

Kansas State University Libraries

New Prairie Press

Adult Education Research Conference

2007 Conference Proceedings (Halifax, NS,
Canada)

Researching the Intersection of Local and Academic Knowledge on Gender: Academics Working With Community-Based Women's Organizations

Nancy Peters

St. Francis Xavier University and Coady International Institute, Canada

Leona M. English

St. Francis Xavier University and Coady International Institute, Canada

Catherine Irving

St. Francis Xavier University and Coady International Institute, Canada

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/aerc>



Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Administration Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 License](#)

Recommended Citation

Peters, Nancy; English, Leona M.; and Irving, Catherine (2007). "Researching the Intersection of Local and Academic Knowledge on Gender: Academics Working With Community-Based Women's Organizations," *Adult Education Research Conference*. <https://newprairiepress.org/aerc/2007/roundtables/18>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Conferences at New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in Adult Education Research Conference by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. For more information, please contact cads@k-state.edu.

Researching the Intersection of Local and Academic Knowledge on Gender: Academics Working With Community-Based Women's Organizations

Nancy Peters, Leona M. English, and Catherine Irving
St. Francis Xavier University and Coady International Institute, Canada

Abstract: Recognizing the key role women's organizations contribute to adult learning, this roundtable discussion will explore issues and opportunities that grow out of partnerships between academic researchers and community-based organizations. Participants are invited to share their experiences of researching in such a collaborative environment.

Collaboration and partnership are key words for proposal writers in Canada, whether their starting place is universities or community-based organizations, though the university researcher is often the lead on the project. We identified the issues in partnering for research from our recent experience of completing a State of the Field Review for Gender and Adult Learning, and from our government funded research projects.

Community based women's organizations are central in creating knowledge by women and for women (Butterwick & Selman, 2003; Lord & Martell, 2004). A recurring concern is that, without the collaboration of an academic partner, much of this exciting grassroots activity remains obscured, since community based organizations have limited access to research funding. Women's organizations in Canada over recent years have faced severe reductions in core funding and rely more heavily on project-based grants (Manicom, et al., 2005), and even this is disappearing. When it can be accessed, project funding requires participation in a contorted funding mechanism (project proposal, project implementation, project report) which creates disjunctures in the organization's overall workflow and curtails opportunities for longer term reflection and analysis, and documentation of accumulated institutional knowledge. The primary access to funded research opportunities for reflection and analysis are with university partners.

From our research and community experience, we have observed that there is tremendous potential to increase collaborative research and community-led knowledge generation in the area of gender and learning. While it seems easy to justify why this gender-based work is important, the more complex issue of *how* remains evasive. Classic works on participatory feminist research (Maguire, 1987) continue to inspire the development of methodologies that consciously deal with bias, voice and the knowledge construction process. However, much of the research that is reported still does not capture or recount the lived messiness of collaborative work, or deal with the contested undercurrents of power and knowledge and suppressed hierarchies within research teams, particularly around issues of gender (Guijt & Shah, 1998). A wide spectrum of feminist, participatory, and interdisciplinary approaches (Lykes & Coquillon, 2007) provide exciting opportunities for creating new knowledge, yet run the risk of luring researchers into adopting approaches that may not best suited for the complex social and historical context in which they are working. In addition, the academic credibility of research results can still be questioned when feminists employ alternative methodologies designed to confront issues of power and exclusion (Strega, 2005).

A key issue here is the inequitable distribution of research funds, though supposedly allocated equally, actually privilege university based researchers. Consequently, the dissemination through refereed fora, the *sine qua none* of academe, is the norm. Challenging

these formal and informal funding policy decisions becomes then a focal point for feminist researchers. Another issue is the naming of research agendas and whose priorities are honored in the research development process. While the literature is relatively quiet on this matter, anecdotal reports are that university-community collaborations are fraught with issues of power, knowledge and discourse.

The questions guiding the roundtable discussion include:

1. Distribution of skills and abilities: What does community participation really mean?
2. Resources & Time: Who has paid time to set the agenda and access resources?
3. Authenticity: What does it mean to be a university-based researcher writing about working in community? Is voice a rhetorical device?

The intent of this roundtable is to share experiences in collaborative feminist research and to explore alternate and possible configurations of academic/local research that honor the commitments of both partners.

References

- Butterwick, S., & Selman, J. (2003). Deep listening in a feminist popular theatre project: Upsetting the position of audience in participatory education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 54(1), 7-22.
- Guijt, I., & Shah, M. K. (Eds.). (1998). *The myth of community: Gender issues in participatory development*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Lord, S., & Martell, A. (2004). *Building transitions to good jobs for low-income women*. Halifax, NS: Nova Scotia Advisory Council on the Status of Women.
- Lykes, M. B., & Coquillon, E. (2007). Participatory and action research and feminisms: Toward transformative praxis. In S. N. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis*. (pp. 297-326). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maguire, P. (1987). *Doing participatory research: A feminist approach*. Amherst, MA: Center for International Education, University of Massachusetts.
- Manicom, A., Rhymes, J., Armour, N., & Parsons, D. (2005). *Public policy and the participation of rural Nova Scotia women in the new economy*. Research Project Report presented to Status of Women Canada, Ottawa, ON.
- Strega, S. (2005). The view from the poststructural margins: Epistemology and methodology reconsidered. In L. Brown & S. Strega (Eds.). *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches*. (pp. 199-235). Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press/Women's Press.