Legitimacy and Belonging:
Community Engagement in Higher Education

A Dissertation
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Rachel Gail Grewell

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

David Pellow, PhD, Michael Goldman, PhD

FEBRUARY 2019

DEDICATION

This Dissertation thesis is dedicated to my loving and patient husband, Tim Suggs, and to my daughter Dosha Lee who gave me the motivation to do this work diligently, authentically, and compassionately.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

The statements below reflect my personal experiences in graduate school and how my history has influenced the focus and intent behind this text. Because this is my own personal experience, struggling through the world of academia, I choose purposefully not to cite academic journals or books in this introduction. This section is intended to introduce myself, as a white woman from a working-class background, entering an academic world, outside of my comfort zone, and the struggle that took place over nine years to finish.

I entered graduate school on an impulse. I got into a great program with funding and a small cohort. I applied to only one school, my undergraduate school, in the city I grew up in and where I continue to reside. I soon found out that applying to only one graduate school and choosing to stay put where I felt a sense of belonging and strong connections was not the norm in academia. Unwritten rules about which and how many schools one should apply to were not available to me. My instinct was to stay where I felt comfortable in a community that I loved and grew up in. This was the beginning of my journey through graduate school where I've felt a tension between what drives me and how the University is 'Driven to

Discover' (Council for Support and Advancement of Education 2007).

Within the first few weeks of graduate school messages came from all sides about expectations for graduate students who are meant to succeed. Research topped the list. We were encouraged to get involved in a very particular type of research immediately. Often that research required volunteering time by joining a faculty project, on top of adjusting to a full course load, in addition to grading and teaching undergraduate discussion sections. Being 'Driven to Discover[1]' had an expected payoff: publishing papers. This secondary expectation of publishing felt like the primary goal. We were advised to have a paper published in a journal as soon as possible; it was imperative to succeeding in graduate school and pursuing a career in academia.

Coming from a non-academic background I've felt out of place in my program and with the expectations of academia in general. Research? Pick a question? Publish? In Journals I've never even heard of before? I was incredibly naïve; I thought graduate school was about learning, reading, and teaching. I

---

[1] The University of Minnesota adopted the branding and marketing campaign 'Driven to Discover' in 2006 with the rationale that the public previously lacked full understanding of what a research university does and its importance in their lives (Council for Support and Advancement of Education, 2007).

was encouraged to learn the academic language. I did the work, passed the courses, wrote the papers and now find myself clinging not to the work but to the memories of laughter in the office during the first few years spent with my cohort building relationships. I now see how my choice to prioritize relationships within and outside of my graduate program pushed me closer to an alternative type of research and work.

My first real experience with research was a summer grant to work on a project of my own. This work interviewing Women Infants and Children (WIC) recipients about their experiences utilizing their Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits at the Farmers' Markets was my first foray into approaching both subject matter and methods that were closer to the community level where I felt most comfortable. While working alone on research projects allowed me freedom, eventually solo work led to feelings of disillusionment. Feeling disappointed by my limited impact, I looked outside of the University. What tangible, real things were people working on? How could I do work that was more applied? These questions pushed me toward community engaged research. I was hired by the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs as a research assistant on two distinct community-based research projects in the climate, environment, and food justice

fields. Although this applied research felt more rewarding, this kind of work that I wanted to do wasn't often rewarded, talked about openly, or legitimated in my academic setting. Seeking a sense of belonging in graduate school shaped my research questions, to better understand legitimacy and belonging in the context of applied community engaged scholarship.

Research Overview and Questions

This dissertation is concerned with a move toward community engagement within academia generally, and more specifically the concepts of legitimacy and belonging in engagement practices. My work contributes to a relatively recent shift toward community engagement classifications and designations for institutions of higher education (Saltmarsh and Driscoll 2015). These designations are important for understanding the growing significance of engagement within academia, as an opportunity for expanding interpretations of how knowledge is understood and produced. I find in this dissertation that the growing field of community engagement is an opportunity to challenge ideas of dominance and power in knowledge systems, as well as offer a space for growing collaborations and building relationships beyond traditional

4

academic research practices. My work contributes to the idea that participatory and collaborative work is a place where practitioners of these methods grapple with questions of legitimacy and a sense of belonging, both in the work and with one another.

It became increasingly important for this study to be conducted in order to break out of the isolation I felt within my doctoral program. Seeking belonging myself, I began to investigate the multitude of engagement practices happening and to uncover the ways in which this method of scholarship fits into a University setting. I believe this work is practically important for graduate students, community members, faculty, academics, departments, colleges, and Universities. Engagement is happening, and these practices offer an opportunity to think through how relationships are built across institutions and communities. Specifically, how these relationships may foster a new sense of belonging for the work and for the practitioners themselves.

The purpose of this research is to explore the motivations of those who chose engagement in their academic paths, to uncover how engagement impacts the work they are doing and to discuss the implications this work has for those

involved. The following are the research questions that guided my research process:

1. Given that the tenets of community engagement include a shifting of power to a more democratically shared sense of participation in research, how salient are questions of legitimacy in community engagement?

2. How is shared participation in community engagement associated with a sense of belonging in the work?

Methods

To help answer the research questions I conducted 30 in-depth interviews with both university academics and community members who have participated in community engaged research. The university academics I approached for interviews were a range of faculty, administration, and graduate students who have been involved in community engaged research processes with communities for various amounts of time. The academic interview subjects in this study were both graduate students and faculty members. I interviewed some graduate students in the middle of their doctoral programs, some in postdocs, some

in the dissertation writing stages. Faculty ranged from tenure track professors to junior faculty.

The data collected in interviews with community members tended to be from older (but not in all cases), retired folks or those in their second (or third) of life careers. Most, but not all, of the community members involved were residents in the Rondo/Summit U and surrounding neighborhoods in St. Paul. This community is rich in diversity but under-resourced and has suffered consequences of predatory loans, lack of easy access to parks and healthy foods. Unemployment in this area is between 14-21% and people with an income below poverty level is 44% (District 7) and 23% (District 8). The residents of this neighborhood involved in this research that I approached for in-depth interviews are either African American or Caucasian and fall in the age range of 45-80 years old.

Qualitative methods were intentionally used to gather a more nuanced representation of thoughts and feelings about the research and engagement process. It proved to be easier to collect more detailed explanations and information with a qualitative approach to the research rather than larger scaled quantitative research. The methods I propose are best suited to more fully represent the experiences and narratives

of interviewees. The interview guide included questions designed to get at participants' conceptions of how knowledge gets produced in and outside of academic settings. The procedures involved contacting the few academics I knew that had engaged in some form of community-based research, this led to contacts with community members they had worked with, as well as other contacts within academia of faculty and graduate students doing this type of work, and so on.

With consent the 30 interviews were recorded using a digital recorder. All interviewees were given an Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved consent form laying out the overview of the project with my contact information, as well as a clear explanation of anonymity in the work; pseudonyms replace real names in the writing to protect confidentiality. While the definition of community and the division between university and community are both complex, I intentionally I use these terms to identify individuals in the data. In this way I utilize Dempsey's argument that the terms allow me to draw attention to the different accountabilities that each group brings to the partnership (Dempsey 2010).

In addition to the interviews, participant observation data was collected over five years in graduate school. This

involved a long process (in each case) of meeting, volunteering, hanging out with, and being of service to the community members that were doing work I was interested in. This warming process cannot be overstated in importance, as well as the amount of time it takes to gain trust and build relationships to work together. The first two community engaged projects were more observational in nature with community interests as the purpose of conducting the research. The last and more fully engaged project included a back and forth discussion of ideas, questioning of power, and balancing of resources in the effort to produce purposeful and engaged research.

My data also came from regular roundtable discussion events about engaged scholarship sponsored by the University over two years. During these open and public roundtable events I took detailed notes of the dialogue and discussion happening as well as participated myself in the question and answer sections of roundtables asking similar questions to those detailed in the interview guide (see appendix). These roundtable events were typically on campus except for one event I attended off campus located at a community center in St. Paul, MN. The events averaged roughly 50-100 attendees. Primarily attended by academics, and focused on the various

concerns and barriers engaged scholars encounter.

One important consideration of this study is the mixed method approach, utilizing both participant observation as well as interviewing for data collection. Each of the projects and the methods shaped my experience in graduate school and eventually led me to investigate the problem of engagement within academia. The data from my participant observation is important for contextualizing the stories I heard repeatedly from graduate students, faculty, community members, and administration. Interview data is equally important for an in-depth understanding of individuals' experiences doing this work. Years of conversations with both community members and academics navigating competing priorities, limited resources and continually changing ideas and goals have allowed for a complex understanding of community engaged work.

Some may see the number and nature of the interviews a limitation to my study. While saturation, as a theoretical construct, has been studied and published in academic journals there continues to be pressure to interview very large numbers to show the representativeness of one's findings (Fusch and Ness 2015; Mason 2010). My mixed method approach includes years of in-depth participant observation as well as key access to multiple years of ongoing

conversations within the University about the struggles of engaged scholarship. My hope is that the data collected over the past 5 years working directly with and talking to community members on engaged research as well as the participant observation at engaged scholarship roundtables are enough to justify the N of my interview sample.

Positionality

The potential for domination, control, and power is very real within research in both overt and subtle ways. In the case of engaged research, the work is either selected by or of real importance to the community. The driving force behind this community-based, rather than community-placed, orientation to research is its participatory nature, capacity building opportunity, and balance of the goals of research and action (Minkler and Wallerstein 2008). This less traditional orientation to research offers the researcher new ways to understand complex social phenomena, which may not be fully understood without community engagement. These methods however require a deeper look at subjectivity, objectivity, and reflexivity in the research, based on the complex process of collecting data. Symbolic power, the production of knowledge and alternative methods that shift the power of the

11

research design and analysis out of solely the hands of the academic researcher and into the hands of the individuals (traditionally known as research subjects) opens opportunities for incredibly engaged and public research, while also exposing questions of legitimacy and belonging in the work, as my research questions allude to.

Working outside the walls of academia, engaged public scholarship is possible. Seeking to interact with individuals, communities and organizations outside of the University is both a political and scholarly decision I have made in my academic career. While the term community is often associated with abstract and essentializing positive ideas, communities are quite diverse, and it is vital to acknowledge the heterogeneity implicit in all community work (Dempsey 2010). Direct input from community members in the research design and interpretation of the data arguably improves the quality of the research being done.

From my own personal experience working as a research assistant on several community-based research projects, I have felt liberated from the rugged individual mindset of graduate school. Building relationships and trust between myself and community members in the food, climate, and environment justice fields has opened my eyes dramatically in

terms of understanding the relevant issues and questions that matter to the folks that feel oppressed by systems of dominance. I appreciate the cooperative, engaging process of research that is possible through qualitative research methods that involve direct contact with those directly embedded in the social world being studied. Although these cooperative engaging processes are a benefit to community engagement, many have faced its challenges and barriers (Israel et al. 1998). Access to resources, scientific knowledge, research assistants, and time are often unbalanced (Wallerstein and Duran 2003) placing more burden on the community to volunteer time to the project (Dempsey 2010).

The "intimate familiarity" needed for this type of data collection requires prolonged immersion in the social location of the research. Participant observation gives the researcher the opportunity to study people in their own time, in their own space, in their own everyday lives; this "natural habitat" allows for a rich description of how people act and how they understand and experience their actions (Burawoy 1991:2). I have found that my years of immersion in the community of food and environmental justice advocates has been instrumental in the surfacing of incredibly rich and important research opportunities that would not have been

possible if I hadn't devoted the time and energy to cultivate an "intimate familiarity" (Lofland and Lofland 1984). Face-to-face interaction and taking on the role of the other are imperative for direct observation of the epistemology or theory of knowledge of the social world (Lofland and Lofland 1984; Goffman 1989). To diminish the omnipresent complex power relationships that develop in research settings it is important to strive to stand in solidarity and conduct research with the other not as the other.

Using participant observation, the researcher has a tremendous impact on the data collection process; consequently, the legacy of ethnographic methods and observations of social worlds has often been one of categorizing the "other" and social worlds as strange. The dominant paradigm in anthropology, the field from which ethnography takes root, is based on the premise that the field is foreign, and that sociologists in the same right are typically and temporarily embedding themselves into a strange land. This conceptualization of non-western, non-white and non-privileged societies as strange has and continues to be problematic for the discipline, especially in situations where the research is primarily interested in encountering a foreign and strange space and documenting its inhabitants'

experiences.

While Feminist studies has pointed out this problem inherent in the method of ethnography, Black feminist scholarship, specifically positions black women researchers in a unique space, as "outsiders within" their social/academic worlds (Collins 1986). The vantage points that women of color, working-class women, lesbians, and women with disabilities have helps them to understand power in relationship to their own social location. The experience of marginalization offers a unique vantage point for recognizing dominant racist, classist, sexist hegemony (hooks 1984). It is important to note however that marginalized individuals have competing interests, disagree about which actions to take, and have different cultural expectations about communication and collaboration (Barge 2006; Pearce and Pearce 2000; Zoller 2000). As with any group various viewpoints, priorities, and interests have the potential to lead to oppression. Therefore, romanticizing the positive aspects of marginalized populations or communities is problematic (Joseph 2002).

The fascination with "the encounter," for less-marginalized researchers, is problematic according to Desmond, in that these researchers are merely temporarily

suspending their privileged positions to spend time in often very marginalized areas of society (Desmond 2007). Desmond argues that an outside ethnographer cannot hope to find the required level of intimacy unless it is cultivated before the fieldwork begins (Desmond 2007: 285). Spending a great deal of time in the field and developing trust relationships with community members to the field before engaging in the research arguably offers the researcher more trust by the "subjects," a level of familiarity that is not available to a researcher who drops into a social world with no experience or credibility to offer the community. Experiencing a cultivated intimacy in my own research development has proven to be a benefit to my access. The community members who see me as a researcher also see me as a community member, having grown up in Northeast Minneapolis, and as an advocate for many of the issues they are grappling with. This has led to opportunities and possibilities for collaboration beyond what I could have imagined.

This cultivated familiarity poses its own obstacles, however, namely the assumed and unquestioned common-sense ways of viewing the world often left unexplained and unexplored by those intimate relationships (Desmond 2007: 286). This requires, according to Desmond, to become even

more uncomfortable, disconcerted and curious in the face of familiarity. This space, according to Desmond, is a place of ambiguity and tension to be informed both by social science and the social setting (2007: 290). The ambiguity and tension that Desmond refers to tend to be the hallmark of well-done ethnographies; those that miss out on the important interplay of tension and ambiguity run the risk of participating blindly in power relationships in the field that could prove to be detrimental to the research and the populations participating in the research. Foucault argues that social science rests inextricably on domination (Foucault 1980) it is this argument that makes reflexivity more important across the social science methods and specifically ethnography.

Bourdieu calls the capacity of dominant groups to impose "the definition of the social world that is best suited to their interests" symbolic power (1991 [1982], p. 167). This symbolic power that researchers have over their fields of interest is very real and an important reason for reflexivity in social science. Despite the dialectical relationship between what Bourdieu calls objectivism and subjectivism within the discipline, objectivity, open-mindedness, detachment, and neutrality are generally the stated goals of dominant social science research. Validity and generalization

are two additional tenets of social science that become more difficult to demonstrate when using participant observation; the closer you get to intensity and depth, the further you recede from objectivity and validity (Burawoy 1991:2). Therefore, this reflexivity, self-objectification and self-scrutiny must be built into the investigation process (Desmond 2007). Drawing on this dialectical relationship, Desmond argues that objectivity is most forthcoming for the ethnographer who knows herself and is reflexive about her own symbolic power (Desmond 2007).

Biases are an important consideration for participant observation as a method. Scholars have come down on all sides of this issue, some arguing for distance to eliminate bias, others full immersion, stripping oneself from all biases, and there are those who prefer dialogue and acknowledgement of biases between researcher and subjects. Those who argue for participant observers insist they must be detached and emotionally removed from the subjects and research itself (Gans 1968; Geertz 1973). Responses to this more distanced approach have been critical of the resulting marginal, unrevealed biases of the ethnographer inherent in the work. Alternatively, these critics argue, a dialogue approach offers an "I-You" relation between researcher and

participants, removing the false "we" or "I-they" relations that can emerge from the research which makes the "I", the researcher, invisible in the process (Burawoy 1991).

Dialogue, the process of uncovering and possibly changing our biases in relation with others, offers the ethnographer the opportunity to more closely look at power differentials in the research and writing process (Burawoy 1991). The power of control over "the perception which social agents have of the social world" is one that scholars in the field must be aware of when embarking on this type of qualitative research, most notably in research that involves minority and low-income communities or individuals.

Ethnographies that involve communities of color and low-income communities have come under criticism for being inauthentic due to a romanticizing within urban ethnography. Wacquant argues a form of "neoromantic ethnography" exists in recent urban ethnography in the discipline. He claims that ethnographies, fearful of producing or reproducing negative images of the poor, are consequently leading to inauthentic representation (Wacquant 2002). This interpretation of the work has been countered however by those who claim that ethnographers have a right to be concerned about the representations enacted by their writing. "Ethnographies of

the lifeways of the poor are highly vulnerable to being taken out of context and used against their subjects as evidence of cultural dysfunction, regardless of the nuances of the writer's own analysis" (Gowan 2010:21). This debate within the field of ethnography highlights the important considerations to be taken when doing research on the social worlds of the poor or socially disadvantaged populations. My own position in this research has been something I have continuously grappled with over the years. Reflexivity about my positionality has informed every aspect of the research and writing. My own positionality in this work ties directly to the research questions that focus on legitimacy and belonging in engagement practices.

Voices of Community Engagement

My research, practically, involved interviewing people about their experiences and participating in community engaged research myself. The following snippets introduce a few voices of academic professors, graduate students and community members all who have participated in community engaged research. In each paragraph I move case to case, starting with Phoebe, then Janice, Benny, and Farrah. The purpose of these four examples is to give context to the

research as well as introduce the level of complexity these topics involve. Each of these cases will be fleshed out in more detail in the following chapters.

Phoebe:

In a South Minneapolis church serving the American Indian community, I sit across from Phoebe in a large space with round tables and chairs. We are the only two in the building early on a cold snowy day. There is one large stained-glass window and the sun is shining through it. The interview covers her extensive experience pulling together a team of academics, community liaisons, and interns to do research that will help her fight for the rights of her community. I can thank her for stressing to me the idea of "healthy research" and expertly addressing the power differential she has felt engaging in research with academics. The research partnership is hugely beneficial, however, for Phoebe it is shocking to see the numbers her team has come up with, when anecdotally she's experienced and seen these trends for years. But the data shows it. And the judicial system wants to hear someone with a PhD say it. From a non-academic community researcher's perspective, the purpose of community engaged research is for legitimacy.

Someone with credentials to legitimize and publish the knowledge her community has held for generations.

Janice:

In a small faculty office on campus with papers and books everywhere, I sit in a chair next to a desk with an open glowing laptop. Behind Janice, a junior faculty in a social science department, is a window overlooking the river many stories below. Janice talks about power dynamics in her community engaged research. She explains, she is a professor and she is white and richer than everyone else involved but she doesn't really know very much at all. But if it's a data set and someone needs to pull numbers, she would be the one to do it. This work is yet to be published with her name attached to it and the department she is in knows very little about the community engaged work she does, yet she thinks more academics are doing this kind of work than we think.

Benny:

We eat food and talk at Benny's kitchen table in the small one-bedroom apartment in St. Paul. The interview is

very informal; my infant daughter is sleeping on her couch. We eventually move to the floor once my baby wakes up looking for me. She has an indoor trellis in her main room with South facing windows. There is green everywhere, plants are hanging from a trellis in her South facing living room. We look at some pictures on her computer of both a recent community event and some of her family. She talks about the informal nature of community research. She uses a cookbook analogy, explaining her grandma's cooking and using recipes as an informal- yet formal way of sharing knowledge through good food and learning from food traditions and religious traditions.

Farrah:

In a semi private reserved study space in a public library in South Minneapolis I interview Farrah, a community member with a master's degree who works for a small non-profit. She has experience with community engaged research and is the first to express the "in-between" status. Her experience as a graduate student in the University setting and now as a community member doing engaged research makes her identity feel complex in this research. Halfway through the interview she needs to pump breast milk and asks me if

I'm OK continuing while she does so. I say I am. We sit across from each other at a mid-sized table in an empty room with one small window while she pumps, and we discuss the complexities involved in the standards of what she calls "science-based research."

These stories help to illustrate the many truths to be held within the method of engaged research. Engaged scholarship can include informal and complex research practices and understandings. The stories of those who are working in this realm show that the bounded nature of knowledge, as produced through academia, does not hold true for all. And the inclusion of community engaged research within the academy fundamentally offers a much more complex understanding of power, ownership, and authorship of information. These concepts all complement the research questions which frame this work to be about legitimacy and belonging in the space of engagement.

CHAPTER TWO: Community Engagement in Academia

Beginning in the 1600s the first American colonial colleges set out to form intellect as well as both moral and civic character in their students (Colby et al. 2000). These institutions were initially for the elite, formed for prepping the wealthy to become leaders of society (Bringle, Games, and Malloy 1999). According to Hollander and Saltmarsh (2000) The founding missions of Higher Education were to produce good citizens for emerging democracy, both economics and politics around the building of the nation motivated the expansion of higher education and more specifically the historic third mission of public service, later to be discussed as extension and now talked about as engagement (Roper and Hirth 2005). In the 1800s State Universities came into being to promote "social improvement and individual happiness", the University of Georgia being the first, created in 1785 and opening in 1800 (Pulliam 1995:67).

Seeking more federal revenue and hopes for economic expansion public policies started to shift regarding public lands for public purposes leading to the emergence of land grant colleges. Through education in agriculture, specifically, as well as practical arts this economic boom related to higher education was also intended to pay off war

debts (Roper and Hirth 2005). The Morrill Act of 1862 was one of three important acts that were passed and influenced the nature and intended impact of higher education. Establishing land-grant institutions had the purpose of educating the public and preparing workers for industrial society. The overarching goal of sustaining democracy was coupled with the more direct goal to improve the welfare of farmers and industrial workers (Bonnen and Schweikhardt 1998) as well as gain prosperity and expansion of the state (Roper and Hirth 2005). During this time there was an assumption that knowledge is a primary foundation for the creation of wealth and prosperity and public land-grant colleges were invested in the infrastructure toward an industrial and technology-based economy (Fitzgerald et al. 2012).

In 1887, The Hatch Act supported the furthering of research that meets the needs of society, at this time the primary research was in agriculture. This new knowledge in the field of agriculture was to be used to produce food and products but also to increase health of Americans through understanding of food consumption (Fitzgerald et al. 2012). Agricultural experiment stations were created to bring information about seeds, livestock and chemicals to farmers and connect the common man and woman with services of higher

education (Thompson and Lamble 2000). Later, the Smith-lever Act of 1914 created the extension program, a system and infrastructure for outreach in agriculture and related subjects. This permanent funding for land-grant colleges had the purpose of distributing results of research to the public (Thompson and Lamble 2000). All three of these acts lay a foundation for the historical goal of engagement in academia. The agricultural and industrial aim of these initiatives are appropriate to the demands of a democratic society at that time. However, these applied research aims at the end of the 19th and turn of the 20th century were becoming no longer enough to answer questions in higher education in social sciences and other disciplines and this marks the emergence of applied studies (Fitzgerald et al. 2012).

By the end of World War II, the American Association of Universities (AAU), founded in 1900, had formalized and regulated the standards for advanced degree programs and the influence of the German model for advanced studies and laboratory research had taken hold. This model prioritized knowledge creation over the resolution of society problems (Fitzgerald et al. 2012; Roper and Hirth 2005). Faculty had become understood as "experts" and disconnected from community context and input. After World War II the

development of the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health and the relationships that particularly public and land-grant universities had with the postwar military industrial complex led to a stronger reliance on the German model of science. This led to more defined processes for the hiring, retention and evaluation of faculty that created stricter and stronger boundaries for disciplines and furthered achievement within academic disciplines rather than the focus on the public good (Fitzgerald et al. 2012).

Engagement in higher education became again an important discussion within academia toward the end of the 20th Century. The public purpose of land grant and other universities had come under fire and the teaching missions as well as the preparation of students outside of academia gained attention (Fitzgerald et al. 2012; Boyer 1990) Efforts to address current and important societal needs were not front and center to the Universities. There was a demand for a broader definition of research, scholarship and teaching and implementation of true community-university partnerships that were based on mutual benefit and reciprocity (Ramaley 2000). This new model of engagement was based upon the understanding that not all expertise and knowledge is held in the University

and that most societal problems are complex and interdisciplinary (Ramaley 2000). A new emphasis began to recognize impact over publications.

The shift from the historical one-way extension delivery of services to a two-way approach of interaction with community partners to address societal needs deserved attention and definition (Boyer 1990; Kellogg Commission 1999). In the early 2000s The Kellogg Commission, The Committee on Institutional Cooperation's (CIC) Committee on Engagement, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, national higher education associations and organizations such as the Association of American Colleges and Universities, the American Association of Community Colleges, the Council of Independent Colleges, Campus Compact, and Imagining America have all developed similar formalized definitions of engagement (Fitzgerald et al. 2012). The four characteristics of engagement evident across all these definitions are as follows:

1. It must be scholarly. A scholarship-based model of engagement embraces both the act of engaging (bringing universities and communities together) and the product of engagement (the spread of scholarship focused, evidence-based practices in communities).

2. It must cut across the missions of teaching, research, and service; rather than being a separate activity, engaged scholarship is an approach to campus-community collaboration.

3. It must be reciprocal and mutually beneficial; university and community partners engage in mutual planning, implementation, and assessment of programs and activities.

4. It must embrace the processes and values of a civil democracy (Bringle and Hatcher 2011).

The four characteristics of engagement across various definitions give a metric for understanding what community engagement can and "should" look like within academia. Flexibility and fluidity of models for measurement and definitions of both community and engagement are a common theme in this chapter and the literature.

For this project the term community will be used to identify non-academic partners who are practicing engagement practices with academics. This fraught term is limiting and imperfect, however it is the generally accepted term that refers to the populations outside of a University system. While I choose to use this term, I am extremely aware of its

complexity. It becomes even more challenging with examples, included in the cases, of the crossover between community and academia. The data highlight situations where the distinction between community members and academics is uncertain. A lack of clear definitions for the terms *community* and *civic engagement* make this work challenging. The existing literature about community engagement is vast and spans disciplines yet those committed to the philosophy of community engagement continue to seek a common definition or understanding. In numerous interviews with graduate students and faculty the issue of a common definition for this work has come up. Some who have been doing this work for years acknowledge that this work is relatively young to be operationalized in academia.

Simon, a white, male, working in the Office for Public Engagement of a large land-grant institution of higher learning provided a helpful continuum example of engagement during our interview. This explanation became a useful metric for understanding how and why the concepts of engagement and community can mean different things to different people. If engagement from a higher learning perspective was on a scale of 1 to 10. On one end of the scale businesses or corporate entities outside of the University system might be considered

community. On the other end of the scale *community* might be defined as individuals or groups of individuals whose community or indigenous knowledge and expertise are considered valuable and integral to academic teaching, research, and education. This variation in what *community* means, in an institutional context, is extremely important for understanding why engagement is a fraught term. With so many definitions of community in academia, defining this term in context becomes important. To make matters more complex, most institutions of higher learning that adhere to the four generally accepted characteristics of engagement will acknowledge each understanding of community along the continuum.

For my research and the interview data presented in this paper, the type of engagement that my interviewees participated in was close to the end of the scale, where community and indigenous knowledge and expertise is valued and integral to the partnership process. In this type of research, community is primarily considered individuals or groups of individuals contributing important community or indigenous knowledge to the collaborative. It is important to note, however, that there were a few circumstances where engagement projects were closer to the middle of the scale,

the space where community can be defined as non-profit organizations or organizations that claim to represent the communities that are impacted by the research.

An additional challenge within higher education is the debate about the definition and meaning of civic engagement in higher education. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2002) pointed out that while engagement is "shorthand for describing a new era of two way partnerships between America's colleges and universities and the publics they serve… it also presents the risk that the term can say everything and nothing at the same time… [T]he lack of clear definition can leave some campuses and their leaders with the impression that they are 'doing engagement,' when in fact they are not" (8). Saltmarsh explains that the lack of clarity about the meaning of "civic engagement" is evident in most gatherings in higher education and this in turn leads to confusion about how to operationalize civic engagement in higher education (2005: 52). Despite the tensions and problems that terms can create, they are accepted and utilized in the academic literature, and how institutions of higher learning explain this work. For these reasons I use the terms within the literature to explain patterns in the research.

Engaged Scholarship and Participation

     Given that the tenets of community engagement include a shifting of power to a more democratically shared sense of participation in research, how salient are questions of legitimacy in community engagement? How is shared participation in community engagement associated with a sense of belonging in the work? The dilemma of community engagement within academia is a well-studied problem across disciplines and institutions and these research questions provide parameters for understanding the scope and purpose of the literature for this research project. In this chapter I illustrate how these different bodies of literature complement one another and create a space where this research can contribute to the conversation.

     The disciplines and literatures this thesis utilize to help answer the research questions are Community Engaged Scholarship, Community Based Participatory Research, Participatory Action Research, Belonging, Legitimacy, and Sociology of Knowledge. To simplify, the first of three literature sections is labeled *Community Engaged Scholarship and Participation.* The second section includes *Belonging* and *Legitimacy,* with the final section titled *Sociology of Knowledge.* This literature review begins with an overview of

academia as an institution and the ways it utilizes and struggles over the shift toward engaged scholarship. This leads into literature about participation and action research, detailing the power and processes involved in working this method. Belonging and Legitimacy highlight the challenges and solutions that engagement may offer in an academic partnership context. Finally, the *Sociology of Knowledge* literature expands on the earlier ideas of participation, legitimacy, and belonging to larger questions of how knowledge is understood and produced.

Community Engaged Scholarship

Arguments have been made that academia is a rapidly changing landscape, a space where Universities are being expected to explain their purpose, practices and relevance in a shifting world (Austin 2002; Boyer 1990). This highly professionalized world has historically lacked in socialization and training for graduate students seeking employment beyond academia. Fifteen years ago, Austin explained diminishing tenure track positions and the need for graduate students to be exposed to potential job opportunities outside of academia (Austin 2002), the situation has become much worse since then. The reality of a

difficult job market, the prevalence of adjunct positions and vanishing tenure positions means graduate students face a much different future than they have in the past. Training and socialization within graduate school toward community engaged research and practices offers a wider range of opportunities beyond graduate school (Austin 2002) as well as create challenges for the unique work of engaging with community with a head full of academic institutionalized socialization and practices.

This expansion of possibilities beyond conventional academic career paths is a challenge to some graduate programs. "Community engagement can be seen as a vehicle for disrupting conventional ideas about and practices in graduate education while renewing thinking about 'learning, knowing, and doing within disciplines'" (O'Meara 2007: 40). This disruption of conventional ideas holds both exciting possibilities as well as extreme challenges working within fixed institutional cultures that benefit from the conventional training, practices and socialization of graduate students (future faculty). Critical scholarship of community engagement argues that academics may reproduce or accentuate problematic social relations due to constraints on engagement initiatives by institutional practices and

existing social and material inequalities (Dempsey 2010). Rather than promoting empowerment and capacity, community campus partnerships may instead ignore important power relations and diminish the complexity of community (Dempsey 2010).

A coalition has formed with ongoing conversations about the visions and future of community engagement within higher education. Campus Compact a national coalition of over 1000+ colleges and universities working toward more democratic experiences through civic and community engagement (https://compact.org/) has reported many positive outcomes of civic education and community development. Despite this, there have been and continue to be calls for a more sustained vision for the future of this work (Stanton 2008; O'Meara 2007; Gelmon et al. 1998; Jaeger, Tuchmayer, and Morin 2014) as the recent visions are based in a historic context of shrinking social supports in a neoliberal era. Community engagement has been an ideal mechanism for addressing the negative social impacts of neoliberal economic policies (Ang 2006). Beyond the institutional perspective on engagement and the challenges that face those in academia others have argued that literature on engagement work needs to address power and process (Rocheleau and Slocum 1995; Arnstein 1969) and focus

on participation (Méndez et al. 2017; Smalkoski et al. 2016; Innes and Booher 2004; Arnstein 1969).

Participation

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) and Participatory Action Research (PAR) are two approaches to research that involve methodologies that increase participation, relevance, and empowerment by communities outside of institutions of higher learning (Minkler and Wallerstein 2008; Hall 1997; Rocheleau and Slocum 1995). According to the WK Kellogg Foundation, Community Health Scholars Program, "Community-based participatory research is a collaborative approach to research that equitably involves all partners in the research process and recognizes the unique strengths that each brings. CBPR begins with a research topic of importance to the community with the aim of combining knowledge and action for social change to improve community (health)…" (Minkler and Wallerstein 2008). Hall (1997) explains Participatory Action Research (PAR) as follows:

1. Participatory research involves a whole range of powerless groups of people – the exploited, the poor, the oppressed, and the marginal.

2. Participatory research involves the full and active participation of the community in the entire research process.

3. The subject of the research originates in the community itself and the problem is defined, analyzed and solved by the community.

4. The ultimate goal is the radical transformation of social reality and the improvement of the lives of the people themselves. The beneficiaries of the research are the members of the community.

5. The process of participatory research can create a greater awareness in the people of their own resources and mobilize them for self-reliant development.

6. It is a more scientific method of research in that the participation of the community in the research process facilitates a more accurate and authentic analysis of social reality.

7. The researcher is a committed participant and learner in the process of research, i.e. a militant rather than a detached observer.

Although the two are defined differently due to disciplinary, epistemological, and methodological traditions, they each have similar aims for a collaborative process that includes processes that lead to social change.

Arnstein places awareness on the power structures in society that impact the different levels of community and civic participation. She argues that citizen participation is a categorical term for citizen power, however participation without the redistribution of power leads to a frustrating and empty process for those participating (1969). The term participation then can be used by those with power to claim that all sides were considered, but limits those who are able to benefit from that participation. Arnstein's eight rung "Ladder of Participation" starts with (1) Manipulation and (2) Therapy, these two, according to Arnstein are "Nonpartication". The next three rungs are considered "Tokenism": (3) Informing, (4) Consultation, and (5) Placation. Finally, the last three rungs: (6) Partnership, (7) Delegated Power (8) Citizen Control are considered by Arnstein to be "Citizen Power". While this may be a simplification, Arnstein argues that there are significant gradations of citizen participation.

Rocheleau and Slocum (1995) move beyond Arnstein's perspective on participation to include not only power but specifically process. They acknowledge uneven relations of power and the influence they can have on the even best designed participatory projects. Subsequently, it is incredibly important to also understand the power relations

within local communities and the entities that yield influence (Rocheleau and Slocum 1995). Their focus on practice and process details the questions that sidestep the pitfalls of participatory work by identifying six key questions to be asked at all stages of a participatory collaboration (Rocheleau and Slocum 1995). They argue communication about these questions needs to be explicit with room for reconciliation. The first three questions are: (1) Why? (necessity), (2) What? (power dynamics), and (3) Who? (involvement, interests, and control). The next three questions: (4) Timeframe? (5) Scales of analysis? and (6) How to proceed with methods/sequence/direction? are about project specifics and how they serve the interests of those involved. For Rocheleau and Slocum scale is very important, specifically the level of analysis which for any problem could be community, municipal, legislative, and or federal. Understanding the level of analysis and scale of the problem is vital for successful partnerships.

Innes and Booher (2004) argue that collaboration has the potential to solve complex and contentious problems and improve the potential for future actions. An example of this is the Granby Toxteth Review, a quarterly research focused newspaper devoted to community race politics in Liverpool's black community. "History has shown us that once an issue has

been identified via research there is always a reaction, be it positive or negative." (Clay 2016:91). Clay argues that despite the experiences of researchers lacking social justice goals, his work with the Granby Toxteth review brought about a sense of ownership and shared goals. In this case co-produced research brought a sense of power and a voice within communities that were previously unable to articulate their needs (Clay 2016). Clay (2016) explains how the collaborative ownership and creation of the Granby Toxteth Review allowed them to articulate their beliefs and elevate the issues facing their community to the relevant agencies for support. This collaborative aspect of participatory methods of research lends well to what many authors would call a sense of belonging.

Belonging

To understand the experience of gemeinschaft, the we-feeling, a sense of collective self, or the feeling of natural belonging (Bender 1978; Kanter 1972; Keller 2003) we must understand Tönnies contrasting concepts of community and society. Gemeinschaft (community) refers to the small traditional rural communities defined by solidarity, proximity, familiarity and social cohesion. Family, kinship,

neighborhoods and friendship are all associated with Gemeinschaft, fostering a strong sense of belonging (Tönnies and Loomis 1964 [1887]). This local-scale social arrangement has more support and security however, as Durkheim argues also more social control and suppression of deviance (Durkheim 2012 [1893]). The other side of Tönnies' coin is Gesellschaft (society), characterized by distance, individualization, anonymity and exchange relationships (Tönnies and Loomis 1964 [1887]). This modern phenomenon came into being in line with the rise of capitalism (Marx 2001 [1867]) bureaucratization (Weber 1968), urbanization (Simmel 1976 [1903]) and the advent of functional differentiation (Durkheim 2012 [1893], Luhmann 2013). This new type of modern social arrangement is society on a larger scale. Functionality, economic exchange, social distance, commercial interests and legal contracts are all developments associated with "modernization" and Gesellschaft (Tönnies and Loomis 1964 [1887]).

For those that study community and belonging at a national level, belonging is not just about feeling 'at home' but feeling 'safe' (Ignatief 2011). Yuval-Davis, Kannabiran and Vieten argue that belonging gets its time in the spotlight when it is threatened in some way, and for these authors it is patterns of trust and confidence that help define belonging in the structural and political conditions of living in

globalized networks and a modern world (Yuval-Davis, Kannabiran and Vieten, 2006). Crisp (2010) argues that belonging can be understood as a form of connectedness, the link between belonging and connectedness is useful for understanding exclusion and inclusion, specifically how they are overlapping processes. Gifford and Wilding (2013) identify belonging and social inclusion as an ambivalent landscape.

Anthias argues that when an individual feels destabilized and is seeking answers to their uncertainty, disconnection, alienation and invisibility they look to find and fix a social place that feels like home, where imagined roots exist, a "secure haven of our group, our family, our nation writ large" (Anthias 2006:21). Anthias argues that belonging is multi-dimensional and focuses on the experiences and feelings individuals have about their location in their social worlds. She centers on social inclusion rather than cohesion arguing that practices and experiences are vital for understanding acceptance in society. This is more than a sense of identity it is about being accepted, feeling safe and having a stake in the future of the community of membership. "To belong is to share values, networks and practices and not just a question of identification." (Anthias 2006:21).

Some scholars have unpacked that not all forms of belonging may be connected to local community but to other

ways of belonging (Jørgensen 2010, Game 2001, Beately 2004, Foucault 1986). For Game, specific places can act as a catalyst for feelings of "coming home" and those feelings may not be tied to specific time and space but connect us to certain childhood experiences, a sacred sense of belonging (Game 2001). Beatley (2004) has argued that visceral connections to seasons and nature have become disconnected in late modern society. He goes on to argue that a connection in social life to generations and age groups is the primary source of feeling history and the past, these things help us define place. For Beatley, history, community, and nature are grounding factors for a life are essential for a sense of belonging and vital for having meaning in life. He argues that construction of place and space must take these three factors into consideration in this global age (Beatley 2004). Foucault's heterotopia describes the connection that some feel to their neighborhoods as an alternative to surrounding society (Foucault 1986). Lifestyle and local community are essential components to heterotopia and create a sense of belonging characterized by establishing an intentional distance from the surrounding society (Jørgensen 2010). Jørgensen calls this 'the subcultural way of belonging' as it is locality, community, and often class specific (2010).

Another approach to understanding belonging is to think through how the social capital that certain places provide may create a feeling of support and security for members of community. Putnam identifies phenomena such as loyalty, solidarity, bonding, and bridging relations within communities (Putnam 2000). Coleman on the other hand addresses the norms and sanctions and closure in social relations as important factors for understanding social capital and belonging (Coleman 1988). For Jørgensen, "the main criterion for quality in a given community is not whether it can be used to maintain or to improve one's position in the social space in general, but to what extent it is capable of providing common norms and mutual solidarity and a feeling of security and equality among the members of a given community" (Jørgensen 2010:13).

Belonging, as a concept of social cohesion, often co-occurs with the word community as an indicator of how individuals perceive their place in society. In the discipline of community psychology, a sense of community (SOC) has been defined as "the sense that one was part of a readily available, mutually supportive network of relationships" (Sarason 1974:1). Other community psychologists, in fact argue that a sense of belonging or the

emotional connections and bonds between people based on interests, concerns or shared history is the greatest consensus for the definition of community or cohesive feelings of membership (Long and Perkins 2003). These definitions illustrate that belonging and community are intersecting concepts with great potential for helping us understand the phenomenon of social cohesion and in this case understand the types of relationships the practices of community engagement may foster.

In their research to uncover the barriers and opportunities to engagement practices, Weerts and Sandmann identified what they called boundary spanners, key people who have certain qualities that make this work feel "more real" to community partners (2008). I would argue that the qualities of these boundary spanners, such as convening, problem solving, and being change agents who negotiate the wants and needs of parties involved (Hutchinson and Huberman 1993) are qualities that encourage a sense of belonging in community engagement practice. Acting as knowledge and power brokers between university and community partners, these boundary spanners were found to play crucial roles in the success of community engagement activities in the research (Weerts and Sandmann 2008). It was through these relationships with

boundary spanners that community partners then evaluated the effectiveness of institutional engagement. The four aspects of good boundary spanners are (a) listening skills, (b) a service ethic, (c) the competent management of power, and (d) neutrality (Weerts and Sandmann 2008). The four belonging inducing aspects of boundary spanners align closely with what Cash et al. (2003) argue reflects a sense of legitimacy in participatory engaged work. "Legitimacy reflects the perception that the production of information and technology has been respectful of stakeholders' divergent values and beliefs, unbiased in its conduct, and fair in its treatment of opposing views and interests" (Cash et al. 2003).

Legitimacy

The fact that legitimacy is an important concept for practitioners in engaged participatory work is not a surprise. Given that the tenets of community engagement include a shifting of power to a more democratically shared sense of participation in research, questions of legitimacy in the work are bound to be salient. Legitimacy is a sociological phenomenon evident in the overlapping literatures of social psychology and organizations as well as an implicit factor in the literature of community engagement,

specifically in research around barriers and challenges to the work. This research draws clear connections between the intersection of community engagement, democratic practices and social psychological understandings of legitimacy. The similarities that all community engaged practitioners hold, the need and desire for legitimacy helps for a better understanding of expertise across scale.

Sociological literature, specifically the two areas of social psychology and organizations, recognizes the role that legitimacy plays in social organization (Zelditch 2001). Others argue that legitimacy is the cornerstone for all theories that explain group and organizational behavior (Johnson et al. 2006). Weber argued that the perception of others supports and adherence to certain norms, rules and beliefs leads to collective objective social facts (1978). This collective construction of social reality is connected to legitimacy in that the social order is perceived collectively by adherence to specific norms, rules and beliefs. An individual's compliance to this social order leads to legitimacy through (a) a set of social obligations, or as (b) a desirable model of action (Walker 2004). Zelditch (2001:33) expands on Weber's theory and argues that "something is legitimate if it is in accord with the norms,

values, beliefs, practices, and procedures accepted by a group." Organizational ecologists, for instance, define an organizational form as legitimate when its existence and prevalence are taken for granted (Hannan and Carroll 1992). Mark Suchman's influential definition of legitimacy is "a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions" (1995:574).

The sociological literature addresses legitimacy for community-based organizations (CBO) by examining how sociopolitical legitimacy can both benefit and cost the CBO in their attempts to "survive" and be "successful" (Walker and McCarthy 2010). According to Haveman, Rao, and Paruchuri, sociopolitical legitimacy "implies approval by authorities such as the state and renowned activists" (2007:120). When an organization "conforms to legal rules and gains endorsement from other powerful actors" (Rao, Morrill, and Zald 2000:242) they are considered to have gained sociopolitical legitimacy. While this sociopolitical legitimacy may seem positive across the board, Walker and McCarthy (2010) found that certain types of sociopolitical legitimacy may create burdens on the community from administrative strain to concern of "mission

drift" when accepting financial support from the government (Minkoff and Powell 2006). The challenge of outside patronage to the autonomy of movement groups is significant and may lead to a decline in indigenous support (Walker and McCarthy 2010).

When an organizational form is relatively new, as community engaged work is predominantly and currently defined in academia, the form is lacking in legitimacy due to low numbers and lack of resources (Johnson et al. 2006). Success in gaining legitimacy can then be increased to the point of securing support and resources. Johnson et al. (2006) argue that this formula for organizational forms is enough, with limitations, and draw on others who claim that cultural support is equally important in securing legitimacy (Meyer and Scott 1983). The cultural component of legitimacy relates back to Weber's social construction of social facts. This is the idea that certain norms, beliefs, and rules, all culturally agreed upon as objective social facts legitimate an organization. Schurman argues that it is legitimacy of an organization and not its individual members that is important to the definition (1995). Schurman's is one of the most accepted definitions of legitimacy in the literature, "a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an

entity are desirable, proper or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs and definitions" (1995:574). Schurman is careful to note that it is the perception of an organization, not the actions of representatives of that organization that matters for legitimacy. Of the varying definitions, all include certain fundamental similarities: (a) legitimacy is a phenomenon of social constructed reality (b) it is a collective process (c) it depends on apparent consensus (d) it incorporates both a cognitive dimension (the object is a valid objective social feature) and a prescriptive dimension (the social object is right) (Johnson et al. 2006).

In the case of the academics doing engaged participatory research, using a set of norms, rules, beliefs, practices, and procedures that deviate from the status quo of academia professional legitimacy and expertise become a place of tension. Expertise is an additional area of study in the discipline of sociology, although literature based in professions and occupations, work and skills, and science and technology all came before and relate to the recent attention on the sociology of expertise (Azocar and Ferree 2016). According to Azocar and Ferree (2016) the sociological studies of professions and occupations were interested in the

idea of expertise as a core feature of professions, as it helped to explain the capacity of scholars to monopolize esoteric knowledge (Parsons 1939; Hughes 1994; Wilensky 1964; Millerson 1964). However, expertise was never central to the work, the attention it received was primarily about what knowledge was and how it was used (Parsons 1939; Abbott 1988), specifically, how professional groups used competition to monopolize knowledge and its use.

The concept of expertise has also been explored in the sociological literature of Everett Hughes and others the symbolic interactionism field (Hughes 1994). Azocar and Ferree argue that opposed to the idea of expertise as a resource controlled and manipulated by certain professions, symbolic interactionists viewed expertise as a symbol or meaning attached to certain tasks or work (2016). Abbot defined expertise as the capacity to accomplish a task based on interactions (Abbott 1988). Finally, sociological literature of science and technology (STS) posits expertise as an enactment or performance with constantly changing context for legitimation of actions, these scholars have specifically focused on how expertise plays out within networks (Callon 2007; Latour 1993; Collins and Evans 2008; Eyal 2013).

The STS approach to understanding expertise has been shaped by Foucault and several feminist critical scholars who have written about the importance of situated truth claims and the problematic subjective-objective binaries in scientific work and writing (Harding 1986; Haraway 2008; Keller 2003; Longino 1990). By locating work in historical, material, and cultural social relations the bias associated with the work can be acknowledged (Azocar and Ferree 2016). Actor Network Theory (ANT) takes this notion one step further to understand expertise as meaning only understood and applied to certain tasks and work within the context of a network. Furthermore, Azocar and Ferree argue that ANT tends to acknowledge laypersons as important actors in these networks without privileging the scientific actors present in the network. This assertion of the importance of laypersons is evident in the literature on expertise. Struggles over jurisdiction can be waged between any groups that can lay a claim to expertise, based in abstract knowledge, control of technique or other bases (Abbott 1988:8). The literature shows a wider scope of actors playing a role in the tasks and problems of society (Eyal 2013). The idea that a wider array of individuals and knowledge can and should be brought to problems of society is applicable to and challenges some of

the big questions of power and the process of knowledge production in academia.

Sociology of Knowledge

Rethinking the basis and function of knowledge is not new to academics, in fact, Foucault argues that the political problem of the intellectual is making possible a new regime of truth (1980). To Foucault, "truth" is "a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and functioning of statements"; it is linked "by a circular relation to systems of power which produce it and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces, and which redirect it". The political question for Foucault is trying to *change* our "political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth" in order to constitute a new "politics of truth" (Foucault 1976:113-114). Lorenzini argues that Foucault shows us that we are not obliged to accept the scientific or epistemological regime of truth, and more importantly that we are not obliged to shape our subjectivity and our way of life on it. On the contrary, we should try to choose other values on which to shape ourselves (2015). This making possible a new regime of truth is very much where I see engaged scholarship sitting. It is a new

regime of truth that includes values other than truth and power (Lorenzini 2015). The New England Resource Center for Higher Education defines Engaged Scholarship: "by the collaboration between academics and individuals outside the academy - knowledge professionals and the lay public (local, regional/state, national, global) - for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (NERCHE). Involving community members outside of academia in the design, implementation and analysis of research surfaces a conversation about the types of discourse which are acceptable and function as true. The current culture and business as usual at the University is arguably fixed in terms of the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisitions of truth (see methods) and the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true (see those with graduate degrees). By opening methods and author/ownership of knowledge beyond the ivory tower, engaged scholarship makes possible a new regime of truth.

So how is the growing field of community engagement opening a space for expanded understandings of legitimacy and belonging? My first research question seeks to answer how engaged scholars express legitimacy in their research processes and the second research question is attempting to

respond to the impact these practices have on a sense of belonging in the work of engaged research. There have been many great authors and scientists who have written about partnerships, expertise, and situated knowledge that I will draw on to help support and explain the phenomenon of community engagement within academic knowledge production.

It has been argued that the academy over the past three decades has become a closed space, with a narrowing down of possibilities, with a market for internal symbolic material that has little or no value outside its borders (Alvares 1992; Mathew 2010). For many land grant Universities this recent trend has sparked research and investigation into the purposes of engaged scholarship (Stanton 2008; O'Meara 2007; Gelmon et al. 1998; Jaeger, Tuchmayer, and Morin 2014) and the responsibility of institutions of higher education to engage with the communities they are situated in and in some cases (Land Grant Universities) the citizens that fund their activities.

Arguments have been made about the role of power, not science that decides what knowledge is, furthermore, Alvares claims that science has become an instrument for colonizing and controlling the direction of knowledge and human behavior (Alvares 1992). Colonizers have determined western knowledge

as "legitimate knowledge" as objective or universal knowledge, relegating power to Europeans and determining indigenous knowledge as savage, superstitious, and primitive (Akena 2012; Kincheloe, 2006). These critiques of the academy and western knowledge production offer an important space to talk about the dimensions of knowledge and science in the context of community engagement.

Sociology as a modern, western, science discipline oscillates between two incompatible points of view, objectivism and subjectivism, two concepts that stand in a dialectical relation to one another (Bourdieu 1990). The discipline tends to reduce the social world to representations and often treats social phenomena as things or (objective) Durkheimian facts and leaves out that beings are objects of cognition (subjectivity) (Bourdieu 1990:124). As it has been claimed by Bourdieu, an agent's point of view depends on an individual's position in that space (Bourdieu 1990:130). The characteristics of the agent that Bourdieu speaks of applies to both the subjects of research and the researcher herself. A researcher's point of view, strongly influenced by her position in that space, is termed positionality; positionality is important for understanding how and why scientists process social, cultural and economic

relationships and produce legitimate knowledge.

The beginnings of discussion about knowledge production and truth in the sociological literature date back to Karl Mannheim's (1985) arguments about how we come to understand social phenomenon. He argues that social circumstances are paramount to understanding how knowledge is produced. Mannheim positions the sociology of knowledge as an analysis of the relationship between knowledge and existence. In other words, studying knowledge should include examining the close relations between individuals and groups (Akena 2012). These arguments support observations that knowledge is socially determined by a given purpose of the society, or that knowledge is motivated by an individual or group's agenda (Sprout 1954; Becker and Dahlke 1941).

According to Berger and Luckmann, our task as social scientists is to uncover how it is that subjective realities (or interpreted "reality") become objective realities (Berger and Luckmann 1966:19). In other words, how does something go from a subjective observation to an objective fact or reality? I viewed my task as a social scientist in this dissertation process to investigate the way that community engaged research partnerships challenge the objective "reality" of elite academic knowledge production and expand how and who

research, and knowledge operates. The processes by which reality is socially constructed is through thoughts and actions, which are based in language, symbolic interactionism, signification, culture, and the drawing on of semantic fields (the common stock of knowledge). It is in this common stock of knowledge that we see change over time, what knowledge is retained and passed on from generation to generation (Berger and Luckmann 1966:41).

Patricia Hill Collins sees commonplace, taken-for-granted knowledge as the first and most fundamental level of knowledge. Experts or specialists on the other hand, participate in and produce a second, more specialized type of knowledge; for Collins, these two types of knowledge are interdependent (Collins 2000). Using Berger and Luckmann's theory of socially constructed reality to analyze the processes of community engagement helped uncover possibilities in the academic social constructs of knowledge production and for how others socially construct knowledge in a different way, a way that presents a more democratic form of knowledge production. I challenged myself to uncover Collins' interdependent nature of these commingling levels of knowledge in the experiences of community engaged researchers.

Foucault's archeology of knowledge claims that one must dig deep into the archives to determine the systems behind the existence of practices, institutions and relationships. He argues that the academic use of the "archive" (knowledge), to explain a phenomenon, is not necessarily a coherent process. By interpreting an archive, or knowledge, academics are inherently accepting the underlying terms of the systems in which that knowledge exists (Foucault 127). Therefore, according to Foucault archives do not reflect reality, they are incomplete and based in systems of power and domination that are dangerous if left unacknowledged. Foucault further explained that truth is not outside of power nor is it deprived of power and that in a 'regime' of truth it is power that determines the separation between truth and error (Foucault 1975-76:145; 164).

Choudry and Kapoor argue that a discourse of original, single authorship, valued in academic knowledge production, contributes to a failure in acknowledging the contributions of activism, or to recognize the lineages of ideas and theories that have been forged outside of academe (Choudry and Kapoor 2010:2). Latour claims that science is another form of politics (Latour 1993:111) and the domination of western ways of thought. In other words, scientific findings

are easily turned into absolute universal ideas, yet those ideas are often divorced from the voices (non-human nature, community, citizens) that experts rely upon in their studies (Latour 1993:118). The role of scientist spokesperson is an important position to address in the dynamics of research relationships and the connections to citizen science.

The role of ordinary people as scientists has been a point of interest for many scholars (Shiva 1992; Choudry and Kapoor 2010; Fischer 2000; Haraway 2008; Rahnema 1992). In contrast to modern science, ecological ways of knowing nature are participatory; ordinary people are the scientists, their knowledge is ecological and plural (Shiva 1992). Critiques and challenges of the limits of expertise and neo-positivist social science have been made through the reflection on these types of alternative knowledges where ordinary people are the scientists (Fischer 2000). Like Berger and Luckmann (1966), Fischer argues social science offers "an account of reality rather than reality itself" (Fischer 2000:75) going further to claim that knowledge does not need to be generalizable beyond a specific context. This is an important argument that opens possibilities for citizen science that fit outside of traditional academic knowledge production, which is predicated on validity, reliability and generalizability. One

form of Fischer's "postpositivism" is participatory research done in a way that empowers laypersons to speak for themselves and have a say in the research process.   Allowing both community members and experts to participate offers the possibility of democratic governance (Fischer 2000:75).

This democratic governance must in my opinion go hand in hand with scholarship on situated knowledge. Advocates for the pursuit of "situated knowledge" or knowledge restricted by historical position and capacity for partial understanding, see this as the route to true scientific objectivity (Haraway 2008). Haraway argues "all knowledge is a condensed node in an agnostic power field" adding that that it is important to acknowledge that the program in the sociology of knowledge joins with semiology and deconstruction to insist on the rhetorical nature of truth (Haraway 2008).   However, this rhetorical nature of truth is problematic as science is a contestable text and power field. Scholars have suggested that truth is relative but not absolute because of the influence of society, class and group affiliation in society (Gerard 1941) Feminist objectivity offers an alternative means: situated knowledges (Haraway 2008).

Arguments for situated and embodied knowledges and

against unlocatable and irresponsible knowledge claims preference subjugated standpoints (Haraway 2008). Based in the "promise of more adequate, sustained, objective, transforming accounts of the world" the subjugated standpoints are not 'innocent' positions, but claims have been made that they are the least likely to allow denial of the critical and interpretive core of all knowledge (Haraway 2008). Arguing for objectivity that privileges contestation, deconstruction, and transformation of systems of knowledge and ways of seeing among other things (Haraway 2008) is a critique of scientific truth and traditional objectivity and for my work an argument that at the same time challenges traditional academic knowledge production while also supporting a partnership theory for research and knowledge production that privileges subjugated knowledges (Collins, 2000; Haraway 2008).

These sociological critiques of academic knowledge production pinpoint the advantage of subjugated standpoints, situated and embodied knowledges, and an expanded definition of objectivity. I found in my research that all of these are available in the practice of community engaged research and participatory methods. The literature in the field of engaged scholarship argues that this work is both recognized and

applauded by Universities at the same time under supported within colleges and departments making the engaged scholarship path a difficult one for many graduate students and faculty.

Roadmap for Remaining Chapters

The following chapters each include an analysis of data collected by participant observation and in-depth interviews through the lens of engaged scholarship. The data are grouped by both the themes and patterns that emerged from the data as well as by project. In the 5 years of data collection on this topic I found myself interviewing and, in some instances, participating in what I see as three large community engaged research cases. These cases all involve multiple academic and community engaged practitioners. I focus on the details of these distinct cases and the collaboration of the individuals involved with the hopes that the rich descriptions and detailed context of each give a good sense of the variety of topics, approaches, and methods utilized under the umbrella of community engaged research. This is a small sample of the type of engaged work that might be done, however, it gives a snapshot in time of what has and is happening now in this

field, and how the practitioners talk and feel about their roles in this process.

Chapter three moves into the details of the community engaged research work of the American Indian Adoptee case. This data includes quotes from both academics and American Indian community practitioners about how research might be conceptualized in different and more democratic ways. The case that chapter four focuses on is the Community Engaged Scholarship Roundtable conversations that occurred over the course of two years, specifically the voices of academics doing this work and the challenges they face working within a more traditional research institution. The final chapter five centers around data from the Community Gardens Organization collaboration. Both participant observation data as well as interview data from multiple academic and community participants are included.

Using the research questions as my guide, each chapter and distinct engaged research case study addresses legitimacy and belonging.

Research question 1: Given that the tenets of community engagement include a shifting of power to a more democratically shared sense of participation in

research, how salient are questions of legitimacy in community engagement?

My first research question asks *how* to describe patterns and experiences and challenges in this type of work, specifically how academic and community practitioners working in a space of more democratically shared participation understand legitimacy in the work and their respective social and political worlds.

Research question 2: How is shared participation in community engagement associated with a sense of belonging in the work?

As with the first research question, this second question assumes that community engagement has the potential to shift the ways a participant thinks about their role in research. As work becomes more participatory, more democratic, and power becomes leveled out across a group of individuals, does that impact a sense of belonging in the work?

The data show how struggles for legitimacy can show up in three very different ways for engagement practitioners, depending on who you talk to and the context. One place in the data where legitimacy becomes salient is around community and indigenous knowledge and expertise. In the first case

study, the focus of chapter three, the data show a community fighting for legitimacy of their knowledge and expertise from stakeholders that control their resources and make laws that dictate their lives. The second case study data, in chapter four, shows a struggle for legitimacy inside of academia. Specifically, how legitimacy and expertise create tension for academics practicing engaged participatory methods within their professions. In chapter five, the third case study demonstrates, primarily, the legitimacy required of academics for community members to trust, build relationships, and create a sense of belonging in participatory engaged research. Each chapter also illustrates how engaged scholarship provides an opportunity for a new space of belonging for those involved. I provide examples of how shared values and a sense of belonging exist in these research collaborations.

These broad themes are grouped into three distinct chapters to tell a story about the challenges and promises of community engaged scholarship. In the context of these cases, democracy as it is defined in the literature will be the backdrop for this paper and will address the larger questions of knowledge production within academia in the conclusion. The potential that community engagement offers to

partnerships across the university and community will be the focus of the final analysis and discussion. This "new" approach to the scientific method offers a re-imagining of concepts like objectivity and subjectivity to collaboratively designing methods that challenge what established research should look and feel like and whose knowledge is accepted and included in the process.

CHAPTER THREE: Academia and Indigenous Knowledge

This is a story about engaged scholarship, a space where academics and community members participate in research and other co-learning opportunities together. In this chapter, narratives from in-depth interviews will offer examples of how academics and community members think about *legitimacy, belonging* and *knowledge* while collaborating in an engaged way. Their stories have implications for how all these terms are understood and how an engaged context creates opportunity for discussion, critical thinking and a more democratic practice of defining and participating in the work. Rather than merely personal challenges, these stories demonstrate how larger patterns of understanding how this work "should" be done are not fixed, that practices can change understandings and that changed perspectives have an influence within institutions and communities. The data shows it is possible for community engagement participatory practices to create a more democratic research experience through critical thinking around taken-for-granted ideas of how knowledge is produced.

American Indian Adoptee Project

There is a team of community and academic researchers working on collecting survey data from American Indian adoptees to support ongoing research that shows the traumatic effects of Indian children being placed in adoptive non-Indian homes. This data is being collected to support testimony, in court, during cases where decisions are being made for American Indian children in the foster care system. The data in this chapter show a community fighting for one type of legitimacy, legitimacy of their knowledge and expertise from stakeholders that control their resources and make laws that dictate their lives. Phoebe, an American Indian adoptee and member of the American Indian community, works alongside Janice and Donna, both tenured faculty, and Corrine, a postdoc on a project involving data collection to support American Indian adoptees in the judicial system.

This work formed from a long history of the removal of American Indian children from their families and placement into non-Indian foster or adoptive homes. Most of the "split feathers" or "lost birds" (Navajo Times 2014) as some call themselves were removed from their homes prior to the 1978 Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA). This act, signed by President Jimmy Carter, addressed the failure "to recognize the

essential Tribal relations of Indian people and the cultural and social standards prevailing in Indian communities and families". American Indian children were being removed or simply went missing prior to the ICWA act. It was not illegal for the abduction of Indian children with the intent for them to be "saved" and assimilated into the dominant culture. The advent of the ICWA act shifted these practices to clearly dictate where Indian children should be placed in the case of removal from their homes: priority going to family members, second to families of the same tribe, and third to families of another tribe. Decades after the ICWA act was passed there continue to be struggles by the American Indian community to have their experiences in the foster and adoptive system heard by social workers and judges.

PHOEBE

In a South Minneapolis church serving the American Indian community I sit across from Phoebe in a large space with round tables and chairs. We are the only two in the building early on a cold snowy day. There is one large stained-glass window and the sun is shining through it. The interview covers her extensive experience pulling together a team of academics, community liaisons, and interns to do

research that will help her fight for the rights of her community. I thank her for stressing to me the idea of "healthy research" and expertly addressing the power differential she has felt engaging in research with academics. However, the research partnership has beneficial. For Phoebe, it is shocking to see the numbers her team has come up with, when anecdotally she's experienced and seen these trends for years. But the data shows it. And the judicial system wants to hear someone with a PhD say it. From a non-academic community researcher's perspective, the purpose of community engaged research is for legitimacy. Someone with credentials to legitimize and publish the knowledge her community has held for generations.

In our early morning interview, Phoebe explained to me that she uses what she already knows, from experience, to see if that matches up to the research this project is doing. Her personal experience in the foster and adoption system and countless experiences she has had with American Indians in the system give her a unique perspective and vantage point for this work. This coincides with Collins' (2000) argument that commonplace, taken-for-granted knowledge is the most fundamental level of knowledge. An expanded view of how knowledge is sought out and transferred in the CBPR field is

evident in the stories that I hear from many of the practitioners I interviewed.

One predominant tension inherent in the practice of community engaged scholarship is the idea of expertise being fluid and, in many cases, shared between academics and the community practitioners of engagement (Minkler and Wallerstein 2008; Hall 1997; Rocheleau and Slocum 1995). Community-engaged outreach practices in research and other areas prioritize reciprocity, mutual benefit, two-way sharing of knowledge, and the leveraging of institutional resources to address community defined challenges and needs (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health 2013). This more democratic practice of leveling out expertise can lead to struggles over legitimacy that look quite different for community practitioners than academics. Phoebe shared with me some struggles over the legitimacy of community or indigenous knowledge when paired with PhD or academic knowledge.

> Phoebe: The community should make the decisions, they know that data. They already know how to heal the community. We are our own experts. What we don't have is them believing. Social workers and judges would hear the long-term effect of child removal but want a study done…. Being an expert witness in a trial wasn't enough without good recent studies and good large numbers. It was shocking to see the numbers when anecdotally we've been seeing it all along, because I know it. But the data shows it to them.

For Phoebe, there is a lot of frustration for not being believed after witnessing countless American Indian adoptee's stories and living through her own adoptee experience. The lack of legitimacy for the American Indian community by the judicial system is even more apparent when the academic research comes back with data that directly supports what she says she has always known. In this case, Phoebe is fighting for what Haveman, Rao, and Paruchuri (2007) call sociopolitical legitimacy, an approval by authorities, such as the state, and endorsement from other powerful actors.

Even for Phoebe, the numbers were shocking, and she understands the need for the partnership with academics to back up the stories she has. The two forms of knowledge, both indigenous and academic, can have similar results or conclusions yet, in Phoebe's experience, the judicial system and other institutions are more likely to listen and make decisions when it's someone with a PhD talking. Legitimacy struggles for community members in this study are more often about this frustration of needing a PhD to say things for them. Phoebe's experience relates to the literature stating that expertise is an enactment or performance (in Phoebe's case, a PhD performance) for legitimation of her and the

American Indian adoptee experiences (Callon 2007; Latour 1993; Collins and Evans 2008; Law 2008; Eyal 2013).

Phoebe made it clear to me that even though she is involved in community engaged research, she doesn't have very healthy or exciting thoughts about research.

> Phoebe: Academic power and expertise is seductive- for an intelligent person this power is seen in a highest light, however there are communities impacted by research that didn't want anything to do with research. One example is the people of color involved in the historic syphilis study. This is the reason people of color are exceptionally cautious about the relationships that they build. If they are going to do research with someone, they must trust they are healthy, and they will not do something behind their back. They must weigh what could happen with getting the numbers to prove something.

This idea of healthy and unhealthy research came up with Phoebe, it is not language that I have encountered in the academic literature. There is, however, literature on legitimacy, as it is defined by Suchman the idea that a community member or group needs "a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions" (1995:574). For Phoebe, research needs to be "healthy" and the researchers she deals with must meet that criteria (desirable, proper, or appropriate) before engaging in any collaborative work. Phoebe discussed her idea of healthy

76

research as "vital, led by us, and impacting policy". For Phoebe, healthy research is un-skewed, unbiased data- to inform, educate and enhance or improve a phenomenon as it exists. She also sees healthy research opening an area of study and or wave of education that didn't previously exist.

The impetus for discussing research in healthy or unhealthy terms draws on a long history of Universities using predatory research practices to draw on community knowledge and experiences without much or any benefit to them. For Cash et al. legitimacy in this realm would reflect a perception of respect for stakeholders' divergent values and beliefs, that it is unbiased in its conduct, and fair in its treatment of opposing views and interests (2003). The distrust that Phoebe expressed to me about traditional academic research is not uncommon in the interviews and experiences I've had working with community members outside of the University. It is difficult to move beyond the frustrations of past stories and experiences of unbiased or unfair treatment in research. The fact that many of these folks were willing to talk to me at all about research is a testament to their resilience and willingness to hope for a better relationship in the future.

In a small faculty office, on campus, with papers and books everywhere, I sit in a chair next to a desk with an open glowing laptop. Behind Janice is a window overlooking the river many stories below. Janice talks about power dynamics in her community engaged research. She explains, she is a professor and she is white and richer than everyone else involved but she doesn't really know very much at all. But if it's a data set and someone needs to pull numbers, she would be the one to do it. This work is yet to be published with her name attached to it and the department she is in knows very little about the community engaged work she does, yet she thinks more academics are doing this kind of work than we think.

Janice is a tenured faculty member, who found herself practicing engaged research with a group of American Indian adoptees she had joined initially for family support. Her younger brother is an American Indian adopted into her white family when they were both young. Her role as part of the community, and then *later* as an academic researcher practicing community engagement, problematizes the notion that communities and universities are separate entities. In a way, Janice had a sense of belonging or "the sense that one

was part of a readily available, mutually supportive network of relationships" (Sarason 1974:1) with this organization long before she began doing research with them.

Janice understands her role, as a white professor on this project, is about legitimacy for the organization. That without her credentials and the backing of the IRB through the University, the stories from Phoebe and her American Indian community will not be believed by the social workers and judges in the system.

> Janice: The organization knows they need the analysis for the legitimacy. For compassion from judges and social workers in the system. Because people who are white are only going to believe the research… They want the result to be something everyone believes including rich white professors and lawyers. It was really important for them to go through the IRB, then the lawyers will accept the research.

This comes across so matter-of-fact for Janice, it's almost as if being a part of this research is primarily about creating legitimacy for Phoebe and her organization. This is, what I would argue, a support of the type of legitimacy seeking that Phoebe is engaging in.

Janice understands the relationships in this project to last a lifetime. "The research wouldn't exist if we didn't trust we would be friends and co-workers the rest of our lives. Time moves so slow. You really need a whole lifetime-

you're not going to get anything done in a matter of years"
(Janice). This type of commitment to a project, to research,
to a group of individuals is not uncommon in the engaged
scholars I interviewed. And for Janice, the legitimacy gained
through her commitment to the relationships (Cash et al. 2003)
and the organization are what allow the research partnership
to sustain. Janice is a good example of a "boundary spanner"
the key people in collaborative research projects that make
this work feel more real and legitimate to community members.
Janice embodies all four aspects of good boundary spanners,
according to Weerts and Sandmann, those are (a) listening
skills, (b) a service ethic, (c) the competent management of
power, and (d) neutrality (2008). This belonging to the group
and to the work takes a lifetime for many to achieve, and the
loyalty, solidarity, bonding, and bridging relations within
communities (Putnam 2000) are key components to a sense of
belonging in the literature.

DONNA

     Donna, a white female, tenured faculty member, with
thirty plus years of participatory research experience in
academia also works with Phoebe and Janice on the American
Indian adoptees project. Donna explains here the challenges

of time and resources that impede collaborative and participatory work.

> Donna: It is time consuming, resource extensive, taking much energy and money and development time, but it is much more applicable to the community in the end, because it's not something that just the researcher alone has dreamt up. You are part of the community in which you are steeped in, it's co-creating.

The notion that collaborative and participatory work takes a long time is a common comment from those who work in this area and it shows up in the literature for participatory research. Reason argues, "The process of drawing people together and creating a framework for collaborative work always takes longer than one imagines. At times building collaboration will seem to get in the way of directly addressing practical problems" (2006:7). However, Axtell, Zimmer, and Noor argue that the time spent on building relationships is a key to successful participation (2016). Donna's quote is a great example of both ideas, that it takes a lot of time and resources to do this work, and that the extra effort is what makes the project successful. Donna uses the phrase, "applicable to the community in the end", this aligns with Hall's 4th component of Participatory Action Research: The ultimate goal is the radical transformation of social reality and the improvement of the lives of the people

themselves. The beneficiaries of the research are the members of the community (1997).

For Donna, the extra effort needed to do this work is worth it to have that feeling of being a part of the community and to be able to co-create something. Here she articulated how she sees the quality of her work improving due to the investment she has made in the community.

> Donna: It's a challenge, it's time consuming, it's energy consuming, not only are you managing the research process you're having to do that relationship building at first and then maintenance over time and so it's not an easy process to do. If you do it well your research is at a higher quality and much more steeped in the essence of the org or families or culture you are working with and then it's much more relevant and... you have a group right there to help you extend the findings so they are helpful to the community in which you are working with.

For Donna an investment in the community leads to higher quality work, and more relevant findings to the community. I would also argue that Donna's investment into the American Indian community has led to a greater sense of legitimacy for doing this work and a greater buy in by Phoebe and the community to do collaborative and participatory research.

Conclusion

There have been clear tangible outcomes related to this project between academic and community scholars. The first, most important to Phoebe and the American Indian community, has been an increase in the reunification of families. The data collection has led to more conversation and communication about the history of separated families and brought the community closer. The second clear result of this work is a compiling of data to push for new processes in the court decisions around placement of American Indian children. The data shows that non-native placements has been correlated with an increase in mental health issues for children who have gone through the system. This collaboration has led to a legitimacy within the judicial system for the American Indian adoptee population. Their experiences, stories and histories are now being heard in a new way, a way that is influencing decisions that impact their families and communities.

Phoebe's experience with this participatory and collaborative research project relates primarily to the literature on legitimacy. The type of legitimacy, I argue, that is unique to community members in these partnerships. A need for legitimacy that is seeking recognition for the

knowledge and expertise that is held in her American Indian adoptee community. This is a type of sociopolitical legitimacy (Walker and McCarthy 2010; Haveman, Rao, and Paruchuri 2007) that is needed by community members from powerful actors in the legislative system and the type of legitimacy that collaborative participatory research increases the chances of obtaining. Janice clearly articulates her efforts to help Phoebe and her organization achieve sociopolitical legitimacy. This is an example of how collaboratively engaged research and participatory research processes can lead to co-producing one form of legitimacy that many non-academic partners seek.

Janice and Donna, the two tenured faculty members on this project, explain their efforts to secure a second type of legitimacy in this work. The legitimacy of an academic working within this community. The sense that they will bring certain values to the work (Bringle and Hatcher 2011; Anthias 2006) and sustain a relationship beyond the scope of the project. This type of legitimacy is also about creating a sense of belonging. For Phoebe and her American Indian community, to accept Janice, Donna, and other academics into their fight for rights, they must meet certain criteria. Phoebe articulates the need to trust the academics she works

with to do "healthy research" and not do anything behind her back. In a way Phoebe needs to feel that these researchers belong in her world, with her community, and in this struggle. This belonging is more than a sense of identity, it is about being accepted, feeling safe and that those involved have a stake in the future of the community (Anthias 2006).

CHAPTER FOUR: Community Engaged Scholars

At the University of Minnesota, the primary academic site for this research, there exists an Office for Public Engagement. Established in 2006, its mission is "to further the integration of public engagement into the University's research and teaching functions" (Office for Public Engagement 2018). Over the past several years they have hosted a series of forums of the Engaged Scholar Critical Community Engagement Roundtables: "Created for faculty and staff on the front lines of the University's community-engaged work... Critical Community Engagement Roundtables are comprised of community-engaged practitioners from across the University united by a desire to share their experiences and learn from others working in community-university partnerships" (Office for Public Engagement 2018). Attending these monthly roundtables offered a rich source of information for this research, relevant to how academics think about community-university partnerships and how engagement looks in their work. Roughly 30 to 75 people attended each roundtable, and the Office for Public Engagement invited faculty from different departments, all who have experience with community engagement practices. I attended 4 of these roundtables, each lasting between 60 and

90 minutes, taking notes in the audience. I was able to follow up with one of these academics, Margie, to do a full interview, her contribution to this section is more substantial due to the amount of data available from her.

Discussion with academics about the expectations of academia often led to frank explanations of why engagement had made them, as academics, stronger writers and researchers. It takes a lot of skill to translate from academic speak to plain language, arguably a form of mastery of the content for many. An academic must be versatile to write with and for non-academic audiences. The expectation of community engaged scholars to incorporate co-existing, and sometimes conflicting, values was an ongoing struggle for many of the academics I talked to.

In this case, I primarily utilize the concepts of legitimacy and belonging to understand how academic community engaged scholars talk about their experiences in community engaged research. Here I identify a third type of legitimacy not evident in the previous case. This type of legitimacy presents itself as community engaged academics seeking professional legitimacy within academia. In this case, the data show academics struggling to find acceptance of their participatory and collaborative methods and practices within

a larger institution that promotes and acknowledges success primarily through peer-reviewed journal publications. The data from these interviews and participant observation makes clear that the semester based and publication driven formula for valuing traditional academic work rarely supports the needs and processes of community engagement.

Often when the conversation moves to legitimacy, community engaged scholars in this chapter defend the values and practices of their work. The data shows a striving for legitimacy that is also motivated by the need for social cohesion and a sense of belonging both within traditional academia and the community engaged scholar community. Legitimacy has been defined as a recognition of an organization's norms, values, beliefs, practices, and procedures (Zelditch 2001). And the hallmark of a sense of belonging is the sharing of values, networks and practices (Anthias 2006). It is an ongoing struggle for community engaged scholars to achieve legitimacy and a type of dual belonging.

<u>Academic Roundtables</u>

It's two o-clock in the afternoon and the engaged roundtable audience is filling large lecture hall on campus to about 50% capacity. A panel of academics sitting on stage are here to present and respond to questions on their community engagement activities. Everyone on stage is introduced to the audience and the purpose of the roundtable discussion is clarified: to share experiences and learn from others working in community-university partnerships. Everyone is here to talk about the work of engaged scholars at the University and to share the challenges that this work poses in a University setting.

PETER

Peter, a middle aged, Latino professor in the medical sciences has been selected to be on stage for this panel during a community engaged roundtable in the summer of 2017. He has been quiet up until this point in the discussion, seemingly allowing faculty with more seniority to field questions, but now he is asked directly to respond to a question about how community engaged scholars (academics) can

make their work more accepted in their departments and at the University as a whole.

> Peter: I never thought about my work as an activist scholar... I approached it as needing to produce knowledge but also be a part of social change. I was struck by this idea that we are still at the stage that we are having to justify our work. Yes, our science is very complicated.... We are still at this point. We are in the middle of an identity crisis. We forget about our mandate to the greater good of the state. The science that we are producing should be to that end. It's not this or that. It's not mutually exclusive.

Peter describes the distinction or label of activist scholar as an afterthought to the work he does. However, he also claims he needs his work to be part of social change. This idea that social change need be integral to the work is one of the defining aspects of both Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) (Minkler and Wallerstein 2008) and Participatory Action Research (PAR) (Hall 1997). His ambivalence to define himself as an activist scholar is interesting given the way he defines the work he is doing. This hesitation or afterthought could have something to do with the legitimacy issues that engaged scholars face. If the title of "activist scholar" isn't rewarded or acknowledged at the University, it may not lead to strong motivations behind labeling oneself in that way.

Peter is amazed that a roundtable like this to discuss the legitimacy of this work within academia is even necessary. He remarks that we are in an identity crisis. It's not clear if he means community engaged scholars or the whole of academia, but it could be argued either way that the meaning and application of a 'mandate to the greater good', which Peter speaks of, isn't consciously agreed upon across disciplines or departments or even within the community of engaged scholars. This speaks to a need for cultural support in securing legitimacy (Meyer and Scott 1983) for these methods. If one is feeling amidst an identity crisis about the mandate to the greater good, cultural support to legitimize engaged scholarship is likely lacking. Many doing engaged work, like Peter, see engagement as a necessary, expected, element of the profession and yet the group struggles to discuss how to legitimize the work in the larger academic circle. The perceived, and likely accurate, number of identified engaged scholars at the University leaves Peter in the minority of his field and profession. The lack of cultural support (Meyer and Scott 1983) as well as a lack of resources (Johnson et al. 2006) available to Peter and his engaged colleagues contributes to ongoing conversations about the need to justify this work at the University.

During the same roundtable conversation, further discussion on the legitimacy of community engaged scholars continued, specifically about what's at stake for the professions and lives of researchers doing this work. Charles, an elder, African American, male speaks up. He is a tenured professor in Social Work, doing work on health policies, and he is on stage with the panel of academics for this roundtable. Charles argues that doing amazing work will lead to being recognized within departments and universities. That the value of doing meaningful work improves our state and our university. This insistence toward excellence in engaged scholarship practices includes a justification for the value of meaningful work. Soon after this call for excellence in engagement practices, Charles issues a warning to stay aware of the traditional forms of legitimacy recognized at the University.

> Charles: I can be committed to Community Engaged Research as much as I want but If I don't get tenure and promoted, what about the next generation? We need to do this work in ways that allow us to stay hired and gain stature. One way to change things is work toward a department head that is an engaged scholar. As we move forward in our own role as leaders, we get a say and have power and can influence power. Do amazing work.

Charles's message includes both a recognition of the value of meaningful work while also keeping an eye on the values that

lead to tenure and promotion for more traditional academic work. By advocating for an approach to this work that satisfies both the values of participatory and collaborative work while also meeting the requirements of publications and other more traditional standards for promotion creates a difficult strain on community engaged scholars. Charles's push for legitimacy in both the engaged scholarship community as well as with traditional academics is motivated by a desire for the values and practices of both communities to be recognized and to feel a sense of belonging in both spaces.

GREG

As conversations continue, at the community engaged roundtable discussions, values often come up in relationship to objectivity in the research. When the moderator asks "is the purpose of research to make change? What extent do our values become part of the process of doing research? To what extent are our values at odds with how the University defines objectivity?" the responses are clearly defensive of the participatory and collaborative approach to research. Quick to juxtapose community engaged research with traditional academic research, Greg, a community engaged faculty member

in the natural sciences, reiterates that objectivity in traditional academic research is a false notion.

> Greg: Logical empiricism is value based. We choose the frames we use and put in the scientific process. We (Community Engaged Scholars) are actually honest about it. It's part of the idea generation and throughout the analysis. It is a false idea that there is objectivity in science.

Another faculty member argues,

> You don't pick something you don't value, you don't select things you're not interested in. If you are trying to do meaningful work and change people's lives, it's even more important you do rigorous work. In many ways when the values are influencing people's lives, I trust that more than just trying to get a raise or get promoted… I want to do the most rigorous work I can. The stakes are so high if I'm wrong.

Greg responds,

> Greg: None of us enter this scholarly/research production without some kind of lens. Even the natural sciences have opened up to the fact that a frame always affects the science. There is no value-free research. The point is to assert your values and then the reader can assess. It's more dangerous not to address your values.

All of this talk about values being important in community engaged scholarship, and with all academic work, is an interesting space where a sense of belonging in a community becomes significant. Values come up in just about every definition of legitimacy and the literature about belonging (Bringle and Hatcher 2011; Cash et al. 2003; Hannan and

Carroll 1992; Suchman 1995; Schurman 1995). This overlap in literatures and emphasis and salience for academics and community members doing collaborative and participatory methods on values is an important connection.

For academics in this study, struggles were most often about legitimizing methods to have their work accepted by peers and administration. One way these academics identified acceptance or belonging was through the process of publishing in peer reviewed journals, a clear value of the traditional academic profession. One challenge, for engaged scholars, with the publications value, is the time and resources required to successfully collaborate with community. The huge time commitment, as articulated in the previous chapter's interviews with Janice and Donna, required of participatory and collaborative work, makes the demands of frequent publishing difficult to sustain.

MARGIE

Margie, a white, female, tenured faculty member, is sitting near the front of the lecture hall during the roundtable discussion. She raises her hand and is passed a

mic as she stands up to share her perspective on journal publications.

> Margie: Research produces publications, peer reviewed articles. When people do community engaged research there is a need to fulfil the publication part but also do some dissemination for the community. Often this wasn't counted, it was on borrowed time. One of the challenges is how do they frame the work they are doing, and it is scholarly to a different audience in a different format: podcasts, scripts, cookbooks, only more recently have we innovated products that are not in the form of journal articles. We are seeing that they are of value, may not be weighted as heavily but we are seeing community engaged scholars have two sets of skills, academic writing and the ability to disseminate and collaborate and write in another set of skills. Shouldn't we value those who go above and beyond in the second set of skills?

For Margie, the impact of engaged scholarship expands beyond citations and journal publications. The more applied community outcomes of the work that Margie lists, such as podcasts, scripts, and cookbooks are not valued as legitimate as peer reviewed journal articles for promotion and tenure. This tension around acceptance of methods and outcomes of engaged scholarship comes up in many of the conversations with community engaged academics.

Margie agreed to do an in-depth interview with me following the academic roundtable discussion on engaged scholarship. When, during the interview, Margie addressed the topic of legitimacy and expertise, she explained why publications are highly valued in academia.

Margie: There is elitism about the sets of skills, the expertise model, terminal degrees, and book knowledge. We did a lot to get that degree and expect others to value that expertise. Academics learned a way of communicating and are reinforced for doing that well. On the flip side, there are other people, not our folk, and they write for the lay audience. Our degrees are more valuable than the lay audience. Academic writing for the lay audience doesn't meet the traditional rigor of science and writing.

For Margie the value of academic writing skills is based in a comparison between us and them. Us being the academics and them being lay persons, non-academics. One consequence of gatekeeping the academic realm is legitimizing a set of writing skills and delegitimizing community engaged research. In this context community engaged research practices and outcomes may pose a problem for upholding the distinction Margie articulated between the experts and the lay persons.

Margie was trained as a clinical psychologist and came to the University in 1992 as a post-doc in pediatric neuropsychology. She has a background in organic chemical exposure and came to the University to specialize in pediatrics. She now works in an administration position, specifically working with community engaged scholars to achieve tenure and promotion.

In the early 1990s Margie was asked to assist a clinic in the area that was approached by several community organizers, with fists in the air, stating the clinic needed

to do more about community health. They argued that the word community in the title of the organization meant nothing unless they could explain what they were doing for the community. Margie remembered that the Director asked, "Well, what would you like me to do?" and the three community members were not sure what to propose. 18 months later, they had decided they wanted to work on childhood lead exposure, and the garbage transfer facility in their community. Lead was impacting their community, and they were concerned.

Margie had the background in chemical exposures for pediatrics and came on board with a group of people from the University, community residents, a local paint company, a state representative, and city and state officials that launched a 10-year long collaboration. After a lot of disagreement and strife and relationships building, they couldn't answer the communities about lead with their research. Margie explained that the community had already been over-researched, but they ended up writing grants worth 3 million dollars for two large federally funded community based participatory based projects. Two studies, one looking at markers of adversity, and one about moms teaching moms about chemical exposure.

Margie came into the project with an interest in lead and over the course of the first few years got more interested in the model at the time we didn't know it was called Community Based participatory Research. They were doing what felt right at the time, asking the community the questions they wanted answered. They hired within the community, providing benefits. Along the way, a few years into it, they created a model, an asset-based "power sharing model". Without knowing that other people around the country were using a similar approach called Community Based participatory Research (CBPR)

For Margie, success in her community engaged work is based on certain conditions, specifically engaging with the community and having the people on the ground directly involved and working on the project. While she had success in her first project, the second was deemed an "utter failure" by Margie. It's important to note that the path to legitimacy, when doing community engaged work, can include stories of failure. The People's Knowledge Editorial Collective argue that the best practices and processes for Participatory Action Research (PAR) can unearth tensions around representation, identity, power and knowledge (People's Knowledge Editorial Collective 2016). An increasing pressure

to only publish successful research has led to a silencing of
the mistakes or missteps that lead to unsuccessful PAR
(People's Knowledge Editorial Collective 2016). Here Margie
explains honestly the 'utter failure' of a project she was
involved in:

> Margie: My next project was an utter failure. I learned
> that in contrast to the previous collaborative, where we
> were working directly with community members and on the
> ground with families, the second one I did was with a
> few non-profits. As a team, we decided that the non-
> profit leaders were the appropriate members. The project
> failed because we didn't engage with the line staff and
> the community. We didn't think it through, and it was a
> failure. I chalk that up to we learned things from it,
> so it wasn't an utter failure but as far as doing the
> project it was an utter failure. Understanding who to
> partner with and what level to partner with was an
> important lesson. You must have the people directly
> involved, the people on the ground, not just the mid-
> level and that takes time. (In the successful project)
> We took the first year just talking about why you need
> a control group and had to get over concern from the
> community about research design and learn how to come to
> consensus. In 10 years, there have been two big projects
> and not that many papers generated from them. That's a
> lot of time to invest for not much traditional progress,
> but I've gotten so much more out of those experiences
> than how many papers on my vita.

The freedom Margie exhibited in discussing the failures of a
community engaged project and where the misstep took place
was quite refreshing and is helpful to the community of
engaged scholars. Margie is not the only person I interviewed
that brought up difficult projects, missed opportunities, and

struggles over working with the right people. Margie's failure of working with the wrong people on a project is a great example of the third question that Rocheleau and Slocum (1995) emphasize in their focus on process and power in participatory work. Rocheleau and Slocum argue certain questions need to be asked early and often to avoid the pitfalls that can occur in participatory projects: Who should be involved? Whose interests are at stake? And who has control? (1995) Specifically, in this case, asking *who* may have led to a better project, more authentic participation, and a more successful project.

Beyond the question of who, Margie mentions that better insight into what "level" to partner on is a lesson learned from the failed project. Rocheleau and Slocum (1995) argue that scale is another important question to ask when designing and implementing a participatory project. The level of analysis could be community, municipal, legislative, and or federal. Understanding the level of analysis and scale of the problem is vital for successful partnerships (Rocheleau and Slocum 1995).

Conclusion

Legitimacy presents itself in three distinct ways through the data in this project, (1) fighting for community and indigenous knowledge legitimacy from stakeholders (2) community engaged scholars struggling for legitimacy inside of academia, and (3) legitimacy required by community of academics for trust, relationships building, and a sense of belonging in participatory engaged research. For this specific case, and chapter, legitimacy primarily takes the 2nd form. Academic engaged scholars in this chapter are seeking acknowledgement and belonging for their methods, practices, and values from an academic University setting that traditionally values other forms of productivity and achievement.

This chapter includes quotes from engaged scholars, who indicate salient practices and values important for doing research within the context of a traditional academic setting. From Peter, who struggles to strongly identify with the label activist scholar, to Charles and Greg who both highlight the importance of values in the work. Finally, Margie uses the notion of competing values to distinguish boundaries between types of expertise and the maintenance of a hierarchy. This hierarchy serves not only maintain the

status quo of the University but also alienates some academics working within the institution who seek legitimacy and a sense of belonging within academia for their methods and research products that don't align with the traditional standards for tenure and promotion.

CHAPTER FIVE: Community Gardens Collaboration

In the Summit-U and Frogtown neighborhoods of St. Paul, MN there is a collaboration of gardeners and garden plots that serve various functions for the community. The group meets weekly to spend time with children in the garden and prepare healthy snacks with the produce they pick. They help host neighborhood block parties and annual peaceful celebrations and work with local schools on their community gardens. They assist with monthly meetings on reconciliation within the neighborhood and they have a history of working with academics from a number or colleges and universities in the area on projects, in applying for grant funding, and conducting research. In this community garden space, I would argue, the three components of belonging that Beatley (2004) identifies, history, nature and community are all present. Nature is evident everywhere you turn, from flowering squash plants to ripe tomatoes the garden holds a space for experiencing nature and the seasons. Generations of family are present in the garden; grandparents with their grandchildren share garden plots, mothers and daughters sit together and have conversations about racial justice at potlucks, children work alongside elders in the children's garden. In addition to the generational component of

belonging there is an emphasis placed on the history of the neighborhood, this history is told to everyone new entering the space.

The Rondo neighborhood of St. Paul, MN is the historically black neighborhood these gardens and residents live in, and the historical black churches and meeting spaces in this neighborhood have been significant since before the destruction of Rondo Avenue for Interstate 94 to be built. "In the 1930s and the 1940s Rondo Avenue was at the heart of St. Paul's largest black neighborhood. African Americans whose families had lived in Minnesota for decades and others who were just arriving from the South made up a vibrant, vital community that was in many ways independent of the white society around it" (Fairbanks 1990). Since the splitting of the Rondo neighborhood by the construction of interstate 94 community members have fought for important walking bridges to gap the freeway that splits the neighborhood for folks continue to be able to walk to the churches their families have been attending for generations.

Rondo continues to change over time as The Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minnesota, have become a primary resettlement center for Hmong refugees since 1975, post-Vietnam War. Minnesota currently boasts the second highest

Hmong population in the U.S. The Rondo neighborhood has shifted to include many of these Hmong refugees as well as non-African-American neighbors. Despite the changes that continue, the history of this black community is still very much linked to the history and present of the gardens. The Community Gardens Organization, formed in the spring of 2014, is building a network across neighborhoods of St. Paul to hold workshops to build knowledge, capacity and community around reconciliation, healing, peace, social and environmental justice through the cultivation and sharing of food in the Summit-University (Rondo) and Frogtown communities.

I have over 3 years of experience working directly with this group on collaborative engaged garden research. In addition to the participant observation data, I interviewed several community and University members who have worked in collaboration with this Community Gardens Organization. This chapter draws on both field notes as well as interview data from my time working in and out of the gardens. The first section titled Participation and Observation in the Gardens includes rich description on the gardens site and the history that led to the collaborative research project. Following this section is the Interviews in the Gardens section that

highlights quotes from several community and University collaborators speaking to the conditions that lead to successful collaborations.

This chapter is an example of how legitimacy and a sense of belonging plays out in community based collaborative projects. The Community Gardens Organization required a lengthy process of coming to belong in the gardens and community that would allow for authentic dialogue and communication. For the academics that worked with this organization, there is an expectation that you come and just "hang out" at community events. This includes volunteering and making food, setting up, cleaning up, and being involved, for a while, before jumping into research or asking questions. This third type of legitimacy I argue, was required for academics to participate and collaborate. This form of legitimacy is different from the previous two highlighted in earlier chapters. Chapter three detailed the first form of legitimacy that indigenous or community members struggle for from stakeholders and tend to receive only after collaboration with academics with PhD credentials. The second form of legitimacy, in chapter four, looks like academics seeking legitimacy of the values and practices of their community engaged work, and a sense of belonging, within a

University setting. This third type of legitimacy, academics needing to belong and be deemed legitimate in the community before beginning their research, shows up in the participant observation data as well as the interview data of the community gardens case.

Community Gardens

Participation and Observation in the Gardens

Pulling up alongside the garden site in the Rondo neighborhood of St. Paul I scan the street for available parking spots. I see one right in front of a lot. At first, it's difficult to tell if this is the side yard of the purple two story house next to it or if it's a community garden space. After more careful inspection, I see a sign indicating it is, in fact, a community garden site, and then I notice the two chain link fences that run along either side of the garden to the back alley. I see a group of people gathered toward the back of the lot and as I put my car in park, I explain to my good friend accompanying me what we are doing here.

It's fall, early winter, my friend and I are wearing our winter jackets, we are here to plant garlic, to attend an

event I was invited to the weekend before. That previous weekend I was attending a conference in Duluth, MN where I met two elder women at a breakout session who introduced themselves to me as being part of a Community Gardens Organization in St. Paul. I had heard of their organization through academics doing work on food and the environment and I was excited to meet them in person. After the breakout session they introduced me to Luther. I introduced myself as a graduate student and employee of a healthy food coalition attending the conference. I explained my interest in community-based research and asked if his organization would be interested in that type of partnership. Luther was an elder African American man, dressed quite stylishly with a tie-died t-shirt and wide brimmed hat. He introduced himself to me warmly and explained that their group consists of urban farmers, not just community gardeners. I understood that point to be important for him to convey, as if some level of credibility may be bestowed upon urban farmers that may not often be attributed to community gardeners. He blew some bubbles and handed me a small bubble container with a peace sticker on it and invited me to the garlic planting the following week. He did not agree to any community-based research at the time, he invited me to a community event,

which I found myself at, standing around in the cold, the following week.

We stand around in the cold and a few women in the crowd of 7 explain that garlic is a crop that is planted in the fall. That this specific garlic was harvested in the summer and saved for this planting, a tradition this group has been doing for some time. We gather around the plotted dirt and plant together with our gloves on. We are on our knees in the dirt, very close to one another, some of us nervously laughing about the cold as we reach for holes to bury our white bulbs. We finish up quickly as folks are starting to move around briskly, to stay warm. Luther gives a short explanation of the garden site and welcomes all who are there this day. A middle-aged Hmong couple pull out sandwiches they have brought for a snack to share. We eat standing in a circle in the cold and take a group picture for their Facebook page. I thank them for inviting me and give them my card and promise to email a follow up soon and my friend and I get into my car and leave.

Soon after the garlic planting, I am invited to a series of monthly meetings as well as a monthly reconciliation lunch

group[2] that is affiliated with but not run by the Community Gardens Organization. I go to as many meetings as I can and find myself volunteering to take notes and to help during the upcoming summer 'children's garden' weekly afternoon events. It becomes clear to me that they have relationships with several colleges and universities in some form or another within the past decade. It's at these monthly meetings that I get a sense of how the organization works and the types of conversations that take place among academics and community members in this setting.

Near the beginning of my time with the organization a few group conversations included comments about the history that one institution has with the Rondo neighborhood. At an oval table, in one of Rondo's historic black churches, midafternoon, we lay out the food. Every meeting includes food. We are on the top floor of the church with a wide view of the green garden space just West of the building below. There are six of us discussing the current projects of the garden organization, two academics and four community members. "I would like to continue our relationships with this college, they are working hard to do good in this

---

[2] The reconciliation lunch group is a monthly meeting in Rondo with the purpose to build trusting relationships and discuss topics that are relevant to the neighborhood.

neighborhood. Let's let them do this". There is agreement around the table. A decision has been made about moving forward on a student led project. This student will create a webpage hosted on the site of the institution to highlight the various gardens in the organization.

The tension around this one institution comes up multiple times over the years with this organization. Two elder members disagree about how involved this college should be in their work. I witness Benny an elder Caucasian woman in the group push back on Luther, the African American elder, male, of the group about how this institution might be involved in an upcoming community event. Luther has had a strong relationship, over time, with a key community-oriented staff member at this college and appreciates him and the work he has done for the organization. He wants to credit this young white man, from a college that has, in the past, not honored the community appropriately.

In the past most of the students from this institution, and students from most Universities and Colleges, came into the Rondo neighborhood not understanding racism, structural racism or the history of the Community. In the last 2-3 years they have had Students of Color working in the gardens from these institutions, so they have obviously been embraced.

But, from the perspective of the community, this institution has done little to recognize racism and/or doesn't actively work at overcoming racism. For Luther, he is ready to forgive and let go, to move forward in the relationship building and collaboration. For Benny, this relationship is harder to swallow, and she has more critical feelings, she continues to push back, with critical questions, often, when the subject of this college is brought up.

While a tension exists, to my knowledge, it doesn't include my academic institution, however, I feel the pressure to listen and pay attention to the ways that I can be a good representative of my institution and community-based research in general. Luther, on multiple occasions, uses the meeting as a format to discuss how students need to come and just hang out for a while. My presence was vital at community events, backyard BBQs and events like the annual National Afternoon Out (a safer, kid-friendly alternative to late night parties in this neighborhood). I see him looking at me when he's explaining this, not directly talking to me but talking in a direct way about how this needs to be done. That people in this community need to see me, and often, before they will be willing to participate on a project or talk to me about their experiences. I need to be present and the

timelines and deadlines of a University don't work in this setting. This community of folks are on the harvest calendar, not the semester calendar. I listen and nod and wait.

Eventually, after about eight months of attending meetings and events in the community, a funding source in the form of a University community-based assistantship comes through and as a group we discuss, at length, the purpose and goals of a collaborative measurement project. For Luther, Benny, Sarah, and others in the gardening organization, having numbers of the yield from their community garden plots and backyard gardens (individual 4' x 4' garden boxes in neighborhood backyards) would give them the statistics they need to prove both the social and economic value of their garden work. This data would be helpful for them to apply for further grants and funds to continue the projects and work they want to do.

Getting more people involved in the measurement project was time consuming and difficult on a semester timeline. We used the weekly children's garden as a platform to incorporate measurement in a consistent way throughout the summer. After introductions, then planting, watering, or weeding, there is a lesson, and then time to measure what we harvested that day before a snack and song. The children helped to sort the

raspberries, strawberries, cucumbers, and cherry tomatoes into baskets that we then weighed and documented on a clipboard. The youth loved the scales, pulling them watching them bounce back up, standing up high on a chair to use their strong muscles to hold up the heavy hanging produce. They smiled and yelled out the numbers for their brothers, sisters, cousins, and neighbors to record. We then washed and then distributed the produce for a snack before circling up to sing and say goodbye. Over time we compiled enough data to have the numbers necessary to write a report with meaningful conclusions.

Analysis

The time I spent working with the Community Gardens Organization, both collaboratively designing and executing a formal project, was rewarding and exhausting. The amount of time it took to come to an agreement about where and how to measure took months of meetings. The research team asked the types of questions that Rocheleau and Slocum (1995) argue are vital for successful partnerships. Why were we doing this measurement? Was it necessary? We asked ourselves who should be involved, and whose interests were important to the project. The question about time came up over and over. Given

115

that the research funds were on a semester basis and the harvest timeframe was summer through fall we struggled with whose calendar we should base the project around. This discussion was the closest we explicitly talked about power and the influence of the University's goal oriented, semester-based focus.

Rocheleau and Slocum (1995) argue that both scale of analysis and a plan for how to proceed with methods, sequence and direction are also important to explicitly discuss. The research team did not discuss scale in detail, other than a few short conversations about the decision to use the measurement results to apply for future funding. Methods and process were openly discussed, many times, specifically questions about how to measure the yield. The decision was collaboratively made to offer multiple ways of measuring yield for more inclusivity. This included prelabeled Ziplock bags, quart and pint containers, a scale for weighing, and a guide for measuring with one's hands. The data collection took constant communication with participants, and checking-in. I participated, myself, in the children's garden, community garden clean-up days, and church garden harvest days to make sure everyone involved knew how to use the measurement kits that were created and understood the

instructions we gave. In the end, we had about 80% participation. This turnout was strongly influenced by my constant communication and interaction with the organization and all the research partners. The time it took to plan, execute, and analyze this project was immense. In reflection, however, the research project was merely one aspect of a much larger effort to build relationships. The work itself came after what could be called an extended invitation process to gain legitimacy and feel a sense of belonging in the community.

The initial contact I had with the Community Gardens Organization (CGO) involved an invitation to a community event. After introducing myself as a community engaged researcher, Luther invited me to plant garlic. This initial invitation, while, to some, may seem counterproductive, led to the slow relationships building that was necessary for true collaboration. After the garlic planting, subsequent invitations were sent for other community events, meetings, and potlucks, where I was encouraged to volunteer to help. These opportunities to see and be seen in the community were valuable for cultivating trust. Slowly, I came to feel a sense of belonging at these events, and other community members could come to learn my name and who I was. Trust was built,

over time, nearly a year before any research, through consistent interaction and willingness to participate and do service for the community and the organization. This slow build up of legitimacy and belonging in the gardens is what, I would argue, led to the participatory and collaborative measurement project.

The data show a historical tension the Community Gardens Organization (CGO) has had, with researchers coming in lacking knowledge of structural racism or the history of the neighborhood. This tension was mitigated, in this case, through a lengthy warming-up process. Over time, I heard Luther and other members of the Community Gardens Organization (CGO), speak in detail about the history of the Rondo neighborhood and complex race relations. This time and willingness to listen and recognize the knowledge and experiences of the community did much for creating a sense of reciprocity in legitimacy and in the relationships building process.

Interviews in the Gardens

After years working on collaborative research, measuring harvest yields from the gardens, I requested that key people

involved in the organization and the research project speak with me about the process and their experiences of community engaged research. Many were wiling to speak with me, others were initially wiling but very difficult to schedule a time with. The following quotes are from the in-depth interviews that took place after the collaborative research project had come to an end. These reflections on legitimacy and belonging are important for understanding what does and does not work for building relationships in this context.

SARAH

Sarah is a key member of the Community Gardens Organization (CGO), alongside Luther and Benny. She began working with residents of the Rondo neighborhood initially as a Master Gardener, a program and distinction offered through a local University. She quickly became a key organizer and manager of the organization. For Sarah, an elder white woman, gardener, and resident of St. Paul, the awareness of racism and trauma in the Rondo community has impacted her view of research and who holds the expertise and legitimacy in the community.

> Sarah: Rondo residents are the experts at this. They have been thrown in the face of dominant white conventional society. They need communal community to come together as a front to speak for a lot of people. They've had to do that because of racism and trauma. They straddle white dominant society and black community. They are using this knowledge all the time.

She sees dominant white conventional society as something to straddle in opposition to the black community voice. In this interview and other informal interactions, she has voiced concern about allowing the Rondo residents to speak for themselves, affirming that they already know what this research is going to reveal and wishing that this wasn't the only way for the needs of this community to be legitimized.

At an earlier point in the interview she says, "All the journal articles do is tell us. They don't need anyone to tell them." In this context she is talking about the purpose of academic journal articles and scholarly research. This idea, that the community doesn't need anyone to tell them, is likely based on many conversations this gardening group has had about historical racism and trauma. Her perspective of the black Rondo community has been shaped largely by reconciliation lunch groups and community meetings where these topics are regularly discussed and grappled with. Her opinion is that community knowledge deserves legitimacy and is often not recognized in traditional research.

When asked about traditional academic research, Sarah drew a stark distinction between traditional research values and community engaged research values. She explained that traditional research is something people at the University need to further a career. And for community participants or "subjects", traditional research is a means to an end. In this context, Sarah sees research as a bother. She dislikes surveys and "being studied" and the community she belongs to has a history of being researched without results. Sarah used a recent book she had read, The Henrietta Lacks story[3], as an example of damaging research and drew a comparison to a long-term friend who has been a "subject" of research in this community in the past. For Sarah, traditional research does not go hand in hand with mutually beneficial outcomes. Sarah is arguing here for what Arnstein (1969) calls citizen power, a form of participation in research that includes a redistribution of power and results from that participation.

When shifting the conversation from traditional research to community engaged research, Sarah explains how her experiences with community-based research has changed her

---

[3] Henrietta Lacks was an African-American woman whose cancer cells were unwittingly taken during a biopsy in 1951 and cultured to reproduce. These HeLa cells have been reproducing and will continue to indefinitely for medical research. Neither Henrietta nor the Lacks family was made aware of the use of Henrietta's cells raising questions of consent and privacy in the medical research field (Skloot, 2010).

views on research. For Sarah, at the University, most of the research is formal and intellectual, and science based, but the experience she's had with community-based research has showed her that it can be a different way, it can be people based. Her understanding of research has widened to hold a bigger picture. It can be more people oriented. This people-oriented approach is one defining characteristic of community engaged scholarship; embracing the processes and values of a civil democracy (Bringle and Hatcher 2011), along with the values of the work being reciprocal and mutually beneficial (Fitzgerald et al 2012).

While Sarah feels strongly against traditional research, she regularly participates in community engaged research with several colleges and universities and expresses gratitude for the partnerships and the assistance of graduate students and faculty. This negative view of traditional research isn't isolated to one community member, in many of the interviews there was a tension around community legitimacy in research. This tension was almost always paired with an expression of gratitude for the community engaged partnership work with academics. This tension between being grateful for the assistance and partnership while also fighting for recognition of community expertise and legitimacy speaks to

the complex management of feelings for community members in community engaged research and participatory and collaborative research partnerships.

FARRAH

In a semi private reserved study space in a public library in South Minneapolis I interview Farrah, a community member with a master's degree. Farrah works for a small non-profit who has collaborated closely with the Community Gardens Organization that is the focus of this chapter. She has experience with community engaged research and expresses an "in-between" status. Her experience as a graduate student in the University setting and now as a community member doing engaged research makes her identity feel complex in this research. Halfway through the interview she needs to pump breast milk and asks me if I'm OK continuing while she does so. I say I am. We sit across from each other at a mid-sized table in an empty room with one small window while she pumps, and we discuss the complexities involved in the standards of what she calls "science-based research."

During the interview the topic of education came up in dealing with University members (academics).

Farrah: One problem is (University members) entering a community and not having humility. There is a prolific feeling that more education is better. In community where a not a lot of people have higher education, they think the knowledge someone has is valued more or better. Letters and affiliation, the idea that more education must be better. For those with less (education)- it takes a lot to get them to be valued, seen as relevant, or be heard. When they might have the answers, everyone is looking for. Those are the dynamics, whose knowledge is valued more?

For Farrah this question of whose knowledge has more valued is one for all involved in community engagement to consider. This question is about power and various authors emphasize the importance of looking at power dynamics in participatory projects (Rocheleau and Slocum 1995; Arnstein 1969) For academics, Farrah is asking for humility, to consider status and positionality when entering a community where disparities exist in access to educational opportunities or resources for higher education. Farrah is also posing this question to community; might they be the one with the answers everyone is looking for? The letters and affiliation that she refers to in this quote are what confer legitimacy within an academic world, but outside of the walls of higher education she argues that legitimacy and expertise can and arguably should be more fluid.

When asking Farrah, a community member working in the food and environmental justice field, about engagement with

academics in a community setting she had much to say about what is needed to build relationships to do collaborative work.

> Farrah: Transparency is needed to breakdown professional identities, be people together and support each other regardless of soc status income and education. We all need to be able to relate on some level and figure out how to be people together. One way to do that is to show up at things you're invited to. That's GOLD- a lottery ticket- GO! And be yourself not your profession. With traditional work there are expectations and goals- unsure of which hat to wear, it is always OK to bring yourself to the table. The separation of personas- shed that part of yourself, you're not just painted with one brush stroke. This separation is not helpful when you're building community. This separation is a trained thing it's institutional.

Here Farrah is arguing to pull back the veils of professional identities to be "people together and support each other". This mutual support is a key component of belonging literature. Sarason defines belonging as "the sense that one was part of a readily available, mutually supportive network of relationships" (1974:1). The separation of personas that exists, often in professional academic settings, is not useful and often a hindrance to building relationships and community and finding a sense of belonging in the work and with others.

For Farrah, it is slow going and challenging to create a community and sense of belonging that includes mutually beneficial experiences. Sometimes that looks like doing paperwork or bringing food to a potluck, or volunteering to watch the kids during a community meeting (all things I and many of us have done as a community engaged scholar). Reason argues the process of collaborative work takes a long time. (2006:7). However, according to the literature, the time spent on building relationships is a key to successful participation (Axtell, Zimmer, and Noor 2016). All these non-professional service opportunities are what can lead to the relationship building and a sense of belonging for both the academic and the community members so that collaborative work can be done. "It's not something you can walk in and out of. You need to be immersed, hang laundry, cook dinner, go to places of worship. A lot of researchers are not willing to do these things. They are few and far between". Farrah is here referring to what Weerts and Sandmann (2008) call boundary spanners, crucial individuals willing to show up and (a) listen (b) be of service (c) be competent with their power and (d) practice neutrality. These four aspects of good boundary spanners or academics doing community engaged work is what makes the difference for academics and community

members to feel a sense of belonging in the research (Hutchinson and Huberman 1993).

This value of mutually beneficial outcomes is emphasized here because I would argue that the coming to a place of mutually agreed upon goals and expected outcomes requires a relationship and shared sense of values. Values that both Farrrah and Sarah indicated, like: a people-oriented approach, relationship building, and communication. Rocheleau and Slocum (1995) insist that engaged work, including participatory and collaborative methods involve communication early and often with everyone involved, specifically, communicating openly and respectfully about mutually beneficial outcomes.

NANCY

Nancy, a white female, tenured faculty member, working closely with the Community Gardens Organization (CGO), has been thinking critically about forms of legitimacy and belonging in the community engaged research work she does with numerous community groups. In this quote Nancy is referring to the collaborative measurement project that the

Community Gardens Organization (CGO) worked on with me and several community members and other academics.

> Nancy: We talked about opening the heuristics (being flexible about methods) and that opens up the on ramp to the research. People might end up finding the more established ways that work better but the fact that the project is open to using hands to measure makes folks feel like they can participate. This is a way into research.

For Nancy it is the flexibility of the methods that makes community engaged research a space of participation. In this quote she refers to folks *feeling* like they can participate in the research simply because the group agreed upon opening the measurement to include people's physical hands. For community gardeners, one might argue, holding cherry tomatoes in one's hands is familiar and this relationship with nature and familiar "at home" feeling of picking and holding produce from their gardens was a way into research. For Game, specific places can act as a catalyst for feelings of "coming home" and those feelings may not be tied to specific time and space but connect us to certain childhood experiences, a sacred sense of belonging (Game 2001). Working with one's hands in the garden and using those hands as a part of research, holding produce, may, for some, offer a sense of belonging in the research. Beatley (2004) argues that visceral connections to seasons and nature are grounding factors are essential for

a sense of belonging (Beatley 2004). According to Beatley, the garden space, being in nature, while collecting data, offers for everyone involved, a sense of belonging associated with the measurement and project.

In my own experience, making the decision to use hands in the measurement project was an important and pivotal moment in the process. A space where community members spoke up about what they thought would increase participation, also a moment for the academic collaborators to listen and be open to this suggestion. I found this flexibility in the community engaged methods was an example of shared values in action. In this case the opportunity for everyone to feel comfortable and included with the methods was a shared value around the table. These shared values and the "at home" practice of using one's hands to measure in the garden, is a space for community members to feel a sense of belonging in the research and with the academics involved in this project. It was what Yuval-Davis, Kannabiran and Vieten (2006) call "patterns of trust and confidence", that helped the academics find belonging in the community and for community members to feel a sense of belonging in the project.

Conclusion

The long sordid history of exploiting and harming communities in the name of research has held back generations of community members in the Rondo neighborhood from wanting any relationship with the academics or higher education institutions. However, the efforts of community engaged scholars to show up, help, go slow, and be flexible has gone a long way in helping people feel a sense of belonging with research projects in their communities. The ways that academics, or community engaged scholars talk about this sense of belonging differs. For some, the process of being "invited in" is salient, for others the word embedded helps explain the sense of belonging they feel in the projects and communities. Regardless of the terminology the message is clear that acceptance and inclusion (Crisp 2010) are important on both sides of this equation, and without these aspects of relationship building true collaborative work would not be possible.

For the Community Gardens Organization (CGO), the boundary spanners (Weerts and Sandmann 2008) involved in their various projects have led to some large leaps for the organization. The creation of a website, grant applications, and more exposure, has led to many new opportunities for

funding and collaboration. Since the beginning, the number of gardens affiliated with the organization has multiplied. CGO is working with several academic institutions and have funding to now take on the work they want to do. Capacity has grown and many of the boundary spanners (Weerts and Sandmann 2008), or community engaged academics, are still very much involved in the work of CGO. Relationship building and a sense of belonging are key elements to the success of these collaborations and the growth of the organization.

CHAPTER SIX: Conclusion

This dissertation has analyzed the stories of practitioners of community engagement to understand concepts of legitimacy and belonging. My research objective in this dissertation was to uncover the opportunity that community engagement holds within academia. An opportunity to challenge ideas of dominance and power in knowledge systems, as well as create space for growing collaborations and building relationships beyond traditional academic research practices. It is in this space of expanded awareness and collaborative relationship building where academics and community members voice their struggles over legitimacy and discuss larger concepts of belonging, both in the work and with each other.

Research Objectives

The purpose of this research was to explore the motivations of those who chose engagement in their academic paths, to uncover how engagement enhances the work they are doing academically and to discuss the implications this work has for the individuals involved. The following are the research questions that guided my research process:

Research Question 1:

    1. Given that the tenets of community engagement include a shifting of power to a more democratically shared sense of participation in research, how salient are questions of legitimacy in community engagement?

The data show that questions of legitimacy are incredibly salient to both academics and community members, albeit in different forms. One place, in the data, where legitimacy becomes salient is around community and indigenous knowledge and expertise. In the first case study, the focus of chapter three, the data show a community fighting for legitimacy of their knowledge and expertise from stakeholders that control their resources and make laws that dictate their lives. The second case study data, in chapter four, show a struggle for legitimacy inside of academia. Specifically, how legitimacy and expertise create tension for academics practicing engaged participatory methods within their professions. In chapter five, the third case study demonstrates the legitimacy required of academics for community members to trust, build relationships, and create a sense of belonging in participatory engaged research.

During my many formal and informal interviews and interactions with academics and community member practitioners of engaged research, legitimacy was a concept that came up time and again. Though there were many other themes and patterns that emerged from the data this topic was frequently explicit or implicit in conversations about community engaged research. Legitimacy was more likely than other concepts to show up in nuanced observations with interesting sociological insights incorporating critical thinking and reflexivity. The patterns that emerged from the interviews indicated, to me, that the concept of legitimacy is a cornerstone for understanding how community engaged practitioners comprehend their roles in this democratic process.

Research Question 2:

2. How is shared participation in community engagement associated with a sense of belonging in the work?

Belonging showed up in the data in numerous ways for both community and academics involved in community engaged research. Academics striving for legitimacy from community

members, in order to collaborate, is one space where a sense of belonging became important to this work. In the first case, Phoebe, the American Indian on the Adoptee Project, needed to feel that the researchers coming into her community could belong in her world, and in the struggle of her organization. This type of belonging is more than a sense of identity, it is about being accepted, feeling safe, and trusting that those involved have a stake in the future of the community (Anthias 2006). This type of belonging also showed up in the Community Gardens Organization (CGO) case. For both myself, and other academics involved with CGO, a lengthy process of being invited in and building trust was needed before any collaboration could take place. We needed to belong there, at community events, backyard cookouts, and annual celebrations, before community members would be willing to talk to us about anything, especially research.

A second interesting space, in the data, that belonging was articulated was in the community engaged roundtables discussions. The desire for legitimacy of community engaged practices and values in traditional academia led to engaged scholars articulating what those values and practices are as a group. By distinguishing their methods and values from traditional academic research they were able to articulate

what engaged scholarship belonging looks like as well as what it takes to achieve a dual belonging, both in that work and in a traditional academic profession. This desire for a sense of belonging within academia seemed to also strengthen an ongoing conversation about what belonging to a community of engaged scholars looks like. In an area of study that is continually working to define its practices and values, a conversation about belonging is worthwhile.

Recommendations

What is next in this area of study? I would suggest that more research might be done on democratic practices within higher education. These do not necessarily need to be done around community engagement. I'm curious if the emphasis of shared values and practices in collaborative working spaces leads to a sense of belonging in other contexts. I'm curious if some advising practices or cohort relationship building practices might foster a sense of belonging, especially when these relationships tend to last for years. I would also say that some group-based academic projects likely have the opportunity for a sense of belonging. Whether or not this is true would require further research. In addition, while this research exposed the mechanism of belonging indirectly, the

question was not directly posed to the interviewees; "do you feel a sense of belonging in this work?". Further research is necessary to go deeper into this question of belonging and the optimum conditions for this experience. This research rested much on Long and Perkin's (2003) assertion that belonging is a proxy for understanding community. This assumption might use further scrutiny to test the reliability of this measure.

As for this data specifically, I would recommend further research into the myriad of practices that fall under the community engagement spectrum. Many larger projects oriented toward industry partners outside of academia are also considered community engagement. I question whether projects or work on this end of the spectrum offer the space for building relationships based on shared values and whether a sense of belonging can be found in these projects. The spectrum of community engagement is wide, and this poses a challenge for making arguments about the field. My research is a small slice of this work and all the individuals I interviewed were far to one side of this spectrum working on smaller projects, long term, with an emphasis on shared knowledge. The context of this evidence is likely to be different from the context of data collected from folks doing

community engagement on the other side of the spectrum. This spectrum could use more investigation and explanation, and specifically this argument about belonging in spaces of work could be tested on different points of the spectrum to see if it holds true in different conditions.

Contributions

This dissertation connects to a different perspective on the literature and research around collaborative work. The two primary fields of study that this work has drawn upon are the legitimacy and belonging for an understanding of the fundamental principles that underscore the practice of community engaged scholarship.

My hope is that this research supports the literature that highlights how the community engaged approach to research involves a straddling of two very different knowledge systems. The traditional western scientific knowledge system has a clearly defined scientific method and an expertise model that relies on a community of highly educated and trained scholars to contribute to and maintain a body of knowledge on an elite level. This knowledge is protected by the expertise and tremendous resources necessary

to achieve an advanced degree and be allowed to contribute to the pool of information. The community engagement knowledge system on the other hand acknowledges a multitude of types of knowledge, from indigenous knowledge to community knowledge, the basic principle is that individuals through lived experience and generational history have a deep understanding and expertise of their social worlds. The knowledge in this model is less protective, less elite, and truthfully less clearly defined. The opening that this knowledge system offers is both an opportunity for expansion as well as a challenge for holding the edges of a pool of knowledge and information that has very few boundaries. To straddle these two very different knowledge systems is difficult.

The connections that this work has to these the literature is a support of those who have articulated this contradiction and holding that these two approaches can both be true and exist simultaneously. The ability to hold two truths simultaneously is important in both academic and community settings. This practice in non-binary thinking might lead to more creative thinking and deeper collaborations. By contradicting the existing model of the scientific method or western truth within academia this work proposes a challenge to reimagine the purpose of higher

education and its democratic principles. By combining these literatures my work expands on an opportunity and possibility for something new. This work shows how community engaged research may help hold the University accountable to its public service and engagement goals and purpose. For both academic and non-academic communities to see that their specific knowledge and expertise is valuable across institutional and community boundaries broadens the space and opportunities for legitimacy and belonging.

The more specific literature that that this work speaks to and ultimately contributes to are the literatures on legitimacy and belonging. From the background research I have done on legitimacy there is very little if any work written on how legitimacy can act as a bridge between. In this dissertation I have found that the common desire for legitimacy has allowed similarities to be drawn where differences are rooted. Seeing the desire for legitimacy as a mechanism for understanding difference and similarity is interesting and is a worthwhile contribution to the literature. It is worth asking questions about how legitimacy can take on different forms for different people and how those different types of legitimacy can be happening simultaneously. Using the common struggle for legitimacy as

a mechanism for recognizing similarities amongst difference is important, especially during the current divisive political climate. Seeing one's struggle in another, despite its forms or specifics, opens a space for compassion and understanding for others and oneself that is vital for a productive collaborative environment. Potential limitations to these questions and thoughts about legitimacy is the lack of research outside of the academic community engaged research setting. It is not clear that this mechanism works the same in different settings.

The belonging literature is both extensive and comprehensive, and this thesis connects to and contributes to that body of work as well. The literature about inclusivity within higher education tends to address the barriers that nonwhite cis males face by the prevailing systems and social practices in higher education (Ndlovu 2014). In being "outsiders, within" (Collins 1986) those marginalized by the system have a unique vantage point to identify dominant racist, classist, sexist hegemony (hooks 1984). The focus of these works is about addressing the inequalities and both internal and external exclusion (Ndlovu 2014). My work addresses and makes connections to the possibility of belonging in these spaces of higher education. The spaces of

belonging in this work are both inside and outside of the walls of academia, yet this community engaged academic work is slowly becoming more legitimized within institutions of higher learning. Despite its lack of representation in the work around higher education and academia the question of belonging is quite important. It's worth asking where and how belonging exists, because, fundamentally, it is about social order, society, and a functioning social world. The question of belonging might arguably be the corner stone for most other sociological inquiry. We should care that in this academic and community engaged setting some are able to find and feel a sense of belonging around shared values and practices. This is important especially in spaces where belonging can be a scarce commodity. One limitation to this is the notion that not everyone may feel a struggle for or a sense of belonging in community engaged work. It is also the case that not every project within the spectrum of community engagement may lead to the shared values and practices that increase the likelihood of a sense of belonging.

Reimagining the University is important given the critiques and concerns that higher education is facing right now. How is it relevant? How can it expand? How can it rethink what knowledge is, who produces it and what it is for? These

questions are relevant for people who care about funding to do research. These questions are relevant for people who want a more just, democratic University, and society. These questions are relevant for people who want to feel more purpose. Reimagining the University, in the context of community engagement is closely related to questions of democracy. Asking questions like: how can the University be a more democratic place? How can research practices, and values, become more democratic? How can it improve? These are all useful for a higher education system that is founded on democratic principles.

Reflections

The challenges and opportunities that engaged scholarship present are undoubtedly unique within the traditional academic world, working collaboratively with community members outside of the academic walls is quite different from working alone or in teams of other academics on research or large funded projects. While this difference in method is apparent, I would like to offer the idea that the democratic potential and opportunity for finding belonging in spaces of work is not unique or special to community engaged scholarship. While the conditions may

present rich opportunities for research to grow into relationships based on shared values, and practices, and foster a sense of belonging, I do not argue that this approach is the only avenue to these experiences. Collaboration works on many levels and in many ways within academia and I believe that there are spaces where a sense of belonging can and does exist without non-academic community engagement.

Where we are coming from matters significantly in the work that we do, especially when working with others. The training, socialization, and culture we have steeped in strongly influences our understandings of the social world. How we understand what research is and who it is for and the purpose or desired impact can be so different. These differences do not need to be comparisons as there is value in all. The specific value of community engaged research in our current academic world is an opening up, a rethinking of the purpose of the work, to add layers to the expected or intended outcomes. Building relationships is not the "job" but it is the work that is happening for many community engaged scholars in this field. These relationships are vital for building trust in each other and the work and for leveling the playing field to include the knowledge and expertise of all in a collaborative project.

To find that the community members and academics I interviewed are all seeking legitimacy, albeit from different entities and in different forms, is an important space of connection. The legitimacy we all hold is valid and important and the belonging we seek for that knowledge and skill set is a common desire. These connections are available through the process of building relationships with others, working together, and working toward shared values. This is what makes a community and leads to a sense of belonging with one another and in spaces of work.

It is not all that surprising to find my own story so clearly articulated in this work. My need for belonging was so strong as a young academic entering graduate school. I felt lost and lacking in the space to build relationships in a professional setting. The need for clear and direct communication about shared values was so powerful that I found myself spending less time in the department and more time in the gardens. I wanted to feel a sense of connection and community and the garden space offered that opportunity to me. It was not clear to me at the time that belonging was what I was seeking but looking back now I see that I found belonging in the work and with the folks I was spending my time with. My own sense of legitimacy was fragile and being with others who struggled for their own expertise to be

acknowledged and valued was healing for me. My initial urgency to write about this approach as *the answer* to the troubles of academia melted away to a certainty, rooted in the data and stories of numerous others doing this work, that it is not the *answer* but merely one approach that offers, to some, the opportunity to rethink the framework of traditional western science and research and open up the boundaries of knowledge and expertise to find spaces where we can work collaboratively together. The literature shows a wider scope of actors playing a role in the tasks and problems of society (Eyal 2013). The idea that a wider array of individuals and knowledge can and should be brought to problems of society is applicable to and challenges some of the big assumptions of power and the process of knowledge production in academia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, Andrew. 1988. *The System of Professions: An Essay on The Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Akena, Francis Adyanga. 2012. "Critical Analysis of the Production of Western Knowledge and Its Implications for Indigenous Knowledge and Decolonization". *Journal of Black Studies*. 43(6): 599-619.

Alvares, Claude. 1992. "Science" in *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, ed. Wolfgang Sachs, 243-259. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Zed.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. 2002. *Stepping forward as stewards of place*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Ang, Ien. 2006. "From Cultural Studies to Cultural Research: Engaged Scholarship in the 21st Century". *Cultural Studies Review*. 12(2): 183-197.

Arnstein, Sherry R. 1969. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation". *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. 35(4): 216-224.

Austin, Ann E. 2002. "Preparing the Next Generation of Faculty: Graduate School as Socialization to the Academic Career". *The Journal of Higher Education*. 73(1): 94-122.

Barge, J. Kevin. 2006. "Dialogue, conflict, and community" in T*he Handbook of Conflict Management*, eds. John G. Oetzel and Stella Ting-Toomey, 517-544. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Beatley, Timothy. 2004. *Native to Nowhere: Sustaining Home and Community in a Global Age*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Becker, Howard, and Helmut Otto Dahlke. 1941. "Max Scheler's Sociology of Knowledge". *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. 2(3): 310-322.

Bender, Thomas H. 1978. *Community and Social Change in America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality; a Treatise in the Sociology of*

Knowledge. 1st ed. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Bonnen, James T. and David B. Schweikhardt. 1998. "The Future of U.S. Agricultural Policy: Reflections on the Disappearance of the "Farm Problem"". *Review of Agricultural Economics*. 20(1): 2-36.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. "Social Space and Symbolic Power" in *Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

----. 1991 (1982). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: The Priorities of the Professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bringle, Robert. G. and Julie A. Hatcher. 2011. "Implementing Service Learning in Higher Education". *The Journal of Higher Education.* 67(2): 221-239.

Bringle, Robert G., Games, Richard and Edward A. Malloy. 1999. "Colleges and Universities as Citizens: Issues and Perspectives" in *Colleges and Universities as Citizens,* eds. Bringle, Robert G., Games, Richard and Edward A. Malloy, 1-16. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Burawoy, Michael. 1991. "Introduction" in *Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis,* ed. Burawoy, Michael, 1-8. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Callon, Michel. 2007. "An Essay on the Growing Contribution of Economic Markets to the Proliferation of the Social". 24(7-8): 139-163.

Cash, David W., Clark, William C., Alcock, Frank, Dickson, Nancy M., Eckley, Noelle, Guston, David H., Jäger, Jill, and Ronald B. Mitchell. 2003. "Knowledge systems for sustainable development". *PNAS.* 100(14): 8086-8091.

Choudry, Aziz and Dip Kapoor. 2010. "Introduction" in *Learning from the Ground up: Global Perspectives on Social Movements and Knowledge Production*, eds. Choudry, Aziz and Dip Kapoor, 1-12. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Clay, David. 2016. "Civil Rights Activist Reflects on Research" in *People's Knowledge and Participatory Action Research: Escaping the white-walled labyrinth,* eds. People's Knowledge Editorial Collective. Warwickshire, UK: Practical Action Publishing.

Colby, Anne, Ehrlich, Thomas, Beaumont, Elizabeth, Rosner, Jennifer and Jason Stephens. 2000. "Introduction" in *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education.* ed. Ehrlich, Thomas, xxii-xliii. Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx Press.

Coleman, James. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital". *American Journal of Sociology.* 94: 95-120.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1986. "Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought". *Social Problems.* 33(6): 14-32.

----. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment.* New York: Routledge.

Collins, Harry and Robert Evans. 2008. *Rethinking Expertise.*
Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Council for Support and Advancement of Education. 2007. "Institution-Wide Branding Programs: University of Minnesota - Grand Gold Medal". Retrieved from: https://www.case.org/Awards/Circle of Excellence/About CO E/Previous Winners/2007 Winners/37 University of Minnesot a 2007 Grand Gold Abstract.html

Crisp, Beth R. 2010. "Belonging, Connectedness and Social Exclusion". *Journal of Social Inclusion.* 1(2): 123-132.

Dempsey, Sarah E. 2010. "Critiquing Community Engagement". *Management Communication Quarterly.* 24(3): 359-390.

Durkheim, Emile. 2012 [1893]. *The Division of Labor in Society.* Eastford, CT: Martino Fine Books.

Eyal, Gil. 2013. "For a Sociology of Expertise: The Social Origins of the Autism Epidemic". *American Journal of Sociology.* 118(4): 863-907.

Fairbanks, Evelyn. 1990. *The Days of Rondo.* Minnesota:

Minnesota Historical Society Press.

Fischer, Frank. 2000. *Citizens, Experts, and the Environment: The Politics of Local Knowledge*. Durham: Duke UP.

Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, Michel. 1986. "Of Other Spaces". *Diacritics* 16(1): 22-7.

Foucault, Michel. 1992. "Society Must Be Defended" in *Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976.* London: Picador.

Fusch, Patricia and Lawrence Ness. 2015. "Are We There Yet? Data Saturation in Qualitative Research". *The Qualitative Report*. 20(9): 1408-1416.

Game, Ann. 2001. "Belonging: Experience in Sacred Time and Space" in *Timespace: Geographies of Temporality*, ed. Nigel Thrift. London: Routledge.

Gans, Herbert. 1968. "The Participant-Observer as a Human Being: Observations on the Personal Aspects of Field Work" in *Intuitions and the Person*, eds. Becker, Howard, Geer, Blanche, Riesman, David and Robert Weiss, 330-317. Chicago: Aldine.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Gelmon, Sherril B., Holland, Barbara A., Seifer, Sarena D., Shinnamon, Anu and Kari Connors. 1998. "Community-University Partnerships for Mutual Learning". *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. 5(1): 97-107.

Gerard, Delanty. 1941. "The Sociology of Knowledge and the Problem of Truth". *Journal of the History of Ideas*. 2: 110-115.

Gibson, Cynthia M. 2012. "New Times Demand New Scholarship: Research Universities and Civic Engagement: A Leadership Agenda". *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*. 16(4): 235-269.

Gifford, Sandra M. and Raelene Wilding. 2013. "Digital Escapes? ICTs, Settlement and Belonging among Karen Youth in Melbourne, Australia". *Journal of Refugee Studies*. 26(4): 558- 575.

Gowan, Teresa. 2010. *Hobos, Hustlers, and Backsliders: Homeless in San Francisco.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Hall, Budd L. 1997, October 15-17. *Looking Back, Looking Forward: Reflections on the origins of the International Participatory Research Network, and the Participatory Research Group in Toronto, Canada*. Paper presented at the Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult Continuing Education. Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Hannan, Michael T. and Glen R Carroll. 1992. *Dynamics of Organizational Populations: Density, Legitimation and Competition*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Haraway, Donna J. 2008. *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Harding, Sandra. 1986. *The Science Question in Feminism.* Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.

hooks, bell. 1984. *Feminist Theory, from Margin to Center.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

Hollander, Elizabeth L. and John Saltmarsh. 2000. "The Engaged University". *Academe.* 86(4): 29-32.

Hughes, Terence P. 1994. "Catastrophes, Phase Shifts, and Large-Scale Degradation of a Caribbean Coral Reef". Science. 265(5178): 1547-1551.

Innes, Judith E. and David E. Booher. 2005. "Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century". *Planning Theory and Practice.* 5(4): 419-436.

Israel, Barbara A., Schulz, Amy J., Parker, Edith A. and Adam B Becker. 1998. "Review of Community-Based Research: Assessing Partnership Approaches to Improve Public Health". *Annual Review of Public Health*. 19: 173-202.

Jaeger, Audrey J., Sandmann, Lorilee R., and Jihyun Kim. 2011. "Advising Graduate Students Doing Community-Engaged

Dissertation Research: The Advisor-Advisee Relationship". *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*. 15(4): 5-25.

Jaeger, Audrey J., Jameson, Jessica Katz, and Patti Clayton. 2012. "Institutionalization of Community-Engaged Scholarship at Institutions that are Both Land-Grant and Research Universities". *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*. 16(1): 149-168.

Jaeger, Audrey J., Tuchmayer, Jeremey B., and Shauna M Morin. 2014. "The Engaged Dissertation: Exploring Trends in Doctoral Student Research". *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*. 18(4): 71-96.

Johnson, Cathryn, Dowd, Timothy J., and Cecilia L Ridgeway. 2006. "Legitimacy as Social Process". *Annual Review of Sociology*. 32: 53-78.

Jørgensen, Anja. 2010. "The Sense of Belonging in New Urban Zones of Transition". *Current Sociology.* 58(1): 3-23.

Joseph, Miranda. 2002. *Against the Romance of Community.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Press.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1972. *Commitment and Community: Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Keller, Suzanne. 2003. *Community*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kincheloe, Joe L. 2006. "Critical Ontology and Indigenous Ways of Being: Forging a Post-Colonial Curriculum", in *Curriculum as Cultural Practice,* ed. Kanu, Yatta, 181-202. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Latour, Bruno. 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Lofland, John and Lyn H. Lofland. 1984. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis, 2nd Edition.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Inc.

Longino, Helen E. 1990. *Science as Social Knowledge: Values and Objectivity in Scientific Inquiry.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lorenzini, Daniele. 2015. "What is a 'Regime of Truth'?". *Le Foucaldien*. 1(1): 1-5.

Luhmann, Niklas. 2013. *Theory of Society, Volume 2.* Stanford University Press: Palo Alto.

Marx, Karl. 1867. Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie. Berlin: Verlag von Otto Meisner.

Mason, Mark. 2010. "Sample Size and Saturation in PhD Studies Using Qualitative Interviews". *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research.* 11(3).

Mathew, Biju. 2010. "Conversations on the M60: Knowledge Production through Collective Ethnographies" in *Learning from the Ground up: Global Perspectives on Social Movements and Knowledge Production*, eds. Choudry, Aziz, and Dip. Kapoor, 157-171. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mannheim, Karl. 1985. *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to Sociology of Knowledge.* San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Méndez, V. Ernesto, Caswell, Martha, Gliessman, Stephen R. and Roseann Cohen. 2017. "Integrating Agroecology and Participatory Action Research (PAR): Lessons from Central America". *Sustainability.* 9(705): 1-19.

Meyer, John W. and W. Richard Scott. 1983. *Organizational Environments: Ritual and Rationality.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Millerson, Geoffrey. 1964. *The Qualifying Associations: A Study in Professionalization.* London, UK: Routledge.

Minkler, Meredith and Nina Wallerstein (Eds.). 2008. "Chapter 1: Introduction to Community-Based Participatory Research", in *Community-Based Participatory Research for Health: From Process to Outcomes, 2nd Edition.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Navajo Times, 2014. "Lost Children of the Indian Adoption Projects". https://splitfeathers.blogspot.com/ Accessed May 2018.

NERCHE. "Definition of Engaged Scholarship" http://www.nerche.org/index.php?option=com content&view=art icle&id=265&catid. Accessed Dec. 2017.

Ndlovu, N.S. 2014. "Turning Adversity into Opportunity: A Black Woman's Journey into Academia: Part 2: Being and Belonging in South African Higher Education: The Voices of Black Women Academics". *South African Journal of Higher Education*. 28(6): 2041-2051.

Office for Public Engagement, University of Minnesota website: https://engagement.umn.edu/ Accessed May 2018.

O'Meara, KerryAnn. 2007. "Graduate Education and Civic Engagement". NERCHE Brief. 20: 1-8. Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education. Website: http://scholarworks.umb.edu/nerche pubs/44

Parsons, Talcott. 1939. "The Professions and Social Structure".
Social Forces. 17(4): 457–467.

Pearce, W. Barnett and Kimberly A. Pearce. 2000. "Extending the Theory of Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) Through a Community Dialogue Process". *Communication Theory*. 10(4): 405-423.

Pulliam, John D. and James J. Van Patten. 1995. *History of Education in America.* 6th ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Merrill.

Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster. Reason, Peter. 2006. "Choice and Quality in Action Research Practice". *Journal of Management Inquiry*. 15(2): 187–203.

Ramaley, Judith. 2000. "Embracing Civic Responsibility".
Higher Education. 2000(110): 75-88.

Roper, Carolyn D. and Marilyn A. Hirth. 2005. "A History of Change in the Third Mission of Higher Education: The Evolution of One-way Service to Interactive Engagement". *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement.* 10(3): 3-21.

Saltmarsh, John. 2005. "The Civic Promise of Service Learning". *Liberal Education*. 91:50-55.

Saltmarsh, John and Amy Driscoll. 2015. "Carnegie Selects Colleges and Universities for 2015 Community Engagement Classification." https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/newsroom/news-releases/carnegie-selects-colleges-universities-2015-community-engagement-classification/. Retrieved December 30, 2018.

Sarason, Seymour B. 1974. T*he Psychological Sense of Community: Prospects for a Community Psychology*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shiva, Vandana. 1992. "Resources" in *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, ed. Wolfgang Sachs, 206-218. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Zed.

Simmel, Georg. 1976 [1903]. "The Metropolis and Mental Life" in *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. New York: Free Press.

Skloot, Rebecca. 2010. *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks.* New York, NY: Crown Publishing Group.

Rocheleau, Dianne and Rachel Slocum. 1995. "Participation in Context: Key Questions", in *Power, Process and Participation: Tools for Change,* eds. Slocum, Rachel, Wichart, Lori, Rocheleau, Dianne, and Barbara Thomas-Slayter, 7-30. United Kingdom: Practical Action.

Smalkoski, Kari, Axtell, Sara, Zimmer, Jeanne, and Ibrahim Noor. 2016. "One Size Does Not Fit All: Effective Community-Engaged Outreach Practices with Immigrant Communities". *Journal of Extension.* 54(4): 1-3.

Sprout, Herbert. 1954. *Science and Social Action*. London, UK: Watts.

Stanton, Timothy K. 2008. "New Times Demand New Scholarship: Opportunities and Challenges for Civic Engagement at Research Universities". *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice.* 3(1): 19-42.

Suchman, Mark C. 1995. "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches". *Academy of Management Review.* 20: 571–610.

People's Knowledge Editorial Collective. 2016. "Introduction" in *People's Knowledge and Participatory Action Research:*

Escaping the white-walled labyrinth, eds. People's Knowledge Editorial Collective. Warwickshire, UK: Practical Action Publishing.

Thompson, Gordon and Wayne Lamble. 2000. "Reconceptualizing University Extension and Public Service". *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education.* 26(1): 51-95.

Tönnies, Ferdinand and Charles Loomis. 1964 [1887]. *Community and Society: Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Wacquant, Loic. 2002. "Scrutinizing the Street: Poverty, Morality, and the Pitfalls of Urban Ethnography". *American Journal of Sociology.* 107(6): 1468-1532.

Walker, Henry A. 2004. "Beyond Power and Domination: Legitimacy and Formal Organizations", in *Legitimacy Processes in Organizations (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 22)*, ed. Johnson, Cathryn, 239-271. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Walker, Henry A. and John D. McCarthy. 2004. "Legitimacy, Strategy, and Resources in the Survival of Community-Based Organizations". *Social Problems.* 57(3): 315-340.

Wallerstein, Nina B. and Bonnie Duran. 2003. "The Conceptual, Historical, and Practice Roots of Community-Based Participatory Research and Related Participatory Traditions" in *Community-Based Participatory Research for Health*, eds. Minkler, Meredith and Nina Wallerstein, 27-52. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weber, Max. 1968. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology.* New York: Bedminster.

Weber Max. 1978 [1924]. *Economy and Society, Vols. I and II,* eds. Roth, Guenther and Claus Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weerts, David J. and Lorilee R. Sandmann. 2008. "Building a Two-Way Street: Challenges and Opportunities for Community Engagement at Research Universities". *The Review of Higher Education.* 32(1):73-106.

Wilensky, Harold L. 1964. "The Professionalization of Everyone?". *American Journal of Sociology.* 70(2): 137-158.

Yuval-Davis, Nira, Kannabiran, Kalpana and Ulrike M. Vieten (Eds.). 2006. *The Situated Politics of Belonging.* London: Sage Publications.

Zelditch, Morris Jr. 2001. "Theories of Legitimacy" in *The Psychology of Legitimacy: Emerging Perspectives on Ideology, Justice, and Intergroup Relations*, eds. Major, Brenda and John Jost, 33-53. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Zoller, Heather M. 2000. "A Place You Haven't Visited Before": Creating the Conditions for Community Dialogue". *Southern Communication Journal*. 65: 191-207.

APPENDIX

PRELIMINARY INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

<u>For Community Members</u>
I. Demographic questions
Name
Age
Gender
Role in the community

II. Questions about what research means:

My experience and understanding of research only came about as a student at the University of Minnesota. Before I started studying there, I really didn't understand what research was, its purpose or who did research. Can you tell me about your first experiences with research? How did you come to learn what research is, its purpose and who does research? Has that understanding of research changed over time?

My understanding is that research is a spectrum of systematic information gathering. We are all researchers, from a google search to a professor at the University doing a highly funded long-term research project we are all collecting information and using it to make decisions. How do you systematically gather data in your everyday life? What other experiences with research have you had?

Usually research is done by collecting information to help make decisions. Those decisions could be about many different things, from how information should be used for education, the decision could be about making a purchase, or research could be used to make a decision about changing a law. What types of decisions are most relevant to you and in your community that collecting information would help you or your community make?

There are a lot of different ways to know things. University ways of knowing things often come from doing research. Because knowledge is powerful and those in powerful positions get to make decisions, I have become more aware of the importance of community knowledge, indigenous knowledge and citizen knowledge. Can you talk about the different ways you've come to know things and how that may have changed over time? How has the community you live in produced knowledge?
IV. Questions about building trusting relationships:

Being part of the University but also a lifelong resident of Northeast Minneapolis I feel conflicted about the type of research I do. I've become very interested in community-based research that engages the community. How do you feel about the University and its efforts to do research with communities? Do you have any personal experiences that you can share about research with a University?

Doing research and being in a position of power at the University traditionally means that it is me who decides what gets researched and how. Do you have any experiences of being in power of making a decision that affects other people's lives? How did you make that decision? Did you ask for input from those that were directly affected and share the power? Did you ever change your mind about a decision after listening to those impacted by that decision?

I've found that doing research with communities takes time. Walking together over time and building trusting relationships is important for me to come to understand how the research will benefit the community long term. What does building a trusting relationship look like to you? How do you feel about prolonged relationships with University folks? How can this be done in a way that creates meaningful benefits for both from the shared work? Are there any constraints for you in prolonged research relationships?

In many cases the western scientific model sees communities as the glass-half-empty, looking for and focusing on the problems and trying to solve those problems. I'm more interested in community assets, wealth in communities that can be built upon. As a community researcher how have you come to understand which questions to focus on?

Keeping in mind the spectrum of research (gathering systematic data) what personal experiences do you have doing research that looks at the glass half full? What personal experiences do you have of doing research that looks at the glass half-empty? What assets does your community have that could be built upon? What are the glass-half-full stories that we can build on over time?

V. Concluding Questions
Are there other questions or issues that you would like to discuss?

I. Demographic questions
Name
Age
Gender
Role at the university

II. Questions about what research means:

My experience and understanding of research only came about as a student at the University of Minnesota. Before I started studying at the UofM I really didn't understand what research was, its purpose or who did research. Can you tell me about your first experiences with research? How did you come to learn what research is, its purpose and who does research? Has that understanding of research changed over time?

My understanding is that research is a spectrum of systematic information gathering. From a google search to a highly funded longitudinal research project we are collecting information and using it to make decisions. How do you systematically gather data in your everyday life? What experiences with research have you had across the spectrum?

Usually research is done by collecting information to help make decisions. Those decisions could be about many different things, from deciding how information should be used for education, the decision could be about making a purchase, or research could be used to make a decision about changing a law. What types of decisions are most relevant to you and the University? How does the systematic collection of information help you or the University make decisions?

There are a lot of different ways to know things. University ways of knowing things often come from doing research. Because knowledge is powerful and those in powerful positions get to make decisions, I have become more aware of the importance of community knowledge, indigenous knowledge and citizen knowledge. Can you talk about the different ways you've come to know things and how that may have changed over time? How has your role in the University allowed you to produce knowledge? Can you tell me about the differences you see between academic knowledge production and other ways of knowing things?

IV. Questions about building trusting relationships:

Being part of the University but also a lifelong resident of Northeast Minneapolis I feel conflicted about the type of research I do. I've become very interested in community-based research that engages the community. How do you feel about the University and its efforts to do research with communities? What personal experiences doing research with communities can you share?

Doing research and being in a position of power at the University traditionally means that I get to decide what gets researched and how. Do you have any experiences of being in power of making a decision that affects other people's lives? How did you make that decision? Did you ask for input from those that were directly affected and share the power? Did you ever change your mind about a decision after listening to those impacted by that decision?

I've found that doing research with communities takes time. Walking together over time and building trusting relationships is important for me to come to understand how the research will benefit the community long term. What does building a trusting relationship look like to you? How do you feel about prolonged research relationships with community folks? How can this be done in a way that creates meaningful benefits for both from the shared work? Are there any constraints for you in prolonged research relationships?

In many cases the western scientific model sees communities as the glass-half-empty, looking for and focusing on the problems and trying to solve those problems. I'm more interested in community assets, wealth in communities that can be built upon. As a university researcher how have you come to understand which questions to focus on? What personal experiences do you have doing research that looks at the glass half full? What personal experiences do you have of doing research that looks at the glass half-empty?

V. Concluding Questions
Are there other questions or issues that you would like to discuss?