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OVERVIEW

- Welcome and ‘round the table introductions
- Introduction
- RESOLVE
  - Stalking project case study
- Community-engaged scholarship as theory
Who are we?

- Mary Hampton, PhD, Provincial Academic Research Coordinator for RESOLVE Saskatchewan, professor at Luther College

- Kimberley Zorn, PhD student Clinical Psychology, SK Research Coordinator RESOLVE

- Gloria DeSantis, PhD, Facilitator/Developer, Voluntary Sector Studies Network at Luther College, Instructor IDS 290AA
RESOLVE

- Tri-prairie research network that coordinates and supports research aimed at ending violence directed towards women and girls
- Goal is to reduce the incidence of violence and the impact of violence and abuse by:
  - Creating and evaluating strategies to address violence and abuse
  - Communicating our research results to public and policy makers
  - Promoting education, awareness and social change
To accomplish these goals we:

- Work with community groups to identify areas where additional research needs to be done
- Develop action-oriented research projects
- Work in interdisciplinary teams in partnership with community groups and other Universities and centres across Canada
STALKING PROJECT

- What is RESOLVE contributing to the research on stalking:

  - Exploring the Impact of Stalking on Women Targets
    - Community-based project in collaboration with Family Service Regina’s Domestic Violence Unit
STALKING PROJECT

● Family Service Regina
  ● Mandate is to support healthy families and strong communities
  ● Non-profit organization, grounded in a history of responding to the needs of people within the Regina community
  ● Work with individuals, families and communities who are currently at risk of in distress
  ● Domestic Violence Unit focuses on helping those who have been victims of family violence
STALKING PROJECT

- Domestic Violence Unit at Family Service Regina approached RESOLVE in hopes of conducting a study to examine:
  - The impact of stalking from former abusive partners on women targets
  - Women targets experiences with police and justice responders
  - Women targets experiences with community service providers
STALKING PROJECT

- This community-based research built on an exploratory study conducted by the Domestic Violence Unit at Family Service Regina which was designed to inform police, justice, and front line service providers about the impact of stalking
STALKING PROJECT

Together, in collaboration with the Domestic Violence Unit, we developed a study whereby we would collect stories from 20 women who had been the targets of stalking from former intimate partners and compile these stories in a way that demonstrated the impact of stalking on victims.
STALKING PROJECT

Purpose:

(1) To numerate the impacts of male perpetrated IPV as indicated by women targets

(2) Explore the experiences of women targets of stalking with the Regina Police Service and justice system

(3) Explore what services and resources within the community women targets found to be helpful during different stages of their ordeal
STALKING PROJECT

• Prairie Action Foundation
  • CARE Grant
    • Goal is to support community-based research into solutions to violence and abuse
    • The program funds grassroots, community-based organizations to do action oriented research that will improve their programs and identify effective strategies to alleviate and prevent violence and abuse in their communities
    • Cannot be used to fund administrative costs for partner academic institutions

Prairieactionfoundation.ca
STALKING PROJECT: Method

Participants

- Phase I – interview 10 women who had experienced intimate partner stalking within Regina area
- Phase II - collect 15 more participants to complete data collection
  - Collecting additional 15 participants (Total $N = 25$) will allow us to better assess services and resources available for women targets

*All participants provided with a $50.00 honorarium following interview*
STALKING PROJECT: Method

- **Procedure**
  - Initial screening and recruitment facilitated by domestic violence case workers
  - Prior to screening and recruitment, information session will be held
    - Including a discussion of the potential risks and harms that may come from participation in the study
    - Session will be led by Kim Zorn, Dr. Mary Hampton, and Karen McGillvray
  - All interviews will be conducted at Family Services Regina
    - Experienced domestic violence worker, or Dr. Mary Hampton, on location during all interviews
STALKING PROJECT: Planned Analysis

- Data collection and analyses will be guided by narrative inquiry methodology as described by Lieblich and colleagues (1998)

- Encourages participants to tell their stories from their own perspectives and in their own words
  - Allows participants to share from beginning to end, what they have experienced (Lieblich et al., 1998)
Implications and Significance

- Expands on previous research
  - To date, no research has utilized narrative inquiry methodology with a diverse Canadian sample of women targets to examine the impacts of stalking
- Data will show a more coherent story, from the perspectives of women targets
  - Aid in the development of further resources and services
  - Integrate these findings into training resources manuals for Family Services Regina
- Raise awareness about the impacts of stalking both within the community and for police/justice responders
This is the case study ... what community-based research looks like in reality. Now we’ll tie it to some theory.
Community-engaged research/scholarship is like a journey:

- It can feel like an adventure
- As we travel, we must pay attention to the environment and the weather around us
- As we move forward into unfamiliar areas, the signs along the road become important
- Sometimes there are no signs ...
- Every now-and-then ... stop and look around
- Periodically, back up because we took a wrong turn
- Eventually, we “arrive” ... somewhere ...
Differing conceptions of CES

There are conceptual challenges (Wenger, Hawkins & Seifer 2010)

- Who’s defining the problem?
- Who’s funding its resolution?
- Who cares about its resolution?
- Who’s working on it now, later ...?
- Who’s the “expert” anyway?
- Who’s doing the writing?
- and on and on and on ....
Our view of community engagement & community-engaged scholarship (CES)

- Community engagement/participation is the process by which people come together to re-design their communities
  - the re-design can be physical, political, social ...
- CES involves faculty members and students in a dynamic process of "mutually beneficial partnerships with the community and results in scholarship deriving from teaching, discovery, integration, application" (Jordan 2007; Carnegie Foundation).
Ongoing:
Preparation
Reflection
Facilitation
Contribution
Ethical behaviour

(G. DeSantis 2015)
These components are linked

On an ongoing basis we need to:

- **Prepare** ourselves for this kind of community-based work knowing that there is not one, universal road or trail map
- Engage in **reflection-action** iterative loops
- Use **facilitation** approaches
- **Contribute** to unfolding processes in various ways
- Ensure continuous **ethical** behaviour

(adapted from Jordan 2007 and CSAHS Certificate in Civic Engagement)
Now let’s start with the **community-engaged** aspects of the conceptualization.
1. The ‘space-in-between’

In principle and fundamentally, CES is about inviting people to enter the ‘space-in-between’ (adapted from Goulet 2011)

- The space is both individual & interpersonal
- The space can be physical, virtual, geographical, social, psychological, emotional and spiritual ... if we let it be
- The space can be transformative if we’re intentional
  - experiential learning in this space can transform students from self-centred to public-centred (Hicks Peterson 2009)
2. Power and voice

Principles:

- Critical inquiry keeps spotlight on power relationships and injustice within society (Crotty 2003)
- Three means of power generation: control of resources, control of people, control of ideas and can be + or - (Grabb 2007)
- Power varies in degree and changes over time depending on context, participants, issues (Cohen 2001)
3. Diversity & sensitivity

Principles (DeSantis 2014):

- Communities comprise diverse people with diverse life experiences, interests, assets, types of power
- Working with communities requires sensitivity to diverse cultures ... we can’t ever know it all so we have to be open to daily learning
- Working with communities requires understanding of our own social location/identity & implications
4. It’s all about “change”

Principles:

- The community defines the problem(s), the attendant issues, the desired change and the actions (Kirby, Greaves & Reid 2006)

- Boundaries among things are socially constructed, thus, they can be de-constructed/re-constructed ... changed (Carroll 2004)
  - disrupt taken-for-granted meanings, break rules

- It’s not just policies, programs & organizations that are changed during CES, people are changed too!
5. Fluid, messy processes

Principles:

- CES is grounded in the real world, we take our cues from and work within community-based processes
  - emergent design
- Multi-layered collection of processes, simultaneous
- Reflect individually & collectively in order to learn to be flexible and adaptive, yet facilitate progressive movement
  - moments of silence/stillness & courage are needed
- The only predictability is unpredictability (Kincheloe & McLaren 2005; DeSantis 2010)
6. Time and timing

Principles:

- Such a simple element? No.
- **Time** is required to form bonds, diagnose power/voice issues, create equity-informed internal processes, create list of change goals, understand context, collect data...
- Community people’s time is necessary, but not easy
- **Timing** of various elements of workplans, rolling out strategic action, connecting with people
Now let’s consider the scholarly aspect of the conceptualization
## 7. Research methods: different models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Research</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Academic-participatory</th>
<th>Facilitative group</th>
<th>Community-directed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to funder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget &amp; setting timelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide on data collection &amp; analyses methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect &amp; transcribe data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse data &amp; draw conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write/re-write action recommendations &amp; documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from O’Connor & Williams, 1994, McMaster Research Centre for Promotion of Women’s Health)
8. Knowledge mobilization

Principles:

- Knowledge-making is a social practice; “conditions and social relations inherent in knowledge production influence its content” (Sayer 1992).
- Traditionally, those who control research (e.g., universities, governments), control knowledge making (Guba 2005).
- Different kinds of knowledge generated at different stages in research projects.
- Delicate dance regarding what knowledge is created, how, in what form, and when ... and then possibly re-shaped again and again ... (DeSantis 2014).
In closing ...

- At least 3 major beneficiaries from this approach: community, students, faculty
- New knowledge ... blend community thinking with academic thinking – everyone has contributions
- Strong relationships are the most important aspect
  - Lots of give-and-take
- Don’t let the hiccups stop you
- Examples of scholarship created from community based research

Thank you for joining us!