

Volume 33 Issue 2

cjsae

the canadian journal for the study of adult education

la revue canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes

rcééa

LEARNING FROM A DECADE OF THE *CANADIAN
JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF ADULT EDUCATION*
PUBLICATIONS: COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH
WITH MARGINALIZED ADULTS

Shauna Butterwick, Suzanne Smythe, and Jing Li

*The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education/
La revue canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes*
Editor-in-Chief: Robert Mizzi
www.cjsae-rceea.ca

33,2 November/novembre 2021, 45–63
ISSN1925-993X (online)

© Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education/
L'Association canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes
www.casae-aceea.ca

LEARNING FROM A DECADE OF THE CANADIAN JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF ADULT EDUCATION PUBLICATIONS: COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH WITH MARGINALIZED ADULTS

Shauna Butterwick

University of British Columbia

Suzanne Smythe¹

Simon Fraser University

Jing Li

University of British Columbia

Abstract

Informed by critical feminisms, we undertook a cartography of publications in the Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education (CJSAE) from 2009 to 2019. We focused on two sets of publications: those that reported on community-based research (CBR) methods and those that aimed to address marginalization as a mode of oppression, with a particular interest in those articles in which CBR and marginalization intersect. Our explorations led us to reflect on important shifts in CBR reported in CJSAE in the decade of study, as well as persistent tensions surrounding the recognition of this research within mainstream academia. We also observed that the theorization of marginalization, and how this concept is taken up with respect to researcher positionality and the politics of research, requires more attention in adult education research. We interpret adult education research as an institution, a regime of truth (Smith, 1987) that opens and/or forecloses possibilities for social transformation, with implications for academic practices and the democratization of knowledge.

- 1 Suzanne Smythe appreciates and acknowledges support for this work from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) Partnership Development Grant. *Making Research Accessible: Transforming the Utility of Scholarly Communication for the Downtown Eastside Community in Vancouver, British Columbia.* # 890-2017-0008.

*The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education/
La revue canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes*
33,2 November/novembre 2021, 45–63
ISSN1925-993X (online)

© Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education/
L'Association canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes

Résumé

Nourrie par les féminismes critiques, cette étude propose une cartographie de publications dans la Revue canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes (RCÉÉA) entre 2009 et 2019. Nous avons examiné deux types de publications : celles qui portaient sur les méthodes de recherche axées sur la communauté (RAC) et celles qui abordaient la marginalisation comme mode d'oppression, particulièrement celles à l'intersection de ces approches. Nos explorations ont suscité des réflexions sur d'importants changements dans les RAC présentées dans la RCÉÉA pendant la période étudiée, ainsi que sur les tensions persistantes liées à la reconnaissance de ces recherches par le milieu universitaire traditionnel. Nous avons également observé que la théorisation de la marginalisation et sa mobilisation relative à la positionnalité des équipes de recherche et aux politiques de recherche exigent plus d'attention dans les recherches en éducation des adultes. Nous interprétons l'éducation des adultes comme institution, un régime de vérité (Smith, 1987) ouvrant ou fermant les possibilités de transformation sociale, ce qui amène des implications pour les pratiques de recherche et la démocratisation des savoirs.

In 2020, proposals for submissions for a special issue to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education (CASAE) were solicited with the aim to look back upon Canadian adult education scholarship in the decade 2009 to 2019. Our contribution to this project is a mapping of *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education* (CJSAE) publications in that decade that were concerned with social and educational marginalization. As scholars who pursue research in community settings among groups who experience marginalization, we were interested in how other scholars theorize marginalization and the methods they draw upon to explore this phenomenon. These interests are stimulated by shifts we have experienced in the past decade as universities and major funding agencies have demonstrated an interest in community-engaged research (Etmanski et al., 2014), drawing attention to the nature of university-community relations, including where, how, and for whom knowledge is created. We are also closely following the resurgence of Indigenous and decolonizing research methods (Archibald, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 2012) and the critical conversations these are opening with respect to researcher-participant positionalities and settler-colonial research logics. In this shifting terrain, the concepts of marginalization and community raise new methodological, ethical, and political questions for adult education researchers.

We situate ourselves as settler scholars who approach this review of scholarship in a spirit of humility and curiosity. We are challenging ourselves to change how we approach our research in light of our scholarly responsibilities to contribute to the democratization and decolonization of adult education research and practice. We look to the corpus of studies in this review not for the strengths or shortcomings of individual studies or scholars, but rather for what the corpus might teach us about research as an *institution*, a regime of truth (Smith, 1987) with implications for justice and decolonization. We begin by laying out the conceptual terrains informing the analysis: (a) critical feminist and critical race theories as they relate to marginalization, (b) meanings of *community*, and (c) trends and practices in community-based research (CBR). We then describe our bibliometric analysis, followed by a thematic mapping of how the concept of marginalization has been

theorized, the politics and challenges of CBR, and where the field seems to be moving. We conclude with reflections and speculations for how adult education researchers and practitioners, including ourselves, can intensify efforts to democratize and decolonize adult education research.

Conceptual Framework

Critical Feminist and Critical Race Theories of Marginalization

A scholar who has influenced our reading of marginalization in this review is Iris Marion Young (2011). In her groundbreaking and still influential critical feminist analysis of *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, first written in 1990, Young identified oppression thus:

Oppression refers to the vast and deep injustices some groups suffer as a consequence of often unconscious assumptions and reactions of well-meaning people in ordinary interactions, media and cultural stereotypes, and structural features of bureaucratic hierarchies and market mechanisms—in short the normal processes of everyday life. *We cannot eliminate this structural oppression by getting rid of the rulers or making some new laws, because oppressions are systematically reproduced in major economic, political, and cultural institutions.* (p. 41, emphasis added)

Young (2011) presented oppression as a structural phenomenon taking five forms, or faces: exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence. These modes of oppression are relational and result from hegemonic practices carried out by dominant groups to effect the subjugation of those considered different (p. 6–7).

Exploitation, Young (2011) argued, is a mode of oppression rooted in capitalism's extractive logics and expressed in "social rules about what work is, who does what for whom, how work is compensated, and the social process by which the results of work are appropriated operate to enact relations of power and inequality" (p. 8). Young extended this Marxian analysis to show that women and racialized groups experience specific forms of exploitation rooted in patriarchy and racism that interact with and compound class exploitation.

Young's (2011) second face of oppression is marginalization, and she argued that it is the most dangerous because it is a mechanism by which whole categories of people are "expelled from useful participation in social life and thus potentially subjected to severe material deprivation and even extermination" (p. 53). These marked groups include those deemed unable to conform to the ideals of full citizenship that require autonomy and independence (p. 55). These ideals are rooted in liberal philosophical doctrines that are read through racist and patriarchal logics, so that those seen as or made to be "dependent" almost always include Indigenous peoples, racialized groups, "single" women with children, LGBTQ2S+ communities (though Young referred at the time to gay men and lesbians), the elderly, and people with disabilities. Dependency has become a warrant to "suspend basic rights to privacy, respect, and individual choice" (p. 54) and to discount capacities, knowledge, and social contributions so that individuals and groups come to doubt their self-worth.

Young's (2011) third face of oppression is powerlessness, a process by which "the labour of most people...augments the power of relatively few" (p. 54). Cultural imperialism is Young's fourth face of oppression and it refers to the process by which dominant groups'

experiences and cultures are considered the norm by which non-dominant practices and beliefs are evaluated and made Other. This is the exercise of power characterized by systems in which some have power to make decisions and others do not, with reference to those actors deemed more reasonable, experienced, and legitimate. Violence, the fifth face of oppression, operates systemically and enforces the logics of the other faces of oppression, so that "some groups live with the knowledge that they must fear random, unprovoked attacks...which have no motive but to damage, humiliate or destroy the person" (p. 61).

Young (2011) was careful to qualify that while there are many conscious acts of oppression—racist attacks, rape, land theft, violent arrests of Indigenous and Black people in North American cities on a regular basis...the list goes on and on—attributing these actions to individual "bad apples" ignores the systemic and structural nature of oppression. Oppression is enacted by groups upon groups in ways that are intersecting, situated, conscious, and unconscious. In this, oppression is not a monolithic force (Sensoy & Di Angelo, 2017), and it has become important to understand how it is that groups and individuals can be at once oppressed and oppressors, and how it is that power and oppression circulate in education and social systems, including those of academic research.

Another scholar who has had a deep impact on the theorization of marginalization, and upon our own theorizing, is Black feminist and critical race scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989, 1991). Drawing on examples of discrimination against Black women in the legal system (Crenshaw, 1989) and of the treatment and fate of Black women in cases of domestic violence (Crenshaw, 1991), Crenshaw showed how the intersections of race and gender compound Black women's oppression in ways that are qualitatively different to single-axis marginalization based on gender *or* race. Observing that the roots of feminism have evolved from within the logics of a White racial context, Crenshaw (1989) argued that when White women speak for "women," they are excluding and silencing Black women's intersectional and compounding experiences of racism and gender. She wrote, "This adoption of a single-issue framework for discrimination not only marginalizes Black women within the very movements that claim them as part of their constituency but it also makes the elusive goal of ending racism and patriarchy even more difficult to attain" (p. 152).

Reflecting on the explanatory power or intersectionality over time, Patricia Hill Collins (2019) observed that "using intersectionality as a metaphor provided a ready-made yet open-ended framework for making meaning of the social world" (p. 28). However, according to Cooper (2015), quite often the concept of intersectionality is distorted to capture broad agendas of diversity and equity that minimize and even exclude racialized women's experiences. In this, argued Puar (2012), "the language of intersectionality substitutes for intersectional analysis itself" (p. 53). As we elaborate in our review below, shifting meanings and uses of the term *intersectionality* are consequential for how race and gender are theorized in studies concerned with marginalization in adult education research.

Meanings of Community

Critical research traditions are concerned with marginalization and other oppressions as problems of social justice that researchers have responsibilities to address (Denzin et al., 2008). As Etmanski et al. (2014) argued, CBR is a set of practices that centre social

justice as a process and a desired outcome. However, meanings of community and CBR are contested and fluid.

Although the term *community* is frequently invoked in education and research discourse, its meaning is rarely troubled. The elasticity and ubiquitous application of the term are concerns raised by Ibáñez-Carrasco and Riaño-Alcalá (2011), who noted that community is "currently applied to almost any gathering of persons, ideas, and products to add a patina of authenticity" (p. 2). The *Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (Honderich, 1995) defined community as "a group of people living a common life through reciprocal relationships" (pp. 143–144), which suggests that community-based learning and research should similarly foreground reciprocity. In her historical study of the notion of community, Lambie (2016) found that early 14th-century uses of the term were synonymous with *the people*, as distinguished from governments, states, or social elites. We share Lambie's observation that this sensibility continues in present-day usage, and this has informed the concept of community we brought to the present review.

Bauman (2001) added another layer of understanding. He wrote, "Company or society can be bad; but not the *community*. Community, we feel, is always a good thing" (p. 1, emphasis in original). Is this association with goodness part of the appeal in recent academic institutions' desire for community engagement? As Smythe's institution described: "SFU's strategic community engagement plan is intended to empower SFU students, faculty and staff to form deeper and more courageous partnerships so that community-engaged teaching, research, and creative activity may better express co-created intentions for community impact while maintaining scholarly rigor" (Simon Fraser University, 2020, para. 1). Such projects are well intended and may have transformative effects, but their formal expression centres the institution, its researchers, and students, and at least in this expression, decentres goals of social justice and social transformation. Harnessed to the goals of large institutions, community risks losing its force as a locus of resistance, difference, affinities, and collective and contested learning.

Community-Based Research

Etmanski et al. (2014) observed that just as community is an elastic concept, so too is CBR. These authors presented a constellation of practices associated with CBR, including participatory research, arts-based research, engaged scholarship, university-community partnerships, Indigenous methodologies, decolonizing research, and knowledge mobilization (p. 7). While CBR methodologies are diverse, these authors argued that "their defining characteristics are that they are action-oriented and participatory" (p. 8). In other words, action-oriented research "commit(s) to supporting the community in improving conditions in some way," and participatory methods imply that the "intended beneficiaries of the research (i.e., community members) have significant control over some if not all parts of the research process" (p. 8).

Another important contribution to CBR is the 4R framework provided by Kirkness and Barnhardt (1991). In response to higher education's often failed efforts to create a welcoming environment for Indigenous students, Kirkness and Barnhardt proposed that institutions practise respect, relevance, reciprocity, and responsibility so that Indigenous students can thrive on their own terms. As Hanson (2018) observed, the 4Rs also work as cornerstones of ethically informed CBR when they are present from the beginning.

Archibald's (2008) principles of Indigenous storywork expand upon the 4Rs to include "reverence, responsibility, holism, respect, reciprocity, synergy and interrelatedness" (p. 11), which together comprise an ethic of decolonial research by and for Indigenous peoples (Archibald et al., 2019).

These principles have been taken up to a certain extent in the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research, 2018), thanks to the influences of Indigenous knowledge and activism with the publication of *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action* (2015) and the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (2007). Yet as Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012) argued, this work goes beyond institutional protocols to "provoke some revolutionary thinking about the roles that knowledge, knowledge production, knowledge hierarchies, and knowledge institutions play in decolonization and social transformation" (p. vi).

Following Denzin et al. (2008) and Tuhiwai Smith et al. (2018), we note that CBR is often located within critical research traditions that share with Indigenous and decolonizing methodologies the goals of social transformation (action) and centring research participants' voices and agency (participation) (Etmanski et al., 2014). However, as Tuck and Yang (2012) asserted, "Decolonization is not a metaphor" (p. 1). Indigenous and decolonizing research are material practices centrally concerned with the repatriation of Indigenous land and life (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Critical research and CBR, although aspiring to social justice, may not always centre these goals.

Methodology and Research Questions

In this section, we describe how we have carried out a bibliometric analysis and thematic map of scholarship informed by the conceptual framing described above. Bibliometrics involves the counting of publications, guided by pragmatic and theoretical questions. Bibliometric analyses are often complemented by thematic analyses that lend interpretation in order to open up new understandings of the state of the field with respect to equity, exclusions, trends, silences, and innovations.

We were inspired by studies that have mapped patterns of geographical and methodological dominance in adult education scholarship (Fejes & Nylander, 2014; Rubenson & Elfert, 2015; Taylor, 2001); trends in gender equity in publishing in CJSAE over 40 years, including the balance of critical, quantitative, qualitative, and policy research (St. Clair, 2011); shifting discourses in feminist theory (Shan, 2015); feminist methods (Taber, 2015); discourses of liberatory adult education (Butterwick et al., 2003); and the interplay of heteronormative and gender discourses and migrant studies (Mizzi, 2013). Thematic analyses have been referred to as mappings (Rubenson & Elfert, 2015), as ethnographic and iterative analyses of concepts (Shan, 2015), and as a prospective and constructivist project as we inevitably create the terrain as we document it (St. Clair, 2011).

Mapping scholarship in these ways can offer adult education researchers perspectives on the field that they are creating together, and what changes might be necessary. These reviews provide a picture of the social organization of adult education scholarship at different points in time, and provide insights into the political economy of citations and publications that are necessary to correct imbalances in scholarly voices. Yet there is still a

need for reviews that centre the positionings of researchers with respect to race and gender and that foreground relationships with diverse and marginalized communities. With these goals in mind, our bibliometric and thematic review was guided by the following questions:

- What research is being carried out that addresses marginalization as a topic or problem in adult education research? For example:
 - Which groups were the focus of these studies?
 - Who were the researchers?
 - What were the methodological approaches?
 - What theories of marginalization inform these studies? How is this changing over the decade under review?
- How do authors describe methodologies of CBR and what are the innovations and challenges that arise?

Our project began in February 2020 when we engaged a research assistant, Jing Li, who carried out several rounds of searches of CJSAE articles published from March 2009 to March 2019, for a total of 120 articles in 22 issues. An initial list of articles was identified using descriptors of adult learning, marginalization, oppression, and CBR, which resulted in 80 articles. Using the descriptors *community-based research*, *participatory research*, *action research*, and *marginalization* produced 83 results. The descriptors *community* and *marginalized* produced 115 results. The same articles surfaced repeatedly, giving us confidence in the relevance and reliability of the search terms.

We then reviewed the abstracts of the selected articles, assessing their fit with our goals, including publications that focused on (a) adult learners who experience social, political, and economic marginalization or that belonged to vulnerable groups, and (b) whether the context of learning was community-based settings and/or with communities (e.g., community-based/participatory projects or approaches). For articles written in both English and French, only one version was kept. Book reviews and the "Perspective" sections of CJSAE were excluded. This process resulted in a final collection of 41, a little under one-third of the total articles published during this 10-year time frame. We excluded three editorial articles for special issues (Butterwick & Roy, 2018; Clover et al., 2019; Taber, 2015). The total number of articles we reviewed was 38.

After settling on our corpus of relevant studies, and working with the concepts of marginalization, intersectionality, community, and CBR, we undertook an iterative review. We read each article and created an excel spreadsheet that responded to our study questions, noting (a) which marginalized groups were the focus of the research, (b) the methodological approach taken, (c) the theories that informed the study, (d) the study findings with respect to the problem addressed and its solutions or responses, and (e) implications and recommendations for further research, including reflections on the study methodology. We then mapped these themes back to the broader questions guiding our inquiry, particularly in relation to the findings and implications that we address in the thematic analysis.

This mapping helped to organize our thinking, but inevitably, the categories spilled over into each other; that is, each article became connected to the others so that we couldn't comment on one without referring to another. Just as Shan (2015) and St. Clair (2011) described of their reviews, what started as a more systematic step-by-step process became

much less linear and more interactive. St. Clair (2011) noted, "Counting and categorizing texts is slippery and articles simply do not fall neatly into one box of a typology, because the point is often to explore relationships between different ideas" (p. 30). We also wanted to attend to how our subjectivities as readers were shaping our analytic approach (Ellis & Flaherty, 1992) as we fluctuated between standing outside and inside of these narratives. The categories we created and keywords we deployed must be considered partial and purposeful, reflecting our research goals, particular interests, and positionings. Other researchers would bring different sensibilities.

Findings

Bibliometric Analysis

Which Groups Were the Focus of These Studies?

As outlined in Table 1, we found that most (23) of the publications focused on women as a marginalized group, differentiated by intersectional experiences as presented in the table. Other studies explored adult literacy and basic education, addressed immigration experiences, or engaged in critical commentary on research methods and scholarship.

Who Were the Researchers?

Our observations related to gender and authorship proceed with the limitation that identifying gender on the basis of people's names is a cisgender practice that can essentialize authors' gender identities. In his review of articles published in CJSAE since its inception in 2005, St. Clair (2011) observed that about 50% of authors identified as women and 62% of women wrote with other women. When writing with men, women were more likely to be co-authors than first authors. In our corpus, we noted a marked difference in this

Table 1: Marginalized groups as the focus of research

Marginalized group	Number of publications
Women	23
Newcomer women (8)	
Indigenous women and settler coloniality (4)	
Criminalization (3)	
Living with a disability and/or mental illness (2)	
Learning in social movements (2)	
Poverty and homelessness (2)	
Aging (1)	
Rurality (1)	
Literacy/adult basic education learners	5
New immigrants	2
Youth	2
Sexual and gender minorities	1

pattern, at least when it comes to research addressing marginalization and in the vein of community-based research. We found only five publications written by authors with typically male names, and the rest were written by authors with typically female names. We also observed how a little over half of these reports (23) were multi-authored and wondered if research with marginalized learners invites more collaborative explorations, particularly among community-based and university-based authors. We also noted that special issues in the journal accounted for 16 of the articles included in the corpus, constituting a substantial contribution to this literature.

What Were the Methodological Approaches?

Methodologies are not mutually exclusive, and just as Etmanski et al. (2014) have observed, approaches to CBR are wide-ranging. We thus grouped such studies according to their professed goals of participation and action, in all the diversity this entails, as recorded in Table 2. Of interest is the emergence since 2018 of research informed by Indigenous conceptual and methodological frameworks, suggesting a new and important focus of adult education research.

What Theories of Marginalization Inform These Studies?

As the work of Young (2011) suggested, how marginalization is theorized in research informs models of social and educational change. Our analysis of how adult educators conceptualized marginality suggests the predominance of feminist, or critical feminist, orientations, along with the continued influence of Freirean (1970/2018) pedagogies and concepts. Psycho-social theories of transformative learning and habitus were also prevalent, though less so as the decade proceeded. Only one article (Warner, 1991) described queer theory. The critical race theory of intersectionality was named in eight publications, although only a few carried this lens into data analysis. Similarly, while racism was an issue of concern in one-third of the articles, none of these publications mentioned thinking with critical race theory (e.g., Delgado & Stefancic, 2017).

Table 2: Methodological Approaches

Methodological approach	Number of publications
Case study	25
CBR	24
Arts-based methods (16)	
Action research (3)	
Indigenous and decolonizing methods (5)	
Narrative inquiry, storytelling, and memoir	17
Ethnography	5
Critical commentary	5
Life history	1

Table 3: Theorizing Marginalization

Theory of marginalization	Number of publications
Feminisms	24
Critical feminism (5)	
Mezirow's transformative learning	14
Freirean theories of oppression	13
Indigenous and decolonizing theories	5
Intersectionality	8
Bourdieuian habitus, social and cultural capital	3
Queer theory	1

We now shift to a thematic mapping of the corpus we constructed, deepening the themes of marginalization and CBR addressed in our research questions and addressing new ones such as the role of intersectionality, researcher positionality, and the making of marginalized subjects. Following this, we offer our observations about how CBR is deployed as a methodology, and we explore how institutional barriers may be at work in fully engaging with this approach.

Thematic Mappings

Marginalization

As researchers working within neo-liberal logics (Taber, 2014), we often find it easier to recognize injustice at the level of the individual rather than as a system. We noted that although authors described "complex" structures that contribute to social marginalization, rarely are those structures analyzed across more than one axis. Several authors noted that women's oppression within patriarchy intersects with age, race, class, and so on, citing Crenshaw (1989, 1991). Maitra (2015) demonstrated the explanatory power of decolonial and critical race critiques of Canada's multicultural imaginary, and Mojab and Taber (2015) similarly read memoirs of women political prisoners in Morocco alongside the colonial violence experienced by Indigenous women in Canada. But few other studies took up race and racism as central to their analyses, even though Crenshaw's concept of intersectionality wants us to pay attention to the particular, compounding experiences of Black women and other racialized people. Somehow, race just kept sliding away, in spite of the fact that many studies were located in settler-colonial contexts and White researchers were carrying out their work among racialized communities. This speaks to Puar's (2012) point described above that sometimes intersectionality is deployed more as a metaphor than as an analytic method. Smythe detected just this phenomenon in the article "Complicating Access," included in this corpus that she co-authored with Breshears (Smythe & Breshears, 2017). In exploring digital exclusion, the authors described marginality as a technological access issue related to low income, inappropriate design, and language and literacy skills. They

did not mention race even though, reading it now, racism so obviously structured these other experiences.

Other authors seemed to be grappling with this too. For example, in his review of heteronormativity in studies of migration, Mizzi (2013) observed that mobilizing intersectionality more directly in analyses is needed. He wrote,

Besides examining the added value that a post-foundational lens brings to this analysis, my additional goal here is grounded in social justice. That goal is to encourage adult educators and researchers in adult education to view encounters of homophobia and racism through multiple lenses in order to bring to light the intersectional nature of power and oppression. (p. 55)

Hanson (2014) picked up on intersectionality in her study of women's experiences in a labour education program, noting that gender oppression is never just about gender:

Although important strategies to address gender bias include organizing women's committees or women's conferences, such efforts seldom include an analysis of how gender intersects with other forms of oppression. The goals of and courses offered by the PSUW [Prairie School for Union Women] speak to efforts at dismantling some of the invisible politics affecting diverse groups of women. (p. 5)

When intersectionality as an analytic concept is fully engaged, new questions open up. One example is Neustaeter's (2015) feminist ethnography of rural women's learning experiences in community-building activities. Neustaeter argued that rurality is often neglected as an axis of women's oppression. In bringing together gender and rurality, she demonstrated the materialities of place in the formation of identities and marginality. Yet Neustaeter concluded by observing that all the rural women included in her study were White, even though Indigenous communities were nearby and new immigrants also lived in the community. She posed some probing questions about the nature of rurality in relation to racism and settler colonialism, with implications for participatory research:

Considering that we tend to keep to our own social identity groups (Tillmann-Healy, 2003) and the perception of homogeneity within rural communities, where are the spaces to critically challenge and engage women's understandings of the local gender culture and how it influences their lives? If we support and encourage the connections as they exist, do we not risk perpetuating the existing understandings of gender culture and practices in rural communities? What about building connections across boundaries, particularly with minorities and marginalized groups such as immigrant and Indigenous women? (p. 113)

As the above observation indicates, Neustaeter (2015) also reflected on her methodology in relation to her own positionality. Critically reflecting on our positionalities as researchers, how we are located in intersecting regimes of inequality, and how our methodologies reinforce or disrupt binaries and hierarchies are important aspects of critical and feminist research. Blackburn Miller (2018), in her study of the Theatre of Witness programs in

Northern Ireland, described herself as a White, middle-class, academic researcher and declared her "bias"—that is, as a supporter of the Irish nationalist side of "The Troubles."

Similarly, Kteily-Hawa (2018) researched South Asian immigrant women's experiences of being diagnosed with HIV. She began her study with a one-way approach, using a structured interview protocol. When participants' responses were minimal, Kteily-Hawa realized that a different approach was required, one that was more dialogic where she was also sharing her own stories of immigration with participants. She wrote, "I realized that it is really important for researchers to think carefully about how they create conditions for stories to be told" (p. 92). Creating conditions for listening and observing was also part of Groen and Kawalilak's (2019) autoethnographic exploration of their visit to an exhibition at the Glenbow Museum in Calgary by Denesuline artist Alex Janvier, of Cold Lake First Nations: "As active engagers, not passive observers, we continue to ask, how do we intentionally take up our work within spaces offered to us and in the spaces we create within university settings?" (p. 79). This stance requires not only reflection upon past practices, but an opening to different futures and relations. Taber et al. (2010) also showed how theory can be put to work in studies to disturb the "mirror effect" of reflexive practice; otherwise, "the ways in which society and education can perpetuate marginalization and oppression remain largely invisible" (p. 49).

Critical positional stances such as these allow us to see more clearly how researchers' relationships to the phenomena that they study shape the process and outcomes, alter their own views, or change them in some way. As Opaskwayak Cree scholar Shawn Wilson (2008) argued in presenting research as ceremony, if research doesn't change us, we aren't doing it right.

Community-Based Research: Multiplicities of Participation and Action

How do authors describe methodologies of CBR and what are the innovations and challenges that arise? Among the rich methods, experimentations, and innovations that are expressed in the corpus, only a few described processes in which community members formulated research questions or in which findings were actively taken up by the community to effect social action. Perhaps this is because what counts as participation and action is contextual. For example, among studies that adopted Freirean (1970/2018) liberatory pedagogical orientations, Balyasnikova and Gillard (2018) wrote about a language-learning program for Chinese seniors where they invited participants to tell their own stories and create curriculum materials based on these stories as authors. The result was new curricula for learners upon which others could build; where this would take them was unknown, but it was clear that the *process* was also the outcome. We saw a similar conscientization approach reported in Blackburn Miller's (2018) study of Theatre of Witness in Northern Ireland, which pointed out how community-engaged theatre broke down barriers in the community and created new understandings and shared possibilities for living beyond The Troubles.

It seems, too, that participatory research processes are difficult to sustain for academics who are working within multiple and often conflicting pressures and academic reward systems. Clover and Craig (2009) referred to this in their description of a community partnership in which data generation was embedded in the flow of aesthetic activity during art workshops in a community organization for women experiencing poverty, trauma, and violence. They argued that trust, like art, is a process, and it takes *time* to create relations

of trust that are vital to research with transformative aims centred on the well-being of participants. They quoted one participant as saying, "Through the project, trust slowly and painstakingly began to grow. I am finally really learning to work well with others, to trust... because I have to and it has been hard for me to trust anyone" (p. 26).

The authors concluded by noting the ongoing tension between these relational processes and the results-based methods incentivized in many tenure and promotion structures, an issue to which we return in the final section. Clover and Craig (2009) were also among the few authors to describe differences in how researchers and participants interpreted study findings. Community research is always going to require a sensitivity to power differences, yet few studies write of sticky relations.

The complexities of research relationships can defy representation in traditional academic article formats. Brigham et al. (2018), in their participatory photography research with migrant women, cited a participant's expressions of her research experience that allude to this ineffability:

We start to interact, and...when you start to express your story...that starts to promote...feelings...and from there you start to connect and you start to create another story [...] The collective [part] is the best part because people add more and more ideas. (p. 113)

The spacing and ellipses in this prose gesture toward a concept of community and of research relationships that are contingent and aspirational, moving beyond mere research to imagining different worlds and ways of being. This calls attention to ethical relationalities and responsibilities for what happens when formal research processes end. Hanson (2018), in her study with Indigenous women weavers, observed that "relationships [do] not begin with the research process" (p. 21).

Thanks to recent special issues (for example, Clover et al., 2019), there are yet more models of collaborative research located within Indigenous and decolonizing frameworks from which to learn. Spring, Wunderlee, and Werhun (2019) demonstrated a collaborative research approach that also disrupts participants' status in a research study based on a feminist ethics of care, using an approach they identified as "museum hacking." They identified paintings found in museums depicting women sex workers and reinterpreted them from the lived experience of Wunderlee and Werhun as sex workers, thus interrupting the male gaze and calling attention to museums and public galleries as important sites of adult education.

Desmoulin (2019) illustrated the 4Rs in her research that explored the potential and processes of decolonizing museums, long associated with reinforcing oppressive, settler-colonial narratives. Desmoulin studied the impact of a memorial exhibit *Walking With Our Sisters*, which toured across Canada in 2013. Moccasin vamps were created to awaken the tragedy of missing and murdered Indigenous women, as well as children who died while in Indian residential schools. She volunteered with the exhibit and sought the approval of the local Indigenous community for the exhibit and her research project, both of which were under the guidance of that community and an Elder. These last two articles are powerful examples of how CBR researchers are taking ownership of their positionality and the possibilities and challenges of reciprocity.

Institutional Barriers to Community-Based Research

We have discussed several interlocking themes in relation to community research oriented to social justice: the elasticity of the concept of community, the power relations that shape research relationships, and the struggles to take up intersecting oppressions and researcher positionalities. We said at the outset that we are interested in research studies for what they say about academic institutions and practices, so let's turn to that now. Brann-Barrett's (2009) nine-month critical ethnography was one of the few studies in our sample to engage in longer-term relations with communities. She drew attention to how ethics boards' assumptions and requirements often conflict with realities of research settings where long and complex consent forms, academic literacy, rules for recruitment, and so on conflict with local realities and bureaucratize researcher relations. Brann-Barrett argued, "There needs to be a degree of flexibility within guidelines without compromising the welfare of potential participants" (2009, p. 67). At the heart of her argument was that disadvantaged voices must be included in research if change is to occur, but this is easier said than done.

Another study that involved longer-term engagement with the community was Desmoulin's exploration of the *Walking With Our Sisters* memorial. As she explained:

I am an educator and researcher who gained Indian status through marriage. This status connected me to Biigtigong Nishnaabeg (formerly known as Pic River First Nation). My husband and I raised our three Anishnaabe children in the urban Aboriginal community of Thunder Bay, where I live and work. These connections to family and communities inspire my research, which focuses on community-led initiatives in education and its interconnections to justice. (p. 61)

It seems that if universities, grant-making institutions, tenure and promotion committees, and so on are committed to community-engaged research, then different concepts of research production need to be mobilized. Our own experiences gaining tenure made it very clear that what was valued was our ability to be productive, evidenced by yearly peer-reviewed publications. For Butterwick, the time she took (away from publishing) to establish longer-term relationships was regarded as problematic and a poor choice for using her time (Butterwick & Dawson, 2004). We see this tension at work in Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council grants, where those individuals and groups with expertise and wisdom who are designated as collaborators cannot be paid for their contributions to research. Hanson (2014) commented on the benefits of participatory action research (PAR) and also alluded to its demands for the researcher:

The collaborative approach between the researcher and the steering committee...provides an additional example of how community-based participatory research develops learning relationships and possibilities for knowledge-generation on multiple levels—academic and community-based—and using both academic and popular formats... While the constant feedback loops between the steering committee and the researcher bode well with the philosophy of PAR—although taxing on researcher energy and commitment—they honour the spirit of mutual learning and benefits of PAR. (p. 14)

Conclusions

The goal of our mapping project was to explore a decade of CJSAE publications (2009 to 2019) and examine those articles focused on marginalized learners and those studies engaging with CBR. To put it another way, we were looking at *the what* and *the how* of adult education research oriented to addressing injustices and how our review could provide direction for future research aimed at democratization and decolonization of knowledge production.

We noted how the marginalization of women learners was a concern for many articles we included in our corpus and how women learners were differentiated by various axes of oppression, such as age, income, rurality, and so on, indicating some engagement with intersectionality as a way to theorize marginality. Encouragingly, towards the end of the decade, we began to see more studies that directly or indirectly engaged with settler-colonial oppression and the experiences of Indigenous communities. We further observed that Black researchers addressing adult education in and for Black communities were under-represented, as were studies that addressed LGBTQ2S+ experiences and those of adults with disabilities.

Critical race and critical feminist scholars call on researchers to locate ourselves within intersectional relations of power. If learners, communities, and so on are enmeshed in relations of power and oppression, so too are researchers. Some of the authors in our corpus positioned themselves, taking note of where they are located with respect to privileges and shared oppressions. More could be explored regarding how researchers' positionalities shape research outcomes, and how research studies may be done differently with respect to topics, theories, and methodologies. Similarly, as a collectivity of researchers, more work can be done to examine how coloniality and White supremacy persist in academic institutions and research, despite expressed commitments to anti-racism and decolonization.

The corpus is rich with diverse examples of community research, innovation, and new practices. In some of the articles, researchers described vigilant efforts to engage ethically and respectfully with participants from the very beginning, particularly in those studies working with Indigenous communities. Undertaking CBR with the goals of participation and social transformation is vital to projects of social justice, yet as noted above, this is not the same as decolonizing research (Tuhiwai Smith et al., 2018). Decolonization centres the sovereignty and self-determination of Indigenous peoples; undoing systemic racism and settler-colonial logics requires more than ensuring active participation throughout the process. As those who identify as White settler adult education scholars, this review has us examining how our own practices and assumptions have failed to fully engage decolonial practices even as we aspired to do so. We also recognize that decolonizing research cannot happen in isolation, and can be strengthened by greater attention to who is empowered to undertake research and what actually happens in our projects. We encourage the sharing of our research stories, providing details as to how this work is undertaken, the power relations and positionalities involved, the challenges we encounter, the mistakes we make. We acknowledge that conducting research can be a very lonely endeavour, encouraged by systems of evaluation where rewards are given for individual research more than they are given for collaborative processes with communities. The latter takes time and humility, two aspects of working in the academy that are not well understood nor rewarded, yet so well represented in the corpus we reviewed.

There is much more we could say about institutional conditions and structures that create both opportunities and barriers to CBR. For now, we close with some questions to guide us in the next decade as we search, stumble, and learn what is needed to decolonize the scholarship of adult education.

Following Shawn Wilson (2008): How does research change us? How do we better tell stories about how researcher positionalities are taken up in studies, how do we describe and enrol participants, and what can we learn from research processes (without also centring the researcher)?

How does the academic journal submission process, specifically CJSAE's, impact the stories we tell about our research and who reads or hears these stories? Building on the strengths of CJSAE as an open-access journal, how can we bring modes of knowledge sharing and public scholarship that embrace languages other than English and French, as well as video, sound, and graphical modalities in our publications?

What are the opportunities and trouble spots associated with the community-engaged university? Whose voices and what contexts are being privileged? How is this movement changing academic scholarship, as well as the workings of academic institutions, and in what ways?

Whose work is cited as informing our theories and methods, and how does this contribute to centring dominant groups (Ahmed, 2017)? In particular, how can we expand our theoretical resources beyond those foundational to adult education (e.g., Mezirow, Bourdieu, Freire) to include critical feminist, critical race, queer, Indigenous, posthuman, and other theories that allow us to experience phenomena in new ways?

References

- Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Duke University Press.
- Archibald, J. (2008). *Indigenous storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body and spirit*. UBC Press.
- Archibald, J., Lee-Morgan, J., & De Santolo, J. (2019). *Decolonizing research: Indigenous storywork as methodology*. ZED Books.
- Balyasnikova, N., & Gillard, S. (2018). "I love to write my story": Storytelling and its role in seniors' language. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 30(2), 81–90.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). *Community: Seeking safety in an insecure world*. Polity Press.
- Blackburn Miller, J. (2018). The transformative and healing power of Theatre of Witness. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 30(2), 47–56.
- Brann-Barrett, T. (2009). We're here, you just don't know how to reach us: A reflexive examination of research with citizens on the socio-economic margins. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 21(2), 53–66.
- Brigham, S., Baillie-Abidi, C., & Calatayud, S. (2018). Migrant women learning and teaching through participatory photography. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 30(2), 101–114.
- Butterwick, S., & Dawson, J. (2004). Undone business in the academy: Examining the production of academic labour. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 28(1), 51–65.
- Butterwick, S., Fenwick, T., & Mojab, S. (2003). Canadian adult education research in the 1990s: Tracing liberatory trends. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 17(2), 1–19.
- Butterwick, S., & Roy, C. (2018). Introduction to finding voice and listening: The potential of community and arts-based adult education and research. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 30(2), 1–9.
- Clover, D., & Craig, C. (2009). Street life's creative turn: An exploration of arts-based adult education and knowledge mobilization with homeless/street-involved women in Victoria. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 22(1), 21–35.
- Clover, D., Sanford, K., & Taber, N. (2019). Adult education, exhibitory strategies and museums. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 31(2), i–iii. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/5565>
- Collins, P. H. (2019). *Intersectionality as critical social theory*. Duke University Press.
- Cooper, B. (2015). Intersectionality. In L. Disch & M. Hawkesworth (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory* (pp. 385–406). Oxford University Press.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 8, 139–167. <https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2017). *Critical race theory: An introduction* (3rd ed.). New York University Press.
- Denzin, L., Lincoln, Y., & Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2008). *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies*. SAGE.
- Desmoulins, L. (2019). Witnessing the Walking With Our Sisters exhibit/memorial: Learning from trauma. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 31(2).
- Ellis, C., & Flaherty, Ed. (Eds.) (1992). *Investigating subjectivity: Research on lived experience*. Sage.
- Etmanski, C., Hall, B. L., & Dawson, T. (2014). *Learning and teaching community-based research*. University of Toronto Press.
- Fejes, A., & Nylander, E. (2014) The anglophone international(e): A bibliometric analysis of three adult education journals, 2005–2012. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 64(3), 222–239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741713614528025>
- Freire, P. (2018). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum. (Original work published 1970)
- Groen, J., & Kawalilak, C. (2019). Disrupting narratives of colonization—Museums as pedagogical spaces. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 31(2), 77–88. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/5486>
- Hanson, C. (2014). "I learned I am a feminist": Lessons for adult learning from participatory action research with union women. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 27(1), 1–16. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/3361>
- Hanson, C. (2018). Stitching together an arts-based inquiry with Indigenous communities in Canada and Chile. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 30(2), 11–22. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/5440>
- Honderich, T. (Ed.). (1995). *Oxford companion to philosophy*. Oxford University Press.
- Ibáñez-Carrasco, F., & Riaño-Alcalá, P. (2011). Organizing community-based research knowledge between universities and communities: Lessons learned. *Community Development Journal*, 46(1), 72–88.

- Kirkness, V. J., & Barnhardt, R. (1991). First Nations and higher education: The four Rs—Respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 30(3), 1–15.
- Kteily-Hawa, R. N. (2018). Women's illness narratives: Storytelling as art-informed inquiry. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 30(2), 91–100. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/5441>
- Lamble, S. (2016). Community. In K. Fritsch, C. O'Donnor, & A. Thompson (Eds.), *Keywords for radicals: The contested vocabulary of late-capitalist struggle* (pp. 103–109). AK Press.
- Maitra, S. (2015). Between conformity and contestation: South Asian immigrant women negotiating soft skill training in Canada. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 27(2 SE), 65–78. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/3417>
- Mizzi, R. (2013). Crossing borders to teach: A literature review of (dis)location, interconnectedness, and pedagogy. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 25(2), 53–64. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/1220>
- Mojab, S., & Taber, N. (2015). Memoir pedagogy: Gender narratives of violence and survival. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 27(2 SE), 31–45. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/343>
- Neustaeter, R. (2015). Situated feminism, rurality and women's learning in rural Manitoba, Canada. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 27(2), 100–119. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/3613>
- Puar, J. (2012). "I'd rather be a cyborg than a goddess": Becoming intersectional in assemblage theory. *Philosophia*, 2(1), 49–66. http://jasbirkpuar.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/JKP_Cyborg-Goddess.pdf
- Rubenson, K., & Elfert, M. (2015). Adult education research. Exploring an increasingly fragmented map. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, 6(2), 125–138. <https://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.rela9066>
- Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research. (2018). *Canadian tri-council policy statement: Ethical conduct for research involving humans*. Government of Canada. https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique_tcps2-eptc2_2018.html
- Sensoy, O., & Di Angelo, R. (2017). *Is everyone really equal?: An introduction to key concepts in social justice education* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Shan, H. (2015). Women, gender, and immigrant studies: State of the art in adult education in Canada. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 27(2), 46–63.
- Simon Fraser University. (2020). *SFU's strategic community engagement plan*. <https://www.sfu.ca/communityengagement/strategic-community-engagement-plan.html>
- Smith, D. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. University of Toronto Press.
- Smythe, S., & Breshears, S. (2017). Complicating access: Digital inequality and adult learning in a public access computing space. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 29(1), 67–81. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/5362>
- Spring, L., Wunderlee, A., & Werhun, A. (2019). Sex workers as "concrete others": Possibilities and perils. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 31(2), 115–122. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/5481>
- St. Clair, R. (2011). Writing ourselves into being: A review of the Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 23(2), 27–44. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/952>
- Taber, N. (2014). Tensions between practice and praxis in academia: Adult education, neoliberalism, professional training, and militarism. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 26(2 SI), 9–20. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/3025>
- Taber, N. (2015). Special issue editor's introduction: A critical engagement with the current place of feminism in Canadian adult education. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 27(2 SE), iv–vii. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/3858>
- Taber, N., Howard, W., & Watson, G. A. (2010). Researcher subjectivities as a conceptual frame in collaborative research: How exploring the experiences of adult educators led to examining research lenses. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 23(1), 39–54. <https://cjsae.library.dal.ca/index.php/cjsae/article/view/27>
- Taylor, E. W. (2001). Adult Education Quarterly from 1989 to 1999: A content analysis of all submissions. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 51(4), 322–340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07417130122087322>
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to action*. https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/british-columbians-our-governments/indigenous-people/aboriginal-peoples-documents/calls_to_action_english2.pdf
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1–40. <https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18630>
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. Zed Books.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L., Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2018). *Indigenous and decolonizing studies in education*. Routledge.
- United Nations. (2007). *United Nations declaration on the rights of Indigenous peoples*. <https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples.html>
- Warner, M. (1991). Introduction: Fear of a queer planet. *Social Text*, 29, 3–17.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood.
- Young, I. M. (2011). *Justice and the politics of difference* (Rev. ed.). Princeton University Press.