure is, in turn, "trickling-down" to community-engaged scholars. Not only do many scholars now report spending more time than ever before applying for (a) grant(s), it has become an expectation of them by their institutions. The effect of this expectation is that scholars are compelled to become ever more entrepreneurial and strategic in their academic pursuits. Such trends are exacerbated by the overly bureaucratic funding structures and institutional processes governing research that undermine the democratic workings of community-engaged research partnerships. However, as much as my discussion has illustrated how the nature and structure of funding regimes exerts a "structuring effect" in the regulation of the relationship between university and community participants, it has also highlighted the means by which scholars are able to comply with and/or co-opt such research governance for their own purposes.

The critical factor I address towards the end of the chapter is how shifts in the nature and structure of research funding (particularly perceptions of government funding cut-backs at community level) has devastated the capacity of community organizations to equitably participate in research. My analysis has highlighted how community organizations are being "pushed" into research in ways that compromise their ability to provide services to the communities they work with. The enveloping political economy of the research landscape, furthermore, is one that pushes community organizations towards conducting policy-relevant research and away from their advocacy and/or activist roles.

Chapter 6: Regulating Community Engagement

Universities want to be community-engaged in safe ways and not in the activist ways.

(Natasha, community-based research)

I think there needs to be a shift in what we value and why are we doing the research that we do.

I think there is a lot of mission drift amongst professors.

(Sophie, community-based researcher)

In this final chapter, I continue my engagement with the experience of scholars committed to conducting community-based research and explore the compromises scholars make with regard to their research and scholarly practices. With regard to the third of my research questions as outlined in my introduction—what difficulties do community-based scholars encounter when seeking to enhance the academic credibility of community-engaged research and support its institutionalization in the university—albeit without sacrificing the commitment they have made to collaborative, democratic research?

Throughout the interviews, respondents spoke with conviction of the commitment they have to community-engagement and they see themselves as using their academic skills and resources to participate in forms of scholarly activism in order to, simply put, make the world a better place. In the context of the funding pressures and enveloping climate of research entrepreneurialism described in the previous chapter, however, scholars interested in community-

engaged research are adopting a more managerial approach to their work as the logic of the market becomes ever more embedded in research practice. The result is that researchers are compelled to operate ever more strategically in an academic landscape that continues to systematically differentiate between the research, teaching, and service functions of the scholar—three components that community-based scholars typically hold in close alignment.

In this chapter, I first address how scholars are experiencing a tension between the commitment they have made to community-engaged scholarship, and the institutional culture within which such work is evaluated. A key cause of this tension, I claim, is that scholars and university administrators differ with regard to what they conceptualize the purpose of community engagement to be. Scholars view it as being about achieving lasting, transformative social change—whereas administrations encourage outcomes that are more readily quantified and measured (e.g., research grants and publications). In particular, my analysis in this chapter illustrates how the institutionalized mechanisms governing the tenure and promotion process continue to reinforce, rather than challenge, such differences. The result is that community-engaged scholars continue to experience challenges in negotiating their way through the tenure and promotion process without compromising the commitment they had made to democratic, activist-scholarship, and research.

Second, I discuss what respondents are experiencing as the intensification of their academic work and address how they are responding to this. This section of the chapter focuses on tensions intrinsic to the social relations of community-engaged research. These social relations consist of—first, the coming together of academic and community partners in collaborative, albeit time-consuming research practices and—second, the conflicting institutional governance of academic work and managerial expectations regarding research "productivity."

The result of this intensification, I claim, is that scholars are increasingly internalizing the logic of performance so as to better "manage" their career trajectories and intellectual commitments.

Third, I address the growing alignment of community-based research with knowledge mobilization strategies. In addressing this, I claim that universities are institutionalizing knowledge mobilization in ways that focus on the dissemination of research findings in narrowly conceived ways. The result is an emphasis on the outcomes or "products" of research and excessive differentiation between the "producers" and "users" of research. In effect, I claim that the focus placed on the dissemination of research "products" undermines and neutralizes the democratic and transformative potential of the community-engaged research. The chapter concludes with discussion of what respondents see as the value of community engagement and its place in the university.

"The university doesn't want to be seen to be engaged in activism"

Many respondents are critical of the extent to which the institutionalization of community engagement is proving compatible with being an advocate or activist. Two examples illustrate this. In the first, Karina speaks of meeting with a research grant adviser at her university, in which they discussed her grant application for a project that utilizes a CBR/ KMb component,

The grant officer who was interviewing me wanted to know more about the project and all that kind of stuff and at the end of the discussion he sort of said, well, you know, in future I would really recommend it that you don't use the word advocacy ... and I thought right! Oh no! We used "advocacy"! I don't know how but it just slipped through somehow! So you can mobilize your knowledge but you do not want to use that knowledge to advocate for one position or another apparently!

In the second example below, Natasha describes her encounter with some university administrators with regard to the launch of a knowledge mobilization event at her university,

The university doesn't want to be seen to be engaged in activism. ... We were talking with some administrators about community engagement and about activist scholars and they were actually quite put off by the term "activist scholars" because they don't wish to be engaged in "activism." But many of the people who are participating under the knowledge mobilization umbrella do actually see themselves as activist scholars. They see themselves as using research for activist aims and see them as intertwined. And I think that is a challenge to the institutions because the institutions—well, they're pretty conservative in many ways even when they're making an effort to be community engaged. Universities want to be community-engaged in safe ways and not in the activist ways.

I address the alignment between community-engagement and the idea of knowledge mobilization at a later point in this chapter. These brief extracts from Karina and Natasha suggest a contradiction between the commitment individual scholars have made to community-engaged research, and the institutional contexts in which they now find themselves working. Many researchers see their scholarship and community activism and/or advocacy as inextricably linked—a sentiment they feel is not necessarily shared by their institution (or, for that matter, by their colleagues who adhere to a more "traditional" scholarly practice). This is a claim substantiated in some of the literature on community-engaged scholarship, insofar as researchers claimed their work has been viewed as a deference to populism, ideologically imbued activism, or political partisanship (Cancian, 1993; Hale, 2008; Bourke, 2012). To some degree, I see the institutional acceptance of community-engagement as a pragmatic response on behalf of

universities to increased calls of accountability by the federal government regarding the use of public funds. However, as scholars come under increasing pressure to satisfy institutional and funding expectations, the result is what Rappert (1999, p. 715) calls the cultivation of a "delusion of relevance" in which research "embalms established practices rather than interrupts, challenges, and changes them in the name of equity and justice." Situating her research practice in contemporary discussions on engaged scholarship, Irina describes her approach to research in the following terms,

I see my scholarship as activist in orientation. I have little interest in doing things that don't have a social change agenda attached to them. I am deeply frustrated by the world around me and I spend lot of my time thinking about strategic ways of inserting myself into these debates and discussions and how can I use my research to actively do that. I think that that is what makes community-based research so attractive to me, because as I am doing my research I am mobilizing a base who can then become activists and advocates in their own right and in their own communities.

The challenge for Irina is how to engage in community-based research that has a social change component in a manner that does not appear overtly activist or radical. She realizes that research perceived as "political" will possibly be looked upon unfavourably by granting councils and her university. Notwithstanding her commitment to a form of scholarly activism that has a social change agenda, Irina is attuned to the necessity of operating strategically in order to do so. For her part, Sophie speaks of the sense of obligation she feels to use the institutional resources at her disposal for the benefit of her community partners,

I didn't get into this business to please others. I got into this business because first and foremost I think about how I can help create spaces for people with small voices. That, to

me, is noble work and I know that it probably sounds totally cheesy but I think that if I have my power and my privilege then it is my responsibility to open up doors and to open networks and to open up funding possibilities to my colleagues who inform my work.

As with Irina, Sophie's remarks are illustrative of scholars who seek to capitalize on their privilege, and the opportunities and university resources they have access to, in order to benefit their community partners. She connects her commitment to engaged scholarship with the "networks" and "funding possibilities" that allow her to engage the community in research projects. In this way, Sophie attempts to "create spaces for people with small voices"—"spaces" illustrative of the movement toward an "organized structural space" that is emerging in support of community-engagement in Canadian universities.

It is significant that Sophie also refers to academia as a "business"—a description which gestures to the market-driven logic that compels scholars to be strategic and managerial ("academic entrepreneurs") in how they plan and manage their career trajectories. Sophie's remarks are symptomatic of the tensions that exist between individual and institutional conceptualizations of community-engagement. While she talks about not getting into "this business" in order to "please others," her comments suggest that she is, in fact, experiencing pressure to please others. This is particularly the case in discussions of how community-engaged research is evaluated with regard to tenure and promotion.

"There is an emerging space for engaged scholarship in the university but ..."

Many researchers spoke of there being a contradiction between the institutionalization of community-engaged scholarship in universities and the institutional culture within which such research is evaluated. According to Paul,

There is an emerging space for engaged scholarship in the university but the problem comes in our traditional incentive or reward system. It's that both tenure and promotion within the academy ... doesn't know how to evaluate non-traditional forms of scholarship and so there is a real tension right now, especially with untenured faculty who are starting out on a tenure track. They are feeling pressure from funders to do engaged scholarship, but they are being told by the universities to publish.

Paul identifies two connected issues here. One (as addressed in the previous chapter) is the pressure being exerted upon scholars by their universities. The second is the pressure to conform to conventional notions of scholarly productivity by prioritizing journal publications. What emerges as a theme in the interviews is that many of the issues addressed in my discussion so far are being experienced by scholars traditionally excluded from the academy. Farah, working towards tenure in a department of education at the time of our interview, explains who these scholars are,

We now have a lot more people in the academy who have not traditionally been in the academy, such as indigenous people and more women, and I think it tends to be those people who are more concerned about community engagement, but what they are being evaluated on are very archaic ideas of research and scholarship and professorship. I'm one of them! I think there is a real shift in many of the people coming in who have a more socially responsible consciousness in terms of their academic position. I think that's very different from some of the people who have been there for ages. It is creating a lot of confusion in the university, when you have these people coming in who don't quite fit the traditional ideas of scholarship.

Before moving to academia, Farah had spent time working in the public school system and so had experience of research participation from the "community" perspective. Her research interests lie with using community-based research to bridge the gap between theory, practice, and social activism. Identifying as a "non-traditional" scholar, Farah seeks to challenge hegemonic conceptualizations of identity, colonialism, and patriarchy in her work. Above, Farah comments on how scholars committed to civically-engaged and socially responsible scholarship are entering the academy in greater numbers than ever before, and yet they continue to be held to account by traditional standards of academic evaluation, standards maintained by those "who have been there for ages." Developing this theme, Farah spoke of the effect that the institutional culture at her university has on her identity as a scholar. She summed up her predicament by saying that "I'm hired to do one thing but I'm evaluated [by her tenure committee] on something completely different ... something very traditional, something very patriarchal, something very colonial." In other words, the very structures that Farah seeks to challenge through her community-engaged scholarship—namely the exclusionary divide between the university and community—are being kept firmly in place by traditional disciplinary standards of evaluation.

Deirdre asserted that traditional assessment criteria that privilege research productivity, rather than teaching or service, remain the barometer for evaluation,

It's very traditional research criteria [that are the basis] for promotion [decisions]. It [tenure] has to do with the number of academic articles you are publishing in academic journals with high impact factors and citations, and the volume of publications is important. The partnerships parts are not valued to the same extent.

For community-based scholars, building relationships and bonds of trust with community members is an objective of the research process, an objective that is not reducible to being

measured or counted in terms of "product." The result is that community-based scholars are often labelled with what Deirdre characterizes as "low levels of productivity" because "productivity" continues to imply specific, tangible outcomes that can be easily counted (e.g., publications and conference presentations).

The lack of institutional recognition of the labour of community-engaged research and what this reveals about the university's commitment to community engagement is widely documented in the literature (Israel et al., 1998; Flicker & Savan, 2006). What remains relatively unexplored is how the institutionalization of community engagement is being influenced, and ultimately undermined, by the logic of research managerialism and entrepreneurialism enveloping the political economy of community engagement and how this logic impacts upon scholars. Whereas in the past the scientific merit and methodological legitimacy of community-based research was questioned by the academic mainstream, such resistance now takes the form of institutionalized mechanisms of assessment and accountability that attempt to measure the "productivity" of community-engaged research.

"You're really penalizing yourself—there is no question that you are."

Issues regarding the "products" of community-engaged research, and how the scholarship of engagement more generally can be assessed in terms of its "productivity" were raised by several respondents. Below, Larissa speaks of the implications of possible changes being made to institutional policy so as to better recognize and reward such research. A key issue, she claims, is how the "impact" of community-engagement should be assessed,

If we are actually going to move institutional policy around tenure and promotion for faculty, it is a challenge for faculty members to get that [community-engagement]

recognized as real research in tenure and promotion within the university ... how are you going to assess the impact of it? Because just engaging in the community is not good enough. How do you assess the impact of community engagement? It can be driven top-down in terms of accountability and the usual methods of assessing [such as] peer review and all that sort of stuff—but there is also an opportunity here for us to think through what does it mean to actually have an impact and that's where we can bring in the social responsibility aspect of the university.

Larissa highlights how the academic credibility of community-engaged research requires a means by which to assess the outcomes of such research. In other words, what are the "products" of community-engaged research and in what ways are community-based scholars "productive"? On the one hand, Larissa highlights the potential compatibility between "top-down" models of accountability (e.g., peer assessment) and the "social responsibility" mandate of the university. On the other hand, the "usual methods" of assessment fail to adequately recognize the value of the scholarship of engagement. For example, Genevieve provides a veritable check-list of ways in which the "doing" of community-engaged research may impact negatively on the career trajectory of a junior scholar,

You can publish less. You can publish with others. You are diluting your research agenda with a community agenda so your efforts are not going to be rewarded with publications but with other kinds of outcomes. Your publications will be multi-authored. They will not be single authored. You might not even be the first author. You will be publishing in journals that are often not within your narrow discipline, but which may transcend other disciplines. They may be considered to be flakier because they may be less specialized and more general. Interdisciplinary research may be seen as less rigorous than more

specialist, disciplinary research. There are a whole host of reasons for why this may place you on the margins and make it more challenging for you to get tenure, to move up through the ranks, to get research grants, to get publications, to get all of those things.

You're really penalizing yourself ... there is no question that you are.

Another respondent, Marius, put it succinctly "one isn't always rewarded for transgressing borders. In fact, there's a lot to keep you in your lane." What emerges from the interviews is a clear disjuncture between the institutional (university) and organizational (SSHRC) support for the purpose of community-engaged research (as civically engaged and socially responsive), and the institutional and disciplinary-based standards of evaluation which police scholarly "transgressions" both at the level of process (regarding the co-design, co-authorship, and co-ownership of research) and the products (interdisciplinary, multi-authored publications) of research.

Farah suggests that the evaluative criteria applied to tenure and promotion files for community-engaged scholars remain firmly based on traditional conceptualizations of scholarship. Commenting upon whether she feels that tenure and promotion processes are changing as a result of the growing mainstream "acceptance" of community-engaged scholarship, Farah claims "It's not changing. I've heard the rhetoric that it will change, but it probably won't change in my lifetime—but I am glad that the conversations are starting." Farah makes a clear distinction here between the rhetoric of community engagement being espoused by her institution and the reality of how she experiences what it is that she does as a community-engaged scholar.

Others were more optimistic with regard to the possibility of achieving more substantive institutional change. Commenting on the ongoing institutionalization of community engagement, Adam claims that, at the very least,

It is putting pressures on universities to take account of the peculiar specificities of engaged scholarship and the time it takes to build relationships with communities and the ways and the forms that knowledge and representations need to be taken ... so there is a flow behind the growth of the movement itself. There's a slow recognition by universities that they have to find a way to recognize excellence amongst their academic staff for purposes of annual salary review or promotion and tenure ... and that's happening.

On the one hand, Adam spoke in his interview of how the agenda of community-engagement has shifted from the margins to the mainstream of academic debate—resulting in its increasingly prominent position in university strategic plans and mission statements. On the other hand, he suggests there to be a contradiction in the alignment of the scholarship of engagement with the institutionally sanctioned language of recognizing "excellence."⁷⁰ The impact such contradictions are having on the research trajectories of younger scholars is addressed by Anna,

I have certainly heard some of them [younger scholars] say that they will wait until they get tenure before they undertake that kind of messy and sometimes time-consuming work

⁷⁰ Bill Readings writes how universities have increasingly used the word "excellence" as a means to distinguish themselves from each other. Describing it as being the product of a market-driven, neoliberal economy, he claims the word is essentially meaningless and a "non-referential unit of value entirely internal to the system" (1996, p. 39).

of community engaged scholarship—because they see the writing on the wall. They know that they have to get so many grants. They know that they have to publish certain things in certain places which don't necessarily fit into some of their community-engaged scholarship work, and so that's a very strategic reading of reality. And so the sadness about that is that then some of the opportunities and some of the relations that you want to build with communities you just kind of put aside. So you may not make yourself available, perhaps, to a project because you know it's going to be regarded unfavorably.

Anna had experienced this pressure at an early stage of her career. That she had made some "bad decisions" in her choice of research projects was conveyed clearly to her during her tenure and promotion evaluation. The "bad" decisions Anna apparently made include those items previously identified by Genevieve—publishing with others, publishing more slowly, and "diluting" her research focus with a community agenda. Anna highlights how punitive traditional standards of academic evaluation can be when faced with the methodological "messiness" of community-engaged research. Her words also testify to the disjuncture that exists between the time-consuming and "messy" processes of community-engaged research that such work necessarily entails (e.g., building relationships with community participants), and the products required by the academy in order to secure tenure (e.g., publications, grants). Suggesting that scholars will see the "writing on the wall," she claims that they are likely to act strategically and opportunistically regarding the decisions they make in order to secure career advancement. But what are the implications of this for democratic research? Are current trends exacerbating what Polster (1007: 619) identifies as the "disenchantment" of community-oriented scholars?

The intensification of the academic labour of community engagement

In the literature review, I address how junior scholars are particularly vulnerable in the climate of research entrepreneurialism that has come to envelope the university—as it threatens to shape their emergent professional identities as "entrepreneurial academics" (Newson & Polster, 2001, p. 60). The claim here is that, in the context of the political economy of the research landscape, scholars are increasingly internalizing the logic of performance so as to better "manage" their career trajectories and intellectual commitments. Commenting on this managerial orientation, Frank states that "I suspect that the pressure has been getting more intense because the pressure on people to do research and publish has gone up significantly. I don't think there is any question about that." Building upon this, Daniel comments on what he sees as the result of the competitive culture on less established scholars, "There is a despairing quality emerging in a lot of promising social scientists who are not able to contribute the way that they always anticipated and not being able to further their career objectives because they are unable to secure necessary funding." Daniel's view would seem to strengthen Drakich, Grant, and Stewart's (2002, p. 255) claim that "Gone are the days when the failure to obtain a research grant was simply a personal disappointment."

Commenting on what she observes to be the increasingly heavy workloads of faculty members, Karina suggests that,

Part of the struggle is that, generally, the intensification of academic work is going on a lot more. ... And then you've got the whole process of applying for these diverse forms of funding, because right now—with the SSHRC deadline whenever it was—people in our department were going crazy! There is a tremendous level of stress and it seems every year that more of that sort of thing is going on.

Coupled with the expectation that scholars devote a considerable portion of their academic labour to applying for grants (as I discuss at length in the previous chapter) is the overall perception of the intensification of their academic labour. Vincent spoke of the increasing work expectations that come with the funding he receives,

It [SSHRC] wanted to see things that they can use and send back to the community. I think those things have been given more profile. They're part of the sort of accountability outcomes and measures that would be expected. ... At one level, SSHRC, or maybe more government than SSHRC, always expects to get far more than what it actually pays for in terms of delivery. It has multiplied in terms of what you are expected to do. You're expected to contribute to the academic literature. You're expected to be media friendly in terms of reporting on things and they encourage that. You're expected to do conferences but also other sorts of things that will reach wider audiences. You're expected to maintain websites and publish various things on the website and use other forms of communication and publications that can get to those wide audiences. In some respects, that puts a large burden on people engaged in those kinds of research initiatives.

Vincent suggests that increased expectations regarding research outcomes are disproportionate to the actual funding he receives. His perception is that SSHRC now routinely requires more "bang for its buck" in terms of research outcomes. Vincent readily admits that finding new ways to engage with communities beyond traditional knowledge dissemination methods (e.g., conferences and publications) can be very rewarding and agreed that being held accountable for public monies received is not in itself a bad thing. These sentiments connect back to the social responsibility mandate that has been a driving force behind the institutionalization of community

engagement. Notwithstanding this, such accountability results in the multiplication of expectations with regard to "productivity," not only in terms of traditional scholarly outcomes, but also in the demand that the "relevance" and "use" of the research for a wider audience be demonstrated. Vincent's comments illustrate how the pressures of institutional accountability trickle down and translate into pressures of individual accountability.

"I feel like I'm just sprinting to get the superficial knowledge that I need to apply for grants"

The extent to which scholars comply with, co-opt, or resist the pressures they experience is, to some extent, determined by their academic position. "Pre-tenure professors are cautious and all that," Justin notes, "but the purpose of tenure is to take away that hammer over you." Commenting on the pressure that many scholars experience to pursue funding and publish frequently, Irina remarks on the job security that having tenure brings,

The thing about being tenured is that you don't have to do anything. You don't have to do jack! They can kind of make your life kind of miserable. They can beg you. They can plead with you. They can do all kinds of things to encourage you, but at the end of the day once you have tenure they have very little power over you on that level.

In other words, being tenured helps to alleviate, if not fully erase, much of the administrative pressure and continuous "encouragement" to seek grants. This is suggested by Irina's suggestion that one can still be made one "kind of miserable." Scholars with seniority, or those nearing the end of their career, have the least to fear. One such scholar, Ian, remarked,

I have to say that, and this may be a heresy to tell you this, but I pay almost no attention to the goings on at SSHRC anymore. I pay no attention to the renewed architecture. I've paid no attention to what it is that they're doing or what their priorities are. I'm living a SSHRC free life (laughs)! I have no involvement in it and have no intention of getting involved in it ever again [...] I can't let SSHRC be the sole measure of whether or not these things are possible or interesting or doable or worthwhile or anything else.

Ian's disdain for SSHRC may be the result of the frustration he experienced in his attempts to secure funding for a CURA grant. The fact that he suggests his views may be construed as "heresy" indicates the importance attached to funding and the extent to which SSHRC has become the measure of academic standards for others. Ian readily admitted that his sentiments would be untenable for an early-career scholar—a recognition of the vulnerability of junior scholars in the institutional contexts in which they work.

As much as Irina, Ian, and Justin suggest that tenure alleviates a lot of the anxiety around job security, others suggest that the cumulative effect of the pressures experienced during early stages of career development may compromise the commitment a researcher makes to community-based research. Commenting on the likelihood of a scholar moving from a "traditional" model of scholarship to a community-engaged and social-change oriented model, Anna suggests that it would be "hard for someone who once they got tenure and promotion to make this radical shift. Maybe they do, but maybe it isn't so radical". Other respondents spoke of how they gradually arrived at the realisation that they could maintain their commitment to community-based scholarship as long as they made sure to meet traditional expectations regarding publishing and productivity at the same time. What this generally seems to lead to, however, is the intensification of their academic labour.

Anna suggests that scholars are encouraged to partake in additional community-engaged and knowledge mobilization activities, but that "there's no shift, there's no replacement ... it's added on as you still have to do the other" (with the "other" being traditional publishing activities). Below, Sophie alludes to the intensification of her academic labour with regard to publishing, while also providing a revealing glimpse into the disciplinary socialization of doctoral students,

This summer coming we are taking four months, so we're taking May, June, July, August, and I've got four doctoral students working with me and we are each going to produce two articles and we are all co-authoring all of these articles, which means that we will have ten peer-reviewed journal articles by the end of August to be able to submit. It doesn't mean that they're published, but you have to write the damn things before you start shopping them around.

Sophie's remarks illustrate how doctoral students are socialized early on in their career to be as productive as possible with regard to publication output. In addition, I think there is a hint of frustration in her description of having to write the "damn" things before "shopping" them around (with "shopping" suggestive of a market-type discourse).

Reflecting on her transition from graduate student to assistant and then associate professor, Natasha also reflected on the intensification of academic work,

My view of what academia was going to be like and what academia is like are worlds apart. I had this vision of being able to do what I did as a graduate student, of spending a long time learning and reading. Whereas, in fact, I feel like I'm just sprinting to get the superficial knowledge that I need to apply for grants ... You have very little time to read outside of your work, outside of exactly what you're working on right now. And you only

read as much as you need because you don't have time. Now, in my case, it's partly because I work in multiple areas so that I feel like I'm not an expert in anything ... but I think it's generally the case that everybody is now overextended and doing research and working at a pace that doesn't really allow for reflective deep learning.

On the one hand, institutional encouragement to pursue interdisciplinary research leads to scholars working with others in complementary fields and, therefore, in "multiple areas." On the other hand, Natasha's experience echoes a topic of discussion from the previous chapter regarding what Patricia identifies as scholars having an interest, but not necessarily the expertise, in the area of research they are seeking funding for. The result, as described by Natasha, is feeling that she is "not an expert in anything" due to the overextension of her scholarly labour.

"Writing papers is really all that is counted"

The difficulty of maintaining a commitment to community engaged research was taken up by Sophie, who recalls an experience she had at an early stage of her career,

When I started off ten years ago as a youngish professor coming in without tenure, I was coming in with my PhD and I was told that, you know, community-based research is fine but it is very labour intensive and it's heavily weighted on the democratic side and if you want to get tenure you might as well just do sort of the straightforward kind of research, and go get a research grant probably... to which I told my Dean at the time—I said, well, look, you hired me to be a community organizer and that's exactly what I am going to do and if that's not what you want me to do then I'm going to go back to my previous institution because that's what I did there.

A decisive tension raised by Sophie is the implied opposition between a "straightforward kind of research" and research with a more "democratic" (that is, community-engaged) aspect. On the one hand, Sophie is the part of the movement toward the institutionalization of community engagement, insofar as she was hired in the early 2000s specifically for her community-engaged scholarship and community organizing activities. On the other hand, the institutionalized mechanisms governing her tenure and promotion process actively discouraged this orientation.

Although Sophie and Anna were both able to successfully navigate their path through the tenure and promotion process without compromising the commitment they had made to democratic, activist-scholarship research, other respondents suggest that this was not always necessarily the case. In her capacity as chair of a university-community-engagement task force at her university, Karina recounts her experience of encountering a young scholar caught in this contradictory space between her commitment to community-based research and the institutional expectations regarding her scholarly productivity,

I remember there was a young woman who was pre-tenure ... and she had a very strong partnership with an organization. It wasn't a research organization, but a community organization, and she was doing work with immigrant woman and it was so time-consuming but she managed to work it in. She did learning courses and combined them with some research—but I could just see how she was ... she was totally aware of the choices she was making and they were not that positive for her in terms of getting tenure and promotion. She has now actually moved to another university and she said that when she's at this new university she really is not going to be doing this kind of community-engaged research. It just became too time-consuming.

According to Karina, the choices made by the faculty member in question involved focusing on the learning and educative, rather than research, components of community engagement.

Although she did not specify if this scholar failed to win tenure or whether she moved to another university by choice, Karina is clear in describing the potentially detrimental career impact such "choices" can have.

In describing the preparation of her tenure and promotion file, Farah spoke of a similar problem she experiences between the community-engaged and democratic nature of her scholarly outputs and the institutional expectations regarding what these outputs should look like. Below, she speaks of rewriting her CV for her tenure and promotion committee to the point where it no longer reflects her scholarly commitment to co-inquiry and the co-creation of research,

They [committees] don't know how to interpret these projects and these initiatives and these untraditional kinds of papers that are written. Eighty per cent of what I write is written with community members. It's collaborative. I call it "co-creative" research because it's all collaborative, co-written articles, and so on, and that's on my CV ... but when it went up to the department level committee they asked, or some people asked, that I write to what percentage of the work I had done as opposed to other people. And I just wrote no, that it would be unethical for me to do so because this is how I envision doing this kind of collaborative work and I can't do it and I won't do it! I had already rewritten my CV two times and by the end of it I looked at the identity of the CV and I thought—that's not even me. I don't know who that is!

Farah's experience is an example of how institutional expectations undermines what she feels to be the democratic nature of the commitment she has made to her community participants.

Furthermore, her case illustrates the difficulty of moving from being complicit with the process (rewriting her CV so as to downplay the extent to which her publications are co-authored with community participants) to more active resistance (refusing to do so but possibly to the detriment of career advancement). Describing a meeting which took place in advance of her tenure and promotion meeting, Farah reflects that,

Writing papers is really all that is counted and it even shocked me again when we were in an office looking at my CV and my department chair looked at everything on my CV and said, well, now let's count your publications—and that's all it was based on! It just shocked me so, that it seemed so empty in terms of the work that so many faculty members do beyond those publications.

What shocked Farah, a scholar hired specifically for her community-engaged activities, was the reduction and calculation of her scholarly contribution and productivity to a count of her academic research articles. It became clear to Farah that the research, teaching and service components of her scholarly labour remained rigidly compartmentalized in value.⁷¹

"Universities want to be community engaged in the safe ways and not in the activist ways."

I make the point in the literature review that as community engagement becomes institutionalized in Canadian universities, the emphasis is increasingly placed upon communicating or "mobilizing" the "products" of community engaged research (Hall, 2009, 2011; Hall & Tremblay, 2012). The increasing alignment between community-based research

⁷¹ Doberneck, Glass, and Schweitzer (2010, p. 11) also note how pre-tenured faculty may be "encouraged" to not fully disclose their community-based research activities in their tenure file, lest such activities be viewed unfavourably.

(CBR) and KMB, and the implications of this for democratic research, was raised by several participants. Irina explains that,

The frustrating part is that CBR now fits within the whole knowledge mobilization and knowledge translation categories so where you're really seeing CBR get taken up is in the whole knowledge mobilization scene where all of a sudden they want us to be partnering with communities and decision makers, however they define that, or knowledge "users". I think it comes from the fact that the average Canadian and member of the public doesn't see research as being all that relevant to them or their daily lives. They [the public] are pushing back on parliament and saying, well, you're cutting everything else why are you spending my taxpaying money on this? And so increasingly I think you are seeing parliament putting pressure on the tri-councils to say hey! Show us how this makes sense for our lives!

What proves frustrating for Irina is that the focus on knowledge mobilization shifts the emphasis to the "products" or outcomes of research and differentiates between the "producers" and "users" of research. Irina's concern is that community-university research partnerships become less about bridging the divide between university and community spaces and more about producing research outcomes that are policy-relevant and that can demonstrate the "benefits" to society of what it is that scholars do with tax-payer money. In effect, the nature of the funding process means that the partnership component is not particularly fostered—with the result being that researchers work more "like a team of independent cats" (as Deirdre put it). This is partly because once funding is secured, all researchers are really assessed upon are the "products" that result, with such products increasingly assessed in terms of knowledge mobilization outputs. In my view, the focus placed on the dissemination of research "products" marks a shift in the

perceived utility of community-engaged research, a shift that undermines the democratic and transformative potential of the collaboration. Such a trajectory, Irina argues, is reductionist in how it shapes the activist or the political orientation of the research,

I don't think it [KMB] is intrinsically communicating the values of where a CBR approach orientation came from. I mean, the history of CBR is either linked to a Lewinian action-research type agenda which very much came out of making factories work better and an industrial approach ... sort of greasing the wheels so that all functions properly. Or it comes out of Freirian approaches which is let's be radical and change the rules of the system and change the system of engagement. And so depending on which sort of history you draw from ... radically changing the rules of the game doesn't fit so nicely with knowledge mobilization in terms of saying, well I'll produce knowledge and you take it and go use it.

What Irina suggests here is that—as the institutionalization of community-based research becomes aligned with knowledge mobilization initiatives—it becomes less oriented towards a social change framework (i.e., less participatory action research oriented) and more about managing the dissemination of research in ways that extend beyond conventional strategies such as conferences and peer-reviewed publications. This shift in research orientation refers back to the crucial distinction between the pragmatic and policy-orientated impulse typical of AR and the more radical and transformative intentions of PAR, with AR effectively serving to alleviate rather than eradicate the inefficiencies and inequities of the status quo. For scholars committed to PAR, institutionally promoted forms of community-engagement resemble an emaciated version of CBR when considered in terms of process and product. Christine spoke of the relationship

between advocacy and what she perceives institutionalized conceptualizations of KMB in the following terms,

I've done a lot of thinking about knowledge mobilisation because I think it is a very euphemistic kind of term. It's not saying ... it doesn't say advocacy. Advocacy is too loaded a word. It's too much action! Knowledge mobilisation is an interesting one because it means that you're moving knowledge along. So you're not just creating knowledge for knowledge's sake, but you are actually using knowledge and shaping it in, say, policy and various things. But if you go into anything to do with advocacy it becomes very dangerous. Advocacy is considered ... you do not want to be seen even in writing proposals that you are an advocate!

Christine is clear in stating that institutionalized conceptualizations of KMB are difficult to reconcile with an advocacy-driven or activist agenda. Other respondents are more at ease with what can be accomplished through KMB initiatives. For example, Hannah sees KMB as a potential strategy with which to reach "people who might be a little uncomfortable with the language around social equity and social justice." According to Hannah, this is particularly the case when working with university administrators and granting agency representatives, two groups she feels are particularly uncomfortable with the language of advocacy and activism.

Notwithstanding the extent to which respondents differ in their interpretations of KMB, there is general agreement that institutionally sanctioned models of community engagement (and associated KMB activities) have a dampening effect on research that has a social justice orientation. This is succinctly stated by Niamh, "for a lot of the academics that are doing research that they say has a social justice bent, the reality is they are often restricted by their institutions. I think that's just a reality of the way that universities work." Niamh's point is also

echoed in Natasha's remarks on a trend towards an institutionally endorsed, albeit depoliticized, conceptualization of CBR,

Another way of thinking about community-based research is that it is not necessarily participatory action research and is not necessarily harking back to that line of anti-oppressive research. It's not necessarily about empowerment. It's more palatable in that context because you can then talk about it as engaging people to talk about their health needs. And when you talk about it in that very narrowly constrained discourse, as if you're just talking about how to get people to eat vegetables, then it's not threatening. But if you engage it in a more critical way, then you do actually have to get people talking about how the real issue for people is not that they don't even have vegetables but that they are too poor to afford the food that they need and what can they do as a community to change that? So then you are talking about political change! I think it's safer and easier in health research if it can be masked in an individual responsibility for health change framework ... which is more acceptable.

In suggesting that depoliticized conceptualizations of community engagement—ones that are "not necessarily about empowerment," are likely to have a greater degree of institutional purchase, Natasha illustrates how the agenda of community engagement becomes structured by a "very narrowly constrained discourse." The consequences are more "palatable" (and depoliticized) operationalizations of research focused on individual issues rather than social problems. The contradiction for Natasha is that the critical factors that lead to poverty and associated poor health outcomes do not originate within the community—but communities are nonetheless tasked with developing community-based solutions to address the effects of these factors.

"There needs to be a shift in what we value"

In this final section, I offer some summative comments that connects a range of themes addressed in the findings chapters, with a particular focus on their effect on what many scholars consider to be the *raison d'être* of community engaged research—a methodological orientation which strives to empower marginalized communities. For example, the emphasis that continues to be placed upon funded research, and the implications for those seeking to establish more equitable relations between "town and gown" is taken up by Ian,

This preoccupation that we see with externally-funded research as being the only thing that counts for anything in the university is to me a very troubling development. I see the university as actually having much broader responsibilities than chasing down externally funded research. I think that the teaching and service mandates of the university are being completely overshadowed with this preoccupation of bringing money into the university. It is distorting the way that we think about our work and it is distorting the kind of lives academics are able to live in a university environment and it has put, to me, very significant barriers and obstacles in the way of thinking about how to make a better relationship between the university and the community.

Ian suggests that the gap between the values of community-based researchers and the institutional commitment to community engagement is widening—a gap fundamentally distorted by what he sees as the preoccupation with research over teaching and service. Commenting on research environment in which individuals and institutions are competing with each other for diminishing resources, Brian said "It's a game. It's part of academic institutions trying to survive and forge ahead in extremely difficult time and there's not any real indication that it's going to change. I think we're going to be living in this kind of environment for the foreseeable future".

Sophie identifies what she characterizes as the individual and institutional "mission drift" that results. Asserting the need for a "shift in value" so as to maintain a critical consciousness of the *raison d'être* of community-engaged scholarship, Sophie claims that,

I think there needs to be a shift in what we value and why are we doing the research that we do. I think there is a lot of mission drift amongst professors, and I think that can be okay because as professors we are allowed to reinvent ourselves. ... We need to be creative and innovative in the ways that we engage, and also too institutionally—universities have to support innovative ways in which we engage community development. Universities want to see money and they want to see publications but that to me is a reductionist view of the breadth of the role that an academic can play in a publically funded institution.

According to Sophie, the "renewal" of community engagement can be accompanied by both a re-visioning of the role of universities and the reinvention of what it is to be a scholar. Below, Ian echoes Sophie's views in calling for a vision of scholarly engagement, and a model of the engaged university, that resists (as characterized by Sophie) "a reductionist view of the breadth of the role that an academic can play in a publically funded institution." According to Ian,

I think that it is very possible for people to participate in productive, reciprocal, exciting, and edgy scholarship without chasing either the funding or the partnerships that are so valued. My interest is in resisting the definition that only legitimate thing that the university does is research—and the only legitimate thing that counts as research is externally-funded research. And so keeping a broad view of what the university does, and a broad view of it as a public institution with its obligations to the public which is also service and teaching, an educational mandate and not just a researching mandate. I think

about my own work in relation to a broader mandate and set of obligations rather than a narrow mandate and a narrow set of obligations.

Ian presents a conceptualization of the university that is "productive" in the sense of fostering reciprocal and relational engagement with the public—one that directly counters the prevailing "reductionist" view that Sophie suggests is becoming dominant.

The necessity of fostering a conceptualization of the engaged university that is productive, reciprocal, and relational was also taken up by Ayala. Below, Ayala evokes the social responsibility mandate of the university in terms similar to Ian's "broader mandate and set of obligations,"

You cannot separate a university's reputation from the community, especially the immediate community. There really is a need for universities to get involved in the communities that they are located in and tackling some of those issues within the communities. ... My point is that even when you feel that you have nothing to lose there are ways that people's lives are kind of tied together when you co-exist within the same geographical space. So even if you're not gaining something from them in terms of donations you could lose something, because whatever the issues they are struggling with might end up becoming your issues as well. So the ideal thing is that people get involved for altruistic reasons, because it is the right thing to do—but of course that doesn't happen, and people think, well, I don't have anything to gain—but even without something to gain you could have something to lose!

Ayala's localized conceptualization of community engagement pays heed to the geographical proximity between community and university spaces. She suggests that there is an intrinsic commonality of interest between these spaces, one that originates not just from an impulse of

altruistic benevolence, but from the necessity of addressing issues that those communities may be struggling with. In asserting this, she recognizes that institutional values have to shift more decisively in order to acknowledge how community-university experiences are "kind of tied together." At the very least, she suggests, the importance of doing so can enhance the reputational standing of the institution in the community. In a broad sense, Ayala's comments gesture to the encompassing political economy of community engagement and how there exists an intrinsic mutuality between individual and institutional practices—one that calls for a greater recognition of the relationship that exists between the social responsibility mandate of the university and the role of the community-engaged scholar.

Chapter 7: Concluding Remarks

This chapter begins with a summary of the study and of the key findings to the research questions I pose in my introduction. I address some implications arising from these findings for community-engaged scholars and the significance of my analysis for the institutionalization of community engagement in Canadian universities. Following discussion of some limitations of the study, I conclude with discussion of ways in which my research can be used as a basis for future study and outline some possible areas of future research.

Summary of the study

The proposed outcome of this study has been to gain insight into how community-based scholars are experiencing the growing strategic importance of community engagement in Canadian universities. In doing so, I have identified differences between institutional and individual conceptualizations of community engagement and have analysed the implications of these differences. There is general agreement amongst those interviewed that the institutionalization of community engagement in Canadian universities, and its uptake by SSHRC in the development of funding opportunities, has significantly transformed the climate for engaged scholarship and community-based research. Across Canada, the momentum behind community engagement continues to grow, and community-engaged research is now "out in the open" and "in from the cold" (Hall, 2005). Be that as it may, respondents have concerns regarding the direction that the institutionalization of community engagement is taking and what the implications of these changes may be. In my introduction, I originally framed my research

topic using three question areas. In light of the presentation of my research findings, what types of answers does my analysis provide?

Revisiting the research questions

My first question asks how the promotion and understanding of community engagement in university and research council documents compares to the understanding and practice of researchers. Documenting the emergence of community engagement as a growing institutional discourse in Canadian universities, what emerges in chapter four is a disjuncture between individual and institutional conceptualizations of community engagement. Central to this discussion is that a key augmentation has occurred in the focus of community-based research practice from that of capacity-building at the level of local communities to a research practice oriented more towards policy relevance and practical applicability. The development of funding opportunities specifically for community-engaged research partnerships has been central to this shift. In particular, chapter four highlights the influence and significance of SSHRC's Community-University Research Alliance (CURA) program.

My second question addresses the extent to which research funding has become important for community-based scholars and what the effects of this importance has been. My findings indicate that not only are funding pressures leading to functional and normative changes with regard to what it is that scholars do and what they feel is expected of them, but that the nature and structure of the funding is compromising what can be accomplished with the research. A central contribution of chapter five is to reveal the extent to which the institutionalization of community engagement as a scholarly function is leading to an "organized structural space" that

is reinforcing rather than challenging the divide between "town and gown"—thereby undermining the movement towards a knowledge democracy.

The final chapter addresses the challenges faced by community-based scholars in their attempts to practice community-engaged research and support its institutionalization in the university—albeit without sacrificing the essentially democratic and collaborative character of the community-engaged research process. Respondents spoke of the difficulties they face in maintaining a commitment to community-engaged research as a form of advocacy or scholarly activism—and the necessity of coupling that commitment to a strategic and managerial orientation to their scholarly activities and career trajectories.

Continuity and change in the research relations between "town and gown"

The movement towards the institutionalization of community engagement, mapped in the dissertation, has led to the creation of a knowledge infrastructure for engaged scholarship that was previously absent. Furthermore, recent developments in the building of what Hall has termed "imaginative partnership structures" (Hall, 2009) between communities and universities can be expected to grow in scale and importance in coming years. Community-based researchers, working in concert with their community participants, will continue to play a key role in this movement. As Mandell et al (2013) observe, communities and academics, working in isolation from each other, are weakly positioned when seeking to achieve transformative social change, but collectively they are difficult to dismiss (p. 8). At the same time, my findings suggest that scholars engaged in community-based research are finding it increasingly difficult to maintain the *raison d'être* of such an approach—as a methodological orientation which strives to empower marginalized communities. This is not to suggest that a wide range of local consciousness-raising

initiatives focused on community engagement will cease to be conspicuous features of the knowledge landscape. Instead, my aim with the dissertation has been to highlight some key concerns regarding the renewal and re-conceptualization of the role and purpose of community engagement as it moves from being a specialized and relatively marginalized research orientation to acquiring a greater degree of mainstream acceptance.

There are growing numbers of scholars involved in the attempt to build a community-engaged and democratic social science—and yet such efforts are being undermined by intransigent disciplinary norms and institutional expectations regarding research. For example, the various gate-keeping mechanisms of academia (such as the peer review and ethical consent processes), coupled with how funding requirements structure the form and functioning of the research process at the level of "boss text" categories—all coalesce to produce more continuity than change for researchers seeking to conduct research democratically with their community partners. Part of the struggle in achieving an "organized structural space" for the scholarship of community engagement in universities, therefore, necessarily involves reflecting upon how scholarly conventions regarding research and institutional policies combine to erect roadblocks to bridging the divide between "town and gown." An argument threaded through my analysis is that institutionalized conceptualizations of community engagement (as evident in universities and SSHRC policy) are characterized by a managerial relation to the research process that conflicts with the guiding methodological principles of community-based research. As many of my respondents commented upon, there are elements integral to how CBR plays out in practice (e.g., the spontaneous and organic process of "coming-togetherness") that are inherently resistant to being governed by the categories and structuring mechanisms of the funding process. In effect,

my study has highlighted that the social relations of research are becoming characterized by a competitiveness and entrepreneurialism that conflicts with what researchers experience it to be.

Notwithstanding enthusiastic talk of the movement toward a "global knowledge exchange system" (Schensul, 2010, p. 312) or of an emergent (global) "knowledge democracy" (Hall, 2009, 2011) being espoused in some of the literature on community engagement, therefore, my findings indicate that the institutional uptake of community engagement by universities continues to be rhetorical and tokenistic and is threatening to reinforce, rather than transform, the hierarchical relationship between the research, teaching, and service functions of the university.

Limitations of the study

A limitation of the study lies in the fact that the changes in the research landscape mapped in the analysis with regard to community engagement remain emergent and are, therefore, subject to change. Furthermore, the extent and intensity of these shifts varies according to region and province, and are experienced in different ways by scholars across the research landscape. The implication of this is that the experiences and perspectives mapped in the dissertation cannot be said to be definitively representative of all those involved in community-engaged research in Canada, and nor are they intended to be. At the same time, I believe that my analysis has raised a number of critical points of tension and contradiction regarding the role and purpose of community engagement in Canadian universities that have been relatively unexplored.

My research also does not offer alternatives to how community engagement is currently being institutionalized in Canadian universities or the granting councils. Instead, my intention has been to destabilize institutionalized conceptualizations of the relevance and utility of

community engagement. In doing so, I have drawn upon interviews with community-engaged scholars in order to better situate institutional initiatives within the enveloping context of the neo-liberal restructuring of higher education and the role that community engagement is seen to play within this. What the study achieves is a destabilization of ideologically-oriented claims about the nature and structure of those initiatives. As such, the analysis has responded to a call for greater scrutiny on the politics of community engagement and, more broadly, shifts in the overall political economy of the research landscape (Winter et al., 2006, Benneworth and Jongbloed, 2010; Dempsey, 2010). At a time in which the perceived value and utility of community-engaged research is seen as the generation of knowledge that can directly inform policy decision-making and be mobilized in a variety of ways, I have argued for the retention of the ongoing value and necessity of critique.

My focus on the experience and perspective of community-engaged scholars, however, reveals an additional limitation of the study—insofar as the experience and perspective of the community partners with which my informants work with is largely absent. In light of such limitations, a number of future research possibilities have the potential to further explore the relationship between community-engaged research practices and the broader political effects and uses of such research.

Continuing the conversation

A first area of inquiry would be to look more specifically at the leadership behind the movement toward the institutionalization of community engagement. In effect, this line of inquiry would involve looking at the activities of those most directly involved in the building of the research infrastructure necessary for community-engaged scholarship. A number of those

interviewed for my dissertation have assumed key leadership roles in pushing their universities to become more community engaged. Others have been active in building research networks so as to build researcher capacity, connect more community and university partners through knowledge mobilization (KMb) initiatives, and advance research and policy engagement with government agencies and civil society organizations. However, looking more concertedly at the challenges and difficulties faced by individuals providing administrative support at both the institutional (universities), organizational (granting councils), and civil society (community agencies) level could productively build upon and extend the analysis I have presented here. In particular, focusing more squarely upon the perspectives of individuals working in the community would add a layer of analysis to what I have presented here, as it could provide insight into how the objectives and mandates of community agencies and organizations has shifted in light of changes in the political economy of the research and funding landscape. In terms similar to how Polster (2007, p. 603) has addressed shifts in the nature of university research, interviews with individuals based in community organizations could provide insight into what the "new survivalism" looks like from the perspective of community partners. Possible questions to ask community partners could mirror those that inform my present study. For example, how do conceptualizations of engagement from the perspective of those based in the community compare and/or differ with institutionalized conceptualizations?

A second area could be to build upon and extend the parts of my dissertation where I focus on the language of community engagement through utilizing the tools of critical discourse analysis (CDA). For example, Peacock (2013) has analysed the discursive construction of community engagement in Australian universities, focusing specifically on the influence and effects of the enveloping neoliberal governance of higher education. Doing similar with regard to

the Canadian context could be a potentially fruitful way by which to identify and describe the discursive strategies being employed by universities and the research councils as they seek to capitalize on positioning themselves as community-engaged institutions. For example, Wodak & Meyer (2009, p. 32) suggest that CDA provides the means by which to detect the linguistic means used by those in power to destabilize or even intensify social inequalities. As such, the value of a CDA approach lies in how it analyses a document or text (e.g., university strategic plan or research council policy document) firmly within the social, economic, and political conditions mediating the context of its production—thereby further revealing the linguistic means which structure institutional promotions and understandings of community engagement.

Finally, analysing the implications of the movement toward the scaling-up of community-engaged research could be a way in which to move beyond my focus on the institutionalization of community engagement in the Canada context. For example, the Global Alliance for Community-Engaged Research (GACER) initiative includes representatives from universities, research networks, and civil society organizations from around the world and is tasked with nurturing the democratic potential of community-engaged research in a globally networked manner. Such developments represent a key shift in the conceptualization of community engagement away from its traditional focus on locality and the regional to include dimensions that are national and international. Community-engaged research is being scaled-up so that lessons learned in local context can be applied to global settings, a movement paralleled by the development of transnational and multi-disciplinary research networks (the global knowledge democracy) which emphasize problem-solving and policy-oriented research. Extending the focus of my dissertation to this broader comparative and international perspective would help situate my analysis in the broader political economy of higher education—and in what Christina

Escrigas (Executive Director of the Global University Network for Innovation (GUNI)) calls the shifting "social relevance of universities" (quoted in Hall, 2011).

Final reflections

The tension at the heart of the "renewal" of community engagement is between a model of the university as a civically-engaged institution contributing to the democratisation of knowledge—in other words, the "engaged university"—and a model of the university increasingly dominated by the market-driven logic and outcomes—the "research university." In the literature review, I cite Singh's (2007, p. 57) claim that it is preferable to aim at the institutionalization of the most conceptually and contextually nuanced versions of community engagement, and at weakening its most excessively reductionist forms. As I have addressed with the dissertation, a major challenge lies in the potential limits of such research practice given the extent to which market-driven and entrepreneurial practices have become embedded in the research landscape. There is, therefore, a need to unshackle what community engagement is, or could be, from the monopoly of the logic of the market—and for it to be re-constructed so as to embrace the democratic potential that is presently only vaguely gestured to. Such unshackling depends upon the extent to which the practitioners of community-engaged research remain sensitive to the economic and political pressures that shape and limit the democratic potential of the scholarship of engagement.

References

- Ansley, F. & Gaventa, J. (1997). Researching for democracy and democratizing research. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 29(1), 46-53.
- Antonio, A.L., Astin, H.A., & Cress, C.M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty, *Review of Higher Education*, 23(4), 373-398.
- Antonio, R. (1981). Immanent critique as the core of critical theory, *British Journal of Sociology*, 32(3), 330-245.
- Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU). (2001). *Engagement as a core value for the university: A consultation document*. London: ACU.
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC). (2008). *Momentum: The 2008 report on university research and knowledge mobilization*. Retrieved from http://www.aucc.ca/publications/aucpubs/research/momentum_e.html
- Australian Universities Community Engagement and Alliance (AUCEA). (2008). *University and community engagement*. Retrieved from http://aucea.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/universities_CE_2008_2010.pdf
- Barinaga, E., & Parker, P. (2013). Community-engaged scholarship: Creating participative spaces for transformative politics, *Tamara: Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry*, 11(4), 5-11.
- Barker, D. (2004). The scholarship of engagement: A taxonomy of five emerging practices. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 9(2), 123-137.
- Barrington, G. (2004). *Community-university research alliances (CURA) program: Analysis of data contained within the milestone and year 1 reports*. Ottawa: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.
- Beck, S. & Maida, C (Eds). (2013). *Toward engaged anthropology*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Becker, H. (1967). Whose side are we on? *Social Problems*, 14, 239-247.
- Benneworth, P. & Jongbloed, B.W. (2010). Who matters to universities? A stakeholder perspective on humanities, arts and social sciences valorization. *Higher Education*, 59, 567-588.
- Benneworth, P. (2013). The evaluation of universities and their contributions for community

- Engagement. In P. Bennworth (Ed.), *University engagement with socially excluded communities* (pp. 329-328-31). Dordrecht & New York: Springer.
- Bensimon, E., Polkinghorne, D., Bauman, G., & Vallejo, E. (2004). Doing research that makes a difference, *Journal of Higher Education*, 75(1), 104-126.
- Blau, J., & Lyall-Smith, K. (2006) *Public sociologies reader*. Lanham, Md. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Boden, R., & Epstein, D. (2006). Managing the research imagination. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 4(2), 223-236.
- Borofsky, R. (2004). *Conceptualizing public anthropology*. Retrieved from <http://www.publicanthropology.org/>
- Bourke, A. (2013). Universities, civil society, and the global agenda of community-engaged research, *Globalisation, Societies, and Education*, 11(4), 498-519.
- Bourke, A (2012). Participatory practices: Relevance and responsibility in community university research collaborations. In A. Bourke, T. Dafnos and M. Kip (Eds)., *Lumpencity: Discourses of marginality / marginalizing discourses* (pp. 291-321). Ottawa. Red Quill Books.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1(1), 11-20
- Brabant, M., & Braid, D. (2009). The devil is in the details: Defining civic engagement. *Journal of Higher Education and Engagement*, 13(2), 59-87.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3.2, 77-101.
- Brown, L., & Stega, S (Eds). (2005). *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous, and anti oppressive approaches*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Brydon-Miller, M., Greenwood, D., & Maguire, P. (2003). Why action research? *Action Research*, 1(1), 9-28.
- Buchbinder, H., & Newson, J. (1988). *The university means business: Universities, corporations, and academic work*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Bunyan, P. (2013). Partnership, the big society and community organizing: Between

- romanticizing, problematizing and politicizing community. *Community Development Journal*, 48(1), 119–133.
- Burawoy, M. (2004). Public sociologies: Contradictions, dilemmas, and possibilities, *Social Forces*, 82(4), 1-16.
- Burawoy, M. (2005). Presidential address: For public sociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 70, 4-28.
- Bussi eres, D. L., Dumais, J.M., Fontan, A., Lapierre, G., Shields, L., Sutton, & Vaillancourt, S. (2008). *Research partnerships: The ARUC- ES and RQRP- ES model*. Retrieved from: http://www.aruc-es.uqam.ca/Portals/0/docs/pdf/Research_Partnerships.pdf
- Butler, D. (2014). Chad Gaffield resigning as president of Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. *Ottawa Citizen*. Retrieved from <http://ottawacitizen.com/news/local-news/chad-gaffield-resigning-as-president-of-social-sciences-and-humanities-research-council>.
- Cahill, C. (2007). The personal is political: Developing new subjectivities through participatory action research. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 14(3), 267-292.
- Calleson, D. C., Jordan, C., & Seifer, D. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship: is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? *Academic Medicine*, 80(4), 317-321.
- Callon, M., & Latour, B. (1981). Unscrewing the big Leviathan: How actors macro-structure reality and how sociologists help them to do so. In Karin Knorr-Cetina and Aaron V. Cicourel (Eds.), *Advances in social theory and methodology: Towards an integration of micro- and macro-sociologies of knowledge?* (pp. 277-303). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). (2002). University-community links are key to better public education. *CAUT Bulletin*, 49(4). Retrieved from https://www.cautbulletin.ca/en_article.asp?ArticleID=1563
- _____. 2002. Community groups say universities should do more. *CAUT Bulletin* 49(4). Retrieved from https://www.cautbulletin.ca/en_article.asp?ArticleID=1560
- _____. 2013. *CAUT Almanac of post-secondary education in Canada*.
- Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences (CFHSS). (2011). *Strategic directions 2011-2015*. Retrieved from <http://www.ideas-idees.ca/sites/default/files/strategic-directions-2011-en.pdf>

- Cancian, F. M. (1993). Conflicts between activist research and academic success: participatory research and alternative strategies. *American Sociologist*, 24(1), 92-106.
- Carr, G. (2012, June). University-community collaboration across the country creates some beautiful things, *The Hill Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.hilltimes.com/opinion-piece/politics/2012/06/25/university-community-collaboration-across-the-country-creates/31212>
- Carr, J. (1999). It's not just academic: University-community partnerships are rebuilding neighbourhoods, *Housing Facts and Figures*, 1(1). Retrieved from http://www.knowledgeplex.org/kp/text_document_summary/article/refiles/hff_0101_car.html
- Carroll, W.K. (2006). Marx's method and the contributions of institutional ethnography. In C. Frampton, G. Kinsman, A.K. Thompson & K. Tilleczek (Eds.), *Sociology for changing the world: Social movements/ social research* (pp. 232-245). Halifax: Fernwood.
- Chan, A., & Fisher, D. (2008). Introduction: The exchange university. In A Chan., & D. Fisher (Eds.), *The exchange university: Corporatization of academic culture* (pp. 1-18), Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Chiapello, E., & Fairclough, N. (2002). Understanding the new management ideology: a transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism, *Discourse & Society* 13(2), 185-208.
- Chopyak, J., & Levesque, P. (2002). Community-based research and changes in the research landscape. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 22(3), 203-209.
- Clark, I.D., Moran, G., Skolnik, M.L., & Trick, D. (2009). *Academic transformation: The forces reshaping higher education in Ontario*. Montreal and Kingston: Queen's Policy student Series, McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Clawson, D (Ed). (2007) *Public sociology: Fifteen eminent sociologists debate politics and the profession in the twenty-first century*. Berkley, Los Angeles, & London: University of California Press.
- Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J.G. (1993). Shattered images: Understanding expectations and realities of field experiences. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9(5/6), 457-471.
- Coleman, D., & Kamboureli, S. (Eds). (2011). *Retooling the humanities: The culture of research in Canadian universities*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

- Council of Ontario Universities (COU). (2011). *Submission to the expert panel on the review of Federal support to research and development, expert panel consultation paper*. Retrieved from [http://rd-review.ca/eic/site/033.nsf/vwapj/sub129.pdf/\\$file/sub129.pdf](http://rd-review.ca/eic/site/033.nsf/vwapj/sub129.pdf/$file/sub129.pdf)
- _____. (2013). *Entrepreneurship at Ontario universities: Fuelling success*. Retrieved from <http://cou.on.ca/publications/reports/pdfs/entrepreneurship-at-ontario-universities---fuellin>
- Coyne, I. T. (1997). Sampling in qualitative research. Purposeful and theoretical sampling; merging or clear boundaries? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 26, 623–630.
- Cressman, D. (2009). *A brief overview of actor-network theory: Punctualization, heterogeneous engineering and translation*. ACT Lab/Centre for Policy Research on Science & Technology (CPROST) School of Communication: Simon Fraser University.
- Cruikshank, J. (2003). *Realism and sociology: Anti-foundationalism, ontology, and social research*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Currie, J. (1998). Introduction. In J. Currie & J. Newson (Eds), *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives*. California: Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Currie, J. & Newson, J. (Eds). (1998). *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Curtis, R. (2014). Foucault beyond Fairclough: From transcendental to immanent critique in organization studies, *Organization Studies*, 1-20.
- Deane, P. (2011). *Forward with integrity: A letter to the McMaster community*. McMaster University. Retrieved from http://www.mcmaster.ca/presidentsoffice/documents/Letter_Forward%20with%20Integrity_21Sep11.pdf
- Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging knowledge: the university in the knowledge society*. Buckingham, [U.K.]; Philadelphia, Pa., Society for Research into Higher Education: Open University Press.
- Dempsey, S. (2010). Critiquing community engagement. *Management Communication Quarterly* 24(3), 359-390.
- Denzin, N., Lincoln, Y, & Giardina, M. (2006). Disciplining qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(6). 796-782.
- Dewar, B. J. (2005). Beyond tokenistic involvement of older people in research: A framework

- for future development and understanding. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 14, 48–53.
- Dillabough, J., & Acker, A. (2008). Gender at work in teacher education. In D. Fisher and A. Chan (Eds.), *The exchange university: Corporatization of academic culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Dippo, D. (2005). Redefining community-university urban relations: A project for education facilities? *Teaching Education* 16(2), 89-101.
- Doberneck, D., Glass, C., & Schweitzer, J. (2010). From rhetoric to reality: A typology of publically engaged scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 4(5), 5-35.
- Drakich, J., Grant, K., & Stewart, P. (2002). The academy in the 21st Century, *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 39(3), 249-260.
- D'Sousa, R. (2009). The prison houses of knowledge: activist scholarship and revolution in the era of "globalization," *McGill Journal of Education*, 44(1), 19-36.
- DuFresne, T. (2010). To SSHRC or not to SSHRC? *Academic Matters: The Journal of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.academicmatters.ca/2010/11/to-sshrc-or-not-to-sshrc/>
- Dzisah, J. (2010). Capitalizing knowledge: The mind-set of academic scientists, *Critical Sociology*, 36(4), 555-573.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London and New York: Longman.
- _____. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: the universities, *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 133-168.
- _____. (2005). Critical discourse analysis, *Marges Linguistiques* 9, 76-94.
- Fairclough, N., Corteze, G., & Adrizzone, P. (2007). *Discourse and contemporary social change*. Bern, Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Fallis, G. (2014) (June). Reclaiming the civic university. *Academic Matters: the Journal of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.academicmatters.ca/2014/06/reclaiming-the-civic-university/>
- Farkas, N. (2002). *Bread, cheese, and expertise: Dutch science shops and democratic Institutions*. Unpublished PhD. Thesis. Retrieved from: <http://www.scienceshops.org/new%20web-content/content/documents/Farkas-thesis.pdf>
- Fasensfest, D. (2010). A political economy of knowledge production. *Critical Sociology* 36(4),

483–487.

- Feagin, J., & Vera, H. (2001). *Liberation sociology*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Fisher, D., & Rubenson, K. (1998). The changing political economy: the private and public lives of Canadian universities. In J. Currie & J. Newson. (Eds), *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives* (pp.77-97). California: Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Flicker, S. & Savan, B. (2006). *A snapshot of CBR in Canada*. Toronto: Wellesley Institute.
Retrieved from
http://www.uvic.ca/research/ocbr/assets/pdfs/CBR_snapshot_report_final.pdf.
- Flicker, S., Savan, B., Kolenda, B., & Mildenberger, M. (2008). A snapshot of community-based research in Canada: who? what? why? how?" *Health Education Research*, 2(1), 106–114.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*, Trans by A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books.
- _____. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A post structuralist reader* (pp. 52-64). Boston: Routledge & K. Paul.
- Frampton, C., Kinsman, G., Thompson, A.K., & Tilleczek, K (Eds). (2006). *Sociology for changing the world: Social movements/ social research*. Halifax: Fernwood.
- Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Fryer, M. (2012, September. 24). Community engagement: We need to deepen the discourse. *Academic Affairs*.
- _____. (2012, November. 14). Some key challenges to community engagement, *Academic Affairs*.
- Gaffield, C. (2009, November. 16). A new model of innovation for successful societies, *The Hill Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.hilltimes.com/policy-briefing/2009/11/16/a-new-model-of-innovation-for-successful-societies/22776>
- Gaffikin, F., & Morrissey, M. (2008). A new synergy for universities: Redefining academy as an "engaged institution". *Education. Citizenship and Social Justice*, 3(1), 97-116.
- Gall, É., Millot, G., & Neubauer, C. (2009). Participation of civil society organizations in research. *Science, technology and civil society: Civil society organizations, Actors in the European system of research and innovation*. Retrieved from
http://www.scienceshops.org/new%20webcontent/content/documents/STACS_Final_Report-Partic.research.pdf

- Gans, H. (1989). Sociology in America: The discipline and the public. *American Sociological Review* 54(1), 1-16.
- Global Alliance on Community Engaged Research (GACER). (2009). *Higher Education, Community Engagement and the World We Want: A Policy Brief to the World Conference on Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://web.uvic.ca/~ccharlie/Higher%20Education,%20Community%20Engagement%20and%20the%20World%20We%20Want.pdf>
- Government of Canada. (2012). *Jobs, growth, and long-term prosperity: Economic action plan 2012*. Ottawa. Retrieved from <http://www.budget.gc.ca/2012/plan/pdf/Plan2012-eng.pdf>
- Graham, K. (2014, June). Beyond all in the family: Community-based research in Canada, *Academic Matters: The Journal of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.academicmatters.ca/2014/06/beyond-all-in-the-family-community-based-research-in-canada/>
- Grant, K., & J. Drakich, J. (2010). The Canada Research Chairs program: the good, the bad, and the ugly. *Higher Education*, 59(1), 21-42.
- Greenwood, D., & Levin, M. (2003). Reconstructing the relationships between universities and society through action research. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues* (pp. 131-162). London: Sage.
- Hale, C. (2006). Activist research v. cultural critique: Indigenous land rights and the contradictions of politically engaged anthropology. *Cultural Anthropology*, 21(1), 96-120.
- Hall, B. (2005). In from the cold? Reflections on participatory research from 1970-2005. *Convergence*, 38, 5-24.
- _____. (2009). Higher education, community engagement, and the public good: Building the future of continuing education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, 35(1), 11-23.
- _____. (2011). Towards a knowledge democracy movement: Contemporary trends in community-university research partnerships, *Rhizome Freirean* no. 9. Retrieved from <http://www.rizoma-freireano.org/index.php/towards-a-knowledge-democracy-movement-contemporary-trends-in-community-university-research-partnerships--budd-l-hall>
- Hall, S. (1996). Gramsci's relevance for the study of race and ethnicity. In D. Morley & Kuan

- Hsing Chen (Eds.), *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (pp. 411-440). London and New York: Routledge.
- Hall, B., & Tremblay, C. (2012). *Learning from SSHRC funded partnerships: community outcomes and conditions for success*. Prepared for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. The Centre for Public Sector Studies: University of Victoria.
- Hall, B., Jackson, E., Tandon, R., Fontan, J-M., & Lall, N. (Eds). (2013). *Knowledge, democracy and action: Community-university research partnerships in global perspectives*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hall, B., & Dawson, T. (Eds). (2014). *Learning and teaching community-based research: Linking pedagogy to practice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hall, P., Smith, J., Kay, A., Downing, R., MacPherson, I., & McKittrick, A. (2011). Introduction: Learning from the social economy community-university research partnerships. In P. Hall & I. MacPherson (Eds.), *Community-university research partnerships: Reflections on the Canadian social economy experience* (pp 1-26). Victoria, B.C: University of Victoria.
- Hart, A., Maddison, E., & Wolff, D. (2008). *Community–university partnerships in practice*. Leicester: National Institute of Continuing Education.
- Harvey, D., & Szeman, I. (2014). Are we all entrepreneurs now? *University Affairs*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/entrepreneurs-now/>
- Hatch, D. (2012). Unpacking the black box of student engagement: The need for programmatic investigation of high impact practices. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 36(11). 903-915.
- Higher Education Strategy Associates (HESA). (2012). *The 2012 federal budget: A Canadian education project commentary*. Retrieved from <http://higheredstrategy.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/2012-Budget-Commentary.pdf>
- Hewitt, T. (2012). Examining the growing trend of engaged research in the social sciences and humanities, *Canadian Federation of Humanities and Social Sciences*. Retrieved from <http://www.ideas-idees.ca/examining-growing-trend-engaged-research-social-sciences-humanities>
- Holland, B. (2005a). Community engagement and community-engaged scholarship: Clarifying

- our meanings when using these terms. Community-engaged scholarship for health collaborative. *Community-Campus Partnerships for Health*. Retrieved from https://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/HollandFIPSE%205.18%20Teleconf.pdf
- Holland, B. (2005b). Reflections on community-campus partnerships: What has been learned? What are the next challenges?. In P. Pasque, J. Burkhardt, & R. Smerek (eds.), *Higher Education Collaboration for Community Improvement and Engagement* (pp. 10-17), National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good. Retrieved from http://www.thenationalforum.org/Docs/PDF/Wingspread_05_Final_Monograph.pdf
- Holstein, J., & Gubrium, J. (1997). Active interviewing. In D. Silverman *Qualitative research* (pp. 113-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hustinx, L., & Denk, T. (2009). The 'black box' problem in the study of participation. *Journal of Civil Society* 5(3), 209-226.
- Israel, B. A., Schulz, A.J., Parker, E.A., & Becker, A. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 19, 173-202.
- Jackson, T. (1993). A way of working: participatory research and the aboriginal movement in Canada. In P. Park, M. Brydon-Miller, B. Hall, & T. Jackson (Eds.), *Voices of change: Participatory research in the United States and Canada*(pp. 46-64). London: Bergin and Garvey.
- Jackson, E. (2008, September). The CUE factor: Community-university engagement for social innovation. *Open Source Business Resource*. Retrieved from <http://www.osbr.ca/ojs/index.php/osbr/rt/printerFriendly/704/672>.
- _____. (2010). University capital, community engagement and continuing education: Blending professional development and social change. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, 36(2), 1-13.
- Jones, G., Weinrib, J., Metcaulfe, A.M., Fisher, D., Ruberson, K., & Snee, I. (2012). Perceptions of early career faculty and the academic workplace in Canada, Paper presented at the Fourth International CETL Conference *Academia as Workplace: Linking Past, Present and Future* held at St. Hugh's College, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom, April 4-6.

- Jongbloed, B., Enders, J., & Salerno, C. (2008). *Higher education and its communities: Interconnections, interdependencies and a research agenda*. *Higher Education*, 56(3), 303-324.
- Jordan, S. (2003). Who stole my methodology? Co-opting PAR. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 1(2), 185-200.
- Jurik, N. (2004). ASA Presidential address: Imagining justice: Challenging the privatization of public life. *Social Problems*, 51(1), 1-15.
- Keith, N. Z. (2005). Community service learning in the face of globalization: rethinking theory and practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11(2), 5-24.
- Khan, C., & Chovancel, D. (2010). Is participatory action research relevant in the Canadian workplace? *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education*, 5(1), 34-44.
- Khanlou, N., & Peter, E. (2005). Participatory action research: Considerations for ethical review. *Social Science and Medicine*, 60(10), 2333-2340.
- Kishchuk, N. (2003). *Performance report: Phase 1 of the community-university research alliances (CURA) program*. Ottawa: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.
- Kitts, J. (2000). Mobilizing in black boxes: Social networks and participation in social movement Organizations. *Mobilization: An International Journal*, 5(2), 241-257.
- Lall, N. (2009). *Measuring the impact of institutional support structures for community university research partnerships*. University of Victoria: Office of Community Based Research.
- Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Open University Press.
- _____. (1994). On technical medication. *Common Knowledge*, 3(2), 29-64.
- Lewis, T., & Neisenbaum, R. (2005). Extending the stay: Using community-based research and service learning to enhance short-term study abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(3), 251-264.
- Lightstone, J. (2014, January. 14). Instead of ivory tower, a place in the neighbourhood, *Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/education/instead-of-ivory-tower-a-place-in-the-neighbourhood/article16169887/>

- Lobera, J. (2009). Community-engaged research: A step forward. *Forum for a New World Governance*. Retrieved from <http://www.worldgovernance.org/spip.php?article453&lang=fr>
- Low, S., & Merry, S. (2010). Engaged anthropology: Diversity and dilemmas: An introduction to supplement 2. *Current Anthropology*, 51(S2), 203–226.
- Lutz, J. & Neis, B. (2008). *Making the moving knowledge: Interdisciplinary and community based research*, Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Lynd, R. (1939). *Knowledge for what? The place of social science in American culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mandell, N., King, K., Weiser, N., Preston, V., Kim, A., Luxton, M., Din, N., & Silver, A. (2013). *Community-academic research partnerships: Practical, ethical and strategic approaches to fostering engaged scholarship*. Research Impact: York University.
- McClung Lee, A. (1976). Presidential address: sociology for whom? *American Sociological Review*, 41(6), 925-936.
- McRae, H.A. (2009). *In search of common space: Exploring university's continuing education's role in civic engagement*, Unpublished PhD thesis: Simon Fraser University.
- Mendygral, H., Omari, A.M., Trost, J., & Vu, K.T. (2012). *Community engagement assessment: McMaster University, Ontario, Canada*. Retrieved from http://www.mcmaster.ca/presidentsoffice/documents/Report_Community_Engagement_Furco_2012.pdf
- Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse*. London & New York. Routledge.
- Minkler, M. & Wallerstein, N. (2003). *Community-based participatory research in health*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Minkler, M. (2005). Community based research partnerships: challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 82(2), 3-12.
- Mizra, R. (2011). *Scan of engagement structures in Canadian universities*. Memorial University Office of Engagement: Memorial University. Retrieved from http://www.mun.ca/publicengagement/toolkit/Canadian_Uni_Engagement.pdf
- Moore, T., & Ward, K. (2010). Institutionalizing faculty engagement through research, teaching, and service at research universities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 17(1), 44-58.

- Morton, M., Dolton, C., Maher, T., & Pennell, J. (2012). Civic engagement and public sociology: two "movements" in search of a mission. *Journal of Applied Social Science*, 6(1), 5-30.
- Munck, R., McQuillan, H., and Ozarowska, J. (2012). Civic engagement in a cold climate: A glocal perspective. In R. Munck, H. McQuillan, & J. Ozarowska (Eds.), *Higher Education and Civic Engagement: Comparative Perspectives* (pp. 15–30). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mykhalovskiy, E., & McCoy, L. (2002). Troubling ruling discourses of health: using institutional ethnography in community-based research. *Critical Public Health*, 12(1), 17-37.
- Mykhalovskiy, E., Armstrong, P., Armstrong, H., Bourgeault, I., Choiniere, J., Lexchin, J., Peters, S., & White, J. (2008). Qualitative research and the politics of knowledge in an age of evidence: developing a research-based practice of immanent critique. *Social Science and Medicine*, 67(1), 195-203.
- Nabatchi, T., Gastil, J., Weiksner, G., & Leighninger, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Democracy in motion: Evaluating the practice and impact of deliberative civic engagement*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Neis, B. (2010). Making the university work for communities. In J., Newson, & C. Polster (Eds.) *Academic callings: the university we have had, now have, and could have* (pp. 243-249). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE). (2015). *Carnegie Community Engagement Classification*. Retrieved March 2, 2015, from http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92
- Newson, J. (1995). CSAA presidential address: Positioning the social sciences and economic restructuring. *Society/Société* 19(3), 1-11
- Newson, J., & Polster, C. (2001). Reclaiming our centre: Towards a robust defense of academic autonomy. *Science Studies*, 14(1), 55-75.
- _____. 2010. *Academic callings: The university we have had, now have, and could have*. Toronto. Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Nichols, L. (Ed.). (2007). *Public sociology: The contemporary debate*. New Brunswick, N.J. Transaction Publishers.
- Nyden, P., Hossfield, L., & Nyden, G. (2012). Public scholarship, the sociological imagination,

- and engaged scholarship. In P. Nyden, L. Hossfield, & G. Nyden (Eds.). *Public sociology: research, action and change* (pp. 1-11). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press.
- O'Connor, A. (2007). *Social science for what: Philanthropy and the social questions in a world turned upside down*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Office of Community Based Research (OCBR). (2009). *The funding and development of community university research partnerships in Canada: Evidence-based investment in knowledge, engaged scholarship, innovation and action for Canada's future*. University of Victoria. Retrieved from <http://communityresearchcanada.ca/documents/CBRFunding052009.pdf>
- Olssen, A., & Peters, M.A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy* 20(3), 313–345.
- O'Meara, K.A. (2002). *Scholarship unbound: Assessing service as scholarship for promotion and tenure*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- One World Inc. (2011). *Campus-community connections: Creating value for a "smart and caring" Canada*. Roundtable discussion. Retrieved from <http://engagedscholarship.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/CCC-Meeting-Report-September-2011.pdf>
- _____. (2012). *Community-campus collaboration initiative: Mobilizing our resources to create a smarter and more caring Canada*: http://engagedscholarship.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/CCC_final.pdf
- Ostrander, S. (2004). Democracy, civic participation, and the university: a comparative study of civic engagement on five campuses. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33(1), 74-93.
- Palys, T. (2008). Purposive sampling. In L. Given (Ed.). *Sage encyclopaedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 2) (pp. 697-698). Thousand Oaks, CA,: Sage.
- Park, P., Brydon-Miller, W., Hall, B., & Jackson, T. (1993). *Voices of change: participatory research in the United States and Canada*, Westport, Connecticut, and London: Bergin and Garvey.
- Patton, M. Q. (2001). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park,

- CA: Sage Publications.
- Peacock, D. (2013). Neoliberal social inclusion? The agenda of the Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance. *Critical Studies in Education*, 53(3), 311-325.
- Peters, M. A. (2003). Classical political economy and the role of universities in the new knowledge economy. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 1(2), 153–168.
- _____. (2007). *Knowledge economy, development and the future of higher education*. Sense Publishers: Rotterdam.
- Phipps, D., & Shapson, A. (2009). Knowledge mobilisation builds local research collaborations for social innovation, *Evidence and Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, 5(3), 211-227.
- Pohle, J. (2013). Opening the black box of policy change: Analyzing policy discourse ‘in the making’. *European Consortium for Political Research General Conference*, Bordeaux. Retrieved from <http://www.ecpr.eu/Filestore/PaperProposal/a92a4a9e-4433-49f4-93f9-0b87d23ef413.pdf>
- Polster, C. (1994). *Compromising positions: The Federal Government and the reorganization of the social relations of Canadian academic research*. (Doctoral dissertation, York University).
- _____. (2002). A break from the past: Impacts and implications of the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Canada Research Chairs initiatives. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 39(3), 275-299.
- _____. (2004). Canadian university research policy at the end of the 20th Century: Continuity and change in the social relations of academic research. *Studies in Political Economy*, 71/72, 177-199.
- _____. (2007). The nature and implications of the growing importance of research grants to Canadian universities and academics. *Higher Education*, 53, 599-622.
- Polster, C., & Newson, J. (1998). Don't count your blessings: the social accomplishments of performance indicators. In J. Currie & J. Newson (Eds.). *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives* (pp. 173-191). Thousand Oaks, London and New Delhi: Sage.
- Rappert, B. (1999). The uses of relevance: Thoughts on a reflexive sociology. *Sociology* 334(4), 705-723.

- Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Reissman, C.K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. LA: Sage Publications.
- Rhoads, R., & Torres, C.A. (Eds). (2006). *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas*. Calif.,: Stanford University Press.
- Ritchie, S. M., & Rigano, D. L. (2007). Solidarity through collaborative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20(2), 129-150.
- Robertson, S. L. (2010). Corporatization, competitiveness, commercialization: New logics in the globalizing of UK higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 8(2), 191-203.
- Robinson, O. (2014). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 11(1), 25-41.
- Roche, B. (2008). *New directions in community-based research*. Toronto: Wellesley Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.wellesleyinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/newdirectionsinibr.pdf>
- Rooney, J. D. (2005). *Town-gown: A new meaning for a new economy*. Campus Compact. Retrieved from <http://www.compact.org/resources/future-of-campus-engagement/town-gown-a-new-meaning-for-a-new-economy/4261/>
- Ryerson University. (2008). *Shaping our future: Academic plan for 2008-2013*. Ryerson University: Office of the Provost and Vice President Academic.
- Rylko-Bauer, B., Singer, M., & Van-Willigen, J. (2008). Reclaiming applied anthropology: It's past, present, and future. *American Anthropologist*, 108(1), 178-190.
- Sandmann, L. (2008). Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement in higher education: A strategic review 1996-2006. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 91-104.
- Santos, de Sousa. (2006). The university in the 21st century: Toward a democratic and emancipatory university reform. In R. Rhoads & C. A. Torres (Ed.). *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas* (pp. 60-100). California: Stanford University Press.
- Savan, B., Flicker, S., Kolenda, B., & Mildemberger, A. (2008). A snapshot of community

- based research in Canada: Who? What? Why? How? *Health Education Research*, 2(1), 106–114.
- _____. (2009). How to facilitate (or discourage) community-based research: Recommendations based on a Canadian survey. *Local Environment*, 14(8), 783–796.
- Schensul J. (2002). Democratizing science through social science research partnerships. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society* 22(3), 190-202.
- _____. (2010). Engaged universities, community based research organizations and third sector science in a global system. *Human Organization*, 69(4), 307-320.
- Schensul, J., Berg, M., & Williamson, K. (2008). Challenging hegemonies: advancing collaboration in community-based participatory action research. *Collaborative Anthropologies*, 1, 102-137.
- Shanahan, T., & Jones, G. (2007). Shifting roles and approaches: Government coordination of postsecondary education in Canada from 1995 to 2006. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 26(1), 31–43.
- Shore, C., & Taitz, M. (2012). Who ‘owns’ the university? Institutional autonomy and academic freedom in an age of knowledge capitalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 10(2), 201–219.
- Shragge, E., Hanley, J., Jordan, S., Baltodano, C., Singh, J., Stiegman, M., & Choudry, A. (2006). *Community university research partnerships: A critical reflection and an alternative experience*. Retrieved from http://www.wallnetwork.ca/resources/Shragge_Partnerships_2006.pdf
- Singh, M. (2007). Universities and society: whose terms of engagement? In S. Sörlin & H. Vessuri (Eds.). *Knowledge society vs. knowledge economy: Knowledge, power, and politics* (pp. 53-78). UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge: Palgrave.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore. John Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, D. (2006). *Institutional ethnography: A sociology for people*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: Alta

- Mira Press.
- Smith, G. (1990). Political activist as ethnographer. *Social Problems*, 17(4), 629-648.
- Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). (1998). *Annual Report 1997-1998*. Ottawa.
- _____. (2007). *Annual Report 2006-2007*. Ottawa. Retrieved from http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/publications/sshrc_annual_report_2006_e.pdf
- _____. (2005). *Knowledge Council Strategic Plan 2006-2011*. Ottawa. Retrieved from <http://scis.athabascau.ca/research/resources/SSHRC%20Strategic%20Plan.pdf>
- _____. (2010). *Framing Our Direction*. Ottawa. Retrieved from http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/publications/FramingOurDirection_2010-12_final_e.pdf
- _____. (2010, March). Briefing on SSHRC's renewed program architecture. Ottawa. Retrieved from http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/news_room-salle_de_presse/Program_Architecture_Consultation_e.pdf
- Sörlin, S., & Vessuri, H. (2007). Introduction: the democratic deficit of knowledge economies. In S. Sörlin & H. Vessuri (Eds.), *Knowledge society vs knowledge economy: Knowledge, power, and politics* (pp. 1–34). Palgrave: UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge.
- Sprain, L., & Carcasson, M. (2013). Democratic engagement through the ethic of passionate Impartiality. *Tamara: Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry*, 11(4), 13-26.
- Stanton, T. K. (2008). New times demand new scholarship: Opportunities and challenges for civic engagement. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 3(1),19-42.
- Stoecker, R. (1999). Are academics irrelevant? Roles for scholars in participatory research. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 42(5), 840-854.
- Strand, K., Marullo, A., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). Principles of best practice for community-based research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Summer, 5-15.
- Susser, I. (2010). The anthropologist as social critic: Working toward a more engaged Anthropology. *Current Anthropology*, 51(S2), 227-233.
- Thomson, A-M., & Perry, J. (2006). Collaboration processes: inside the black box. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 20-32.
- Tongco, M. D. (2007). Purposive sampling as a tool for informant selection. *Ethnobotany*

- Research and Application: A Journal of Plants, Peoples and Applied Research*, 5, 147-158.
- University of British Columbia (UBC). (2012). *Place and promise: The UCB plan*. Retrieved from <http://strategicplan.ubc.ca/the-plan/>
- Vaillancourt, Y. (2005). *Democratizing knowledge: Research experiments based on university community partnerships*, Ontario: Carold Institute for the Advancement of Citizenship in Social Change.
- Van de Ven, A.H. (2007). *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wade, A., & Demb, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community Engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15(2), 5-16.
- Wallerstein, N., & Duran, B. (2003). The conceptual, historical, and practice roots of community based participatory research and related participatory traditions. In Minkler, M. and N. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Community-based participatory research in health* (pp. 3-267). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Watson. D. (2008). The university in the modern world: Ten lessons of civic and community engagement, *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 3(1), 43-55.
- Wehbi, S., & Turcotte, P. (2007). Social work education: Neoliberalism's willing victim? *Critical Social Work*, 8(1). Retrieved from <http://www1.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/social-work-education-neoliberalism%E2%80%99s-willing-victim>
- Wenger L., Hawkins, L., & Seifer, S. (2012). Community-engaged scholarship: Critical junctures in research, practice and policy: Conference report. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 171-181.
- Willis, C., Anders, C., & Stoeker, R. (2012). Case study 8: when the community leads. In P. Nyden, L. Hossfield and G. Nyden (Eds.). *Public sociology: research, action and change* (pp. 286-291). Thousand Oaks, Calif., Pine Forge Press: Sage.
- Winner, L. (1993). Upon opening the black box and finding it empty: Social constructionism and the philosophy of technology. *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, 18(3), 362-378.
- Winter, A., Wiseman, J., & Muirhead, B. (2006). University-community engagement in Australia: Practice, policy and public good. *Education Citizenship and Social Justice*, 1(3), 211-230.

World Bank. (1999). *Knowledge for development*. New York, N.Y: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2002). *Constructing knowledge societies: New challenges for tertiary education*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group.

York University. (2010). *Towards an engaged university: President's Task Force Report on Community Engagement: Final report and recommendations*. Retrieved from <http://www.yorku.ca/commeng/documents/finalreport.pdf>

Appendix A: Faculty Portraits

This appendix provides biographical detail on all thirty-five respondents interviewed for the dissertation and is intended to be read alongside the description in the methods chapter of the sample selection process. It includes information drawn from university faculty pages, personal websites of scholars, funding agency databases (primarily SSHRC) and, where relevant, other affiliated institutional, organizational or agency websites. A pseudonym is used for each respondent. Included are details of faculty status and notable related academic appointments or affiliations (e.g., Chair, Dean, Director etc). The research interests and focus of each respondent (where applicable) is emphasized. For candidates without a specialization in community-engaged or community-based research, I have specified why they were included in the sample selection. The respondents and their key field of research are numbered as follows:

1. Ayala (youth, community development)
2. Christine (women, work, and health)
3. Michelle (Aboriginal and Northern research)
4. Daniel (security and regional studies)
5. Ian (schooling, teaching education)
6. Adam (adult education, CBR)
7. Justin (housing, community development)
8. Natasha (women and mental health)
9. Fatima (Aboriginal research, child advocacy)
10. Irina (youth, HIV, health)
11. Marius (youth, homelessness)
12. Gustav (poverty, crime, exclusion)
13. Deirdre (health, CBR)
14. Carla (health, CBR, KT/E)
15. Stephen (racism, education)
16. Frank (education, policy)
17. Paul (knowledge mobilization)
18. Saidul (non-profits, social economy)
19. Polina (health, disability rights)
20. Niamh (CBR Director)
21. Genevieve (climate change, sustainability)

22. Vincent (labour, welfare, policy)
23. Susan (queer studies, disability rights)
24. Laura (research officer)
25. Brian (education, schooling)
26. Naomi (fisheries, community development)
27. Patricia (Aboriginal research, pedagogy)
28. Anna (education, CBR)
29. Karina (urban, community development)
30. Larissa (child welfare, Aboriginal research)
31. Sophie (immigrant welfare, domestic rights)
32. Hannah (community development, CBR)
33. Clara (women and housing, community development)
34. Lorraine (health, housing)
35. Farah (schooling, education, CBR)

1. **Ayala** is an associate professor in social work with research specializations in homelessness, immigration, and youth in local, national and international contexts. Ayala employs a dialogic approach to the co-production and co-creation of CBR with her community partners that seeks to bridge the gap between knowledge production and its use. She has received funding for her research from a variety of sources at different levels of government, including tri-council funding. I was interested in interviewing Ayala due to her interest and knowledge of community-based research methodologies, her focus on conducting research with a social justice orientation, and because of her participation in a CURA and collaboration in numerous other community-engaged research projects.

2. **Christine** is an associate professor in sociology with research specializations in women and healthcare. She has been involved with a wide range of national initiatives focused on these issues. She has been principle investigator on a number of tri-council funded research projects, and has participated as collaborator on many more. I interviewed Christine because of her broad spectrum of experience and career-long blending of academic activities and activism, her ongoing interest in community-engaged research, and her knowledge and experience of the research councils (as grant application and as grant reviewer).

3. **Michelle** is a professor in a school of public policy and administration with research interests in the development of northern communities. Michelle played a leading role in the development of her university's strategic plan and has worked as part of her university's administration in helping develop her university's engagement with local communities—and with aboriginal initiatives in particular. She has been centrally involved in a number of institutional and pan-institutional initiatives focused on community engagement and community-based research.

4. **Daniel** is a professor of political science with specializations in international and regional security studies, and also has experience of working at the administrative level in his university. Another one of my respondents recommended I speak with Daniel on institutional policies around community engagement, his extensive knowledge of the workings of the research councils and of the funding landscape more generally, and on the relationship between scholars and the research councils.

5. **Ian** is an associate professor with research interests in education, university—community relations, and teacher education. Ian has spent his career deeply involved in a range of community-engaged research projects and service-oriented initiatives between the faculty at his university and local community agencies and organizations. His long-standing interest and involvement in community-engaged scholarly activities made him an ideal candidate to interview on the subject of shifting community-university relations.

6. **Adam** is a professor in a school of public administration with research interests in community-based research, community development, and learning and social movements. He has long been involved in community-based adult education and community-based participatory research, both nationally and internationally. He is committed to building institutional capacity for community engagement and is involved with a number of local, national, and international projects committed to achieving this aim.

7. **Justin** is an associate professor in social work with specializations in local and global trends in housing and community development. He conducts research that employs a multi-method approach that embraces both qualitative and quantitative research and, whenever possible, employs a participatory research process. He has extensive experience and involvement

in numerous tri-council funded interdisciplinary and multi-institutional community-university research projects.

8. **Natasha** is an associate professor in psychology with research specializations in immigration and mental health. Natasha is interested in conducting research for social change and in combining her scholarly activities with an activist agenda. In doing so, she utilizes a range of community-based and participatory methodologies to engage with diverse immigrant communities. Working in national and international inter-disciplinary research projects, she has a particular interest in addressing how different types of social connections can be mobilized to nurture community capacity and resilience. Natasha has received funding from SSHRC and CIHR for her research.

9. **Fatima** is an associate professor with specializations in community-based research and aboriginal research, and has experience of working at different levels of government before moving to an academic post. Identifying as a scholar and community activist, Fatima's research is guided by a participatory, CBR process committed to advancing social change and social justice.

10. **Irina** is an associate professor in environmental studies with specializations in community development, public health, and youth. She employs community-based and participatory methodologies in a wide range of national (and some international) research projects. She has received funding for CBR from a variety of sources, including from the tri-councils.

11. **Marias** is an associate professor in education with specializations in homelessness and community development. He is a long-time advocate and activist for homelessness and is committed to a research practice that foregrounds social justice and policy change. He has been

principle investigator on a number of large, collaborative, and interdisciplinary research projects with funding from various levels of government. Marius's experience of working in the community and in government, and his extensive knowledge of the funding landscape for community-engaged research, made him a valuable source of information with regard to my project.

12. **Gustav** is an associate professor in politics and public administration with specializations in community development, education, and human rights. He has had previous experience of working in government as a policy analyst on social issues and has been an active and long-time participant and advocate for social justice for marginalized communities. He works closely with a number community agencies and organizations.

13. **Deirdre** is an assistant professor in public health with specializations in community-based, participatory research, and mental health. She has been a long-time practitioner of, and advocate for, the utilization of community-engaged research in a wide range of research projects focused on public and mental health issues. She has extensive knowledge and expertise on community-based research (CBR) in Canada with regard to key trends, issues, and changes in the community, university, and funding landscape.

14. **Carla** was (at the time of our interview) an associate professor in public health with specializations in mental health policy, knowledge transfer and exchange, and community-based research. Carla has worked extensively in the community and in university settings throughout her career.

15. **Stephen** is an associate professor in education with specializations in multicultural education and urban education. He has been principle investigator on a number of SSHRC

grants, and has been co-principle investigator, co-investigator, and collaborator on a wide range of other research projects funded by various levels of government, including SSHRC.

16. **Frank** is an associate professor in education with interests and specializations in educational reform and policy. He has extensive experience of working with government as advisor and consultant at a number of different levels. I became interested in interviewing Frank because of his experience of working with a range of university, community, and government partners and for his knowledge of key shifts in the nature and structure of the research landscape with regard to community engagement and related discussions on knowledge mobilization.

17. **Paul** is a specialist in the area of knowledge transfer and knowledge mobilization. His current expertise extends to research grants and contracts, ethics, knowledge transfer, and technology transfer initiatives. I became interested in interviewing Paul after his name was recommended to me by another respondent and in light of his experience in the field of research facilitation and management, particularly with regard to the connection between community-engaged research and knowledge mobilization.

18. **Saidul** is an associate professor in education with research specializations in non-profit organizations, co-operatives, and community development. He has had a live-long involvement and participation with the non-profit sector and the Canadian tradition of social economy. He has been principle investigator on a number of tri-council grants.

19. **Polina** is an associate professor in health with research interests and specializations in public health policy and disability rights. She has been principle investigator on a number of tri-council grants, and collaborator and participant on many others. I interviewed her due to her interest in community engagement and involvement in a number of large, collaborative research partnerships.

20. **Niamh** is director of research at an urban-based, non-profit research and policy institute. Niamh was interviewed following the recommendation of another interviewee. In her capacity as director of research in a community-based agency, she has worked closely with a broad range of university and community partners on a wide range of research projects and was a valuable source of information on the challenges of working with university-based scholars from the perspective of a community-based agency.

21. **Genevieve** is a senior lecturer in an environmental studies program with research interests and specializations in sustainable development and climate change. Genevieve has been active as a government adviser in both a municipal and provincial capacity on a range of environmental issues and has extensive experience of working on large-scale tri-council grants in a variety of capacities.

22. **Vincent** is an associate professor in politics and public administration with research specializations in the labour market, welfare state restructuring, and immigrant settlement and integration policy and practices. Vincent has worked extensively with government as a researcher and policy adviser at municipal and provincial levels on issues pertaining to government and community development. A recent focus of his work has been on knowledge creation and knowledge transfer practices and policies between university-based scholars and community groups and agencies.

23. **Susan** is associate professor in social work and specializes in community-based practice on sexualities and disabilities. She has variously worked as a social development consultant, a program manager, and as a director of services in a community organization. Often incorporating arts-based approaches in her research, she is interested in creating alternative narratives relating to issues of oppression and displacement in urban communities.

24. **Laura** is a research officer for the social sciences in her university. She has over a decade of experience in areas of project management, grants facilitation, and specializes in supporting social sciences and humanities faculty in their funding applications to the tri-councils. I interviewed Laura following the recommendation of a previous interviewee, Paul, who suggested Laura in light of her knowledge and expertise regarding the nature and structure of university funding processes and trends.

25. **Brian** is an associate professor in education with a specialization in the history of schooling, higher education, and Canadian education policy. He has written extensively on the history of higher education, on policy developments in higher education, and on student experiences of higher education. I decided to interview Brian in light of his knowledge of the history of higher education and of the vicissitudes of policy changes for universities and the granting councils, both in Canada and internationally. Brian participated in the drafting of his university's institutional policy statement on community engagement.

26. **Naomi** is professor of sociology with research interests in the relationships between health, environment, and community in rural and remote areas. Naomi is director of a research unit at her university and has been principle investigator (PI) and co-principle investigator on several tri-council funded projects. I decided to interview Naomi due to her extensive experience of reviewing grants and her knowledge of workings of the tri-councils.

27. **Patricia** is an associate professor in education with specializations in adult and community education, and critical pedagogy. She has received a number of SSHRC grants for her research. I decided to interview Patricia in light of the long-standing interest she has in community-based research, particularly with aboriginal communities.

28. **Anna** is an associate professor in educational studies with interests in community-based adult education, research methodologies, and teacher education. Anna has been involved in a number of community-based and arts-based research projects throughout her career. Her current research, funded by the tri-councils, explores arts-based research and community-service learning initiatives in Canada.

29. **Karina** is professor in a school of community and regional planning with research interests in community development and planning, sustainability, and participatory development. Her research focuses on developing strategies and initiatives that encourage diversity and equity in the planning and design of communities. She is currently the co-principal investigator of a research project looking at housing and community development, and has previously been the co-principal investigator on a SSHRC project focusing on the relationship between environmental issues and social inequality. Karina has worked on a number of projects funded by the tri-councils. She is currently working with her university in developing an institutional policy statement on community-engagement.

30. **Larissa** is a professor of social work with research interests in areas of aboriginal issues and community development. I became interested in interviewing Larissa after reading her work on community-engaged methodologies and because of her interest in anti-oppressive social research.

31. **Sophie** is an associate professor in social work with research interests in racism and discrimination in the health care system and the immigrant experience in Canada. Sophie is a long-time practitioner of community-based research methodologies. She is involved in the training of a multidisciplinary group of researchers and community practitioners dedicated to university/community collaboration based at her current university.

32. **Hannah** is co-founder and director of a university-affiliated, community-based research institute and has worked extensively with community groups and organizations throughout her career. Through her work, she seeks to build capacity for research engagement between faculty, community, and students, and is currently working on a pan-institutional initiative focused on developing institutional policies so as to recognize and reward community-engaged scholarship. Hannah has extensive experience of designing, implementing and facilitating community-university partnership alliances centred on community needs.

33. **Clara** is a professor of geography with areas of research including public policy, community development, and housing and homelessness. Clara utilizes a combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods in a range of collaborative, community-based research projects. She is currently principal investigator of a SSHRC funded project addressing social exclusion in urban settings.

34. **Lorraine** is an assistant professor of social work with research specializations in the social determinants of health, housing instability and homelessness, and families living with HIV. Lorraine regularly employs community-based, participatory research in her work and is particularly concerned with the experiential dimension of the inequitable distribution of the burden of health inequality in the community.

35. **Farah** is an assistant professor of education with research interests in schooling, higher education, and social justice. Farah has previously worked in the school system. She is particularly interested in using her research practice to bridge the gap between theory, practice, and social activism with regard to community-university relationships. Central to her work is a critical engagement with issues of identity, power, and discrimination.

Appendix B: University Profiles

This appendix provides a brief description of the range of community-engaged activities in the universities to which my interviewees are affiliated. It supplements the methods chapter and is also intended to be read as contextualizing accompaniment to the opening section of Chapter 3 *Out in the open? Snapshots of community engagement in Canadian universities*. All the information gathered below is from the websites of the respective universities.

1. York University (Toronto)
2. University of Victoria (British Columbia)
3. University of British Columbia (British Columbia)
4. University of Toronto (Toronto)
5. Ryerson University (Toronto)
6. Memorial University of Newfoundland
7. Carleton University (Ottawa)
8. Wilfrid Laurier University (Waterloo)
9. McMaster University (Hamilton)
10. University of Guelph (Guelph)

1. **York University** is a public research university in Toronto (Ontario) with 11 faculties, approximately 7,000 faculty, and 27 research centres. Community-engagement has a central place in the strategic plan of York University. In 2010, *Towards an Engaged University: President's Task Force Report on Community Engagement: Final Report and Recommendations* positioned democratic research engagement and civic responsibility as central pillars of the university's institutional mission. As stated in the report "York is committed to fostering and sustaining community-university collaborations for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources that address pertinent societal issues, enhance learning and discovery, strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility, and prepare educated, engaged citizens" (2010).

This is supported by a 2010 white paper companion piece authored by the university provost *Building a More Engaged University: Strategic Directions for York University 2010-2020*. Highlighting the central roles of research partnerships with the public and private sectors—and the importance of the granting councils—the white paper emphasizes the educative and knowledge mobilization components of community engagement in the context of globalization. The rationale is specified as follows—"... the social transformation of universities as public institutions with the mandate to respond to global concerns has never been more evident. Research activities and granting agencies (such as the Tri-Council) increasingly emphasize the application and exchange of knowledge (i.e., knowledge transfer and knowledge mobilization) between universities and other community partners." In the paper, CBR and CSL "can help to foster social and civic responsibility and develop the habit of active, engaged citizenship" (p. 39). Prominent themes emphasized in the paper include sustainable development and sustainable communities.

A number of academic departments are actively involved in school-university partnership programs, most notable the Faculty of Education. The York-TD Community Engagement Centre (CEC) is a university office located off campus. Members affiliated with the CEC proclaim a commitment to social justice and community capacity building through, primarily, the teaching and service functions of the university. Originally a joint SSHRC-funded venture with the University of Victoria, York is also co-host to the knowledge mobilization unit *Research Impact*.

2. The **University of Victoria** is a research university located in Victoria (British Columbia) with 12 faculties, approximately 886 faculty, and 18 research centres. University researchers received approximately \$125 million in external research funding in 2012-2013 (nearly triple the amount they received 10 years ago)

Civic engagement and "community-relevant research" are central pillars of the institutional mission of University of Victoria. Positioning itself as "A university of civic engagement," the university has assumed a position of national leadership in community-engaged research (<https://www.uvic.ca/home/about/a-university-of/civic-engagement/index.php>). According to the University's strategic plan *A Vision for the Future: Building on Excellence* According to the University's Strategic Plan for the University of Victoria: "Civic engagement is a thread that runs through the fabric of the institution—all faculties in varying degrees participate and engage with communities, locally and globally" (2012, p. 13).

The University of Victoria is host to the launch in 2013 of the Institute for Studies and Innovation in Community-University Engagement (ISICUE) (previously known as the Office of Community Based Research). This is an institute which aims to provide a space for the study and practice of the scholarship of engagement and interdisciplinary innovation. Using an "innovative structure of joint community and university governance and collaboration [...] the Institute will

harvest new knowledge that will contribute to solutions of community issues focused on sustainability, public policy development and improved theory and practice."

(<http://www.uvic.ca/hsd/home/home/research/community/index.php>). The mandate of the institute is one of civic engagement, both locally, regionally, and globally. The importance of community engagement is also mentioned in the university's strategic plan.

A significant service initiative includes the Centre for Outreach Education (CORE), a multidisciplinary centre run by the Faculty of Education to enhance the education of youth and children from local communities. Victoria was also the original co-host with York University for the knowledge mobilization unit *Research Impact*.

3. The **University of British Columbia** is a public research university located in British Columbia with campuses in Vancouver and Okanagan, and approximately 5130 faculty members with 14 (Vancouver) and 8 (Okanagan) faculties and schools. The university received approximately \$519 million in research funding in 2012-2013.

The University of British Columbia outlines three main commitments in its institutional mission statement—student learning, research excellence, and community engagement. The university's strategic plan *Place and Promise: the UCB Plan* claims that "Beginning with interest and outreach and moving through engagement and empowerment, UBC recognizes degrees of commitment and nurtures relationships along the full spectrum." To this end, the university aspires "to be made relevant and accountable through its relationships with communities". The strategic plan states that "UBC exists for the communities it serves: local, provincial, national, and global" (p. 14). In supporting this mandate, the university has a Community Partnership Office and hosts the UBC Community Learning Initiative and Learning Exchange.

The university has recently set up a website run by the former and intended as an impetus for the advancement of community-engagement at the university—and as a springboard for the development of a Community Engagement strategy (see <http://communityengagement.ubc.ca/>).

4. The **University of Toronto** is public research university located over three campuses in Toronto (Ontario) with 18 divisions and faculties and approximately 12,589 faculty members. The university received approximately \$1.2 billion in research funding in 2011-2012 (29% of which came from the granting councils)

The community-engaged activities at Toronto are centred in two centres. The Centre for Community Partnerships is active in promoting civic and educational capacity for students and is centrally involved in a range of service-learning initiatives. Their mission statement claims to "strengthen, through community engagement, a culture of learning and development that fosters global citizenship and leads to socially conscious practice"⁷². Community engagement is most pronounced at the University's Scarborough campus. Positioning engagement in local and global terms, the campus is "committed to promoting and facilitating community-based learning opportunities for all UTSC students within an anti-oppression framework".

The second location of significance for community engagement—with a more pronounced research and policy focus—is the Cities Centre (which incorporated the Centre for Urban and Community Studies (CUCS) in 2008). The Centre is a multi-disciplinary research and policy institute established in 2007 as part of a broader institutional mandate to encourage and facilitate research on a range of urban issues and to provide a pathway for communication between the university and the broader community.

⁷² See: <https://www.ccp.utoronto.ca/About-The-CCP.htm>

5. **Ryerson University** is a public research university located in downtown Toronto (Ontario) with approximately 780 faculty and 6 faculties. Focusing on "innovation and entrepreneurship" in the community, Ryerson University affirms a long-standing commitment to engaging its community. According to the University's strategic plan (2013) *Shaping Our Future: Academic Plan for 2008-2013*. The plan emphasizes the importance of partnerships "As post-secondary education itself becomes more global, and as government funding models in Ontario and Canada continue to encourage institutions to make meaningful partnerships in areas of research in particular, partnerships will become substantially more consequential to the success of institutions than ever before" (p. 24). Ryerson University also offers a certificate in community engagement, leadership, and development.

6. **Memorial University of Newfoundland (MUN)** is a comprehensive university located in St. Johns (Newfoundland) with 6 faculties and 6 schools. Memorial has increased its research funding to more than \$100 million dollars in 2012-13. Memorial University's Office of Public Engagement has developed an official Public Engagement Framework and public engagement "toolkit". Emphasizing the "global movement towards emphasizing public engagement at universities, driven from both inside and outside the academy" (<http://www.mun.ca/publicengagement/>), Memorial is host to the Leslie Harris Centre of Regional Policy and Development, through which many of its engaged initiatives are channelled. The centre is active with community-engaged teaching, research and outreach activities, and is central to the university's plan to establish a civically-engaged "knowledge community". A notable initiative is Memorials Yaffle (yaffle.ca)—an online search engine of the university's areas of expertise and community development resources. Specific initiatives at Memorial

include a focus on the social and economic effects of the collapse of the Maritimes fisheries industry.

7. **Carleton University** is a comprehensive university located in Ottawa (Ontario) with 6 faculties and many professional schools and institutes. Carleton received \$59 million in research funding 2011-2012. Carleton University's strategic plan *Defining Dreams: A Strategic Plan for Carleton University 2009* identifies community engagement as one of its four pillars of institutional identity. According to the plan "Carleton University has long been recognized for its community engagement. Carleton was built by the community, for the community and in the community and our community" (2009, p. 1). The university's integrated strategic plan, *Collaboration, Leadership and Resilience: Sustainable Communities-Global Prosperity—The Carleton University Strategic Integrated Plan 2013-2018*, builds upon this and foregrounds the importance of community engagement. Emphasising the importance of collaboration and partnership, this document states that "As a modern university, Carleton is an active partner with communities, business, industry, government, institutions and organizations, providing research, education opportunities and solutions to the challenges of society and the economy" (p. 4).

The university has a community engagement website which documents its engaged activities ⁹ (<http://carleton.ca/communityengagement/>). Positioning itself as part of the implementation of two of the university's strategic plan—community engagement and real-world problem-solving—a document on the website *The Energy of Partnership: Carleton University's Collaboration with Local Institutions* highlights 65 local partnership activities covering the 2009-2010 academic year.

8. **Wilfrid Laurier University** is a public research university located in Waterloo (Ontario) with 6 faculties. There is a history of community engagement at Wilfrid Laurier. The

university's strategic research plan—*Commitment to the Future: Laurier's Community of Research Wilfrid Laurier University Strategic Research Plan 2014–2019* (2013) positions community engagement as one of the three main strengths of the university. According to the plan "Our research and innovation enterprise intersects with a wide range of stakeholders, and there is increasing engagement with the community to help advance research in new directions that are targeted, strategic, and collaborative (p. 7).

The Centre for Community Research, Learning, and Action (CCRLA) is an interdisciplinary research centre focused on "developing community partnerships and producing research, learning and action that advances community well-being and social justice. The CCRLA facilitates community-based research (CBR) by brokering linkages between community partners, students and faculty researchers" (https://www.wlu.ca/homepage.php?grp_id=2615). The CCRLA "works to sustain long-term community partnerships for action research, which ultimately fosters and facilitates knowledge translation and mobilization of such projects." Wilfrid Laurier also has a long-standing emphasis on community service-learning through its Centre for Community Service-Learning (CCSL)—in addition to offering an MA in social justice and community engagement.

9. **McMaster University** is a public research university located in Hamilton (Ontario) with 6 faculties and approximately 1,377 full-time faculty and over 100 research units. The appointment of a new president in 2010 led to a renewal of the university's institutional mission in which community engagement was listed as a central priority (one of four) and a community engagement task force was established. In an open letter, the president suggested that "above all else the obligation of the University [is] to serve the greater good, beginning with our immediate community, our city, and extending outwards to the world at large (Deane, 2011, p. 24).

Following this, a document—Forward with Integrity: Community Engagement Task Force Position Paper (2011) provided a detailed reflection on the possible implementation of a community engagement mandate for the university. Contextualized in national and global context, the paper embraced a broad definition of community engagement and recommended the appointment of a faculty member to the position of Vice-President of community engagement. The university has also recently begun releasing "snapshots" of their community-engaged activities. The goal of this endeavour is to build upon it "in order to integrate community engagement activities more deeply into the work of our University and realize the potential for further collaborations." http://www.mcmaster.ca/presidentsoffice/reports/community_eng.html).

10. The **University of Guelph** is a comprehensive public research university located in Guelph (Ontario) with 7 faculties. The University of Guelph supports a regional centre for community engagement in the Institute for Community Engaged Scholarship (ICES). Drawing upon existing traditions of community-engaged and socially responsive research in the College of Social and Applied Sciences (CSAHS) and the University of Guelph, the institute aims to nurture collaborative and reciprocal research partnerships between the university and its communities. The ICES seeks to build "capacity for community-engaged scholarship by strengthening faculty and student engagement with local, national and international communities of interest, addressing faculty reward and development, and training faculty and students in knowledge mobilization." (<http://www.theresearchshop.ca/>).

The university is in the process of developing a School for Civil Society in which community engagement will be a core value. In other activities, the College of Management and Economics affiliated with the university is active in promoting a community-engaged agenda,

and are active in "engaging in authentic and meaningful partnerships with community members, businesses and associations with whom we share a common vision and interests".

Appendix C: Interview Questions

The interview questions are divided into four areas of inquiry as detailed below. Interviews tended to focus on different aspects of the question guide depending on who was being interviewed and their areas of expertise.

1. Questions on community-engagement in Canada.

- What do you see as being the dominant trends (and likely future direction) of community-engaged research (CER) practice in Canada? What evidence do you see for this?
- What do you see as being the primary movers/ influences in the promotion of CER?
- Do you see any conflict(s) regarding what that direction should be? How and why?
- How would you situate these trends in historical context?
- What degree of support do you think community-engaged research receives in the academia/ the university? What evidence do you see for this?

2. Questions on key trends with regard to funding agencies and the institutional uptake of community engagement.

- How has or is the funding landscape changing? What evidence do you see for this?
- How do shifts and changes in the nature and structure of funding impact upon research practice? What are these shifts?
- What do you see as being dominant trends in the funding environment at both community and university level? Is this changing in any way what community-engaged scholars do?
- To what extent do you see the rewards system of academia changing (or not) so as to acknowledge the value of community-engaged research and scholarship?

- How would you situate community-engaged research within the political economy of the research landscape?

3. Challenges and road-blocks for community engagement.

- What are the challenges or roadblocks that exist for community-engaged research?
- Do you think research between universities and communities is becoming more or less democratic? What evidence do you see for this?
- What challenges and difficulties have you encountered?
- How do you think the landscape of community-engagement is likely to develop?

4. Experiences of research partnership/ collaboration

- What is your experience of community-engaged research/scholarship?
- What has been your experience in regard to forming collaborations with academic/ non-academic partners?
- What have been the main challenges you have faced in such collaborative work?
- What tensions, challenges or difficulties emerge regarding roles and expectations? What difficulties have you encountered in terms of making partnerships workable?
- In your experience, to what extent has community expertise and knowledge informed the research process and findings? How is this changing?
- What is a key burning issue for you? What keeps you awake at night?

Study Name: *Capitalizing Community: Collaborative Research and Democratic Social Science*

Researchers: Alan Bourke, Phd. Candidate, Dept. of Sociology, York University, abourke@yorku.ca

Purpose of the Research: The aim of the dissertation is to explore the changing dynamics of community-university research collaborations. The goal is to investigate changes in how academic research in the social sciences is funded, what types of research are prominent, and how research is made relevant to the community. The guiding hypothesis of the dissertation is that the nature of academic research is changing due to increased levels of participation in the creation of knowledge from constituencies outside of the university. The dissertation will present a critical analysis of collaborative research and the idea of a democratic social science.

What You Will Be Asked to Do in the Research: You are asked to participate in a semi-structured interview which will last an estimated 90 minutes. You will be asked questions about the nature of your research or work, and your role as a scholar or community activist working in the university and community.

Risks and Discomforts: I am not expecting that it will have any benefits or risks for you, although I hope that you will find it interesting to discuss your experiences and views.

Benefits of the Research and Benefits to You: None are expected.

Voluntary Participation: You may choose to not answer questions, to stop participating at any time and to withdraw from the research. Your decision to stop participating, or to refuse to answer particular questions, will not affect your relationship with the researchers or York University. In the event you withdraw from the study, all associated data collected will be immediately destroyed. Your decision to not participate will not affect your relationship with York University, now or in the future.

Confidentiality: All information you supply during the research will be held in the strictest confidence and unless you specifically indicate your consent your name will not appear in any report or publication of the research. I may use quotes from the interview but such use will be anonymous. The interview will be recorded with a digital recorder and the resulting data will be safely stored in a securely locked facility or in password-protected computers. Besides myself, only my supervisory dissertation committee will have access to this information. All data collected in this interview will be destroyed after five years by shredding them. Confidentiality will be provided to the fullest extent possible by law.

Questions About the Research? If you have questions about the research in general or about your role in the study, please feel free to contact myself (abourke@yorku.ca) or my Graduate Supervisor: Dr. Lorna Erwin either by telephone at (416) 736-2100 Ext. 60306 or by e-mail (lerwin@yorku.ca). You may also contact my Graduate Program: Department of Sociology, 2075 Vari Hall, 4700 Keele St., Toronto, On, M3J 1P3. Phone: 416-736-5013. This research has been reviewed and approved by the Human Participants Review Sub-committee, York University's Ethics Review Board and conforms to the standards of the Canadian Tri-Council Research Ethics guidelines. If you have any questions about this process or about your rights as a participant in the study, please contact Ms. Alison Collins-Mrakas, the Sr. Manager & Policy Advisor for the Office of Research Ethics, 5th Floor, York Research Tower, York University (telephone 416-736-5201/ FAX 416-650-8197 or e-mail acollins@yorku.ca).

Legal Rights and Signatures:

I _____ consent to participate in *Capitalizing Community: Collaborative Research and Democratic Social Science* conducted by Alan Bourke. I have understood the nature of this project and wish to participate. I am not waiving any of my legal rights by signing this form. My signature below indicates my consent.

Signature
Participant

Date

Signature
Principal Investigator

Date

Appendix E: Description of Research Topic for Respondents

Dear _____,

My name is Alan Bourke and I am a PhD candidate in the Department of Sociology at York University. My dissertation research explores issues relating to collaboration and partnership in community-university projects. A brief summation of the project can be found below. As part of my research I am conducting a series of interviews with researchers and personnel involved in community-based and collaborative research projects. I would greatly appreciate an opportunity to meet with you in order to discuss your knowledge of the research and policy landscape.

Kindly let me know if you are interested in meeting with me. I am happy to accommodate to your schedule if you are available to meet.

I will look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,
Alan Bourke

Graduate Program in Sociology
York University
2075 Vari Hall
4700 Keele St.
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M3J 1P3

aboutke@yorku.ca

Project Description:

Capitalizing community: collaborative research and democratic social science

The aim of the dissertation is to explore the changing dynamics of community-university research collaborations and the politics of knowledge in the context of the social sciences. In essence, my intention is to provide a contemporary reading of long-standing questions of *Knowledge for whom?* and *Knowledge for what?* The dissertation intends to present a critical and reflexive analysis of collaborative, community-engaged research within the "knowledge economy" of the university.

About myself:

I received an MA in Sociology from the National University of Ireland (NUI) and am currently a PhD candidate in sociology at York University. A recent co-authored article of mine appeared in *Urban Education* (2011) "Between Vulnerability and Risk: Promoting Access and Equity in a School-University Partnership Program" which deals with access in education in a disadvantaged neighbourhood in Toronto.

Appendix F: Glossary of Terms

Action Research (AR) is a "participatory, democratic process concerned with developing practical knowing in the pursuit of worthwhile human purposes, grounded in a participatory worldview which we believe is emerging at this historical moment. It seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their communities" (Reason & Bradbury in Brydon-Miller et al., 2003)

Civic Engagement involves citizens in policy and program development to create new social realities. Dialogue can deepen the effectiveness of civic engagement by bringing multiple voices into a conversation. When used effectively, both dialogue and civic engagement can be catalysts for positive social change (Simon Frazer University)

Continuing-Education describes a broad spectrum of post-secondary learning programs and activities and is typically associated with adult and professional training. Such programs tend to be focused on connecting educational practice to policy.

Community-Based Research (CBR) is "a collaborative enterprise between academic and community members. CBR seeks to democratize knowledge creation by validating multiple sources of knowledge and promoting the use of multiple methods of discovery and dissemination. The goal of CBR is social action (broadly defined) for the purpose of achieving (directly or indirectly) social change and social justice" (Strand et al., 2003).

Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) refer to recognized entities that may utilize either a formal or an informal organizational structure in order to build capacity to engage diverse stakeholders, including residents and others, in sustained, collaborative, strategic efforts to strengthen and improve conditions in an identified geographic area (United Way of Greater Victoria, 2007).

Community-Service Learning (CSL) is an educational approach integrating community service with intentional learning activities (and) working together toward outcomes that are mutually beneficial (Canadian Alliance for Community-Service Learning).

Community-engaged Scholarship is a specific conception of faculty work that connects the intellectual assets of the institution (i.e., faculty expertise) to public issues such as community, social, cultural, human and economic development. Through engaged forms of teaching and research, faculty apply their academic expertise to public purposes, as a way of contributing to fulfilment of the core mission of the institution (Holland, 2005a).

Community-University Research Partnerships (CURPs) are partnerships with Higher Education Institutions (HEI) and Civil Society Organizations that respond to a wide range of community needs and services and often involves capacity building, knowledge building, participatory research, citizen-centric development, and policy advocacy. These partnerships involve an iterative process of learning, reflection and action, whereby the process and results are useful to both community members and university partners in a wide range of areas developing social equity and creating positive social and institutional change (UNESCO Chair in community engagement)

Institutionalization of Community-Engagement is the development of institutional frameworks that identify and support civic engagement as a scholarly function. It involves the application of institutional (university) resources to address and solve challenges facing communities (in both local and global settings) through collaboration with those communities (Sandmann, 2008, p. 98).

The **Knowledge Democracy** is part of a global knowledge movement that is "an action-oriented formation that recognizes, gives visibility to and strengthens the knowledge that is created in the context of, as Marx said, people trying to 'change the world'" (Hall, 2009).

Knowledge Mobilization (KMb) is about ensuring that all citizens benefit from publicly funded research. It can take many forms, but the essential objective is to allow research knowledge to flow both within the academic world, and between academic researchers and the wider community. By moving research knowledge into society, knowledge mobilization increases its intellectual, economic, social and cultural impact (SSHRC)

Participatory Action Research (PAR) is a qualitative research methodology option that requires further understanding and consideration. PAR is considered democratic, equitable, liberating, and life-enhancing qualitative inquiry that remains distinct from other qualitative methodologies (Kach & Kralik, 2006).

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 (National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE)).

Appendix G: List of Acronyms

ACU	Association of Commonwealth Universities
AR	Action Research
AUCC	Association of University and Colleges Canada
AUCEU	Australian Alliance of Community-Engaged Universities
CBR	Community-Based Research
CBRC	Community Based Research Canada
CIHR	Canadian Institutes of Health Research
CFHSS	Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CUE	Community-University-Engagement
CURA	Community-University Research Alliance
GACER	Global Alliance for Community-Engaged Research
GUNI	Global University Network for Innovation
ICES	Institute for Community-Engaged Scholarship
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
ISICUE	Institute for Studies and Innovation in Community-University Engagement
KBE	Knowledge-Based Economy
KC	Knowledge Commons
KMb	Knowledge Mobilization
NSERC	National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada
KT/E	Knowledge translation/ exchange
PAR	Participatory Action Research
SSHRC	Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization