

Mount Saint Vincent University

From the Selected Works of Anthony A. Davis Dr,

2007

‘Where’s the Fisk in the Fiskebollen?’
Community-University Research Alliances - the
Case of Social Research for Sustainable Fisheries
and empowerment through research

Anthony A. Davis, Dr., *Mount Saint Vincent University*



Available at: https://works.bepress.com/anthony_davis/12/

***‘Where’s the Fisk in the Fiskebollen?’ Community-University
Research Alliances - the Case of Social Research for
Sustainable Fisheries and empowerment through research’****

Anthony Davis
Director
Social Research for Sustainable Fisheries
and
Associate Vice-President (Research)
Mount Saint Vincent University
166 Bedford Highway
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3M 2J6

[published in *I disiplinenes grensland’* Torill Nyseth, S. Jentoft, A. Forde, and J.O. Baerenholt, eds., Bergen (Norway):, Fagbokforlaget, pp. 128-143, 2007.]

c 2006

* The Social Research for Sustainable Fisheries (SRSF) Community-University Research Alliance (CURA) was supported from its inception in 1999 until December 2005 by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, CURA Program, grants (#s 833-99-1012 and 833-2002-2000), Fisheries and Oceans Canada Science and Technology Horizons Internships, and a couple of Fisheries and Oceans Canada Science Subvention research grants. SRSF is a partnership of Northeastern Nova Scotian Mi’kmaq, non-native marine harvester organizations, and university researchers. The work and experiences of this partnership have contributed mightily to the author’s understandings and perspectives. Yet, the description and analysis contained herein are attributable only to the author. All correspondence respecting this paper should be directed to: anthony.davis@msvu.ca

Abstract

This essay demonstrates the interdisciplinary methodology underscoring a multilevel research collaboration titled: 'Social Research for Sustainable Fisheries (SRSF)'. Sited in Northeastern Nova Scotia, this Community-University Research Alliance was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. SRSF researchers crafted a unique partnership with two fish harvester organizations, and a Mi'kmaq organization. This paper also highlights key issues concerning multilevel (individual, organizational and governmental) action and interdisciplinary research initiatives. Among these are the ways and means for negotiating and reconciling conflicting agendas, the meaning and substance of local empowerment, and the need for an outcomes commitment that moves beyond rhetorics of good intentions.

Key Words: community-university social research partnerships

Introductory Remarks

The complexity of many conditions and processes has led to the conclusion that something other than narrow and reductionist research practices are requisite in order to realise the sophisticated, holistic knowledge and understandings necessary for effective human action (Lawrence and Despres 2004, Max-Neef 2005). Documenting and understanding climate change is but one example of the challenges of complexity. Arguably, most matters concerning human socio-economic, cultural, political, and psychological-emotional conditions embody similar ‘complexity challenges’. Recognizing the inability of single research disciplines and their particularistic and inductive modes of inquiry to meet these challenges, over the last thirty years or so a growing body of opinion and research mobilization champions the necessity for interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research (Futures 2004, Max-Neef 2005, Rapport 1997).

Considerable debate continues to attend the precise meanings of these terms (Balsiger 2004, Lawrence and Despres 2004: 400, Max-Neef 2005). None the less, broad agreement exists on the necessity of engaging research processes that begin with, at a minimum, the inclusion and integration of the widest range possible of pertinent research knowledge, practices and understandings (Horlick-Jones and Sime 2004; Klein 2004; and Max-Neef 2005). For many, this includes the knowledge, practices, and understandings of the public, ranging from those of particular ‘communities of interest’, through politicians and policy makers, to the general public. These forms of knowledge, practice and understandings, while substantially different than those of the academic research disciplines, are argued to embody and express critical attributes that must be centrally situated within interdisciplinary and, especially, transdisciplinary practice (Max-Neef 2005). The advent of several recent research funding programs emphasize the importance of and expectations respecting multi-level and broadly inclusive interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary research processes. This paper discusses core approaches and key resulting experiences with respect to one Canadian research program, as well as some of the challenges associated with such collaborations.

In February 1999 the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) launched the Community-University Research Alliances (CURAs) Program. From its inception the CURA initiative has been intended to foster and to support ‘action-oriented’ and applied research; that is, research framed and mobilized for the purpose of intersecting with and impacting on ‘real world’ human situations and conditions.¹ The CURA program encourages the formation of CURAs wherein the collaborating community organizations engage as full and equal partners. SSHRC justifies the CURA Program as an innovation necessary for mobilizing university-based social sciences and humanities research know-how as a means for enabling ‘communities of interest’ to meet and address the challenges and impacts of a changing world. CURAs are also considered an effective means to mobilize, in the public interest, know-how that is assayed as largely isolated within the university ‘ivory tower’ and, by implication, in the possession of intellectual elites. The CURA approach is also judged as a means to

access, engage, and integrate non-academic understandings in the creation of new knowledge and research practice.²

Of course, such programs rest on several assumptions. They presume that university-based researchers and scholars are interested in working with ‘communities of interest’. They also presume that ‘communities of interest’ discern some tangible advantage from working with university researchers and scholars. Finally, they assume that these parties are able to work together, and, through the collaboration, actually have something substantial to contribute to broader social understanding and well-being. Quoting the SSHRC CURA Program Description, “SSHRC believes that by working together as equal partners in a research endeavour, universities and community organizations can jointly develop new knowledge and capabilities in key areas, sharpen research priorities, provide new research training opportunities and enhance the ability of social sciences and humanities research to meet the needs of Canadian communities in the midst of change” (www.sshrc.ca/web/apply/program_descriptions/cura_e.asp).

These noble intentions aside, the CURA Program and linked initiatives have been met with some criticism and resistance from Canadian university social scientists and humanists, as well as on the part of some ‘communities of interest’. Some opine that initiatives such as CURA drain resources away from SSHRC’s legislated mandate to “...promote and assist research and scholarship in the social sciences and humanities...” (www.laws.justice.gc.ca/en/S-12/211166.html). Funding for discipline-based research and in support of individual scholars, in this view, is SSHRC’s legislated priority, and programs such the CURAs redirects support to interdisciplinary team activities that, while leaving warm and fuzzy feelings, offer little promise for substantive contributions. Others despair of the CURAs ‘action’ and ‘applied’ requirements, arguing that these must be at best unintended consequences of intellectual pursuits that need to be in their essence unfettered and uninfluenced by the expectations and politics of collaborations with non-academics and other interests. Still others insist that CURAs will require that the research scholarship coin be debased, thereby fundamentally compromising the strengths of discipline-based academic research and scholarship.³

This essay addresses a variety of the substantial, challenging, and concerning issues through my perspective on the story of one CURA – Social Research for Sustainable Fisheries (SRSF) (<http://faculty.msvu.ca/srsf>) and through my experiences as its Director. The tale told here reviews key qualities in SRSF’s formation, dynamics and work. It relates the processes and successes; and, it reviews the conflicts and crises. In short, the essay provides an opportunity to reflect upon the ways and means that university-sited, discipline-based researchers and scholars may intersect meaningfully with ‘communities of interest’.

Additionally, this essay also affords the opportunity to situate SRSF intentions and experiences with respect to broader issues, practices, and potentials regarding current emphasis on and aspirations concerning interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research collaborations. These latter qualities of research collaboration currently receive considerable encouragement within Canada’s research councils programs.⁴ The promise

is that such collaborations will generate knowledge and understandings where the outcomes are much more than simply a sum of individual discipline perspectives and contributions. Community-university researcher collaborations offer another entry point and prospect for interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary processes, assuming community-based experiences, understandings, and approaches are appreciated and engaged as if analogous with a distinctive field of knowledge.

A Reflection on Key Considerations

As a social anthropologist of a certain vintage, my personal formation and relation with the discipline of anthropology have been fundamental in shaping my sense of purpose as a social scientist and my conviction that a scholarly research discipline and practice are made meaningful through their contribution to enriching the human condition. Of course, my formation within anthropology has included a rich appreciation of the discipline's storied and troubled past, a past that includes data-raping peoples, leading entirely destructive so-called 'modernization' experiments, co-optation within imperial state service, and the discipline's internecine struggles to exorcise the past's demons while rediscovering virtue. Anthropologists have been unquestionably implicated in compromising peoples' interests and capacities, while ostensibly engaging with the best intentions and the best interests of people in mind. By way of providing one Canadian example, between the late 1940s and mid 1970s anthropologists made a considerable contribution to aiding in the resettling of coastal Newfoundland and Labrador – closing 307 communities and relocating 4,168 households and 20,656 people – all in the service of modernization (Brox 1972; and Mathews 1976). As the prominent space given research ethics today attests, the discipline of anthropology strives mightily to distance itself from this past, while distilling the lessons learned, and carrying these forward into new, more equitable and just research practices.

From the outset the process of developing community-university research alliances poses a difficult challenge. Perhaps the most important initial challenge is captured in responses to the question: *What is it that discipline-based, university-sited research scholars have to contribute to and that would be useful for 'communities of interest'?* While many university researchers no doubt want to do good and to contribute meaningfully, such intentions, while necessary, are in themselves insufficient. In fact, research collaborations characterized in the main by such intentions run the risk of doing much by way of harm.

In my experience, community organizations and their memberships are rarely interested in the theoretical-conceptual concerns and discourses of discipline-based academics. Moreover, few are willing to be positioned as subjects on whom social experiments and tests are played out. Additionally, many community organizations and their members are justifiably suspicious of research and researchers' motives. It is now widely recognized that *information is power*, and that surrendering information increases vulnerability to those in positions of social and economic determination, including governments. Many have direct personal experience with some sort of research; but, rarely discern any personal benefit or consideration resulting from this experience. For

some, research has become an important means whereby their disempowerment and vulnerabilities are deepened. Compounding this is the common perception that researchers, particularly university researchers, consider themselves as of superior intelligence and motives. While others view university researchers as little more than a group of advantaged elites largely divorced and insulated from reality who use language in a way intended to intimidate, to demean, and to limit access.

Yet, community organizations and their memberships also recognize that collaborating with university-sited researchers delivers sought after and potentially valuable forms of legitimacy, status-credential benefits, and socially valued 'gravitas' that are otherwise generally unavailable. Such qualities are understood to buttress organizational and membership 'voice', particularly in public policy forums and settings where vested interests are expressed and negotiated. In short, finding ways to attract and work with university researchers, from the community organization perspective, offers the promise of substantial benefits. From the organizational and membership perspective the challenge is to find and to engage with researchers in a manner that will reduce the risks and minimize discomfort, while maximizing advantages. Why otherwise engage? Yet, few researchers will simply lend their credentials for use in the interests of community organizations. Trade-offs are negotiated and definitively operational in these arrangements, even where the parties involved may be uncomfortable with or resistant to acknowledging that they have specific interests that addressed within the relationship.

Other challenges characterise discipline-referenced researcher readiness and capacity to engage with community collaborations. Here I am drawing an intentional distinction between academic discipline-based as in the 'traditional' social sciences and humanities and professional studies disciplines often housed within universities such as education, social work, business, law and the like. The latter have a particular practice and, in some cases, expectation of enabling and engaging with 'applied' or 'practical' research, while the former are characterised by more discipline-centric ('disciplinary chauvinist' (Giri 2004)) scholarship values and practices. To begin with, discipline-referenced academic research is oriented ordinarily to the study of questions and issues posed with respect to theoretical and conceptual frameworks. Empirical sites, the subjects, wherein research is targeted are chosen on the basis of their likely 'fit' respecting questions asked and answers sought. Such qualities are compelling for and will attract academic researchers. Yet, tailoring these qualities within community organization collaborations that may offer, at best, an imperfect research 'fit' is difficult, if not impossible. Attempting to do so may mortally compromise the capacity of the resulting research to address substantially the questions of interest. Moreover, the very prospect of investing the time and energy required to negotiate workable conditions in such circumstances is, for many, simply unappealing.

In addition to the 'fit' issue, the academic career reward system, in much of Europe and North America, has yet to value substantially the most likely categories of research outputs to be generated through discipline-referenced research-community collaborations. Tenure and promotion are achieved largely with respect to the quantity and quality of research publications within peer-reviewed journals and academic presses.

The so-called ‘grey literature’ outputs such as research reports, fact sheets, and research communications in popular media are valued, at best, as light weight contributions that will do little if anything to establish scholarly reputations and to generate academically sophisticated knowledge. Yet, these are the very sorts of research outputs most likely to be produced, at least through the initial years, from collaborations such as CURAs. Certainly the career interests of junior rank and untenured researchers are not likely to be well served through participation in CURA-like initiatives. Commentary in the initial performance evaluation report of SSHRC’s CURA Program supports these observations. At the end of the very first bullet within the report’s summary and conclusion the author remarks: “...some early contributions have been made. However, a fairly high proportion of CURAs (about one-third) have not yet yielded significant peer-reviewed research publications” (Kishchuk 2003: 21).

In this respect, it is telling to note that these attributes also underscore core motivations driving discipline-referenced university research. While theoretically framed curiosity guides intellectual pursuits and research activity, likewise career considerations, academic advancement valuation practices, and academic reputation/status dynamics shape choices. In fact, these attributes of the academic researcher’s ‘real world’ are centrally at play in any and all choices respecting research practices and collaborations. The discipline-referenced academic ‘Mother Teresa’ is a rare beast, at least until they become tenured, full professors with little need to reference their research careers with respect to the standard and pervasive valuation and status practices.

In short, both community organizations and academic researchers, while likely sharing general intentions and concerns, are more than likely to bring substantial contrasting and conflicting needs, goals, and orientations to the collaborative process and dynamics. The answers to the query ‘*Where’s the Fiske in the Fiskebollen?*’ in academic scholar-community research partnerships will embody necessarily and unavoidably quite different reference points, conditions, and interests. In my view, directness in and success at taking on this issue right from the outset will determine much of a research partnership’s likelihood of achieving substance and success. Moreover, these outcomes are contingent on clearly identifying and operationalizing what each partner is prepared to bring to the table. From an academic research perspective, university researchers bring knowledge about how to design and conduct research, how to analyse and write up data, and approaches to take in communicating research outcomes – in brief, knowledge generation and knowledge communication. Community organization partners are best positioned to know the key issues that confront their memberships and communities, issues that might benefit from rigorously designed and conducted research. Much of SRSF’s early story concerns identifying these issues and working up the processes necessary to address them.

SRSF’s Genesis

By 1998 the Atlantic Canadian moratorium on fishing the great Northern Cod and the closure or down-sizing of other fisheries had stripped thousands of the basis for their livelihoods, reshaped coastal community inter- and intra-family dynamics, and fueled a

massive out-migration of young men and women. Recovery remains a distant hope. Of course, the present crisis is but the latest catastrophic event in a sequence of resource and economic crises that have swept through Atlantic Canada's fisheries over the last fifty years or so. Many communities' remaining small boat fleets are now able to work only for only three or four months in one or two limited entry and highly regulated fisheries. Once the cornerstone in coastal community life and livelihood, small boat fisheries have been transformed from full-time, multi-species based livelihoods into part-time, specialised activities dependent for their well-being on the abundance of one or two marine resources. In Atlantic Canada that resource is the American lobster.

Understandably, this set of conditions has created a pervasive sense of disruption, vulnerability, and uncertainty among many small boat fishing families and communities. To cap all of this off, the Canada's federal regulatory agency, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO), also instituted dramatically increased license renewal fees, particularly in the lobster fishery. This accumulation of demands and pressures has played off of the fact that many small boat harvesters' associations do not have the capacity to represent their memberships' interests effectively and have little or no political leverage. Consequently, many have been left feeling entirely powerless and victimised. Even the most rosy-eyed optimist would be forgiven for concluding that not much, given the recent developments, offers promise for the future of community-based, small boat fisheries.

This is the broad outline of the situation into which has been mixed the September 1999 Supreme Court of Canada's 'Marshall' decision. The 'Marshall' decision affirmed that the Mi'kmaq had a treaty right to participate in commercial fisheries for the purpose of realising a 'moderate livelihood'. Consequently, the region's commercial fisheries are now required to somehow accommodate the Mi'kmaq as largely new entrants in an environment completely stressed by single-species dependency, social upheaval, and pervasive feelings of vulnerability and powerlessness. For the Mi'kmaq, a First Nation that has been dispossessed from access to primary resource-based livelihoods including fisheries, the Marshall decision represents a key piece in developing the economic foundations essential to realising successful self-governance, to improving social and economic conditions within families and communities, and to further revitalising culture, identity and language.

These attributes provide the broad social and political context within which the community-university alliance – Social Research for Sustainable Fisheries (SRSF) – was launched. The SRSF alliance arose to address several Mi'kmaq and non-native fisheries organisations' stated needs for developing greater research literacy and capacity through the formation of linkages with university-seated expertise. SRSF partners the Gulf Nova Scotia Bonafide Fishermen's Association (GNSBFA), the Guysborough County Inshore Fishermen's Association (GCIFA) and the Paq'tnek Fish and Wildlife Society (PFWS) with an interdisciplinary group of university researchers.

The SRSF collaboration took shape prior to the 'Marshall decision'; but, was launched in January 2000, upon winning three years of SSHRC-CURA funding. As an

alliance, SRSF was governed by a Steering Committee composed of partner organisation and social research representatives. Agendas, work-plans, timetables, and tasks were identified and agreed to through a consensus decision-making process. One of the first substantial outcomes from this process was the development of a *Memorandum of Understanding* (MOU). All SRSF partners were required to sign this document. The MOU details SRSF's goals, governance processes, and the broad outline of partner commitments to one and another as well as to SRSF, particularly respecting the perceived need to affirm operating principles such as transparency, inclusivity, and accountability.

Drafting a *Researcher Protocol* was another early focus and achievement. The SRSF alliance judged it essential that all research affiliated with it be conducted in a manner that assures adherence to ethical procedures and the principles of transparency and accountability. SRSF partners also judged it critical for all researchers supported through and engaged in the alliance's projects to understand their obligations and responsibilities, particularly the need to share all information gathered, to report results in a timely fashion, and to include the SRSF alliance partners in previews of data analyses and presentations of findings before public release and dissemination. The prerogative claim to preview was understood and exercised as a relationship consideration, and was not engaged to censure or otherwise compromise research and intellectual freedoms.

Another signifying early achievement was the design and launch of the SRSF website (<http://faculty.msvu.ca/srsf>). The alliance demonstrated its commitment 'in practice' to its central operating principles by employing the project website as a means through which all SRSF documents are archived and made publicly accessible. As developed, the SRSF website contains copies of documents ranging from Steering Committee minutes, through workshop materials, to research instruments, reports, and publications. The website listserv was established for the purpose of providing a dynamic means through which SRSF's geographically dispersed partners could maintain mutual contact and engagement. These attributes characterise SRSF's commitment to and engagement with a form of governance and conduct that was intent building social research capacity, relationships, and understandings. While there were several bumps in the road, SRSF facilitated successful working relations between the partners as well as initiated a social research capacity-building process that produced results.

The Alliance, from its outset, recognized that a serious-minded commitment to capacity building required that SRSF resources be invested directly and substantially in organizational infrastructure, human resources, and student internships. To these ends, SRSF throughout its SSHRC-CURA funded lifespan paid four-fifths of each of the core organization's Community Research Coordinator's annual salary and employer contributions (\$20,000), covered the full salary of all student interns (usually 2 per organization per year), purchased essential equipment and materials such as PCs, interview tape recorders, software, and reference materials, and assisted with some operating costs such as room rental, telephone/internet charges, and office supplies. In total, approximately three-quarters of SRSF's annual funding was dedicated directly to support partner organization human and technical capacity development and student internships. The university office and infrastructure, provided as an in-kind contribution

by St. Francis Xavier University in Northeastern Nova Scotia, was staffed by the SRSF Project Officer. After SRSF's 1st year, over one-half of the Project Officer's annual salary (\$20,000) was covered through an internship won from within Fisheries and Ocean Canada's Science and Technology Internship Program. This enabled SRSF to support a three year fulltime Research Co-ordinator position, set-up as a post-doctoral fellowship, and, thereafter, almost two years of support for a half-time Senior Research Fellowship position. Of course, all research activities were engaged through a team approach, with each organization's team also participating in each others research design and data gathering activities. SRSF's remaining resources were employed to support these research activities, with organizational and university staff completing all phases of data gathering and participating in all aspects of initial data analyses and write-ups.

SRSF – Form, Focus, and Substance

SRSF's central purpose has been to build community-university capacity and linkages through interdisciplinary research workshops and social research projects. The workshops enabled university researchers drawn from a variety of disciplines and traditions to engage community organisation staff and student interns in a review of specific 'real world' research design and methodological attributes and issues. The emphasis, from the outset, was on asking researchers to employ 'Plain English' and forthrightness in explaining attributes of research designs and methodologies, as well as in relating the strengths and weaknesses of various approaches to conducting social research and in discussing their own experiences in terms of what worked and what did not work. Additional research workshops were organised and run by SRSF staff and others on topics ranging from proposal writing, through working with particular software packages and statistical analyses, to preparing and presenting researched information in a variety of documentary forms.

SRSF employed workshop-based learning as a key means to build community organization staff and student intern research literacy and know-how. Most commonly, this was accomplished through the numerous workshops targeted on the very concrete issues and needs respecting the design and conduct of specific primary social research projects. Research issues were defined by the community organisation partners in consultation with their membership – a 'bottom-up' process. These issues were then discussed and refined within SRSF workshops, several of which invited the participation of researchers from throughout Atlantic Canadian universities. Once the specific research issues were refined, attention focused on developing appropriate research designs, tools, and methodologies. This aspect of our process engaged all SRSF collaborators in a series of working seminars focused on building an understanding of the various attributes of and needs for credible and defensible social research.

By consensus, documenting Mi'kmaq and small boat fisher local ecological knowledge became SRSF's initial focus for primary research. Various attributes of local understandings of lobster grounds, reproduction, and recruitment were the focus of research with the non-native fisheries organizations. With the Mi'kmaq, relations with and knowledge about American Eel (*K'at* [pronounced *ka:taq*]) were identified as the

priority. While the research projects addressed specific issues as identified by each SRSF partner organisation, all of the partners participated in the work of designing the research, of developing the research methodologies, and, where appropriate, of participating in the research. This approach and the associated experiences fostered inter-partner working relations and engagements, creating a ‘learning circle’ of sorts to which all contributed and within which all learned.

During SRSF’s first year, most of the research effort was focused on developing detailed background documents that review key attributes of the social, economic and political contexts within which the primary social research was to be seated. For instance, both of the fisheries organizations gathered government and published information concerning core historical and present-day characteristics of their areas’ fisheries. The data bases developed with this information provide a detailed and exhaustive review of characteristics, through time, of factors such as numbers fishing, licenses held, vessel attributes such as numbers, ages, and sizes, and landed weights and landed values by species, sector and gear types. This information was developed into detailed background documents profiling historical trends and current conditions.

The Mi’kmaq partner focused on developing a document that accomplished two inter-related objectives. The document reviews current scientific knowledge of American Eel, including commercial fishing data and marine biology. It also profiles key features of the Mi’kmaq relation with, understandings and use of American Eel. For example, Mi’kmaq words pertaining to Eel are documented and discussed, as are Mi’kmaq concerns about the current state of American Eel populations. In all cases, the background materials are understood as ‘living documents’ in that new information is always being incorporated. Additionally, these documents were developed with the understanding that they provide essential background and context that is critical to informing the focus, design and conduct of primary social research. SRSF’s subsequent years focused on conducting and completing the primary social research on the issues and themes outlined above.

As the SRSF partnership developed and research priorities were drawn into clear focus, several key messages came to assume a critical place throughout most dialogues. These are:

- *‘The Road to Hell Is Paved With Good Intentions’* In this message the partnership acknowledged that the desire to do ‘good work’, while necessary, was insufficient. Demonstrated clarity in focus, commitment to engagement, and timeliness in task completion all became understood as essential to goals, intended outcomes, and achievements.
- *‘Garbage In ... Garbage Out’* In this message the partnership came to express its understanding that the usefulness of social research is dependent entirely upon the thought and care invested in research design and the commitment given to the conduct and completion of research undertaken. All came to understand and, more importantly, to engage with social research from a perspective that appreciated fully the requirement for rigor in research design and conduct.

- *‘Useful Research Is Rarely, If Ever, An Act of Confirmation’* In this message SRSF acknowledged that community organization and university faculty research priorities most frequently arise from places such as researcher interests, membership needs and beliefs and representational issues where it is anticipated that research will provide support for contentions and confirm beliefs. While recognized that at some level all research is potentially a political activity, the Alliance came to understand that a commitment to well-designed research will generate outcomes that, while unlikely to provide simple black/white solutions, will contribute to understanding, will withstand the rigors of public inspection, and will provide useful, confidence-building information.
- *‘Strong Partnerships Foster Independent Capacity and Mutual Responsibility, Not Dependency Relations’* In this message the Partnership was affirming its commitment to build research capacity and know-how in a manner that would foster ‘equal but different’ operative attributes in relations between university researchers and community organization partners. The objective differences and potential conflicts between university-based researcher and community organization ‘interests’ were also acknowledged upfront in this message. Further, the Partnership worked with the explicit intention of building research capacity and relations that would assure organizational independence and, thereafter, equity in community organization – university researcher relations.

Various iterations of these four messages were developed early in the SRSF partnership and repeated in an almost mantra fashion throughout the collaboration. To a large extent, they captured and represented the Alliance’s spirit, while also providing continual reminders of the partnership’s commitments, purpose, and precautions.

These messages proved particularly useful as reference points when SRSF delved into specific research projects and research goals. In the end, the projects employed a variety of research designs and methodologies; but, all were arrived at through what came to be characterized as a ‘research results rich process’ (cf. Figure 1).

[Figure 1 about here]

As Illustration of SRSF Research Projects

One of SRSF’s primary research activities is reviewed here. Again, the research area arose from priorities specified by the partner organization, and was refined with and ‘fitted’ to the backgrounds, skill sets, and interests of the SRSF linked university researchers. This illustration concerns a research partnership formed to examine white hake predation on juvenile lobster. In this case, Partner members expressed a concern that white hake were observed feeding on juvenile lobster, thereby potentially impacting on recruitment into harvestable lobster stocks. They insisted that Fisheries and Oceans Canada failed to record this interaction because research surveys were conducted in the wrong places at inappropriate times of the year. In order to address this issue, SRSF struck a partnership with Fisheries and Oceans. Funding support was won from a Fisheries and Oceans Research Program.

Both peer recommended local knowledge experts and an opportunistic sample of fish harvesters were interviewed for the purpose of identifying sites and the times of year were white hake should be sampled in order to observe feeding on juvenile lobster. This resulted in two different sets of sites, but similar time of year recommendations. Two years of sampling (3500 white hake and a variety of other species were caught) and stomach contents analyses ensued. No white hake were found to have eaten any juvenile lobster. But, a number were found to have fed on the mud shrimp, a crustacean that looks to the untrained eye as similar to a juvenile lobster (cf. Figure 2).

[Figure 2 about here]

The results from this research were presented at the end of each study period to the Partner's membership during their annual meetings. While some surprise at the results was expressed, considerable interest in the results generated considerable discussion about misidentification and the fact that the common short-horn sculpin was identified as a major predator of juvenile lobster. Harvesters, having no reason to examine sculpin stomachs, were unaware of this relationship. The results from this research were prepared in several SRSF Research Reports and mailed to every Partner member. Additionally, these results have been communicated through brief articles in trade and fishing industry publications, a couple of conference presentations, and in one scientific research publication (Davis et. al 2004; MacPherson 2003; and Watts et. al. 2002a, 2002b, and 2003).

Lessons from the SRSF Experience

SRSF's strength, substance, and successes reside in its specific focus on developing social research capacity and literacy that draw on both best practices in academic social sciences and the practical knowledge and understandings of the community partners, as well as in the focus on conducting research projects that arose from partner priorities. The emphasis on learning and doing through collaboration built positive, outcomes-oriented learning experiences among the partners. Partner collaboration in data analyses, writing, conference presentations, and other communication activities also enriched the learning and capacity of the academic researchers. For instance, most university and community organization staff and several students participated in regional, national and international conference presentations, developing valuable experiences in what had been extremely foreign settings. All of these formed the basis for achieving SRSF's core capacity-building and research-informed 'voice' goals, as well as contributing to the building of substantial relations between the small boat fishing organisations and Mi'kmaq participants. SRSF's partners have come to know and to trust one and another through this process. If nothing else, the SRSF process demonstrated that Mi'kmaq and coastal peoples can work together with tremendous effect when provided with means and issues that reveal shared concerns and needs. Additionally, SRSF's work, through the act of treating peoples' experiences and concerns seriously and with respect, affirmed for many that their experiences and observations are valuable, meaningful, and deserving of respect and consideration. This

has been one of SRSF's most important outcomes, at a fundamental human level, as it contributes to how people think about and value their histories, places, experiences and concerns.

As might be imagined, the SRSF CURA process and relations experienced several difficulties and a couple of crises, one of which resulted in a major partnership re-arrangement. None the less, essential lessons were drawn by the CURA from these experiences. The most direct lesson concerned SRSF's on-the-ground organization and management. Early in the CURA's development it became apparent that a full-time dedicated research coordinator was required in order to assure the project stayed on track and achieved its targets in a timely fashion. It became readily apparent that the initial funding arrangement in support of a part-time research coordinator was insufficient to assure the time and attention dedication necessary to address the CURA's priorities. A partnership crisis, in part precipitated by the fact that one of the initial partners situated at the opposite end of the province, was logistically challenged with respect to participation, and choose to focus on non-SRSF priorities, provided the CURA with the opportunity to recalibrate. The part-time research coordinator resigned the position and the distant community partner withdrew from the CURA, leaving SRSF with sufficient resources to fund a fulltime, dedicated research coordinator. Once this position was staffed and the CURA's remaining partners had realigned and affirmed their relations, commitments, and expectations, SRSF became positioned to move forward on its research capacity-building priorities.

The early challenges also underscored the fact that community organizations have and pursue priorities that are not shared necessarily with university researchers. Community organizations are in their heart advocacy organizations championing the interests of their memberships, often in a political and decision-making context that is contentious. University, discipline-centric, research traditions and practices are not easily meshed with community organization advocacy and representational interests, particularly as they are oriented to advance their own interests. For instance, the time, energy, and resources associated with the design, conduct, and preparation of defensible research may be poorly understood by community organizations, and, as a consequence, testing of their patience. The small 'c' caution often associated with data interpretation, data ambiguities, and difficulties in simply discovering clear support in research outcomes for contentions and preferences also may result in frustrations, disappointments, and conflicts. None the less, developing substantial and sustainable research capacity and literacy require a community-university partnership process that avoids short-cuts and either hasty or overly selective interpretations, while fostering confidence in the information and insight advantages to be gained from well-designed, thorough research practices. Notably, these practices were also informed by the community partner understandings and knowledge, particularly in areas such as ways and means for involving community members in the research, the sorts of questions to ask and wordings to use, and how effectively to communicate research results.

Additionally, a commitment to participation in research processes within consensually defined timelines is also a critical piece in the working process of a

successful and mutually engaged CURAs partnership. All partners must commit to and satisfy, within reason, commitments for research engagements and outcomes. Failures to do so by one or more partners are highly corrosive of partnership confidence, mutuality, and inter-personal dynamics. This quality impacted upon SRSF partnership dynamics during its initial year, and was sorted out during the CURA's realignment. This experience also highlighted the need for a CURA governance process that enables difficult decisions and the wisdom of including such decision-making processes within the partnership *Memorandum of Understanding*. Additionally, this experience underscored the requirement for leadership that keeps the partnership focused on CURA goals and commitments.

University-sited, discipline-centric researchers and scholars also cart considerable baggage into the matrix of partnership focused and driven research. The necessary sequence of work activities and research outcome products, that is aside from being associated with a large, competitively won, external research award, may offer younger researchers little by way of career incentives and benefits. Academic advancement is contingent to a large degree on evidence of research productivity, particularly expressed through publication in academic research and scholarly journals. The development trajectories and initial foci of many CURA undertakings are unlikely to enable much by way of meaningful early academic research productivity, a point that was remarked upon within the initial CURA Program performance report (Kishchuk 2003). In the SRSF experience, such a focus would have been inappropriate, and likely destructive.

For many university scholars team approaches and dynamics are foreign to their traditional discipline-based training, particularly in the social sciences and humanities, of individual scholars beavering away on curiosity driven, theoretically and conceptually interesting questions. Status merit and career advancement accrues to those who contribute, through academic scholarly publication, to discipline-based understandings. Such is difficult, although not impossible, to square within CURA-like settings where a very different focus and process must determine research foci and priorities. SRSF followed a practice of inviting researchers from the host and other universities to workshops and of communicating SRSF news, activities, and outcomes to those who had attended workshops or otherwise indicated an interest in the CURA and its work. Invitations to engage further were repeated continuously and embedded in every communication package. One of these communications went as far as to describe the attributes of the secondary data inventoried within the partner organizations and invited researchers to engage with the partners independent of any SRSF connection. None the less, not one university researcher, other than the original proponents, initiated any sort of mature, sustained research relation with either SRSF or any of its community partners, or took up opportunities to broaden the interdisciplinary work. This was quite disappointing.

SRSF's orientation to build stand-alone capacity within its community partners was interpreted to mean that at some point the organizations' leadership and membership would need to decide whether the research capacity built was valued sufficiently to warrant priority support. This has been achieved in a half measure manner, mainly through the appointments of the Community Research Coordinators to management

positions. It remains to be seen whether these organizations research know-how and capacity will be further developed and expressed. In my view, publically funded research councils should not be expected to provide continuous funding for community organization research capacity.

As currently cast, the so-called traditional discipline-centric social sciences offer two main research-related potentials for advocacy-dedicated community organizations. The first of these are essentially the technical requirements for designing and conducting research and for interpreting research data that will produce defensible and representational findings. The second potentially useful contribution concerns presenting organizations with alternative and, hopefully, new ways of examining and understanding research-based information, as well as with insights concerning the relation and vested interests of organizations and their memberships to research-generated information. To some extent, this may engage ways and means of communicating research outcomes, although university academic researchers are not necessarily the first group that comes to mind when thinking about clear and accessible communication skills.

For researchers open to the experience, working with community organizations offers wonderful opportunities to learn about new and alternative ways of approaching and understanding human conditions and issues, as well as compelling critical questions concerning the social purposes of academic research and scholarship. But, in my view, university researchers are poorly positioned to be champions of specific community organization interests, if simply because they are not at risk of suffering much by way of personal consequence arising from misinterpretations or bad advice. Furthermore, having contributed to building community organizations' research know-how and literacy, I think it critical that organizations be positioned and encouraged to employ this capacity in a fully independent manner. After all, one research partnership core goal is to foster organizational and membership capacity and 'voice' empowerment, a goal that is best realized through fostering independence from university-based researchers and full capacity for independent action.

As a final note, SRSF's interdisciplinary strengths and successes were rooted in and expressed through the university researcher-community organization collaborations. This was certainly not the case respecting the engagement of and relations between discipline-centric academic researchers. Little, if any, substantial forward movement was achieved in transcending discipline-referenced boundaries and preferences. I suspect that one means through which interdisciplinary strengths may have been accessed and mobilized was through a process that identified this as a critical initial start-up goal. Actual interdisciplinarity, as contrasted with its 'as presented on paper' relative, requires considerable open-mindedness, good faith, and effort investments on the part of all participants from the very beginning, meaning in the early formative stages of the research collaboration. Indeed, forming and working with rich interdisciplinarity, if not transdisciplinarity, must be a key collaborative goal from the outset. The SRSF-affiliated research academics neither recognized nor substantially achieved such an outcome.

References Cited

Balsiger, Philip W.

2004 Supradisciplinary research practices: history, objectives and rationale. *Futures* 36: 407-421.

Brox, Ottar

1972 *Newfoundland Fishermen in the Age of Industry – A Sociology of Economic Dualism*. St. John's: ISER Books.

Davis, Anthony, John Mark Hanson, Hadley Watts, and Holli MacPherson,

2004 'Local Ecological Knowledge and Marine Fisheries Research: the Case of St. Georges Bay Fish Harvesters' Ecological Knowledge of White Hake (*Urophycis tenuis*) Predation on Juvenile American Lobster (*Homarus americanus*)', *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 61: 1191-1201.

Giri, Ananta Kumar

2004 The calling of a creative transdisciplinarity. *Futures* 34: 103-115.

Horlick-Jones, Tom and Jonathan Sime

2004 Living on the border: knowledge, risk and transdisciplinarity. *Futures* 36:441-456.

Kishchuck, Natalie

2003 Performance Report: Phase 1 of the Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) Program. Ottawa: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Klein, Julie Thompson

2004 Prospects for transdisciplinarity. *Futures* 36: 515-526.

Lawrence, Roderick J. and Carole Despres

2004 Introduction: Futures of Transdisciplinarity. *Futures* 36: 397-405.

MacPerson, Holli, Hadley Watts, and Anthony Davis,

2003 'Seeking Answers and Learning Lessons from White Hake Stomachs: An Example of Results from Collaborative Research', *Hook, Line and Thinker: The Newsletter of the Fishermen and Scientists Research Society*, Issue 2003-2: 16-18.

Matthews, Ralph D.

1976 *There's No Better Place Than Here: Social Change in Three Newfoundland Communities*. Peter Martin Associates, Toronto: Irwin Publishers.

Max-Neef, Manfred A.

2005 Foundation of transdisciplinarity. *Ecological Economics* 53:5-16.

Rapport, David J.

1997 Transdisciplinarity: transcending the disciplines. *Tree* 12(7): 289

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

2001 'Working Group on the Future of the Humanities: A Response from SSHRC Council'. Ottawa: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

2006 Knowledge Council: SSHRC, 2006-2011. Ottawa: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Watts, Hadley J. and Holli C. MacPherson

2002a *An Interdisciplinary Study of St. Georges Bay Fish Harvesters' Ecological Knowledge: White Hake (Urophycis tenuis) Predation on Juvenile American Lobster (Homarus americanus)*, Phase II. SRSF Research Report 5, 16 pp.

Watts, Hadley J. and Holli C. MacPherson

2002b *An Interdisciplinary Study of St. Georges Bay Fish Harvesters' Ecological Knowledge: White Hake (Urophycis tenuis) Predation on Juvenile American Lobster (Homarus americanus)*, Phase III. SRSF Research Report 6, 18 pp.

Watts, Hadley, Holli MacPherson, Anthony Davis and Mark Hanson

2003 *St. Georges Bay Fish Harvesters' Ecological Knowledge and White Hake (Urophycis tenuis) Predation on Juvenile American Lobster (Homarus americanus): Comparative Analysis of Research Results*. SRSF Research Report 7, 46 pp.

Working Group on the Future of the Humanities

2001 'The Humanities in 2010: Alternative Wor[ld]ds'. Report of the Working Group on the Future of the Humanities. Ottawa: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Figure 1: A Results Rich Research Process

Phase I & II	Phase III
Collaborative Definition of Research Issues	Develop Interview Schedule and Consent Forms for Detailed Interviews with Local Experts Recommended by Their Peers and Communities
Collaborative Development of Research Design and Methodology	Complete and Transcribe Interviews as Phase III Proceeds
Compile Background Data, Develop Research Protocols and Ethics Approval, Develop and Test Survey	All Data and Research Results are Catalogued and Securely Archived, with Partners and that All Confidentiality Provisions Satisfied
Inform Participants Through a Mail-Out About the Planned Research	Community Meetings - Research Results and Policy Implications
The Project Teams Complete Interviews. Phase I&II Research is Administered by The Partner CRC and St.FX Researchers.	Develop Research Communications - Community Newspapers, Industry Publications and SRSF Fact Sheets
Develop Data File and Enter Information as the Interviews are Completed	Develop and Present Academic Research Papers and Monographs
Complete Analysis and Distribute Phase I & II Research Reports	
Community Meetings - Research Results and Their Implications, Dialogue - Development and Focus of Phase III	
Develop and Present Academic Research Papers and Monographs	

Figure 2: Comparison: *Axius serratus* (Mud Shrimp) & Juvenile American Lobster



Notes

¹ To date, the CURA Program has held three competitions, funded 52 CURAs, and has committed as much as \$52 million Cdn in support.

² Lately, considerable resources and attention in many jurisdictions have been invested in developing university and community research collaborations. In the Canadian context, the SSHRC CURA initiative represents the first, substantial investment in such initiatives for over at least one generation. Notably Canada's two other national research councils, the Canadian Institutes for Health Research and the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada, recently launched initiatives targeted on developing and supporting research collaborations.

³ These opinions were expressed by many throughout recent SSHRC consultations with Canada's research and academic community linked with transforming SSHRC from a research council to a 'knowledge council' (cf. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada 2001, 2006; and Working Group on the Future of the Humanities 2001).

⁴ This is made evident through the briefest of reviews of many program descriptions (www.sshrc.ca; www.nserc.ca; www.cihr.ca).