Productive Margins: Regulating *for* Engagement
Scoping Study: Phase I

Table of Contents

Introduction

As a member of the Authority Research Network, with a research background in participation and mental health, I have here brought together materials for Phase I of a scoping study on the practices of 'co-production' in research, drawing out resources that might be useful for orienting 'Productive Margins: Regulating *for* Engagement'.

The Authority Research Network (ARN) is a group of researchers engaged with questions of positive power, political subjectivity, experiential knowledge and the generation of new authority structures. The ARN's latest project, 'Authority, Knowledge and Performance in Participatory Practice' was a Connected Communities-funded project that elaborated upon different problematics brought forth by renewed emphasis on the use of participatory techniques in (re)kindling participatory democracy. In this project, we focused on how authority is produced in the generation and performance of knowledge through processes of inquiry.

It is striking how many histories and narratives of co-production there are. Broadly, we can distinguish between its use in service delivery and its use in research. Healthcare is the big example that comes up, straddling the otherwise fairly distinct literatures on service provision on the one hand and research on the other. The field is fraught with contradictions over definitions and types of coproduction (Barker, 2010). Rather than get caught up in this, Phase I is intended to showcase a range of ideas of how co-production has and can be taken up in relation to university-community research, and where it has, and could, lead us.

There is no Wikipedia page for co-production 'in research' as yet – only for the co-production of public services, and in the specific industries of film-making, music and technology & society. I have not delved into the literatures on service delivery/provision in as much detail, focusing the scoping study on co-production in research practices. However, the resources bank that comes with this report includes folders on service provision, especially as it relates to healthcare, and I have scanned these sources to find additional relevant points were lacking in the literatures on co-production in research practices.

<u>Context</u>

This overview has driven by the imperative not to reinvent the wheel. However, one of the difficulties is that, while the field is certainly 'mapable', the proximity of the term 'co-production' to so many others means that it acts as a connector between other massive, heterogeneous literatures, such as on communities of practice, community-university partnerships, action research, participatory research, publics, participation and performance, deliberative democracy, participatory techniques, critical pedagogies and the sociology of translation.

From the minutes of the first forum meeting, it is already clear that different community group members have had differing degrees of success in attempting co-production, and have also interpreted it in different ways. This suggests that the effectiveness of co-production will depend in part on the particular circumstances and problems to which it is applied, but also that the aims of co-production will differ depending on the context.

One narrative thread from the forum meeting minutes questioned the problematic term of 'hard-to-reach' groups. As Durose *et al.* put it,

> "Defining communities in such a way relies on constructing a dichotomy between the mainstream and the marginalized. For co-produced research, this focus brings a welcome challenge to why research may be exclusionary, but also raises the problematic definition by the relatively powerful of who is 'hard to reach' and selected for attention and the structures which create this distance; as well as the question of why particular communities might 'choose' to be marginalized" (2012: 5-6).

By bringing co-production into contact with 'marginalised communities', the Productive Margins programme will need to engage with these issues. This might be important to bear in mind when deciding what aspects of the resources presented here are chosen for closer scrutiny and development in Phase II of the scoping study.

Methodology:

First, I accessed the previous Connected Communities literature reviews and scoping studies on co-production, using their references as further sources.

I also conducted online literature searches using the following search terms:
"co-production"
"co-production research"
"critical pedagogies co-production"
"regulation co-production"
"engagement co-production research"

I used the search terms 'co-production' and 'research' to sift through all publications listed on Google as having cited two books in the field of co-production:

Newman and Tonkens (2011) *Responsibility, Participation and Choice* (AUP)
Newman (2001) *Modernising Governance* (Sage)

In total, this produced over 60 articles, books and some blog posts.

I also drew on notes from the first forum meeting of the Productive Margins programme, and received partial bibliographies from academics working in the field. Finally, I spoke

with a member of staff at Brighton University's Community-University Partnership Programme, to get a sense of how CUPP works as a case study.

The report is divided into three sections, which build up in layers:

- Section I is on 'Co-production' theory and practice, mainly as it relates to research between universities and communities
- Section II is on 'Regulating *for* Engagement'
- Section III is on 'Productive Margins Forum setup'

Each section contains sub-sections. In each of the above sections, I have placed the 'dangers' sub-section before the literatures sub-section, for two main reasons: to jump right in with the problems that the programme might face, and to prevent judging the approaches described in the literatures section by reading the dangers as indicating the failures of approaches. Rather, the aim is to understand the different literatures as cognizant of, and often actively engaging, the dangers outlined, in both direct and indirect ways.

Couple of notes for you

Firstly, it has been tricky to bring 'co-production', as an approach, alongside 'regulating for engagement', as an aim of the programme. In one sense the latter clearly connects with the former – that is, thinking about ways of incorporating effective regulation into the format of the forum meetings and research project process, in order to maximize engagement. However, there is much more around the notion of regulating for engagement, in terms of what the Productive Margins projects will explore and potentially reveal, and I suspect a lot of that would benefit from a greater engagement with the service delivery/provision literatures than has been provided here.

Secondly, you might actually disagree with some of the 'facts' described here. If so, please do flag it up. As this phase has involved casting such a wide net, I have not had the chance to familiarize myself with all the authors, literatures, concepts and issues.

What are some ideas for going forward in Phase II?

- Continue to build on what's here, deepening the content of the sections, perhaps drawing in more from the service delivery/provision literatures.

- Build up specific sections of the report – such as the key concepts sections, or focusing in on relevant literatures, or omitting literatures/concepts/problematics that you feel to be less relevant/useful.

- Reorient the literatures and references around a set of specific/targeted questions.

- Pick up on a few of the case studies to flesh out the form of co-producing research establishments/organizations, and the methods that they use.

- Divide the content into what's useful for the short term (i.e. next few months), the medium term (the first year) and the long term (duration of PM programme).

- What is the most useful format of the scoping study, for all programme partners to benefit most?

- Take some of the main dangers and build up 'toolkits' (oh no that word again) of literatures/concepts for addressing each. For example, the issue of 'language barriers' could be split into: a) participatory techniques for breaking down jargon; b) accessible description of 'thought styles' (Fleck) and other theorizations of how jargon emerges; c) build up a kit of non-text techniques, etc. Another could be different typologies for understanding the research process cycle; or; typologies of different kinds of knowledge. This would also allow me to present the scoping study less linearly.

- Offer suggestions on whether and how to use the term, co-production, and offer some defining statement/s, methods and goals of the Productive Margins 'approach'.

- Organise the materials I have pulled together as raw materials for generative work. For example, tag the articles using keywords that relate to Productive Margins, and produce some illustrations demonstrating the clustering within the literatures.

Coproduction

History

> "Until recently, there were few forums for community partners to share their experiences, although this is being remedied. In these discussions, common questions relate to: how best to design different forms of engagement for and with different groups for different purposes; how to articulate a rationale for engagement; how best to evaluate and measure the impact of engagement activities; what institutional practices promote and enable engagement; how longstanding issues of power and equity, access and inclusion can be addressed" (Facer *et al.*, 2012: 5).

The term, co-production, was coined four decades ago by economist Elinor Ostrom at Indiana University when researching the Chicago police in the 1970s.

Today, co-production takes various forms, and this report is not an attempt to knit them together or celebrate one over others. However it is mobilized in practice, it is always more than simply presenting knowledge to the public. Indeed, as Pohl *et al.* (2010) point out, top-down models of knowledge 'transfer' that are aimed at the ignorant learner have been criticized and undermined as 'banking concepts' (Freire, 1970), 'deficit models' (Lewenstein, 2002; Wynne, 1991) and 'neo-colonial science' (Dahdouh-Guebas *et al.*, 2003).

This has been heightened by the changing funding landscape for British higher education, and there are almost certainly going to be increasing practices of co-production into the future (Martin, 2010).

Dangers

Where do we start?! Of course, co-production has to begin somewhere. Speaking egocentrically (and this is perhaps both cause and effect of the dilemma), I have been concerned that this phase of the scoping study will guide what is looked into in more detail in Phase II of the scoping study, which in turn will orient how the key concepts of the programme are mobilized. This is a nerve-wracking prospect, and researchers heading individual projects or themes may face the same paralysis, in not wanting to set a framework to begin with, hoping that the community groups or some other authority will take the lead. This space of refusing to act is a first danger, as it can lead to established/conventional modes and knowledges that dominate ensuing practices. Researchers need to balance preparedness with a necessary flexibility about design issues. This is an important skill required for effective co-production (Ospina, 2001).

Tokenism is another danger – that the differences that a 'co-production' approach are meant to introduce into the research process amount to nothing, and we carry on business as usual, wasting people's time and possibly deepening power differentials and inequalities.

In particular, can academics fundamentally change their ways of doing research? Or are professional researchers simply demonstrating to funders that they're collaborating, while convincing communities that the research requires their input, when in reality it would have been the same with or without them? Conversely, are community organizations more interested in showing that they have contributed to research without actually having engaged with it? And are those at the margins of the target communities, and not accessible to community group structures, excluded in their very descriptions (hard-to-reach, etc.) in order for both academics and community partners to perform the research more easily, while claiming the need for future funding/research to engage these hard-to-reach individuals?

Another danger lies in the positivist idea amongst academics that co-produced research simply cannot be objective (enough) research, and correspondingly, that research is not the sort of thing that communities *do* (Ospina, 2001). Related to the latter, researched communities may feel that co-production at a time of severely limited resources is not a priority concern for them.

Durose *et al*. (2012) describe three barriers to effective co-production that exist within academia. Firstly, they suggest that there is a dominant cultural norm in academia that international audiences are more highly valued than local ones. In critical response to this, Mulvihill *et al.* suggest,

> "The days when universities can aspire to some kind of 'world status' linking to scholars in other parts of the world while ignoring or remaining detached from the communities where our higher education institutions are located are surely over" (Professor Budd Hall, University of Victoria, Canada, cited in Mulvihill *et al.*, 2011, see also Bond and Paterson, 2010).

Secondly, Durose *et al.* describe 'epistemological protectionism' where scholars create specialized jargon (see also Fenge *et al.*, 2011) and use processes such as peer review in order to safeguard their own positions (see also Walker, 2010).

Finally, Durose *et al.* suggest that, especially at a time when resources are tight, those who engage in co-productive research rarely have the opportunity to reflect upon it, meaning that there is a separation between the 'theorists' and the 'practitioners' (see also Ospina *et al.*, 2001), which has a knock-on effect in producing different sets of jargon. Academics are encouraged to publish in journals respected in their sub-fields, and this helps create a divide between the theoretical literatures that reflect upon practices of co-produced research and the non-theoretical literatures that report on/write up practices of co-produced research (Facer *et al.*, 2012: 6). Moreover theoretical work is often privileged over policy or practice-oriented work (Durose *et al.*, 2012; Newman, 2012a).

Another danger is that sites of co-production easily become spaces of domination – by certain people, approaches, ideas and so on. Even (and perhaps especially) in spaces that claim to have no hierarchies of privilege or power, or where different kinds of expertise

meet and everyone is an 'expert', hidden forms of elitism or domination can flourish (for a classic text on this, see Freeman, 1970). The problem is exacerbated where it is accepted that not everyone is equally well-informed in relation to any particular framing of a problem or issue, and often this can occur within, rather than between expertises, where the threat of another is the most manifest.

Market forces hold ever-present dangers to co-production, in watering down its forms and the extent to which it is practiced. One example, in relation to impact, is in evaluation and monitoring forms that are based upon individualised notions of 'consumer preference' rather than collective and individual changes in power, equality and possibility.

Related to this, there can be a danger that if and where co-production is successful, it leads to the incorporation of agendas that claim that communities no longer need access to effective forms of regulation, when in fact this is still necessary to combat powerful corporate interests.

On a technical level, new knowledges lead to new dangers. A vast body of knowledge has grown around the how-to's of co-production, including how best to involve individuals in combinations of small- and large-group meetings. For instance, it has been argued that structured, facilitated small groups work best for informed, deliberative dialogue, whereas large forums are better for amplifying shared conclusions and moving from 'talk' to 'action' (Leighninger, 2012). One of the technical dangers in involvement and engagement practices has been to use large meetings for goals (like deliberation) that can only be effective in small meetings and vice versa, and so on with other techniques (see also Needham, 2007).

There are dangers of institutional appropriation/recuperation – by either university or powerful community groups/organizations. Even where co-production research is successful, there is a risk that it can work to 'extract' the solutions of marginalized communities and individuals, packaging them up as research-produced solutions without crediting the communities and individuals for the knowledge that they contributed.

Co-production can encourage academics to become uncritical advocates for the communities they research (David, 2002). Conversely, Jung *et al*, (2012), in describing many of the dangers involved in the politics between researchers and vulnerable groups, document the concerns of the latter when they feel the research has been motivated/funded by a desire to evaluate the researched negatively. Such vulnerability may belong to disempowered communities and marginalized individuals, but also to service providers who want to make sure that any research will have a positive impact upon their future viability.

Key concepts

Durose *et al.* (2012) emphasise key concepts of the 'presence' of excluded voices and 'interactive knowledge production' through developing 'shared thought styles' (see also

Pohl et al, 2010; Fleck, 1935) in order to instate 'inter-disciplinary participatory research traditions' that aim at the 'empowerment' of individuals and groups.

They also describe the emergence of 'public value' and 'authentic relations' of 'trust', which includes seeking forms of 'accountability' beyond simply representation (see also Chapmen and Lowndes, 2009),

'Reflexivity' is a key concept for co-production (Orr and Bennett, 2009), providing spaces for collaborative learning:

> "Reflexivity in social research recognizes the inevitably dynamic relationship between researchers and their subjects, rejecting the idea of a binary relationship in which the researcher discovers facts about her/his subject without being influenced by the subject or without influencing the subject. Research is seen as a social and human practice that embodies institutional, personal and political factors that influence its design, impact and acceptability at any point in time…Reflexivity enables us to highlight the political dynamics of our endeavours, attention to which would otherwise tend to be absent from the representation of our project" (Orr and Bennett, 2009: 85-87).

This includes the need to develop 'beyond-text tools' (Purcell, 2009; Boeck and Thomas, 2010; Jones, 2006; Scearce, 2011, Beebeejaun *et al.*, 2013), including performative concepts and methods.

Focusing on the nature of the 'dialogue' within practices of co-production allows us to embrace possibilities for research where it can be mature, respectful and productively 'self-critical'. Bakhtinian and narrative approaches allow us to get a better grip on co-production as practices that are always 'negotiated' through dialogue.

Attention to 'uncertainty' in collaborative inquiry, including ways of getting lost (Pearce, 2008) in order to open up contingencies that mere consultation is not able to reach.

Other literatures draw upon concepts of 'peer support' environments, where different individuals and groups with different skill and knowledge-sets share experiences, and in so doing cultivate a set of skills around 'active listening', 'empathy', 'ethical sensitivity' and ability to step outside of comfort zones. They develop 'experiential knowledge' (Borkman, 1970), that can be understood either through narrative approaches or through approaches to knowledge as 'know-how' (Fuller, 2013).

Pohl *et al*. (2010) describe 3 types of researcher roles within a co-productive framework – 'reflective scientists', 'intermediaries' and 'facilitators'. Durose *et al.* (2012) suggest that all of these roles presume a separation between the researcher and the researched, which suggests that there is space for another role – that of the 'activist-academic'.

Finally, there are concepts that draw upon the idea of co-production as requiring the crossing of 'boundaries', finding ways of doing this such as 'boundary objects' and 'mediators' who can bridge different languages and intellectual traditions.

Key literatures

Since Arnstein's Ladder of Participation (Arnstein, 1969, and see IAP2 for a more recent 'Spectrum of Public Participation), a vast number of manuals, handbooks and compendia of techniques for co-producing research have been published, discussed, rolled out and evaluated. Phase II of the scoping study could entail spending much time providing a list of the most relevant techniques for co-producing research with communities, with a short description and/or critique of each. For instance, there are techniques of:

- Citizens juries
- Consensus conferences
- Deliberative polling
- Delphi
- Expert panels
- Focus groups
- Planning cells
- Scenario-WS/building exercises
- World Café
- Sand pit
- Workshops of various kinds
- Hotseating
- Grafitti Carouselling
- Forum theatre
- Open Space Technology
- Dialogue Storyboarding

These technique-focused fields of participatory practice are drawn upon by political science literatures that offer frameworks for exploring 'deliberative democracy' – the enhancing of democracy through more and better spaces for deliberation. Fung and Wright (2001) describe the three principles of what they call 'empowered deliberative democracy':

- Practical orientation
- Bottom-up participation
- Deliberative solution generation

They also offer three design properties:

- Devolution
- Centralized supervision and coordination
- State centered, not voluntaristic

The idea behind centralized supervision and coordination is to strike a balance between what Fung and Wright see as untenable forms of both democratic centralism and strict decentralization. It is State-centered in the sense that they wish to leave intact basic institutions of state governance, attempting to change them graduallynby making them more deliberative.

It may be fair to say that the field of deliberative democracy, as driven through political science, tends towards cataloguing and typologising the methods, approaches and understandings at play in the fields where knowledge is co-produced.

In a very different vein, Durose *et al.* (2012) offers one of the most recent reviews of attempts at co-production between universities and communities by reviewing the university-public engagement literature. They aim to provide conceptual substantiation and practical guidance for co-producing research with communities, and to advance the theory and practice of co-producing research with communities.

Their exploration of the 'university-public engagement' literature can tend to assume a singular notion of 'the public'. The idea of the public, however, has been a subject in its own right since at least Habermas' *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Recently there have been attempts to broaden, deconstruct, historicise and pluralise the Habermasian concept of the public using notions of 'public-making', including at the Publics Research Programme of the Open University's Centre for Citizenship Identities and Governance (CCIG) and the Making Publics project at McGill (which ran from 2005-2010). According to these literatures, publics can be understood as particular concentrations of things, knowledges and people, where imagination plays a central role and particular modalities of (co-)attention are generated. Co-production could be seen as a question of summoning a new public, made up of otherwise disconnected people, around the research issues that are at stake. The focus then shifts to how one does this, creating the kinds of active and engaged publics we want rather than disengaged or abject publics (Mahony and Clarke, 2012, see also Newman and Clarke, 2009; Barnett, 2011).

Another set of literatures stem from the category of 'Communities of Practice' (CoP, Wenger, 1998; Lewin, 1951; Hart and Wolff, 2006). Here, 'boundary objects' and (cross-boundary) 'brokers' are important. Rather than call for new research programmes and projects to create structures afresh, the CoP literature aims to determine, develop and expand co-productive relations that already exist. The idea is that there are always collaborative openings, possibilities, energies that are flowing, and community-university research is about locating and focusing on these. This challenges the idea that a new programme/project requires new organizations/groups/spaces/labels etc. Boundary objects, such as Productive Margins forum member Gabrielle Ivanson's bicycle, allow conversations across cultures. Activist-academics might themselves serve as brokers/boundary spanners within the CoP. CoP literatures promote friendships, shared interests and social networks.

Hart *et al.* (2012) offer a useful review of literature that applies the CoP approach to community-university partnerships during a time of stretched resources. They consider

CoP as where participants from different backgrounds and with different expertises share a mutual interest. Rather than focus on sameness in normative commitments to direct one another through advice based on the sharing of individual experiences, CoP encourage analyses of the differences in each other's practice in order to develop joint understanding or collaborative activity (see also Wenger, 2009). Hart *et al.* (2012) highlight,

> "...the importance of sustained, informal and fluid flows of information across different organizational or individual boundaries followed by focused, joint action to really enhance capacity and understanding between people from different backgrounds" (2012: 6).

For Hart *et al.*, conflict can potentially be focused outwards to shared causes, and if a learning agenda can be developed that is sufficiently inclusive, all participants can subsume the conflict by working together. In accordance with this aspiration, Hart *et al.* claim, that when CoPs fail it is often because they are trying to mobilize around a pre-existing solution that represents partial, rather than shared, priorities. By focusing on "identifying and sharing risks" (*ibid.*), participants do not need to feel as though they are speaking *for* other individuals or groups, which sidesteps the dilemma/danger of whether they are representing others, such as the even further 'marginalised', or not.

Amin and Roberts (2006) offer several typologies to help develop a more heterogenous lexicon than that of CoP, differentiating both tentatively and provisionally between craft/task-based, professional, expert/creative and virtual CoPs in terms of type of knowledge, proximity/nature of communication, temporal aspects of interaction, nature of social ties, nature of innovation and the organizational dynamics.

Corley (2006) draws attention to how different CoP use particular 'interpretative repertoires' that allow can certain discourses to dominate over others – that the CoP approach may be more difficult to interrupt than other approaches. Hart *et al.* (2012) caution against using the CoP framework explicitly as a theoretical model too early in projects, as it has exclude potential partners who see it as an unnecessary level of discourse.

Switching literatures, action research (AR) and participatory research (PR) are well-established in anthropology, social geography and sociology, while less so in political science (Durose *et al.*, 2012). AR and PR research range from the dialogical to the transformative (*ibid.*, see also Robinson and Tansey, 2006).

Action research uses community partners to engage in cycles of research, in bottom-up ways that are aimed at producing more equitable research processes (Khanlou and Peter, 2005; Silverman *et al.*, 2008). The approach differs from positivist accounts in that it combines the generation of theory with attempts to change the research field by researchers acting directly on or in it (Khanlou and Peter, 2005; Susman and Evered, 1978). Co-production might differ from this description of action research insofar as members of that field could be expected to change academic research practices *and* contribute to the generation of theory.

There is a huge literature around action research that can be drawn upon. Moreover, there is a growing bridge between technocentric approaches to creating spaces for deliberative democracy on the one hand, and action research on the other (for example, Cunningham and Leighninger, 2010). One of the advantages of action research approaches is that they allow community members (and other stakeholders) to build up a consensus that will make the outputs of the research more acceptable to all parties.

Pearce (2008) describes how all participants in action research methodologies that attempt to co-produce research must endeavour to cede considerable control, as the creativity of the research lies in the unexpected and the contingent. On this account, co-production requires participation, and not being open to the contingent, or as Pearce puts it, "making progress through getting lost", is not *real* participation – at best, it is mere consultation (see also Boyle and Harris, 2009: 17). For Pearce, co-production through action research involves:

- Personal, circular and contradictory processes of knowing (see also Rowan and Reason, 1981: 136)
- Contingent possibilities
- The intelligent agency of the researcher and the well-informed 'other'
- Engagement with critical and constructed intersubjectivities
- Extended epistemologies encompassing not just propositional knowledge, but experiential knowledge, practical knowledge and presentational knowledge (from Heron, 1981a&b, see also Raymond *et al*, 2010 for a different typology)
- Direct links to action
- Democratizing both the research content and method

Meanwhile, participatory research has its origins in the research of oppressed peoples and groups in the global South (Khanlou and Peter, 2005; Park *et al.*, 1993). People in the community control the whole research process, and the outside researchers who get involved "tend towards militancy rather than detachment" (Hall, 1981). The end goal is the empowerment of the community, through the key steps of:

- Community-centered control
- Ensuring the reciprocal production of knowledge
- Making sure outcomes are action-oriented and leave the community more empowered to conduct more research

(From Wulfhorst *et al.*, 2008).

Participatory action research has historically involved incorporating community members as researchers, with the aim of advocating for particular issues in order to influence policy change.

There are ethical challenges with community-based participatory research, many of which pertain to the relationship between community partners and academics. For a literature review, see Durham Community Research Team (2012), which explores issues of,

"...partnership, collaboration and power; community rights, conflict and

representation; ownership and dissemination of data, findings and publications; anonymity, privacy and confidentiality; institutional ethical review processes; and blurred boundaries between researcher and researched, academic and activist".

Co-production can be understood as a performance, encouraging attention to the ways in which failing to perform effectively lead to doubt and mistrust (Clarke, 2006), which can trouble effective forms of collaboration, participation and collective, reflexive research. The field of performative social science offers ways of understanding 'learning through co-production' as in need of more expansive conceptions of learning, beyond the simple lexicon of *analysis*. Here, the idea of learning-by-doing links learning and experience, and must therefore take account of the fact that experience is far more multi-faceted, involving feeling, hearing, tasting, touching, seeing (for example, Doornbos, 2008). The community arts literature offers insights into this aspect of co-production.

Relatedly, an improvisational framework allows us to view co-production as a set of practices built around the moment of collective participation, as a moment that both requires and demands improvisation. By viewing the community as a growing and changing 'improvisational performance ensemble' that is seeking to perform relationships on new stages (environments) without a strict conception of outcome or product, even former antagonists are able to develop new relationships (for example, Farmer, 2005). In this literature, professionals or facilitators take on a role akin to theatre directors, in welcoming the unexpected and discovering new ways of building and creating together.

If we want to probe the topic of dialogue and dialogism, two places to start on the nature and potential of dialogic approaches would be:

- Phillips (2011) on building an integrated theoretical framework across dialogic communication theory, action research and STS;
- Jensen (2000) on Bakhtinian approaches to narrative and sharing.

Some critiques of co-production suggest that the funders are an unacknowledged player in the research. The 'Strong Interaction Social Research' model was created in part to address this issue, by bringing the funders into the research process. The SISR model understands co-production as an activity that occurs all the way up/across to the process of getting funding. As an ideal type for co-production, this model could be argued to be taking co-production, as different partners coming together, to its logical endpoint. At the same time, it runs the risk of even greater collusion with political or politicized agendas that drive funding decisions.

The Authority Research Network has analysed the generating new forms of authority in collaborative inquiry, and the centrality of the cultivation of trust and honesty in the production of relations of authority (Blencowe *et al.*, 2011; Brigstocke and Noorani, 2012).

STS and feminist science approaches to knowledge generation, posthuman performativity and participation allow us to engage with the nature of objectivity differently, pluralizing 'objectivity' as a set of knowledge claims (e.g. Barad, 2007; Harding, 1993; Brigstocke and

Noorani, 2012). According to these literatures, we need to develop approaches that include and encourage sensitivity to the ways in which we can understand how the objects of research follow their own autonomous paths, and to work with them rather than dominate them (e.g. Bastion, 2013).

Knowledge translation and mediation work can also be explored through the large literatures of and related to Actor Network Theory. One of the contributions of these approaches is that 'process' becomes foregrounded. For example, the processual act of 'wondering' dynamises 'unknowns' by turning them into inquiries, and expands the possibilities for working with what we know. Figure/ground relations are isolated and reversed, in order to transform our understanding of 'chronic problems' as in fact 'sustainable solutions', which could be a useful lens for engaging with the problematics faced by the Productive Margins target communities.

Challenges and Gaps

In addressing the major challenge of producing quality research through co-production, Martin describes 5 subject positions occupied by participants for engagement in research: informants; recipients; endorsers; commissioners and co-researchers. Commissioning research includes government department approaches to research, and co-researchers include people from communities being paid to take the time off, perhaps in sabbatical, to co-conduct the research. Martin's co-researchers may be understood in terms of Durose *et al.*'s (2012) activist-academics. Martin suggests that greater levels of engagement increase the chance of research being utilized but risk politicizing the research process:

> 'The challenge is then to find ways of co-producing studies in order to enhance the prospects that it will be useful to and used by practitioners while minimising the threats to academic freedom and the integrity of the research process' (Martin 2010, 213).

Putting this another way, research must challenge the embedded hierarchies of the expert versus the layperson (Durose et al, 2012; Porter, 2010), while making sure the research process retains its integrity.

The uncritical rolling out of techniques for co-produced or participatory research can simply end up reinscribing power differences, or even increasing them, while creating other powerful subject positions (such as the supposedly-neutral facilitator position – see Wakeford and Pimbert, 2013). Critiques of participatory practices have pointed to the need to understand practices that strive to enhance collaborative research in terms of a *craft* or *ethos*, rather than as a set of techniques (Noorani *et al.*, 2013, Beebeejaun *et al.*, 2013).

Pearce (2008) suggests that participatory methodologies that used to be more radical have been easily appropriated into handbooks and manuals of formulaic techniques because of the lack of a theoretical elaboration of how and why they work (2008: 6-7). This suggests that one challenge of the Productive Margins programme is to develop the theoretical arm

of co-production in order to buttress its own progress in defining and reinvigorating a 'coproduction' method.

The key concept of 'presence' does not mean that co-production should be solely focused on bringing differences together, as difference and objectification are central to knowledge-production itself (Brigstocke and Noorani, 2012; Noorani *et al.*, 2013). For example, Orr and Bennett (2012) explore the importance in co-producing (or as they describe it, 'co-creating') research, of paying attention to situated and unsettling interactions rather than a striving for communion between the different researchers. Moreover, striving for openness to all (i.e. co-production as always being open to the 'other' participating) is in tension with a necessary closedness within events and processes. For example, citizens juries determine the number of people involved; multiple-day workshops and retreats need to hold the boundaries of the event still for long enough for a sense of shared context to emerge.

At a more abstract level, if all knowledge production, including knowledge co-production, occurs through processes of inquiry and *experimentation*, then we must take account of the ways in which inquiry and experimentation involve holding some things still while changing other things in order to produce meaningful differences (Stengers, 2000; Lury and Wakeford, 2012) – differences that matter, and that present themselves through matter (Barad, 2007).

For some, the problem that co-production purports to address is not so much about getting researchers to partner with communities, but allowing communities to research themselves without being tied to the predetermined requirements of funders. This links to action research methodologies. One response to this demand is to consider the many ways in which 'quality research' can and has been opened up beyond the purview of what has traditionally been considered high standard research in the academy (pluralizing objectivity, arguing for a stronger form of objectivity *a la* Harding, 1993, etc.). A different response is to explore the techniques and methods for incorporating research autonomy into the co-production process, by ring-fencing resources to be put towards the contingent requirements of research practices as they unfold – which links to the field of participatory techniques for how best to enact co-production.

It is crucial that the outputs of research are useful for *all* partners, which includes having ongoing resources for all partners that build both practical knowledge and foundational knowledge (Facer *et al.*, 2012), as well as non-knowledge forms. This can be described in terms of generating social capital for all involved (Lesser, Prusak *et al.*, 2000), through 'joint' practices or shared repertoires (Wenger and McDermott, 2002 – see the CoP literature).

Co-production must include inventing 'beyond-text tools', that is, beyond mere textual sources, tools and outputs. For instance, using forum theatre techniques to focus on stories (Brookes *et al.*, 2012), art and photography (Beebeejaun *et al.*, 2013). According to Beebeejaun *et al.* (2013), the *ethos* is more important than the techniques *per se* when devising beyond-text tools. Such beyond-text tools should not be understood as 'without

text' – tweeting, for example, is beyond text in a conventional sense. These tools can be used both to supplement and to critique the range of participatory and deliberative techniques.

Co-production must include training, of students involved and of community partners interested in research methods. This ties to the imperative in co-production of drawing upon existing and new university resources in engagement with communities. In both offering and using such resources, students might take the position of boundary-crossers. Pohl *et al.* (2010) list training requirements for effective co-production, including:

- Pluralist understandings of cognition and interpretation
- Sensitivity to underlying power relations
- Skills in integrating different interests
- Practices and values and skills in facilitating learning processes

In relation to the last of these, effective co-production demands an attention to the affective and emotional aspects of practice, building positive engagements that help sustain the process for the duration of the research and beyond. As Leighninger remarks of the field of deliberative democracy,

> "We have acted as if organizing public participation requires a public adminstration degree, or experience in facilitating dialogue and deliberation – and those are good qualities, but when it comes to sustaining participation, you might also want someone with experience as a cruise director" (2012: 10).

Pain *et al.* (2013) offer an example of how the experiences of co-producing research with communities can form a teaching aid through its retelling – echoing the importance of maintaining and being aware of differences, disagreements and tensions between research partners. The challenges of dealing with difference and plural expertises have given rise to an interesting bifurcation in practice, around the question of whether we think of participants as experts or not: many spaces of co-production claim that *everyone* is an expert *in some way* (e.g. many service user involvement approaches in the UK), and the challenge is to share expertise. At the same time, other co-production spaces explore how *no one* is an expert (e.g. IPLAI's Thinking Art event at McGill[1]), in order to foster play and break established knowledge hierarchies. The latter events sometimes suggest that trust can be generated quickly as all are vulnerable and more evidently learning together. A challenge in spaces where everybody is recognized as *not* being an expert is for something to carry forward, especially when those confident in performing outside of their comfort zones are often those with few stakes in relinquishing their authority/expertise *temporarily*. On the broader problematic, Ward claims,

> "We need to acknowledge that casting ourselves, or being cast as, 'experts' is only one way of participating in dialogues with the publics [*sic*]. Mutual and reciprocated learning must also be valued" (Ward, 2006, p 500).

---

[1] http://www.mcgill.ca/iplai/events/thinking-art

In terms of outputs, academic research is increasingly measured according to impact and benefit to wider society (Armstrong and Allsop, 2010). We need to move beyond the temptation to conduct research solely for advocacy (including self-advocacy), where measuring impact as a means of acquiring future funding (Facer *et al.*, 2012). This includes the need for different publications mechanisms that are both rigorous and accessible to all the groups involved.

Monitoring and evaluation needs to focus on the level of process as well as outcome. Process and results mapping tools could be helpful here. The Triple Task method (Bell *et al.*, 2012) attempts to measure group dynamics, on the basis that this is important alongside the outputs of events, and does this using measures that assess dynamics from the 'outside in' and from the 'inside out'. Triple Task is an example of attempts at identifying the *how* of participation:

> "...not 'how' in the sense of a group or groups proceeding through a process to arrive at an output but the more [sic] in the sense of an appreciation as to why groups have arrived at their insights" (Bell *et al.*, 2012: 21).

Newman (2012b) explores how we might connect qualitative analyses of emotion and affect to regimes of governing and wider shifts in policy and politics, in ways that put pressure on an uncritical notion of the contained, self-interested *deliberative subject*.

At the same time, we need to make sure that scholars do not become uncritical advocates, as David (2002) suggests of action research (see also Silverman *et al.*, 2008). David's (2002) solution is to reject the question, 'who's side are you on?', and to state instead, 'we are on our own side'. Researchers who are up-front about being on the side of 'research integrity' may be more able to develop relations of trust and honesty in the research process more easily.

In terms of methodology, impact-work should of course be understood as collaborative work, but also as impact *work* - the work of generating ideas and integrating knowledges (Antonacopoulou, 2010). According to an approach that affirms the existence of multiple kinds of objectivity, communities and community groups are understood as systematic inquirers (if not scientists) in their own right. One of the tasks of impact work is to take their inquiries seriously as distinct forms of knowledge-generation.

Moreover, if we are going to guard against researcher constructions dominating the research process, we need to incorporate methodologies that consider how community members co-construct the research relationship through their own sense of what their involvement means (Bell, 2011, see also Pearce, 2008 cited above on the need for critical understandings of intersubjectivity). Their understandings, together with their skills, knowledge and capacities, could be considered a resource rather than merely 'misunderstandings' or 'partial understandings' (Boyle and Harris, 2009: 11).

Draft list of examples, including learning from HEI programmes that have sought to engage communities.

- Brighton's Community University Partnership Programme (CUPP) has worked in the area of co-production since 2004. Lots of resources are available at
http://www.brighton.ac.uk/cupp/materials-and-resources/materials-a-resources-research-a-development.html
Phase II could spend a lot of time drawing upon the multiple sets of resources available in CUPP, or other such examples where they have spent years amassing relevant information on community-university engagement and collaboration.

From conversations with a member of CUPP, it became clear that the form of the programme has changed over the years since 2004. When CUPP was first established there was a steering group consisting of different stakeholders that included academics and community partners. To help the operational running of their (communities) Helpdesk, they also established a Senior Researchers Group (SRG) and a Tutors Group. The SRG looked at enquiries coming through from the community and looked at where these could be referred to/who amongst the interested academics would take on. The Tutors Group aimed more to look at student community engagement and pedagogic related issues.

As CUPP established itself, the steering group disbanded – there hasn't been a formal space for academics and community partners since then. The SRG was running until about a year ago, but there were problems with people attending. When CUPP first started it had money to buy out academics time to sit on these groups, but now without this and increased pressures on academics, it's been harder to keep any groups going. Likewise, pressures on the community side has meant less time for community partners to come and explore things with academics. From a practical point of view, when enquiries come in, the CUPP team triage, directly approach researchers at the University that they think might be interested. And increasingly, community based research projects for organisations (the majority of which are evaluations or needs assessments/scoping) are done by postgraduate research students. CUPP's deputy director specialises in this postgraduate student engagement to make this work for both the student and community organisation.

However there have been various other spaces for people to come together. CUPP has put on many day conferences in the past, with themes that have been requested such as on measuring social impact. For the larger projects undertaken, there have been project-specific partner/steering groups. And at different points, CoP have been facilitated to bring people with different types of expertise come together. The most successful has been the Resilience Forum, initiated by Prof Angie Hart. Speed-dating has brought community partners and academics together in a fun way, with unexpected and welcome effects such as academics becoming trustees and having long-term involvement in the organisation.

There is currently a need to bring partners together, requested by both university and community sides. For example, previous members of the SRG say they want more contact with community organisations to know what's happening in the sector. One current proposal is to have an annual day conference that brings together everyone to share, learn

and hopefully collaborate, and also to have some internal events that showcase and promote community engagement stuff on the different campuses. (Brighton has the problem of having 5 sites, which always causes logistical problems for this sort of work.) And there are other things underway like a community evaluation forum pilot – exploring ways that community organisations can come together to get peer support and targeted help from academic specialists.

Other established spaces/case studies that could be investigated and learnt from:

- Bradford's International Centre for Participation Studies – and in particular, Jenny Pearce
- The international Talloires Network based at Tufts University
- Community-University Research Alliance (CURA) in Canada
http://www.guninetwork.org/resources/he-articles/working-towards-the-coproduction-of-knowledge-a-research-partnership-involving-aboriginal-people
- Campus Engage in Ireland
- Provisional University in Ireland, Alternative University Project in Montreal, and other critical education initiatives (Lazarus in Oxford, etc)
- International Centre for Cultural and Heritage Studies at Newcastle university:
http://icchsresearch.wordpress.com/tag/coproduction/
- KCL Urban Public Health Initiative, e.g. at
http://www.kcl.ac.uk/medicine/research/divisions/hscr/about/publichealth/co-production.aspx
- University of Bern's Centre for Development and Environment (CDE), e.g. at
http://www.cde.unibe.ch/Pages/Publication/1865/Researchers%E2%80%99-roles-in-knowledge-co-production-experience-from-sustainability-research-in-Kenya,-Switzerland,-Bolivia-and-Nepal.aspx
- Occupy and it's research groups – could investigate how they are run, what forms of regulation facilitate their approach, and how engaged their approach (consequently) is.
- REACT Hub, Bristol-based and AHRC-funded.
- University of Local Knowledge project (RCUK-funded).
- The Steans Center, DePaul University, Chicago – 10 years of using a CoP approach, at http://steans.depaul.edu/aboutUs.asp
-MEDEA – design led research centre for collaborative media at Malmo University, Sweden. At http://medea.mah.se/about-medea/medea-approach-to-coproduction-research-methodology/

- Public Science Project based in NYC (Michelle Fine and Maria Torre), which explores 'contact zones' in relation to decentering expertise
- 'Social life of methods' at CRISC (OU and University of Manchester)
- National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE based in Bristol), and 6 Beacons for Public Engagement across the UK.
http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/how/methods/co-inquiry
- Scottish Co-Production Network, e.g. at
http://www.coproductionscotland.org.uk/resources/reports-and-publications/research-and-related-resources/
- West Midlands Co-Production Network meeting

- South East Coastal Communities' 5 discussion papers
- Welsh Government's Sustainable Health Action Research Programme (Cropper *et al.*, 2007).

-Technique-focused participatory research institutions – IPPR, Involve, etc.
- Asset-Based Community Development Institute, at http://www.abcdinstitute.org
- NESTA/nef
- Beacons network

- Michelle Bastion's work at http://www.morethanhumanresearch.com/.
- Emerging techniques for letting digital engagement 'speak' – network analysis, IssueCrawler, data mining techniques, big data approaches
- Science shops (Mulder and De Bok, 2006).

- Outputs from Bristol City Council, Cardiff City Council and the Welsh government – e.g. TEDMED Live Bristol is happening this year
(http://www.ideasfestival.co.uk/2013/events/tedmed-live-bristol-peoples-choice/) , linked to TEDMED Live Washington DC – I could use this as a case study given I know both places!
-West Midlands Co-production Network Event on April 26th at
http://www.govint.org/fileadmin/user_upload/case_studies/Warwickshire_Peer_Review/Programme_WMCo-ProductionNetworkMeeting_26_April_2013.pdf
- The Georgia Basin Futures Project, described by Robinson and Tansey (2006) as strong interactive social research - involving researchers, interested publics, other organizations AND sponsors of research.
- The Detroit Future City participatory action plan

Co-production in service delivery sectors

Co-production of public services is an established approach, if ambiguous and normative (Durose *et al.*, 2012; Bovaird, 2007; Joshi and Moore, 2003; Ostrom, 1996). In service delivery, there are a vast number of typologies of what co-production is about. Boyle and Harris (2009) summarise many of these when stating that co-production is about recognizing people as assets, valuing 'work' differently (mainly, more *expansively*), promoting reciprocity as it builds trust and respect, and building social networks to broaden people's relationships which keeps them healthy.

Within service delivery/provision, the many challenges posed by co-production include institutional appropriation/recuperation, tokenism, poisoning the pool, watering down research or negating expertises, mixing kinds of knowledges that should not be mixed, making the power differentials in the community even worse, siphoning off that part of the community that seeks to change it into mechanisms and processes where their energies are drawn out and sapped, etc.

- Interview by MM with Nick Hooper, Bristol City Council Strategic Housing.

'Co-design' seems to be a term now being used to denote the idea of turning people into participants (http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/government-society/inlogov/briefing-papers/beyond-the-state.pdf)
- Third Sector Research Centre at
http://www.tsrc.ac.uk/Research/ServiceDeliverySD/Userandcommunitycoproduction/tabid/617/Default.aspx

Co-production approaches in the corporate sector

'Co-creation' (corporate sector term coined in the 1980s) is similar to co-production in some respects, largely overlapping with consumerist approaches to co-production in service delivery/provision. On corporate examples, see Co-Production International at http://www.co-production.net/

The idea of the 'buy-in' is interesting, meaning that consumers involved in production will be more satisfied with the end result. See for example, Bendapudi, N and Leone, R. P. (2003) 'Psychological Implications of Customer Participation in Co-Production', *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 67(1), pp.14-28.

There are a lot of resources around co-creation in the corporate sector. A few articles that looked interesting:

Ramaswamy, V. and Gouillart, F. (2010) *The Power of Co-Creation: Build it with Them to Boost Growth, Productivity, and Profits*, New York: Free Press.
Ramirez, R. (1999) 'Value co-production: intellectual origins and implications for practice and research', *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 20, pp.49-65.
Green, S.D. and Harty, C. (2008) 'Towards a co-production research agenda for construction competitiveness', Joint 2008 CIB W065/W055 International Symposium, Dubai.
Zwass, V. (2010) 'Co-creation: Toward a Taxonomy and an Integrated Research Perspective', *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, vol. 15(1), pp.11-48.

Regulation *for* Engagement

Problem: How can we design regulatory regimes that begin from the capabilities of communities excluded from the mainstream, finding ways of powerfully supporting the knowledge, passions and creativity of citizens?

Dangers

There are a number of difficulties with getting involved, ranging from not knowing about the research to not having the time, access issues including childcare and so on. There are

structural conflicts around language, the expectations of research, timetables, deadlines and notions of power (Mayer, 2000; Barton and Tusting, 2005 in relation to the CoP approach).

Moreover, sometimes even when barriers to engagement are acknowledged and mitigated, at the same time there is no desire to get involved either, because of the feeling that nothing will actually change as a result of the co-production (see the dangers of tokenism in co-production above). Mulgan (1991) notes that it is not progressive to distribute responsibilities to the powerless, and the responsibilisation of the powerless has been a persistent feature of New Labour policy towards community-building (Bresnihan, 2013; Bresnihan and Dawney, 2013).

The claim to 'represent' is always caught in a double bind, as representatives are expected to speak the will of those they represent, which is difficult at best (Brigstocke, 2013). Furthermore, representative positions can get hijacked by the 'usual suspects', where insular processes of jargon-creation set in such that others get turned off from participating. When caught in conflicts of interest, people can feel compelled to speak on behalf of their employing organization, whether a university, a community or other, rather than from their 'own perspective'.

From some of the service delivery literatures, a common problem is that desires for community-led practices, or community partnerships, become overly focused upon measuring up to indicators, where 'failures' (to meet indicators) are dealt with through more regulation, including the creation of ever-more sub-groups, sub-sub-groups and so on. Resources can (then) get watered down, energy is absorbed, and questions become ever-smaller and aimed at technical or detailed service-level issues.

These dangers have prompted the critical field of 'post-politics' (Tsouvalis and Waterton, 2011). One of the dangers of thinking about regulation as a way of encouraging engagement is that it can easily slip to a set of practices that do not admit flexibility outside of particular technocratic protocols, procedures and systems for determining engagement decision-making. 'Post-political' critiques of social and political theory, including those of Žižek and Ranciere, consider how participatory strategies are actually *de-politicising* in that they take attention away from the need to rethink the political stakes and parameters and ask instead increasingly detailed technocratic and managerial questions. Thus in regulating generally, and in the forum discussions more specifically (see below), one concern is that the practices of co-production will focus on more and more detailed technocratic issues while leaving larger issues of dominant social relations unchanged.

Key concepts

For Callon, 'controversies' enrich democracy, but in order for that to happen, they must be used to launch 'collective explorations'.

Hybrid forums are spaces where different expertises come together, and delegative democracy meets dialogic democracy. New knowledge can be created through translations, and a persistent challenge is to co-produce research 'in the wild'.

Plural forms of 'accountability' need to be explored, especially in a context where there are plural relations of 'authority' already existing and being produced.

'Regulation', understood analytically, exists wherever structures exist, including the habitual structured processes of individual and collective bodies. Thinking at this level of 'habits', of the everyday forces that regulate our lives, there is a literature emerging around how we change habits, and the importance of keeping regulation loose so that it is adaptable, capable of incorporating and being changed by diverse and dissenting practices and so forth. This exists in tension with the field of reflexive governance, where 'learning' occurs but one may wonder whether the learning is according to strict meta-level protocols or emphasizes analysis over other sensory and non-sensory aspects of experiencing in general (Doornbos, 2008).

Key literatures

Callon offers a methodology for creating hybrid forums:

> "*Hybrid forums* - forums because they are open spaces where groups can come together to discuss technical options involving the collective, hybrid because the groups involved and the spokespersons claiming to represent them are heterogeneous, including experts, politicians, technicians, and laypersons who consider themselves involved. They are also hybrid because the questions and problems taken up are addressed at different levels in a variety of domains, from ethics to economic and including physiology, nuclear physics, and electromagnetism."

Callon *et al.* discuss various forms of cooperation between secluded research and 'research in the wild', and between the aggregation of individuals and the composition of the collective. These hybrid forums aim for some mix of 'delegative democracy' (conducted by scientific specialists or specialized political representatives) and 'dialogic democracy' (conducted collaboratively, by all interested parties). Callon has written extensively on how to organise and evaluate hybrid forums.

Callon's treatment of translation might also be useful, as a process that takes us from t1 (macrocosm to microcosm) to t2 (a series of equivalences in 'laboratory'-microcosm) to t3 (from the microcosm back to the macrocosm). In order for t3 to succeed, t1 must reconstitute the networks of interests at the microcosm, rather than lose them in a sort of experimenter will-to-abstraction.

There is a large literature on the practicalities of designing and regulating research projects so that they are able to effectively co-produce research (for example, see Hewison, 2012).

Alternative ways of doing and seeing, or regulating and self-regulating, already exist in given communities and can be brought to light to showcase the diversity of these "excluded others". The Community Economics Collective methods allow us to see this in terms of a plurality,[2] and PAR and feminist methodology-type approaches encourage drawing out alternatives and making them speak.

Jasanoff, for example on 'civic epistemologies', offers collective accounts of how we can recognize authoritative knowledge, which proofs are acceptable and trustworthy, and what accountabilities ought to be demanded.

Habit is explored in disciplines ranging from cognitive science (e.g. Gianessi, 2012) to human geography (Schwanen *et al.*, 2012).

As learning environments change, such as on new virtual platforms, we have to learn how to participate in a new environment, and to do so together, where each reconstitutes the other (Marchi and Ciceri, 2011).

Challenges and Gaps

One challenge to explore might be to develop specific, novel grounds for legitimising community involvement, instead of relying on traditional/conventional beliefs in legitimacy that may smuggle in other sorts of expectations (Connolly, 2001; Haikio, 2012). For instance, Haikio (2012) suggests that the model of involvement often relied on within scientific studies presupposes citizens who seek consensus and who are cooperative, consequently tending towards the exclusion of those who are neither. And yet, citizens:

> "…might simply be interested in consuming political products for their own personal reasons or to receive and articulate new ideas, values and identities" (431, see also Bang, 2003).

Naturally, this pull towards anti-instrumentalism needs to be balanced against the rigidly instrumental goals of the programme.

What forms of accountability are possible – where who is held accountable to whom?

Regulation is not neutral, and it cannot be understood in the general. Deaf communities provide an interesting example – Emma Burns from the Productive Margins forum meeting points out that there is no sign language for the terminology around regulation, meaning there is a barrier to including deaf communities in the first place. Regulation by the university, or through the university, is itself obviously contingent and creates ways of doing and of seeing.

---

[2] See http://www.communityeconomies.org/Home/Key-Ideas

Thus we need to highlight other forms of regulation that are allowing engagement but not in ways recognized by formal political or economic structures, and not accorded value through market mechanisms or bureaucratic authority.

Focusing regulation on promoting forms of engagement does not mean that the power of regulation to exclude is no longer needed – especially in relation to powerful corporate forces.

How do we accelerate serendipity in productive encounters (Facer, 2013)?

How do we regulate for better or more open spaces using improvisation techniques and approaches?

New ways of holding others to account need to be invented. 'Science' as an accountable practice can be opened up here – what is an expert-by-experience, for example? What makes somebody's experience 'expert'? What is science beyond something like 'systematic study'? And what is the task of the scientist or researcher over and above finding ways of allowing differences that matter/matter to speak/present themselves? This requires systems of verification within a community of peers – the creation and documenting of new objective cultures with their own claims to knowledge staked in their own ideas of objectivity (Blencowe *et al.*, forthcoming).

Ben Barker from the Productive Margins forum meeting makes the point that the need for public toilets illustrates the challenge of making the regulatory powers of *things* more explicit.

At the outset, the programme needs to be capable of enabling unintended consequences that act as starting points – alternative visions of spaces of access and restriction, and other such reorganisations and reproblematisations. The £800 seed corn money is potentially a really powerful tool for doing this, depending of course on how cumbersome the application process is and how the implementation and accountability protocols are designed. In this way a co-production agenda might actually allow universities to be more autonomous in determining how to spend money as the processes unfold rather than in advance. Phase II of the scoping study could include looking at radical seed money-offering schemes to see how they operate?

PM Forum setup

Dangers

Focusing on forum spaces as spaces of co-production can lead to a process where co-production is not embedded but occasional, transitory and only for an emergent privileged group, where access is limited for many and forum meetings exist only – or largely – as an extra layer of bureaucracy.

Forum meetings can easily become spaces where conflict and disagreement are uncomfortable, and the space starts to feel ossified, heavy or tiring.

Accessing communities at the margins, and the margins of those margins, and so on, presents difficulties:

- The non-organised marginalised are always less cohesive than organisations
- Community organisations must act as a conduit for forum recruitment for the more marginalised, but the relations between these two actors are never simple and often already heavily politicised.

Key concepts

That the forum not be an advisory board, nor a partnership model, but 'site(s) of experimentation', acting as a dynamic location for co-producing knowledges, enhancing exchange and dissemination and developing 'innovative methods' for the social sciences arts and humanities. Also is about bringing different (aspects of different) projects into conversation/dialogue.

A 'pre-figurative' politics (see Osterweil, 2003), where governance is replaced by forms of 'co-governance', and 'accountability' structures can be explored.

Key literatures

One literature documents how 'co'-governance is vital from the very beginning of the research (for instance, Ackerman, 2005).

The critical pedagogies literatures include critiques of technique-focused practices, looking at how power remains, including the important role of the facilitator. These literatures also offer their own inventive techniques for engagement/dialogue, including creative grammars of communication. This can be accessed via case studies of Community-University partnerships (such as those listed above), and the methods used by Free Universities and Occupy.

Large meetings and events that are creative in their approach, including the World Social Forum and the Detroit works project.

Principles of small groups that work together in collaborative and self-regulating ways, attempting to ensure that all voices are heard and that do not get stuck on small issues. This includes peer-support and self-help groups and the diversity of their respective groundrules.

Pohl *et al.* (2010) describe co-production as what occurs in what they describe as the *agoras* between science and non-science – that is, the public spaces where "science meets the public" and "public speaks back to science" (Nowotny *et al.*, 2001: 247, cited in Pohl *et al.*, 2010: 269).

Pohl *et al.* describe three challenges in structuring agoras in relation to sustainable development – power, integration and sustainability (the last being a core value of sustainable development practice). They problematise power in terms of the need to advocate for the co-existence of 'thought collectives' with their respective 'thought styles' (Fleck, 1935), while integration concerns interrelating the perspectives of the various thought collectives on the issues at stake.

Pohl *et al.*'s formulation of the process of co-production risks reducing power to language issues. Nevertheless, their case studies point to several key values that need to emerge in successful co-production, such as trust and respect between different thought collectives.

Literatures around the modes of organization used by the Zapatistas, Situationists, anarchists and Autonomist activist/scholars/activist-academics, that attempt to 'consciously resemble the world you want to create' (Osterweil, 2003).

Participatory Organizational Research has emerged as a way of hearing the voices of marginalized segments within organizations (Burns *et al.*, 2012 for a case study in the elder care community), and might offer insights for keeping forum activities open to marginalized voices.

Hart and Wolff (2006) reflect upon Brighton University's CUPP, and offer advice on different practical aspects of forum design, including choosing spaces carefully and managing a balance between the evolution of the core and the periphery of the forum.

Challenges and Gaps

The forum needs to develop "ethical understandings of how tensions and conflict can be addressed creatively", and inclusive methods of decision-making and engaging wider communities in deliberation and decision-making.

One suggestion is that the forum avoid the risk of becoming a time-consuming and superfluous site in its own right, mirroring the suggestion that 'co-production' not become a field in its own right, but about enhancing conversations and meta-networks (see Facer *et al.*, 2012: 3, cited above). Instead, the forum needs to find ways of aiming to be a site where reflexive conversations can take place, possibly including offering a resource bank for all community partners to bring and share resources. The latter can be taken up in part through the website; the former could be arranged by establishing that the forum can play a role at all levels of the programme, rather than just be the connection point of the 7 projects. Perhaps every meeting within each of the 7 projects could have 'forum-wide-relevant issues' as one of the agenda items, allowing a space to ask what would benefit from, or be

useful to, a wider public than those present to that (part of that) project at that time? Another possibility is to regulate into the forum meeting procedures having someone from another project than the one being discussed, who can act as a discussant or commentator during that meeting, and whose role would be to think through how the issues raised by the one project could productively engage with the other project(s)?

To the extent that the forum does need to exist in some form, what could this look like? Consider the space of the community partners themselves – the physical building is important for some, for example – this could be mirrored or incorporated into the forum processes. What if, instead, the forum were simply 'conduits', technologies and practices that allowed the reflections, comments and thoughts of the community members of one project site to be seen (and otherwise amplified) by the partners of the other projects? This lends itself to an idea where communities help research one another directly, rather than through influencing some central structure that in turn directs or otherwise regulates research and engagement in the other projects. University researchers, on this model, act more like catalysts for research by communities upon themselves *and* each other. But does this bring us back to a model of knowledge transfer rather than knowledge exchange?

This might include not just connecting sites but placing boundaries around particular incubation spaces of co-production through engagement. Such initiatives could draw upon the slow-thinking retreat format developed by the Authority Research Network,[3] the practices of presencing developed in Theory U,[4] Future Workshops[5] and other such techniques, depending on the needs of the forum at any particular time. However, these and similar techniques can be slow and resource-heavy (in particular in relation to the amount of 'incubation' time required); as a result, we should be wary of how exclusive such sites can be.

The forum needs to be open to contingency (Pearce, 2008), and partially this means creating ways for the voices at the margins of the margins to be expressed. These voices might not be ones that community 'representatives' or organizations involved in the research bring to the forum (which itself might not be an *actual* space as per above). How then can such voices influence the nature and direction of the research?

The CoP literature is relevant to thinking through forum design, and the history of CoP practices such as the above case study at CUPP in Brighton could again be useful here. The CoP approach suggests not building something totally fresh, that first needs to be imagined or conceptualised, but drawing upon the co-productive relationships and resources already present, and build them into a forum more closely connected with (incipient versions of) already-existing capacities (see also Pearce, 2008: 19 for some good examples).

Dunn and Hedges (2012) provide a Connected Communities scoping study on crowd-sourcing in the humanities, highlighting usefulness of various processes including collaborative tagging, linking, correcting/modifying content, transcribing, recording and

---

[3] At http://www.authorityresearch.net/about.html
[4] At http://www.ottoscharmer.com/publications/summaries.php
[5] At https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Future_workshop

creating content, commenting, critical responses and stating preferences, categorizing, cataloguing, contextualizing, mapping, geo-referencing and translating.

The website design could draw upon the experiences of the Creating Publics website at the Open University, and perhaps Participedia in the US, which have both spent time thinking about developing their sites for a range of audiences in as organic a way as possible. Other large institutionally-housed websites, such as CUPP's website, might have much to share on the challenges they encountered and the creative solutions they came up with.

The field of deliberative democracy involving online tools is growing fast, especially in the US. Leighninger (2011) provides 10 tactics for using online tools for engaging communities, which might prove useful in devising a generic or baseline forum online outreach strategy.

Finally, the Bakhtinian idea of the 'carnival' could provide a way of thinking about structuring (parts of) the Productive Margins forum and/or festivals in carnivalesque form.

Partial Bibliography

Ackerman, J. (2003) 'Co-Governance for Accountability: Beyond "Exit" and "Voice"', *World Development*, vol. 32(3), pp.447-463.

Amin, A. and Roberts, J. (2006) 'Communities of Practice? Varieties of Situated Learning', paper prepared for EU Network of Excellence: Dynamics of Institutions and Markets in Europe (DIME).

Amsden, J., and Van Wynsberghe, R. (2005) 'Community mapping as a research tool with youth', *Action Research*, vol. 3(4), pp. 357–381.

Antonacopoulou, E.P. (2010) 'Beyond co-production: practice-relevant scholarship as a foundation for delivering impact through powerful ideas', *Public Money & Management*, vol. 30(4), pp. 219-226

Arnstein, S. R. (1969), 'A Ladder of Citizen Participation', *Journal of the American Institute of Planners,* 35 (4), 216-24.

Bang, H. (ed.) (2003) *Governance as social and political communication*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Barad, K. (2007) *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*, London: Duke University Press.

Barker, A. (2010) 'Co-Production of Local Public Services', Local Authorities & Research Councils Initiative Themed Programme Information Sheet.

Barnett, C. (2011) 'Theorising Emergent Publics', Paper presented at Creating Publcis Workshop, University of Westminster, July 2011.

Barton, D. and Tusting, K. (2005) *Beyond Communities of Practice: Language, Power and Social context,* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Beebeejaun, Y., Durose, C., Rees, J., Richardson, J and Richardson, L. (2013) ''Beyond text': exploring ethos and method in co-producing research with communities', *Community Development Journal.*

Bell, K. (2011) 'Participants' motivations and co-construction of the qualitative research process', *Qualitative Social Work*, vol. 0(0), pp.1-17.

Bell, S., Morse, S. and Shah, R. (2012) 'Understanding stakeholder participation in research as part of sustainable development', *Journal of Environmental Management*, vol. 101, pp.13-22.

Blencowe, C., Brigstocke, J., Dawney, L., Amaral, A., Kirwan, S., Millner, N. and Noorani, T. (2011) 'Immanent Authority and the Making of Community', AHRC Report.

Blencowe, C., Noorani, T. and Brigstocke, J. 'Objective Culture, Authority and Service-User EmpowermentL A Reflection on Participatory Practice', forthcoming.

Boeck, T. and Thomas, S. (2010) *Amplified Leicester: Impact on social capital and cohesion* London, NESTA www.nesta.org

Borkman, T. J. (1976) 'Experiential knowledge: A new concept for the analysis of self-help groups', *Social Science Review*, vol. 50, pp.445-455.

Boyle, D. and Harris, M. (2009) 'The Challenges of Co-Production: How equal partnerships between professionals and the public are crucial to improving public services', NESTA.

Bresnihan, P. (2013) 'Participation in (A Time) of Crisis', in T. Noorani, C. Blencowe and J. Brigstocke (eds) *Problems of Participation: Reflections on Democracy, Authority and the Struggle for Common Life*, Lewes: ARN Press, pp. 119-127.

Bresnihan, P. and Dawney, L. (2013) ''Barriers to Participation and Capitalist Temporalities', in T. Noorani, C. Blencowe and J. Brigstocke (eds) *Problems of Participation: Reflections on Democracy, Authority and the Struggle for Common Life*, Lewes: ARN Press, pp. 129-142.

Brigstocke, J. (2013) 'Democracy and the Reinvention of Authority', in T. Noorani, C. Blencowe and J. Brigstocke (eds) *Problems of Participation: Reflections on Democracy, Authority and the Struggle for Common Life*, Lewes: ARN Press, pp. 7-12.

Brigstocke, J. and Noorani, T. (2012) 'Participation: a Literature Survey', unpublished literature survey, available at http://www.authorityresearch.net/participatory-practice.html

Brookes, I., Archibald, S., McInnes, K., Cross, B., Daniel, B. and Johnson, F. (2012) 'Finding the words to work together: developing a research design to explore risk and adult protection in co-produced research', *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, vol. 40, pp.143-151.

Burns, D., Hyde, P., Killett, A., Poland, F. and Gray, R. (2012) 'Participatory Organizational Research: Examining Voice in the Co-Production of Knowledge', *British Journal of Management*.

Callon, M. (1999) 'The role of lay people in the production and dissemination of scientific knowledge', *Science Technology and Human Values*, pp. 81-94.

Callon, M. (2009) *Acting in an Uncertain World*, MIT Press.

Chapman, R. and Lowndes, V. (2009) Accountable, authorised or authentic? What do

faith representatives offer urban governance?' *Public Money and Management* 29(6), 371-378.

Clarke, J. (2006) 'Performing for the Public: evaluation, evidence and evangelism in social policy', Paper for the inaugural ESPAnet conference, Danish National Institute of Social Research.

Connelly, S. (2011) 'Constructing legitimacy in the new community governance', *Urban Studies*, vol. 48 (5), 929–946.

Corley, A. (2006) 'Communities of Practice: idealistic thinking or achievable outcome?'

Cunningham, K. and Leighninger, M. (2010) 'Research for Democracy and Democracy for Research', *New Directions for Higher Education*, vol. 152, pp. 59-66.

Dahdouh-Guebas, F, J Ahimbisibwe, R V Moll and N Koedam 2003. Neo-colonial science by the most industrialised upon the least developed countries in peer-reviewed publishing. S*cientometrics*, vol. 56, pp.329-343.

David, M. (2002) 'Problems of participation: the limits of action research', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, vol. 5(1), pp.11-17.

Dunn, S. and Hedges, M. (2012) 'Crowd-Sourcing Scoping Study: Engaging the Crowd with Humanities Research', AHRC Report, http://humanitiescrowds.org/wp-uploads/2012/12/Crowdsourcing-connected-communities.pdf.

Durham Community Research Team (2012) 'Community-based Participatory Research: Ethical Challenges', *Centre for Social Justice and Community Action*, Durham University.

Durose, C., Beebeejaun, Y., Rees, J., Richardson, J. and Richardson, L. (2013) 'Beyond Text: exploring ethos and method in co-producing research with communities', Community Development Journal, at http://cdj.oxfordjournals.org.ezproxyd.bham.ac.uk/content/early/2013/02/14/cdj.bst008.full.pdf+html <last accessed 22nd April 2013>.

Durose, C., Beebeejaun, Y., Rees, J., Richardson, J. and Richardson, L. (2012) *Towards Co-production in Research with Communities*, AHRC Connected Communities programme, at http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/FundingOpportunities/Documents/CC%20scoping%20studies/DuroseTowards.pdf <last accessed 22nd April 2013>.

Farmer, E. (2005) 'Community Development as Improvisational Performance: A New Framework for Understanding and Reshaping Practice', *Journal of the Community Development Society*, vol. 36(2), 1.14.

Fenge, L.A., Fannin, A. and Hicks, C. (2011) 'Co-production in scholarly activity: Valuing the social capital of lay people and volunteers', *Journal of Social Work*, pp.1-15.

Fleck, L. (1979[1935]) *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*, F. Bardley and T. J. Trenn (trans.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freire, P 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury.

Fuller, G. (2013) 'Towards an Archaeology of 'Know-how'', *Cultural Studies Review*, vol. 19(1), pp.271-95.

Fung, A. and Wright, E. (2001) 'Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance', *Politics & Society*, vol. 29(1), pp.5-41.

Freeman, J. (1970) 'The Tyranny of Structurelessness', available at http://struggle.ws/pdfs/tyranny.pdf <last accessed 1st April 2013>.

Gianessi, C.A. (2012) 'From Habits to Self-Regulation: How do we change?', Yale J Biol Med. 2012 June; 85(2): 293–299.

Gillard, S., Turner, K., Lovell, K., Norton, K., Clarke, T. Addicott, R., McGivern, G. and Ferlie, E. (2010) '"Staying native": coproduction in mental health services research', *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, vol. 23(6), pp. 567-577.

Haikio, L. (2012) 'From Innovation to Convention: Legitimate Citizen Participation in Local Governance', *Local Government Studies*, vol. 38(4), pp.415-435.

Harding, S. (1993) 'Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is "Strong Objectivity"?', in *Feminist Epistemologies*, L. Alcoff & E. Potter (eds), London: Routledge, 49-82.

Hart, A., Ntung, A., Millican, J., Davies, C., Wenger, E., Rosing, H. and Pearce, J. (2012) 'Community-University partnerships through communities of practice', AHRC Report.

Heron, J. (1981a). "Experiential Research Methodology". In Reason, P., Rowan, J (eds.). Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research. Chichester, John Wiley & Sons: 153-166.

Heron, J. (1981b). "Philosophical basis for a new paradigm" In Reason, P., Rowan, J (eds.) Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research. Chichester, John Wiley & Sons: 19-35.

Heron, J. (1988). "Validity in Co-operative Inquiry". In Reason, P. (ed.) Human Inquiry in Action: Developments in New Paradigm Research. London, Sage.

Heron, J. (1992). Feeling and Personhood. London, Sage.

Heron, J. (1996 reprinted 1998). Co-operative Inquiry. London, Sage Publications.

Hewison, A., Gale, N. and Shapiro, J. (2012) 'Co-production in research: some reflections on the experience of engaging prctitioners in health research', *Public Money & Management*, vol. 32(4).

IAP2 Spectrum of Participation, at http://www.iap2.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=5

Jensen, G. H. (2000) *Storytelling in Alcoholics Anonymous: A rhetorical analysis*, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

Jung, T., Harrow, J. and Pharoah, C. (2012) 'Co-producing research: working together or falling apart?', Centre for Charitable Giving and Philanthropy Briefing Note 8.

Leighninger, M. (2011) 'Using Online Tools to Engage – and be Engaged by – the Public', IBM Center for The Business of Government: Using Technology Series.

Lesser, E., Prusak, L. et al. (2000) "Communities of Practice, Social Capital and Organizational Knowledge." *Knowledge and Communities*. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann**,** 123–31.

Lewenstein, B V 2002. Editorial: a decade of public understanding. *Public Understanding of Science*, 11, 1–4.

Mahony, N. and Clarke, J. (2012) 'Public Crises, Public Futures', *Cultural Studies*

Martin, S. (2010) 'Co-production of social research: Strategies for engaged scholarship', *Public Money and Management*, vol. 30(4), pp.211-218.

Marchi, S. and Ciceri, E. (2011) 'Login and logout: practices of resistance and presence in virtual environments as a kind of reflective learning activity', *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, vol. 12(2), pp.209-223.

Mayer, B. (2000) *The Dynamics of Conflict Resolution: A Practitioner's Guide.* San Francisco: Jose Bass.

Mulder, H. and De Bok C. F. M. (2006) "Science shops as university-community interfaces: an interactive approach in science communication" in D. Cheng, J Met calfe, B. Schiele (Eds), *At the Human Scale - International Practices in Science Communication*, Beijing: Science Press.

Mulvihill, N., Hart, A., Northmore, S., Wolff, D. and Pratt, J. (2011) 'The Future of Community-University Engagement', South East Coastal Communities Dissemination Paper 1.

Needham, C. (2007) 'Realising the Potential of Co-production: Negotiating Improvements in Public Services', *Social Policy & Society*, vol. 7(2), pp.221-231.

Newman, J. (2012a) *Working the Spaces of Power*

Newman, J. (2012b) 'Beyond the deliberative subject? Problems of theory, method and critique in the turn to emotion and affect', *Critical Policy Studies*, vol. 6(4), pp.465-479.

Newman, J. & Clarke, J. (2009) Publics, Politics and Power: Remaking the Public in Public Services, London, Sage Publishing.

Noorani, T., Blencowe, C. and Brigstocke, J. (eds) *Problems of Participation: Reflections on Democracy, Authority and the Struggle for Common Life*, Lewes: ARN Press.

Nowotny, H., Scott, P. and Gibbons, M. (2001) *Rethinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Orr, K.M. and Bennett, M. (2009) 'Reflexivity in the co-production of academic-practitioner r esearch' *Qualitative Research in Organisations and Management* 4, 85-102

Osterweil, M. (2003) 'De-centering The Forum: Is Another Critique Of The Forum Possible?' *The WSF: Challenging Empires*, pp. 183-190.

Ostrom, E. (1996) 'Crossing the Great Divide: Co-production, Synergy and Development' *World Development* 24(6), 1073–88

Pearce, J. (2008) ''We make progress because we are lost': Critical Reflections on Co Producing Knowledge as a Methodology for Researching Non governmental Public Action'

Pohl, C., Rist, R., Zimmerman, A., Fry, P., Gurung, G.S., Schneider, F., Speranza, C.I., Kiteme, B., Boillat, S., Serrano, E., Hirsch Hadorn G. and Weismann, U (2010)
'Researchers' roles in knowledge co-production: experience from sustainability research in Kenya, Switzerland, Bolivia and Nepal' *Science and Public Policy* 37(4), 267-281.

Ospina, S., Godsoe, B. and Schall, E. (2001) 'Co-producing Knowledge: Practitioners and Scholars Working Together to Understand Leadership', paper based on a roundtable presentation given by Sonia Ospina, Robert F, Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, and Richard Couto, Jepson School of Leadership Studies, at the 2001 International Leadership Association Conference

Pain, R., Finn, M., Bouveng, R. and Ngobe, G. (2013) 'Productive tensions – engaging georgraphy students in participatory action research with communities', *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, vol. 37(1), 28-43.

Phillips, L. (2011) *The Promise of Dialogue*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Porter. L. (2010) *Unlearning the colonial cultures of planning* Surrey, Ashgate

Purcell, R. (2009) 'Images for change: community development, community arts and photography', *Community Development Journal* 44(1), 111-122.

Raymond, C.M., Fazey,I., Reed,M.S., Stringer, L.C., Robinson,G.M., and Evely, A.C. (2010) 'Integrating local and scientific knowledge for environmental management', *Journal of Environmental Management*, vol. 91,pp. 1766–1777.

Robinson, J. and Tansey, J. (2006) 'Co-production, emergent properties and strong interactive social research: the Georgia Basin Futures Project', *Science and Public Policy*, vol. 33(2), pp.151-160.

Scearce, D (2011) *Connected Citizens: The Power, Peril and Potential of Networks* Knight Fou ndation www.connectedcitizens.net

Schwanen, T., Banister, D. and Anable, J. (2012) 'Rethinking habits and their role in behaviour change: The case of low-carbon mobility', *Journal of Transport Georgraphy*.

Silverman, R. M., Taylor, H. L. and Crawford, C. (2008) 'The role of citizen participation and action research principles in Main Street revitalization: An analysis of a local planning project', *Action Research*, vol. 6(1), pp. 69-93.

Tsouvalis, J. and Waterton, C. (2011) 'Public Participation as a Process of De-Politicization', AHRC Report.

Wakeford, T. and Pimbert, M. (2013) 'Opening Participatory Democracy's Black Box: Facilitation as Creative Bricolage', in T. Noorani, C. Blencowe and J. Brigstocke (eds) *Problems of Participation: Reflections on Democracy, Authority and the Struggle for Common Life*, Lewes: ARN Press, pp. 69-81.

Wenger, E. (2009) 'Communities of practice: a brief introduction', at http://www.ewenger.com/theory

Wenger, E., McDermott, R. et al. (2002) *Cultivating Communities of Practice*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Whatmore, S. J. (2009) 'Mapping knowledge controversies: science, democracy and the redistribution of expertise', *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 33(5) 587-598.

Wulfhorst, J.D., Eisenhauer, B.W., Gripne, S.L. and Ward, J.M. (2008) 'Core Criteria and Assessment of Participatory Research', in C. Wilmsen, W. Elmendorf, L. Fisher, J. Ross, B. Sarathy and G. Wells (eds) *Partnerships* for *Empowerment: Participatory Research for Community-based Natural Resource Management*,
London: Earthscan, pp. 23.46.

Wynne, B 1991. Knowledges in context. *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, 16(1), 111–121.