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It is an international trend that higher education institutions and agencies are encouraging and promoting community engagement. At the same time, there is recognition of a lack of consistent definitions and understandings of what it is they are promoting. This volume brings together diverse theoretical reflections and practices of community engaged scholarship in order to stimulate critical discussion, deepen theory, and invite critical practice. As a counterweight to the dominance of pragmatic and technical discussions in the literature on engaged scholarship, the chapters in this book shift the discourse to ask foundational questions that emphasize the political nature of engagement. Recognizing that acts of engagement are never neutral, the authors in this book explore how engaged scholarship requires decision-making that is inherently grounded in values, beliefs, and interpretations of what is and what ought to be.

Alongside complex multi-scalar social movements rising to address social, environmental, and economic issues, we see corresponding concerns expressed about the limited participation by excluded, silenced, and invisibilized people throughout the world. How might higher education respond to these events? How can engaged scholarship be mobilized and who will it serve within such contexts? With contributions covering such diverse topics as a non-binary approach to engagement; citizenship of knowledge; university contexts and corporatization; stranger pedagogies and anti-foundational approaches to service learning; contemporary revolutionary movements in the Arab world; and transforming higher education through Africanist onto-epistemologies, this volume is poised to open the door to a deeper understanding of engaged scholarship.
Engaged Scholarship
Comparative and International Education:
A Diversity of Voices
Volume 26

Series Editors
Allan Pitman, University of Western Ontario, Canada
Miguel A. Pereyra, University of Granada, Spain

Editorial Board
Mark Bray, University of Hong Kong
Ali Abdi, University of Alberta, Canada
Christine Fox, University of Wollongong, Australia
Steven Klee, University of Maryland, USA
Nagwa Megahed, Ain Shams University, Egypt
Crain Soudien, University of Cape Town, South Africa
David Turner, University of Glamorgan, England
Medardo Tapia Uribe, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico
Clementina Acedo, International Bureau of Education, Geneva, Switzerland

Scope
Comparative and International Education: A Diversity of Voices aims to provide a comprehensive range of titles, making available to readers work from across the comparative and international education research community. Authors will represent as broad a range of voices as possible, from geographic, cultural and ideological standpoints. The editors are making a conscious effort to disseminate the work of newer scholars as well as that of well-established writers. The series includes authored books and edited works focusing upon current issues and controversies in a field that is undergoing changes as profound as the geopolitical and economic forces that are reshaping our worlds. The series aims to provide books which present new work, in which the range of methodologies associated with comparative education and international education are both exemplified and opened up for debate. As the series develops, it is intended that new writers from settings and locations not frequently part of the English language discourse will find a place in the list.
Engaged Scholarship

The Politics of Engagement and Disengagement

Edited by;

Lynette Shultz
University of Alberta, Canada

and

Tania Kajner
University of Alberta, Canada
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preface</th>
<th>vii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budd L. Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania Kajner &amp; Lynette Shultz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Beyond the Binary: Scholarship, Engagement, and Social Transformation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania Kajner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Between Engagement and Citizenship: Scholarship, Public Policy and Their Others</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-Ming Khoo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engaged Scholarship in a Time of the Corporatization of the University and Distrust of the Public Sphere: A Decolonizing Response</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynette Shultz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Engaging Africanist Philosophies and Epistemologies in Education for Social Development: Historical and Current Analyses</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali A. Abdi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ‘The Stranger’ in CSL Pedagogy and Research: Learning In, Through, and for CSL as Anti-foundational Practice</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Dorow, Ruth Wolfe, Alison Taylor, Leah Trueblood &amp; Meaghan Goebel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Little Stories of Social Justice: Lessons I Learned from Immigrant Women and First Nations People</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fay Fletcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Social Learning and Deliberative Democracy</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Barraclough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janette Hartz-Karp &amp; Laura Stocker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Shifting Development Education and University Engagement: A Project of Moral and Cognitive Reconstruction of Citizenship</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine A. Odora Hoppers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Herrera &amp; Peter Mayo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul R. Carr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributor Biographies</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lynette Shultz and Tania Kajner offer us a terrific new bouquet of challenges, critiques, theories and practices. This new book is wonderfully timely and fascinating reading for the growing number of scholar-activists, community researchers, administrators of engagements strategies, social movement members and others who are increasingly clustering around the light that we call engaged scholarship. To be clear, engaged scholarship is but one of a larger family of concepts and practices that have floated to the surface in the past decade. We speak or hear of community-based research, community-based participatory research, participatory research, participatory action research, appreciative inquiry, Indigenous centered research, Indigenist research, and scores of better and lesser known members of the family. All of these discourses have in common an interest in questions about knowledge. Whose knowledge counts? How is knowledge constructed and/or co-constructed? What is the relationship between knowledge, learning and action? How do we support knowledge strategies that build capacity for movements for change? How do we support our own personal processes of de-colonization as well as de-colonization of higher education itself?

The arrival of this book is an indication that we are moving into a new historical stage in the dance between higher education and community-based research. In Canada we can divide the history of engaged scholarship fairly neatly into three periods: the ‘olds days’ before the creation of the Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) in 1998; the 1998-2012 era, which has been about the recovery, revitalization, growth and institutionalization of engaged scholarship; and the future, which begins marked by the May 26, 2012 event that had the Governor-General of Canada delivering a paper to the Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences on Knowledge Democracy.

The ‘olds days’ is about the early years with places like Frontier College (1899), university extension (University of Alberta, 1912), the Antigonish Movement at St. Francis Xavier University (1930s-60s), the Workers’ Education Association with links to the University of Toronto (1930s), the emergence of Indigenous researchers (1960s and 70s), the development of university structures such as Service aux Collectivites at the UQAM in Quebec (1970s), the planting of the seeds of participatory research from the anti-colonial struggles of the Global South to Toronto at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (1970s and 80s), the
rise of social movements such as Gay/Lesbian movements and the move to control HIV/AIDS research (1980s), and women’s movements linking knowledge to taking action for health, against violence and poverty (1970s and 80s). Prior to 1998, the engaged scholarship movement was located outside the walls of academia largely, but where it had a university base, there were direct and accountable links to the social movements of the times. And Canada had a deep and politically oriented practice, with engaged scholars working in the labour movements, the anti-apartheid movements and so many other locations. During the ‘old days’ there were no courses about engaged scholarship, no Deans of engaged learning, no degree programmes and in fact few academics at all.

The creation of the SSHRC CURA grant, itself inspired by the early participatory research traditions, the Quebec university experiences and the Dutch ‘Science Shop’ movement of the late 70s and 80s, marked the beginning of a new era. Academics whose ideological or epistemological preferences were aligned to working with community groups, to listening to their issues and concerns and co-constructing knowledge together, flooded the SSHRC offices with proposals which were, for the first time, products of alliances between scholars based in universities and scholar-intellectuals located in community groups. So great was the interest in CURA grants and the built-up demand for funding windows of this nature, that the SSHRC grants soon became the most competitive of any of the SSHRC grants. It was the CURAs that laid the contemporary foundations of the engaged scholarship practices in Canada, not the work of Boyer and others in the United States. Obviously as we institutionalized elements of engaged scholarship in Canada, we have drawn on practices from those places where for a variety of reasons the people running universities were motivated to implement a variety of more top-down approaches. Some universities such as the University of Victoria have been inspired by the work of places like the Community-University Partnership Programme at the University of Brighton or a similar centre in Barcelona. Others have had exposure and have been influenced by American practices. Some like Memorial University of Newfoundland have built their engagement strategies from an institutional history of community-university engagement fully homemade. In early 2013, we have a national scene where some 50–60 universities either have engaged scholarship written into their strategic plans or have a university-wide structure to support engaged scholarship or both. Simon Fraser University calls itself “The Engaged University” in its public branding with “engaged research, engaged communities and engaged students”. At the national level we have seen the creation of the Community Campus Collaboration Initiative under the patronage of the Governor General and supported by SSHRC itself, the United Way of Canada and York University. There are four national networks: Research Impact focusing on knowledge mobilization, Community Based Research Canada on CBR, Engaged Scholarship Partnership with a focus on faculty policies and the Canadian Alliance for Community Service Learning. So, while the picture continues to become clearer and more inclusive, it would seem as though
engaged scholarship has taken a solid hold within the university sector and will continue to expand.

Which brings me to this wonderful collection. Shultz and Kajner offer us a fresh and spicy set of thoughts. In the rush to endorse engaged scholarship have we lost track of the reasons why these ideas emerged in the first place? Community is a concept that hides as many inequalities and power struggles as it reveals. What are the political dimensions of engagement? What are the ideological and the epistemological elements that we need to take account of if we wish to support an agenda of increased equality, deeper democracy, more sustainability and just community? We have here a troubling of the concept of engagement by their introduction of disengagement! We are able to explore the disrupting of the university. We are encouraged to move away from the idea of the knowledge economy to a citizenship of knowledge. We are introduced to stranger pedagogies and anti-foundational approaches to service learning. We have pieces on contemporary revolutionary movements in the Arab world and insights from South Africa.

Shultz, Kajner and their colleagues have seen the opening of the doors of the new era of engaged scholarship, an era demanding deeper theory and more critical practices, and they invite us to join with them in this new and promising discussion.

Victoria, BC
1. INTRODUCTION

This book was motivated by a desire to contribute to in-depth, critical discussions about engaged scholarship and education. Recognizing that, although some theorizing is underway, much of the published literature on community-engaged scholarship focuses on practice-based stories and pragmatic concerns relating to encouraging, supporting, rewarding and institutionalizing engagement in a variety of educational settings, we sought to shift the discourse and create space for a more broad discussion. Too often the political nature of community-university engagement goes unrecognized and engagement takes on institutional forms that are a reflection of values and beliefs that remain unquestioned and unproblematised. Since all forms of scholarship require decisions about where time and efforts will be directed, and since these decisions are grounded, in part, in values, beliefs and interpretations about what is and what ought to be, engagement can be understood as supporting particular values and particular ends. Thus there is no neutral engagement. We sought, therefore to introduce a way of looking at engagement that was more explicit in positioning it as a political practice. Authors rose to the challenge of the book's topic, some by offering new insights and thinking on community-engaged scholarship in education, some by exploring cases and examples on the edges of what is typically discussed as engagement.

DEFINING ENGAGEMENT

What do we mean when we talk about community-engaged scholarship? While organizations and higher education institutional working groups have encouraged and promoted engaged scholarship, some also have acknowledged the lack of a consistent understanding of what it is they are promoting (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, 2005). Attempting to establish what constitutes community engagement is a central challenge in the field (Mullins, 2011), one that scholars are grappling with as they conceptualize and theorize their work.

The term scholarship of engagement was first introduced by Ernest Boyer in United States in the mid nineteen nineties and this language has permeated the organizational culture in institutions of higher education in Canada. It is important to note, however, that some of the foundational principles of engagement identified by Boyer were already being enacted in a variety of ways in Canada. As Budd Hall (2013) points out in the preface to this book, in the ‘old days’ of engagement in Canada actions were largely positioned outside academia, and even when positioned within academia had direct accountability to social movements. It was only in the
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late 1990s that funding mechanisms shifted these politically oriented practices to stronger alliance with institutions of higher education. The timing of this movement in Canada parallels the upsurge of interest in community-engaged scholarship in the United States, indeed institutions in both countries now use community-engaged scholarship as an umbrella term to capture a variety of practices that may not be new, but are being re-conceptualized and re-articulated.

Citing the “decline in public confidence in America’s colleges and universities” (1996, p. 18) as a key driver of the need to re-conceptualize scholarship, Boyer argued that American universities were facing a crisis of relevancy and legitimacy. Universities, he asserted, are no longer seen as being at the “vital centre” (Boyer, 1996, p. 18) of the nation’s work, but as somehow separate from the problems and concerns of communities. The overemphasis on research in institutions of higher education was seen by Boyer as a contributing factor. He developed a new understanding of scholarship that included four functions of the scholar: discovery, integration, sharing, and application.

The Carnegie foundation, with whom Boyer worked, has developed the most widely adopted definition of community engagement, seeing it as the “collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in the context of partnership and reciprocity” (as cited in Hall, 2009, p. 16). The National Centre for Outreach Scholarship at Michigan State University similarly defined outreach and engagement as scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service in a manner that involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions (Glass, Doberneck, & Schweitzer, 2010). The Kellogg Commission (1999) envisioned engagement broadly, as reciprocal and mutually beneficial partnerships: two-way streets defined by mutual respect for what each brings to the table.

These understandings of engagement are broad and often intended to encompass a variety of forms of scholarship and/or activities of institutions of higher education. Looking more specifically, however, the following quote may provide some interesting food for thought:

A scholarship that is engaged is a scholarship of doing it, rather than talking about doing it: scholarship as action. The difference between doing it and talking about doing it is the difference between scholarship that enjoins us, say, to attend to race in feminist scholarship – which it may be an action to say once –and addressing issues and solving problems from a Black feminist perspective, which can be done for at least as many lifetimes as it has been ignored (MacKinnon, 2010, p. 193).

What MacKinnon touches on is the idea that community-engaged scholarship is primarily concerned with the lifeworld in the community, not necessarily with the lifeworld of scholars. Thus action in community-engaged scholarship has an impact that centers more directly on community concerns, while still being of
reciprocal benefit. These understandings bring us to questions of how engagement and democracy are linked. If democracy is in the spaces between citizens then engagement, as a description of what takes place in this space, becomes an important concern and location of study. This book seeks to understand the links and dynamics of relationships and engagements as scholars and their communities make claims to encounters of knowledge creation.

Disengagement

In addition to expanding the realm of discussion on the political nature of engagement, we also hoped to provide a space to prompt thinking about the relationship between engagement and disengagement – though the latter is only picked up on implicitly in most of this book. A quick review of journal articles on disengagement and education reveals an emphasis on an understanding of disengagement that is analogous to student detachment – either in terms of interest and attention in educational settings or in terms of leaving educational institutions altogether. If we take as a starting point that all engagement is inevitably political, then the question of disengagement shifts from thoughts about emotional, social, and organizational detachment to thoughts about the political nature of what or who we choose to engage with. To be part of the lifeworld of the scholar is to be engaged with something and to be engaging some community, the question becomes “which one?”

Also of concern are issues of disengagement from community in terms of methodology. The detachment of positivist approaches to research, teaching, and service calls for a distancing or disengagement of the scholar from the lifeworld they are studying (as opposed to an explicitly recognized and articulated positioning of the scholar within that lifeworld). In this sense, disengagement can be a methodological choice that has both political and epistemological implications– a strategy used when working with communities outside the university or when engaging the community of scholars comprising one’s discipline.

International scholars, Norman Denzin and Michael Giardini write in their 2006 book, *Qualitative Inquiry and the Conservative Challenge*, that the rise of state intervention in research and the limitation on qualitative research particularly, have created a “war on truth” (p. ix). Where policies were once expected to be evidence based, the rise of neoconservative authoritarianism sees a move to decision-based evidence through the increasingly strict regulation of scientific inquiry. Qualitative inquiry is particularly vulnerable as is research that is located in communities to address current social, environmental and economic problems. Such work that strives to re-imagine critical responses within communities stands to be particularly disruptive to neoconservative agendas. Community engagement as acts of disengagement from dominant contextual conservatism can then become a radical apparatus of resistance through epistemic disobedience. Universities continue to play important institutional roles in holding open spaces for academic freedom and scholarship that resists political trends.
That universities are concerned with facilitating and encouraging engagement, on the part of scholars and students, is not surprising given the broader focus on democratic engagement in most parts of the world. With rising global social movements related to, for example, climate change or the global financial collapse, as well as more local movements across more regions of the world, we see corresponding concerns being expressed about the formal political participation of youth, women, and minorities. That a number of people are disengaging with formal politics has been constructed as a democratic deficit requiring immediate attention. Clearly, complex links between community-engaged scholarship and democratic engagement require additional study. While these complexities are such that we can’t delve deeply into them here, suffice it to say that democratic efforts, such as deliberative democracy are gaining popularity at the same time that calls for engaged scholarship are emerging. We have attempted, therefore, to ensure that a number of chapters in this book are located at the intersection of engagement and deliberative democracy.

Contributions

We begin in chapter 2, with Tania Kajner exploring the potential of community-engaged scholarship for enacting social transformation. Drawing from the work of Marx and Allman, she argues that socially transformative engagement can disrupt both the academy and wider social system by challenging the binary logic underlying exclusionary and oppressive practices. Kajner suggests that by developing a relational consciousness engaged scholars can recognize how subjectivities, power, and knowledge are all constructed through relations. This recognition invites scholars to deconstruct and reconstruct the relations through which oppression and exclusion are created, thereby effecting significant social transformation. This form of engagement, argues Kajner, requires paying attention to both epistemological and ontological considerations; it requires asking what we can know and who we can become together.

The next two chapters bring to the fore important considerations relating to the context within which community-engaged scholarship takes place and the impact of context on engagement practices. In Chapter 3, Su-Ming Khoo critically explores different notions of engagement taken up in higher education and examines the civic engagement agenda, which she contextualizes within a broader agenda for higher education policy. Khoo points to the ideological tension between the support of capitalist accumulation and individualism on one hand, and the desire for increased democracy, egalitarianism, and civility on the other. She argues that the links between public education and public policy need to be surfaced and the connections between social justice and political democracy rearticulated. Khoo provides historical and emerging examples of the shifting understanding of civic engagement and its relationship to knowledge and what might be considered an engaged curriculum (one that is engaged and engaging in an ethical and democratic sense). She argues that universities, if they are to play their constitutive role in the
knowledge society, must engage curriculum in furthering the kind of productive uncertainty that invokes ethical obligations and critical questioning of the current tendency towards marketized and managed consensus.

In Chapter 4, Lynette Shultz argues that conceptualizations and practices of engagement with communities in the university’s research and teaching must attend to the context for this engagement if the social goals of engagement are to be recognized. She points out that given the globalized context of universities, we understand that the “community” academics engage is not a homogenous entity but rather a complex multi-scalar network of personal, institutional, and corporate relationships. Internationalization and the global economic system have produced significant investment of human and material resources to create what has come to be called a “global knowledge economy”, a networked and commodifiable system of knowledge creation and dissemination. The problems of corporatism and its impact on scholarship are important foci for study given that universities are seen as key to creating hubs for these networks of productivity, exchange, and power. Community engagement within this context demands critique and thoughtful (re)location if it is to avoid reproducing the neocolonialism of the global corporatization of knowledge.

In Chapter 5, Ali A. Abdi analyzes educational growth in Sub-Saharan Africa, arguing that while education has expanded, new regimes of counter-colonial philosophies and epistemologies of education were not constructed. Pointing to the deep problems caused by colonial education founded on the dephilosophization of African peoples, he argues for the need to reconstruct the philosophical and epistemological platforms of education, establishing the “reculturing and the relative Africanization” of knowledge systems. For any system of learning to be effective and responsive it has to be based on sound and culturally inclusive social philosophies that are reflective of the lives of people. Abdi calls for an inclusionist program of educational reconstruction that enlarges the possibilities of participation, as well as the select harmonization of epistemic possibilities that serve the interests of humanity irrespective of one’s actual location or background. Turning to questions about engaged scholarship and learning, the following four chapters examine engaged scholarship in terms of student learning, scholar’s learning, and social learning endeavors. In Chapter 6, Sara Dorow, Ruth Wolfe, Alison Taylor, Leah Trueblood and Meaghan Goebel share their experiences with anti-foundational service-learning. They argue that anti-foundational approaches to community service-learning (CSL) require research and assessment approaches that mirror this pedagogy. In an anti-foundational approach, CSL de-familiarizes the seemingly natural state of knowledge and social life, forcing students to question their certainties. Drawing on Himley’s notion of the stranger in CSL, the authors explore ‘stranger pedagogy’ as a key element of anti-foundational pedagogy that centers ambiguity and anticipates the risks of experiential learning without necessarily promising resolution. Stranger pedagogy invites assessment and research approaches that similarly embrace ambiguity. For this reason, the authors argue, anti-foundation pedagogy demands
evaluative methodologies that are attentive to both the uncertainties and unevenness of knowledge production and the contradictions in CSL practice itself.

In Chapter 7, Fay Fletcher shares her own learning journey as an engaged scholar working for social justice, identifying herself as a social justice educator and encouraging others to reflect on their own influences and learning moments. Through “little stories” she shares her experiences as a white woman teaching and researching with Aboriginal peoples, inviting us to consider both the emotional and rational aspects of social justice. By reflecting on little stories, and positioning these learning moments within the larger body of social justice literature, Fletcher argues that scholars can develop a more in-depth understanding of how they might contribute to social justice education.

The potential for engagement practices to foster learning and change in such critical areas as democratic participation, social learning, and sustainability is the topic addressed in Chapters 8 & 9. Here the specific practices of deliberative democracy and public deliberation, two popular forms of engaged scholarship, are analyzed. In Chapter 8, Rhonda Barraclough outlines a framework for social learning that can be realized in the process of deliberative democracy. She argues that by creating new spaces for citizens to directly influence decisions that affect their lives, deliberative processes can offer important experiential learning in democratic participation. Further, if social learning is seen as an outcome of deliberative processes, then the decisions taken through this process are that much stronger. Through an examination of both social learning and deliberative democracy, she demonstrates how deliberation can have a social learning aspect that helps determine how different segments live together, even when deliberation is not confirmed in explicit decisions. This emphasis on the social learning aspect of deliberation will, she argues, lead to deeper understanding of each other and better decisions if and when they are required.

In Chapter 9 Janette Hartz-Karp and Laura Stocker share exemplary case studies of pioneering efforts to create opportunities for authentic participation in the co-construction of meaning, knowledge, and action in sustainability. They demonstrate the role that public deliberation can play in helping understand and address complex issues and argue that public deliberation can help unearth the tensions, alternative pathways, trade-offs, and mutual understanding that are so often needed to move towards greater sustainability. They call for a radical transformation of social interactions, which they see as necessary if we are to achieve sustainability and sustainable futures, and argue that these new forms of social interaction must be supported by corresponding education and governance processes.

Positioning engagement within the context of African education, Catherine Odora Hoppers, in Chapter 10, analyzes engaged scholarship in relation to knowledge systems and curriculum development within higher education institutional arrangements, challenging colonial approaches and enactments. She highlights the need to understand the conditions for a new social contract between universities and society and presents one response to this need: the establishment of the SARChI
Chairs initiative by the South African government. The SARChI Chair, by engaging in deep diagnosis and identifying root causes, articulates new proposals for higher education to put itself face to face with humanity. Through analysis of the SARChI Chair in development education, Odoro Hoppers argues that lifelong learning must pay attention to the corrosion of trust as a key social capital; embrace humanity where they are; and not reinforce the deficit formula that has been endemic to educational and developmental practices for so long. This is particularly important today when craftsmen, tribal elements, traditional experts and women are not seen as part of the citizenship of knowledge. The goal, she argues, is to return life to these forms of knowledge and to restore their place in the livelihood of communities so that they can, without coercion, determine the nature and pace of the development they require.

Moving outward to a very broad view of engagement, the next two chapters expand from an understanding of engaged scholarship grounded explicitly in community-university partnerships, to thinking about engagement writ large. Both chapters touch on the importance of media in terms of critical political engagement in the lifeworld. In Chapter 11, Linda Herrera and Peter Mayo begin with wrenching stories of citizen actions that triggered revolutions. While these individual actions appeared to be the impetus for social movements, Herrera and Mayo point out that the issues of civic injustice that triggered protests and retaliative state violence are closely linked to issues of economic injustice and insecurity. Noting that digitally savvy youth have been using new media for politically subversive activities, and that new media use raises questions about the use of technology for revolutionary purposes, the authors pose questions regarding the digitally mediated technologies. Emphasizing that the economic factor is not to be underplayed, they assert that it is not enough to see youth’s engagement with digital media as the path to justice. We also need to see the links between economic injustice, state violence, and the mass dissatisfaction that leads to protests such as the Arab spring. Without the wider connections to economic justice, the individual sacrifices and political engagement through digital media might lead to a transformed state that paves the way for the tyranny of the market. It is essential, they argue, to ensure that the outcomes of transformation include economic change that ensures key elements, education as one example, are not privatized.

Paul Carr invites us to consider the relationship between media literacy and democracy in Chapter 12, where he argues that critical media engagement, which ought to be a core component of media literacy in education, is connected to creating a more vibrant and meaningful participatory democracy. Pointing out that agreement on the need for media literacy as a component of education is often accompanied by contestations of what media literacy is and how it ought to be taught, Carr shares seven great debates on media literacy. These debates set the context for a consideration of the place of media studies in education. Carr argues that the connection between democracy, education and media literacy is fundamental to achieving transformative and ethically grounded forms of democracy. Being able to access technology does
not necessarily correlate with a more meaningful and relevant democracy. Rather, Carr examines ways of engaging in newer forms of democracy while seeking to be immersed in more critical forms of media literacy.
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2. BEYOND THE BINARY

Scholarship, Engagement, and Social Transformation

INTRODUCTION

As a result of the increasingly tight relationship between knowledge, power, and economy within neo-liberalism, knowledge has become seen as an important means of economic prosperity. Higher education is at the apex of knowledge contestation and power transmission; in most developed societies, the transmission of power takes place through educational credentials (Wacquant, 1993). For this reason, governments, policy-makers, and private and public sector stakeholders have a renewed interest in the worth and relevance of scholarly work, which is often criticized for not providing useful evidence nor value for money (Dehli & Taylor, 2006). The autonomy once taken for granted by universities and scholars is being challenged as they are pushed to respond to these criticisms, increase revenue from private sponsors, and operate more like businesses. The current economic and social context requires a re-thinking of the role higher education can, and ought to play in a globalizing world.

Many institutions of higher education in Canada acknowledge the need to connect more closely with communities and are institutionalizing this interest through policy development, support for community-service learning programs, creation of centres and institutes, establishment of administrative leadership positions linked to engagement, and development of engagement programs and processes. Scholars in North America are supporting this process with discussions of how to motivate (e.g., Colbeck & Weaver, 2008; O’Meara, 2008), conduct (e.g., Peterson, 2009; Van de Ven, 2007), measure and reward (e.g., O’Meara, 2005; Saltmarsh, Giles, O’Meara, & Sandmann, 2009) engaged scholarship in higher education. While organizational considerations are important in enabling, or discouraging, the work of engagement, a wider conversation is necessary, one that asks critical questions about the potential for engaged scholarship to have a significant and transformative impact on communities.

In this chapter I explore the potential of engaged scholarship for enacting social transformations aimed at equality. I argue that socially transformative engagement can disrupt both the academy and the wider social system because it challenges the binary logic underlying exclusionary and oppressive practices. This kind of engaged scholarship requires attending to both the epistemological and ontological
dimensions of engagement with community partners. It requires asking questions about what can we know, and who we can become, together.

ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP

In Scholarship Reconsidered (1990) Ernest Boyer claimed that American universities and the professoriate have a restricted view of scholarship, one that places a disproportionate value on research. Traditionally, teaching, service, and application of knowledge are seen to grow out of scholarship, narrowly defined as scholarly research, instead of being understood as themselves valuable forms of scholarship. In addition, the overall work of faculty is not perceived to be relevant to the larger social good, to the problems facing communities. Instead, the academy is seen as a place where “students get credentialed and professors get tenured” (Boyer, 1996, p. 23). While recognizing that institutions of higher education must protect their independence, both politically and intellectually, Boyer (1996) asserted that higher education must broaden the scope of scholarship, moving beyond the insular engagement of academics with other academics, to rediscover the higher purpose of scholarship of engagement. This rediscovery requires a new paradigm of scholarship that includes the equal valuation of four interlocking functions of the scholar: discovery, integration of discoveries in the larger social and intellectual contexts, sharing discoveries in a variety of formats appropriate to different audiences, and application of knowledge to the problems faced by individuals and society.

Since publication of Ernest Boyer’s (1996) The Scholarship of Engagement, activities labeled engaged scholarship have expanded enormously. Attempting to establish what constitutes engagement is a central challenge in the field (Mullins, 2011). Holland, Powell, Eng, and Drew (2010) described this challenge as “an ongoing negotiation being conducted in different places through a range of university-based and community-based practices” (p. 1). These practices commonly include: community-service learning, whereby students work on activities that address community needs; community-based research and other forms of participatory scholarship such as deliberative democracy and participatory action research; and public scholarship, including different ways of supporting community action with academic expertise. While this is not an exhaustive list of engagement practices, and while the definition and purpose of these practices may themselves be subject to much debate, it helps to draw a picture of what engagement practices hold in common: an orientation to community interests, as well as a way of interacting with communities that goes beyond the one-way dissemination of knowledge. The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities (1999), drawing on the seminal work of Ernest Boyer (1990, 1996), defined engagement as reciprocal and mutually beneficial partnerships: two-way streets defined by mutual respect for what each partner brings to the table. Engagement moves higher education beyond the idea of outreach, a one-way transfer whereby scholars extend their expertise and the resources of institutions of higher education to the community, to engagement,
whereby scholars and communities both contribute through mutually beneficial and reciprocal partnerships.

Engaged scholarship is often positioned within the civic mission of institutions of higher education, as a means of achieving civic and democratic renewal. Ramaley (2001) pointed out that engaged scholars share a concern about civic responsibility, though this concern is motivated by different factors. As a result of these differing motivations, there is a need to expand and institutionalize civic engagement within research-intensive universities in terms of engaged scholarship, while at the same time leaving room for diverse understandings of democracy in the work of engaged scholars (Stanton, 2007). Barker (2004) fleshed out some of these diverse understandings of democracy in his development of a taxonomy of five main forms of engaged scholarship. Each of the forms he explored is anchored in a different idea of democracy, uses different methodologies, and frames community problems in slightly different ways. Thus engagement is seen as encompassing diverse, and sometimes directly oppositional, political understandings and goals through the common approach of linking community and higher education. While attempts to be inclusive in defining engagement are important, without a common understanding of what democracy means, how it is envisioned, and how engaged scholars can best work with communities to support it, engaged scholarship results, paradoxically, in an apolitical civic engagement (Saltmarsh, Hartley & Clayton, 2009). It becomes a means to support and renew contested and contradictory understandings of democracy that can work against each other and result in maintenance of the status quo.

Pointing to this risk, Saltmarsh, Hartley and Clayton (2009) delineated two forms of engaged scholarship: civic engagement and democratic engagement. Civic engagement is often used as an umbrella term for activities that connect with or relate to something (issue, concern, organization) that is understood as “outside” of the campus. In many cases, these activities are easily adapted into the existing hegemonic culture of higher education and may, in fact, reflect a new language with which to describe traditional academic practices of teaching and research. Democratic engagement, on the other hand, focuses on process, which is reciprocal and respects difference, and purpose, which is seen as that of enhancing a public culture of democracy on and off campus and alleviating public problems through democratic means. Democratic engagement is distinguished not by the kind of knowledge generated, but if that knowledge and its use is inclusive of other sources of knowledge. Democratic engagement thus locates the university within “an ecosystem of knowledge production” (p. 10) whereby the multi-directional flow of knowledge is key. While Saltmarsh, Hartley and Clayton do not go so far as to detail the specific form of democracy that democratic engagement involves, their attention to process and purpose as key elements of a democratic approach is important because it shifts attention away from the pragmatics of practice to deeper considerations of what engaged scholars hope to achieve through engagement. When social transformation is the aim, these deeper considerations lead scholars to question how they and their partners are positioned in relation to one another, and in relation to knowledge.
SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

In *Revolutionary Social Transformation* (1999), Paula Allman drew off both Marx and Freire to articulate the difference between social transformation and social reform. She argued that the major goal of social transformation is to ensure that human capacity is used to meet the needs of all human beings, while also sustaining the environment. Allman’s vision of social transformation is one that includes a desire to provide all humans the opportunity to realize their full humanity through participation in a social order that is non-oppressive and non-alienating. Building on Marx’s theories, she argues that capitalist societies obscure the relations of power that shape the social order. Because capitalism rests on capitalist relations, making changes that do not address the relational aspect of capitalism will only produce cosmetic results. This is the work of social reform, which does not go deep enough to destroy the roots of oppression in a truly radical manner. Reform often involves working to help a marginalized group gain access to rights and privileges that others enjoy, rather than a critical appraisal and transformation of the structures that enable privilege and exclusion in the first place.

The distinction between reform and transformation is informed not just by an assertion of the importance of examining relations, but also by the importance of developing a dialectical understanding of these relations, a dialectical consciousness. This involves recognizing that concepts and ideas are not reflections of things or objects of study, but rather arise from relations between people or between people and objects. If thought focuses on the results of relations, rather than the relations themselves, it becomes “a fragmented and partial consciousness” that prevents people from forming a relational understanding of their reality (p. 39).

Dialectical consciousness involves apprehending a situation as part of a relation, a unity of two opposites that could not have developed, and could not exist in the form that they do, without this relation to one another. While commonly misunderstood as a linear “thesis-antithesis-synthesis” progression, in fact, dialectical relations reveal a pre-existing, inner-connection between opposites. Each appears separate from the other, but is actually created and maintained through the other. This is the paradoxical nature of the dialectic. Opposites are both opposed and mutually constituting, both different and unified. Because these opposites stand in dialectical relation to one another, any change in one will result in changes in the other. Understanding this inner-connection opens up possibilities of developing interventions that will transform the structure of the relation.

Allman’s understanding of transformation is strongly influenced by Marx’s approach, an approach rooted in the material existence of social beings and a dialectical theory of human development (Peet & Hartwick, 1999). It is concerned with how individuals, groups, and institutions act and interact with each other. Society, social organization, and changes in these, are constructed by what happens in the physical and material world, in social relationships in this world, and more specifically, through capitalist modes of production (Marx, 1973). Once this relation is understood, social
change strategies aimed at altering the relationship can be developed. However, Hegemonic systems and structures encourage a more static understanding that focuses not on the relations that underpin inequality, but on the results of the relations as fixed and immutable. They encourage a fragmented and alienated consciousness that misperceives opposites as disconnected elements that are fixed and solid.

It may be helpful here to look more closely at Allman’s argument on education to better see how developing a dialectical consciousness might point to transformative change. Allman (1999) examined the relation of expert and learner to better spot the inner-connection between these two seemingly opposite subject positions. She argued that experts only exist as the exclusive possessors of knowledge if they are related to learners in a way that determines the latter as deficient or devoid of knowledge and therefore dependent. Likewise, learners only exist if there is an expert who has knowledge that they themselves do not possess. Indeed, if they already knew all they needed to know, they would not be considered learners. Each depends on the other for their subject position, but an alienated conscious does not perceive this inner-connection of subjectivities. Rather, an alienated consciousness perceives the learner as separate from the expert and visa versa. They are understood not in terms of their relation to one another but in terms of the positions resulting from that relation, the static positions of an expert who has knowledge and a learner who needs it.

This dichotomized relationship between expert and learner, in turn, depends on an even more fundamental relation: the relation of the subject to knowledge. This relation should be dialectically understood as another unity of opposites. However, an alienated consciousness perceives knowledge as an object that is separate from the subject and the subject’s positionality. Knowledge is conceptualized as a thing, as an object that appears to come from outside the subject and which the subject can then possess. The expert possesses the object of knowledge, which he or she created or obtained, and the learner seeks to gain the object of knowledge for him or herself. This knowledge seeking obscures the relationship between knowledge and education by separating the act of acquiring knowledge from the act of producing new knowledge. A dialectical consciousness, on the other hand, reveals the way in which knowledge shapes and is shaped by an inner-connection with the subject.

As long as scholars focus on assisting the learner to gain access to the object of knowledge, they do not challenge the relation that enables the construction of one party as lacking, the dichotomy of subject and object, and the objectification of knowledge. A revolutionary or critical praxis is needed to reveal and transform the relations that constitute the social contradictions inherent in knowledge production if the structures that make inequality possible are to be transformed. In the context of engaged scholarship, a socially transformative approach would include looking at the structure of the relation between scholars and communities in terms of how they position each other as knowledge holders and how they relate to knowledge overall. Given the tight connection between knowing and being, a socially transformative engagement also depends on examining the relationally constituted subject positions held by each partner.
TRANSFORMATIVE ENGAGEMENT

As the field of engagement develops, scholars are beginning to suggest that engaged scholarship can be seen as a critical means by which they can work for justice and disrupt the dominant epistemology of the academy. For example, Fear and Sandmann (2001/2002) called for a critical, values based engagement that asks questions about responsibility to the wider public, particularly underprivileged publics. Holland et al. (2010) echoed this sentiment: “the engaged scholarship movement, to the extent that it serves marginalized publics, is a move towards the democratization of knowledge production and distribution” (p. 24). Collaborative knowledge production is a power sharing activity that positions all parties as knowledge holders and creators, an approach to knowledge that includes creating a relationship of equality between scholars and communities. When practiced in this way, engaged scholarship can run counter to academic elitism with its corresponding focus on exclusion, domination, and the unilateral exercise of power (Fear, Rosaen, Bawden & Foster-Fishman, 2006). Critical engagement is “profoundly democratic, emancipative, and empowering – precisely what engagement in civil society needs to be” (Fear et. al., 2006, p. 251).

The challenge that this understanding of engagement might present to dominant knowledge paradigms in higher education was taken up by Schon (1995) who argued engaged scholarship requires a new epistemology that includes norms of practice which conflict with the prevailing epistemology of technical rationality built into the research university. The epistemological distinction is important because engagement can be easily taken up without challenging the hegemonic force of higher education’s dominant paradigm, which removes much of engagement’s exciting impetus for transformational change in how knowledge is produced and understood (Fear & Sandmann, 2001/2002). Engaged scholarship calls for an epistemology that challenges traditional notions of scholarly expertise, knowledge as objective, and knowledge as decontextualized (Rice, 2002; McDowell, 2003). Thus, the scholarship of engagement requires an epistemology that enables going beyond the “expert” model to one of “collaboration” (Rice, 2002, p. 14).

ONTLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

While critical scholars are expanding and deepening their understanding of engagement, including the potential for engagement to disrupt traditional academic knowledge systems, without a clear articulation of, and agreement on, what constitutes an appropriate epistemology for engagement, engaged scholarship might be primarily taken up in an instrumentalist and positivist manner (Saltmarsh, Hartley & Clayton, 2009). Critical scholars are on the right track in terms of attending to epistemology. However more work needs to be done in fleshing out what this epistemology, or even epistemologies, might be. Further, the development of an engagement specific epistemology is by itself not enough to enable the kind of deep transformation that engaged scholarship is capable of bringing about.
Given that the scholar and community come together around knowledge of some sort, when their orientation to knowledge changes, their relationship to one another changes as well. Watson, Hollister, Stroud and Babcock (2011) asserted that engagement in higher education, as a global phenomenon, is very much marked by differences in North and South that call for attention to the interconnection of epistemic and social exclusions. Inclusion, then, must attend to efforts to understand how the subject is excluded as well as how his/her knowledge is excluded. As Marx’s internal relations theory proposed, epistemological and ontological transformations are codependent on one another (Allman, 2001). Thus changes in epistemology, which concerns the nature of truth and how we come to know, and ontology, which concerns the nature of existence and what it means to be, are deeply inter-related. A relational consciousness reveals an understanding of epistemology and ontology as socially constructed through dialectical relations with one another. Without attention to ontology, engaged scholars might develop new ways of knowing without understanding how they position the “other” and without ensuring they reflect the worldview of both partners. Smith (1999) argued that reciprocity in education requires prioritizing ontology. Reciprocity implies a way of being together that includes an emphasis on a shared journey, rather than just the creation and accumulation of knowledge. Without this attention to how we are co-constituted, subjectively positioned by our interactions with one another, engagement can lead to knowledge that seems to be co-created, but in reality is a relationship of exploitation and oppression.

DISENGAGEMENT

These unequal relationships, even when masked within inclusive language, often result in resistance and disengagement on the part of those scholars are purportedly seeking to work with. When community partners do not see themselves reflected in the questions being asked, in research, classroom, and public forums, they are far less like to engage and remain engaged, even if they have equal power in shaping the knowledge developed in response to these questions. Disengagement can result when there is a disconnect between the political, social, economic, and educational systems and structures of society, and the concerns that stem from people’s everyday lived experiences. Indeed, Smith (2011 as cited in McGregor, 2011) made this point clearly with regards to women’s political participation, or lack thereof, and the ways in which public spaces of decision makers are not informed by women’s everyday experiences. Indigenous scholars, such as Battiste, Bell, & Findlay (2002) and Lambe (2003), have pointed to this disconnect and the disengagement that arises as a consequence of curricula, structures, and assumptions embedded in higher education that do not reflect Aboriginal people’s way of being in the world. Similarly, in his examination of philosophy and race, Mills (1998) argued that the questions and concerns driving inquiry are shaped by social-ontological positioning, by the lived experience of being in the world. When educational philosophies, texts, and
approaches do not resonate with these driving concerns and ontological perspectives, they serve to render those excluded as invisible, thereby inviting their disengagement. Others (e.g., Dall’Alba & Barnacle, 2007) have made a similar argument about the consequences of failing to address exclusions at the level of educational structure and the importance of focusing on ontology when thinking about higher education and transformation. It is not enough to widen access to higher education in order to include marginalized groups, nor is it enough to create access points for community to become involved in research, teaching and scholarship. If engaged scholars are to transform the social world for the purposes of equality, they need to be examining questions and concerns that are directly relevant to the everyday lived experiences of excluded individuals and communities, questions which emerge from their own ontological understandings of what it means to be in the world. This is the basis from which changes in the structures, systems, and relations that underpin social exclusion can emerge. Thus the focus is not just on what is known and what scholars and communities can know together, but also who they can become together.

While not originally articulated as such, Boyer’s work can be positioned as pointing to the dialectical interconnectedness of research and other scholarly activities in a way that links closely to the ontological claims of those silenced or invisible in traditional academe. This is a direct response to the crisis of relevancy that Boyer (1996) saw as providing the impetus for engagement and it must happen not at a superficial level, but at a deeper level whereby the “other” can be reflected in scholarship – in its driving questions, assumptions, structures and epistemologies. To ensure scholarship is relevant to those outside the academy can be an act of anti oppressive education and research (Strega, 2005); it can transform the structure of self-other relations that underpins activities of co-creating knowledge.

IMPLICATIONS

Higher education is a site of struggle over the truth of both the academic and the social worlds (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Knowledge flowing from and sanctioned by the academic world is peculiar in that it has a high degree of social power. As a result, the implications of practicing a critical and transformative engaged scholarship reach far beyond the walls of academe. Developing a relational consciousness can help unmask the structures and relations in which inequality and oppression are created and maintained. It can reveal inner-connections, shattering our illusion of a subject/object dichotomy and challenging the either/or logic that supports exclusionary thinking. This in turn enables scholars to conceptualize and practice a form of engaged scholarship that is emancipatory and transformative for higher education and the wider social world.

A relational understanding of knowledge and being reveals the subject as both created by and creating the social and material world. Given that subjects hold multiple identity positions, and interact with social spaces in different ways, their epistemological and ontological understandings are always changing. A relational
consciousness helps to make this point concrete as it reveals the way in which knowledge is fluid and dynamic. Knowledge is not built upon a transcendental signified (Kaufmann, 2000), or a universal point of reference, but is plural, multiple, complex, and shifting. This further invites a view that truths that are multiple, situated, historical, and dependent on interaction.

Knowledge, truths, meanings, and identity are socially constructed through relations, through our continued interaction in all forms of discourse. When engaged scholars recognize the subject is constructed through multiple relations with others in different contexts, through different positionalities, and as a result of situatedness, their understanding of oppression also shifts and morphs to be fluid and changing. Thus a continual questioning of the blind spots and the unsaid in relations becomes an important part of practicing a transformative engaged scholarship, as does a continual recognition of the need to move beyond the “tired binaries” that pit one against the other, blocking allies from working collectively for change (Henry, 2011 as cited in McGregor, 2011, p. 2)

Once scholars and community partners recognize that subjectivities, power, and knowledge are constructed through relations, they can begin to deconstruct and reconstruct them. Socially transformative engagement, as I have described it, also enables an experience of something beyond the reductive binary of self/other, expert/learner, winner/loser, or other forms of either/or thinking that have their basis in positivistic ideas of truth. Binary logic underpins neoliberal ideology, patriarchy, and colonialism; this insight is vital to resisting oppression, particularly at this point in history. Capitalism has entered a time of deep recurring crisis, which the recent collapse of the global financial system and subsequent fallouts from this demonstrate (O’Sullivan, 2010). The global crisis, both institutional and ideological, of neoliberal capitalism has created an opening for critical scholars to make a fundamental critique of neoliberalism. One of the ways this can be done is by challenging the very logic of neoliberalism, the binary logic of either/or exclusion, and by simultaneously highlighting the relational construction of subjectivity and knowledge. Problematizing our relationship to each other, and to knowledge itself, is a necessary precursor to resisting neoliberalism (Thesee, 2006). This in turn can reinvigorate critiques of patriarchy and colonialism that are supported by the neoliberal narrative.

I have argued that engaged scholarship, when identified as a means to achieve an emancipatory knowledge generation and, more generally, social equality, can also create a space where the fluidity of knowledge is recognized and the binary logic underlying neoliberalism and other structures that help maintain oppression are exposed. Practicing critical and transformative engaged scholarship in this way includes the following:

• Commitment to equality. When scholars recognize the inner-dependence of the scholar and community, they better understand the need to ensure, at a structural and relational level, equal power for each partner.
Relational / dialectical consciousness. Dialectical consciousness enables an analysis of the inner-relation of things as well as a “both/and” approach necessary for inclusion of diverse perspectives and horizons of knowledge.

Dynamic Knowledge. Knowledge is dynamic, fluid, contextual, and temporal. It is not as an object that can be possessed by a subject, but as something that emerges through relations.

Ontological fluidity. At a deep level of being, scholars and communities are shaped by each other. When scholars operate from this perspective, structures of interaction can begin to morph and reflect this inner-dependence in a way that does not erase difference.

CONCLUSION

While individuals, administrative leaders, organizations, and institutional working groups have encouraged and promoted engaged scholarship, there are no consistently used definitions of community engagement, scholarship, or community-engaged scholarship. In fact, the Research Universities and Civic Engagement Network, at their UCLA gathering in 2007, called on their colleagues to embrace engagement, engaged scholarship, and community-engaged scholarship while acknowledging the need for a much sharper, nuanced conceptualization of engaged scholarship (Stanton, 2007).

What I have suggested here is that engaged scholarship has the potential to transform both higher education and wider social structures. This is not to say that all scholarship ought to be engaged, or that all engaged scholarship ought to be transformative. Rather, I have argued that scholars seeking social transformation can only achieve this through a form of engagement that attends to both epistemological and ontological considerations. This approach is not without barriers, many of which are put in place by the administrative structures of higher education, including: promotion and tenure requirements; academic culture; scholarly training in graduate school; and the time it takes to move ideas and plans through the administrative system. Barriers exist in the community as well, including: the sense of urgency that sometimes leads to quick action and not always effective action; positioning the academic as knowledge holder; high staff turnover and volunteer fatigue; the pressures of securing funding; and maintaining delicate funder relationships.

The effort required to overcome these barriers and truly engage with others is rewarded by an experience of coming together as multiple subjectivities, an experience of unity and difference in unity and difference. Embracing a dialectical consciousness in actions and interactions with others creates a space of inclusion and in doing so challenges the fundamental binary logic underlying systems of oppression. Engaged scholarship can be a radical political act that is not based on exclusions and divisions but, rather, is grounded in a profound connection with one another.
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