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ABSTRACT

This dissertation argues that the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada’s focus on knowledge mobilization—meant to address a “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility”—inadvertently results in another paradox: a “zero-sum language game.” While there is increasing pressure to mobilize research knowledge across stakeholder communities—government, media, community organizations and publics—work beyond academic arenas is not sufficiently recognized within academic discourse communities. Discourse theory and game theory brought together illustrate how rules of discourse govern the kinds of “moves” that are made in the language game(s) of discourse communities, however, since what is well received in one discourse community is not always well received in another, the result is a “zero-sum language game.”

Two forms of discourse are presented here. The first is an introductory narrative, which frames the dissertation by providing context and disclosing some of the subtext for the doctoral work undertaken, while illustrating what is made possible when different discursive practices invite freedom and diversity of voice and style into academic discourse. The second form of discourse is the more conventional series of dissertation chapters to defend the thesis through the presentation of theory, method, data, analysis and discussion.

An overview of the historical context of SSHRC policy (since 1977) and the international context of a shift toward extending the reach of research as a public good are presented. A discussion of rhetorical understandings and Burkean pentadic rhetorical analysis—identifying act, agent, agency, scene and purpose—in several SSHRC documents are presented. Discourse theory and some fundamentals of game theory are presented to explicate what is meant by the term “zero-sum language game.” Evidence of the described “zero-sum language game” is presented in a discussion of issues on tenure and promotion in the research literature and by a review of tenure and promotion policies found in the collective agreements of 38 Canadian universities.
The dissertation then suggests two sets of possible changes: the first provides practical considerations that involve revisiting “service” in faculty work; the second requires a revisited understanding of the changing role of academe and academic discourse. The dissertation then concludes with a short, narrative epilogue.

Keywords: knowledge mobilization; discourse communities; research funding policy; rhetorical analysis; scholarship of service; research as a public good; higher education; Canada.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2004, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada released the first volume of *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada*. The document provided an outline of a consultation process that would involve 81 universities and 71 scholarly associations, among other organizations in Canada. One of the claims that SSHRC made in this document was that social sciences and humanities research in Canada was “a paradox of ubiquity and invisibility: present everywhere, but for all intents and purposes, visible almost nowhere.” In January 2005, SSHRC released their report on the consultation process, and one of the key commitments being made by SSHRC was to improve “knowledge mobilization” of social sciences and humanities research.

For the purpose of this dissertation, a rhetorical analysis of several SSHRC documents was undertaken, in order to better understand what SSHRC meant by “knowledge mobilization.” The results of this analysis, interpreted through an intersection of discourse theory and game theory, brought forward the following thesis statement: SSHRC’s knowledge mobilization imperative—meant to address a “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility”—inadvertently results in another paradox for the social sciences and humanities research community: the paradox of a “zero-sum language game.” Briefly put, this paradox shows that while there is increasing pressure on Canada’s social sciences and humanities researchers and scholars to succeed in mobilizing knowledge across the stakeholder communities named by SSHRC—government, media, community organizations and publics—this comes at the cost of success in contributing what is recognized as legitimate knowledge within academic discourse communities.

In this dissertation, to elaborate upon and defend this thesis, two forms of discourse are presented. The first of these takes the form of an introductory narrative and a closing, narrative epilogue. The introductory narrative and closing epilogue are intended to accomplish two goals: (1) to frame the dissertation by providing context and disclosing some
of the subtext for the doctoral work undertaken (the tensions and intensions, the resistance and persistence, of confronting boundaries, of trying to understand the rules of the academy and academic discourse, and trying to change them); (2) to provide an illustration of what is made possible by different forms of discourse, by different discursive practices, by inviting into scholarly discourse freedom and diversity of voice and style, to advance scholarship and understanding, as a tenet of academic and other freedoms.

The second form of discourse is the more conventional series of dissertation chapters to defend the thesis statement through the presentation of theory, method, data, analysis and discussion. The following is a brief outline of these chapters (in the numbering below, please recall that the first chapter is the introductory narrative):

**Chapter Two** provides a general discussion of SSHRC’s transformation “from granting council to knowledge council” as it appeared in documents released by SSHRC in 2004-2005 and in several issues of *University Affairs* during that time frame. This discussion is taken up within the historical context of SSHRC policy since the Council was established in 1977 and within the international context of a shift toward extending the reach of research as a public good.

**Chapter Three** provides a discussion of rhetorical understandings and rhetorical analysis as appropriate for discerning from SSHRC documents what is meant by “knowledge mobilization” and its implications and possibilities for the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada. Rhetorical analysis of several SSHRC documents was undertaken for the purposes of this chapter and some of the data and analysis are presented. The form of analysis used is Burkean pentadic rhetorical analysis, which identifies how a rhetor (in this case, SSHRC), situates *act, agent, agency, scene* and *purpose* in relation to each other. The results of the analysis brings forward the thesis statement (as presented above) and introduces the concept of the “zero-sum language game” that is central to the thesis.

**Chapter Four** provides a discussion of discourse theory and presents some of the fundamentals of game theory in order to explicate what is meant by the term “zero-sum language game.” The chapter posits that a “zero-sum language game” is evident in the meritocracy of the academy, which values some kinds of discourse and activities above others.

**Chapter Five** provides evidence of the described “zero-sum language game” by presenting a discussion of issues on tenure and promotion and the tripartite model of faculty responsibilities as they are discussed in the research literature. The chapter provides further evidence by presenting a review of the tenure and promotion policies found in the collective agreements of 38 Canadian universities. Both the literature and the collective agreements discussed in the chapter suggest that there are some changes
afoot that offer possibilities for moving beyond the current “zero-sum language game.”

Chapter Six suggests two sets of possible changes to move beyond the current “zero-sum language game.” The first set of changes involves practical considerations that require changed understandings (and possibilities) for what is recognized and supported as important faculty-led work, in particular, as related to the service category in the tripartite model of faculty of work and “Scholarship of Service” as a field of research. The second set of suggested changes requires a revisited understanding of the changing role of the university, including issues of: academic identity and academic citizenship (from graduate education forward); mutual respect and trust within the academy and beyond it to other discourse communities; better and more equitably acknowledging and appreciating (formally and informally) different approaches to knowledge as legitimate, in the interest of extending the reach and benefits of research and scholarship as a public good.

The dissertation then closes with a short, narrative epilogue that returns the author and the reader to the personal, professional and scholarly interests first introduced in the opening, narrative chapter, providing a closing, candid snapshot: of the doctoral work, of the academy, and of next steps envisioned.

The work presented in this dissertation makes three important contributions. First, the introductory narrative and closing epilogue, as a frame and complement for the work presented in the more conventional chapters between them, offer an example and illustration of what can either flourish or perish with and without plurality and diversity in the discursive practices of scholarly discourse. Second, the dissertation provides important understandings of changes to research funding policies and priorities (in Canada and internationally), the changing role of the university and the increasing need to extend the reach of research as a public good. Third, by bringing together the two disparate theoretical frameworks of game theory and discourse theory, this work provides an insightful and useful perspective on the rules that govern (and can change) epistemological (and ontological) understandings, freedoms and possibilities.
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INTRODUCTION:

SOME CONTEXT ON SUBTEXT AND IR/RECONCILABLE DIFFERENCES

Whoever really wishes to become acquainted with something new (whether it be a person, an event, or a book), does well to take up the matter with all possible love, and to avert his eye quickly from all that seems hostile, objectionable, and false therein, – in fact to forget such things; so that, for instance, he gives the author of a book the best start possible, and straightway, just as in a race, longs with beating heart that he may reach the goal. In this manner one penetrates to the heart of the new thing, to its moving point, and this is called becoming acquainted with it. This stage having been arrived at, the understanding afterwards makes its restrictions; the over-estimation and the temporary suspension of the critical pendulum were only artifices to lure forth the soul of the matter. (Friedrich Nietzsche, *Human All-Too-Human: A Book for Free Spirits*, 1886)

This opening narrative is intended as a bookend of sorts, before entering into discussion of “zero-sum language games” and game theory, discourse theory and rhetorical analysis of

---

2 A small point of qualification: In the work of Nietzsche, “artifice” can be interpreted as a “mask”—both “dramatic” and “metaphysical”—that allows for a “play at truth, because truth is only ever doubling, a marriage of artifice and human spirit…truth is only ever creative…[and] functions within the creativity of acting…that demands an unflinching existential commitment to artifice” (Hass 2003, p. 101). I qualify here in order that “artifice” can be interpreted without a negative connotation and instead, considered as useful (or necessary, as Nietzsche seems to suggest) in arriving at human understandings.

3 What is meant by the term “zero-sum language game” is discussed in detail in chapter four and a brief introduction to the term is given later in this chapter. At the outset, however, is should be noted that the concept of a “zero-sum language game” being put forward in this thesis brings together discourse theory and game theory as follows: In a given discourse community, rules of discourse govern the kinds of “moves” that are made in the language game(s) of that discourse community. Discourse communities differ, however, and consequently, a language choice or move that is well received in one discourse community is not always well received in another, hence, a “zero-sum language game” is at play.
research funding policy documents, review of tenure and promotion policy in faculty collective agreements, the changing role of the university and extending the reach of social sciences and humanities research as a public good.\footnote{The phrase, “research as a public good,” appears periodically in this thesis and although I do not append a citation, I do want to note at the outset that I borrow this phrase from John Willinsky and his work as an advocate of open access scholarly publishing. I cannot recall when or where I first encountered this phrase in John’s work, but it can be found there, consistently, from 1999 to 2009.} As an opening narrative, it is intended as a gentle, unfolding introduction, to provide some context for the subtext of what is presented in the pages to follow, as a way of getting to the soul of the matter at hand. The narrative of this chapter serves, therefore, as a preface for the theory, method, data and analysis of the thesis, but also, as context for the tensions and intensions of my persistence, in trying to reconcile differences and in confronting resistance (my own and that of others) while negotiating those differences in the doctoral research undertaken for this thesis.

This chapter provides a delineation of the doctoral work presented in the chapters to follow, but also, context relevant to understanding how the work contained in this thesis was carried out by virtue (or vice?) of my inability and/or unwillingness to separate my scholarly, professional and personal interests from each other.\footnote{It is worth noting that in the qualitative methods course in the first semester of my program, taken with Suzanne de Castell, I conducted an autoethnographic case study. The protocol I developed for the autoethnography was influenced by a course I was taking the same semester with Heesoon Bai, in which she invited the “emotional, physical, psychological and spiritual” into our doctoral seminar along with what was commonly considered the “intellectual” dimension of scholarly inquiry. One version of this autoethnographic work can be found under the title, “An autoethnographic miniature on the tensions and boundaries of research experiences” in \textit{Small Cities Imprint}: http://smallcities.tru.ca/. The autoethnographic disposition that came from this work, I am sure, played a role in my giving attention to what had hold on me (and what I was not prepared to let go), whether in my scholarly, professional or personal pursuits.} To some readers, such an inability or unwillingness may be interpreted as insufficient focus and discipline or even, regrettably for some, as lack of commitment to scholarly rigour. I ask any such reader not only for support of academic freedom and academic diversity, but also, to suspend disbelief and to consider how it could be possible that recognizing the links between personal, professional and
scholarly interests requires a high degree of focus, discipline and rigour, alongside a good deal of self-disclosure, critically examined and made public, no less. To other readers, the unwillingness or inability to separate personal, professional and scholarly interests is understood as inevitable (although this is often denied, in some scholarly disciplines and research paradigms more than others) and therefore, is necessary and sufficient to properly advance scholarly, professional and personal work and the best possible consequences that can come of that work. To readers from one end of the spectrum to the other, the invitation is the same: allow us some time and a few words, together, please, as Nietzsche suggests, above, to become acquainted, to reach the soul of the matter, before the swing of the critical pendulum can be expected (and in the interest of scholarly discourse, welcomed), in taking up the theory, method, data, analysis and discussion in the chapters that follow.

I.I

On publishing, perishing and publics:

The scholarly, professional, and personal

First, one small, personal confession: I have a rather inconvenient love of language that has in some ways led me astray according to what are common professional and scholarly expectations. With this confession, I ask the reader to grant me a few words—of explanation, justification, and I expect, for some, redemption—related to my earlier academic work and my professional experience in the field of publishing. My post-secondary work began with a degree in English literature, a degree that then, as now, ranks among

6 On issues related to what tends to be denied or accepted in different scholarly disciplines and research paradigms, there is interesting research by Neil Gross and Solon Simmons, in their recent study of the professoriate in the US. See, for example, “The Social and Political Views of American Professors” (http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/~ngross/lounsbery_9-25.pdf) for discussion of research conducted on “social and political attitudes” among US academics (in various disciplines), including questions on whether or not research participants saw these attitudes influencing teaching and research.
those most disparaged for limited pragmatic value or job market preparation, for good sense, except among those who also allow a passion for literature or other knowledge to lead them astray, so to speak. As it turned out, to my surprise, the literature degree did provide job market preparation as I, like many before me (and many others since), stepped from a literature degree to work with literary publishers.

Here, a professional confession: in working with literary publishers, I witnessed and participated in identifying, publishing and celebrating emerging Canadian literary authors. How scandalous (sometimes, it was, truly). The more the publishers and authors pushed the boundaries of literary possibilities, the more drawn I was to them. Not surprising, perhaps, after four years of reading the canonical texts of undergraduate curriculum: masterpieces, moving, magnificent, but not even the contemporary literature course reading list texts were “experimental” or “avant-garde” in the way that I experienced at the book launches and other literary events that I began to attend after I completed my undergraduate degree in literature. The literary publishing world brought something remarkable to my life and work that nothing ever had before. The linguistic and literary ground beneath me shook and the way I saw the world around me was forever changed.

Finally, a scholarly confession: after several years of working in publishing, I missed certain aspects of academic work, but I had developed a passion for publishing, Canadian

---

7 Aside from scandals of passion and politics, one of my “favourite” scandalous episodes tells the story of how in the late 1990’s a particular literary publisher (which shall remain nameless) was required to defend to a disapproving officer at particular funding council (they too shall remain nameless), that the word “fuck” could in some cases be an altogether (and perfectly) appropriate word for an author to use in the narrative of a literary work (the objection of said, disapproving funding council officer was, if the word were used in the dialogue of one of the literary characters, that it did not violate literary sensibilities but in the narrative itself, no, this was far too scandalous).
publishing, in particular: for the independent presses, the writers, the editors, the publishers, and those who supported them as readers of contemporary, Canadian literature. I had also found among independent publishers a professional community bound together by what was so clearly a labour of love and a kind of solidarity, which I shared (and in terms of solidarity, the next footnote applies here, too). I was not prepared to abandon publishing, nor did I want to lose what I had found in the publishing community.

Simon Fraser University offers a Master's degree program in Publishing (the only one in Canada), so I applied, thinking that the degree would satisfy my academic interests, but also, would provide me with what I needed to take on a role in the succession that was soon to be underway in many of the publishing houses in Canada (as there was an expected wave of retirement among founding publishers of many of the presses). By the time I

---

8 For the most part, I refer to book launches and other literary events in Vancouver in the years between 1995-2005, involving authors from Anvil Press, Arsenal Pulp Press, Douglas & McIntyre, New Star Books, and Talon Books, among others from across Canada, such as ECW Press, House of Anansi Press, Insomniac Press, and McClelland & Stewart. There is also a long list of Canadian literary magazines that held events that shook the roof, the floor and conventional literary sensibilities.

9 I began this work, first, in 1996 as a volunteer at Anvil Press and sub-Terrain Magazine, which became part-time work for me for three years, where I learned about everything from acquisitions, to cover design decisions, to pricing print quotes, to book launches and not least, about funding applications. This wearing of many publishing hats is characteristic of most small presses, which tend to be operated by one, two, maybe three people (not all full-time, either, which is really quite astonishing, given the amount of work involved, not to mention, the astonishingly low salaries for which many are willing to work, in the name of love for publishing, literature, language). I have many fond memories of learning the ropes at Anvil and work there led me to an interest in industry-wide matters, which I would take up as Executive Director for the British Columbia Association of Magazine Publishers (BCAMP) from 1999-2002. At BCAMP, I learned about not-for-profit, cultural industry association management—publishing association management, in particular—which involved ongoing funding applications and managing multiple and concurrent budgets and project plans in efforts to strengthen and support individual publishers and the industry as a whole.

10 Many of the publishing houses in Canada were born after WWII, with strong government support for Canadian culture, seen as necessary to strengthen the nation in the post-war era. The following excerpt from the report by the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (also known as the “Massey Report”) provides some of the reasoning for such support: “Canada became a national entity because of certain habits of mind and convictions which its people shared and would not surrender. Our country was sustained through difficult times by the power of this spiritual legacy. It will flourish in the future in proportion as we believe in ourselves. It is the intangibles which give a nation not only its essential character but its vitality as well. What may seem unimportant or even irrelevant under the pressure of daily life may well be the thing which endures, which may give a community its power to survive” (1951, p. 4). In the interest of the “vitality” of the nation, the report outlined necessary support for arts, culture, education and scholarship. It
completed my Master’s degree coursework, however, academic questions had drawn me in. These were questions about the history of publishing, literacy and curriculum, communication and media theory, government policy and programs, publishing (and perishing). Of equal significance, there were also questions of diversity of style and voice in written texts and what this diversity meant in terms of possible understandings and experiences. I spent one semester after the completion of my Master’s degree to consider my career options and prepare applications for doctoral study. When the acceptance letters arrived, I decided to pursue my doctoral studies in the Curriculum Theory and Implementation program at the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University, because I was interested in studying with Heesoon Bai and Suzanne de Castell.

Yet, while I was drawn back to academic work, I felt a resistance to academic discourse and to what seemed (and still seems now) conformism and uniformity in style and voice in scholarly writing. Genre-bending and the use of poetic license (if done well) had been applauded among the literary publishers but in scholarly publishing, such risks seem almost unthinkable as they can lead to academic marginalization, if not academic suicide, outright. As it turns out, evidently, I either cannot bring myself to sacrificing what is made possible by certain discursive freedoms and I am unwilling to give up my resistance to conformism, or perhaps, I just have a bit of an academic death wish.

was on the recommendations of the Massey Report that the Canada Council for the Arts was established by an Act of Parliament in 1957, “to foster and promote the study and enjoyment of, and the production of works in, the arts, humanities and social sciences” (Canada Council 2009). From the Canada Council for the Arts, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada would emerge later as a separate entity, formed by an Act of Parliament in 1977.

11 For an interesting and engaging discussion of issues of conformism in scholarly writing, see, for example, an article by Barbara Tomlinson: “The politics of textual vehemence, or Go to your room until you learn how to act” in Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 22, no. 11 (1996): 86-114.
Be that as it may, resistance and all, long story short, in my doctoral work I turned to the research literature to try to understand both the resistance and the drawing in that I experienced in moving from the world of literary publishing to the world of the academy (worlds I would later discover could also be referred to as discourse communities or symbolic universes, among other things). The research literature I sought out first raised questions about discourse and discursive practices, genre and rhetoric, but soon, questions also about power and politics, culture and identity, and with this literature, I began to understand the culture shock I was experiencing in moving from the literati to academe. With the research literature of my doctoral studies, the ground beneath me shook, once again (this time, epistemological and ontological ground) and the way I saw the world around me was again forever changed.

One of the things that changed, as my way of seeing and understanding changed, was the idea of publishing and perishing, a dynamic that in some ways was similar in the literary and scholarly worlds, but in other ways, was notably different. Whether among the literati or in academe, equally, it was necessary to publish, otherwise, perish as unread and unknown. For the literati, the warning is this: publish books with reputable and successful presses (preferably with high print runs) and join the ranks in prestigious and high circulation magazines (with the aim to reach both the literary connoisseur and the mass market, if at all possible), otherwise, perish as a starving artist. In academe, the warning differs somewhat: publish scholarly monographs and peer-reviewed journal articles with

---

12 From before the start of my doctoral work and to my planned post-doctoral work, my ideas of publishing and perishing would also change in relation to open access publishing and questions of extending the reach of research as a public good. I mention this as an aside, here, as it is linked to the other differences between scholarly and literary publishing (in particular, with regard to business models, copyright, and changes in funding policy, for example).
reputable and successful publishers, otherwise, perish, un-cited, unacknowledged, and with little hope of tenure or research funding.

It was while living somewhere between these two worlds of publishing—literary and academic—that I was also encountering the research literature in my PhD program in curriculum theory and implementation. Curriculum theory and implementation, as a program of study, can of course be expected to have shaped my understanding, through the required readings and the orientations of my instructors.\footnote{Here, I would like to note my good fortune and appreciation for the instructors who taught me much in their courses during my program: Heesoon Bai, Charles Bingham, Suzanne de Castell and Kelleen Toohey. Under their direction, I learned a great deal about curriculum theory and implementation, about educational theory and research methods, which encompassed philosophical, cultural, psychoanalytic, and socio-theoretical perspectives and texts that helped me to navigate in my search for answers to my research questions.}

My understanding of publishing and perishing, in my program of study, became critically examined and informed through a lens that focused on configurations of curriculum, from issues of the hidden curriculum (within classrooms and beyond) to issues of what is (and has been) published (or not) and how this is itself a form of curriculum (hidden or otherwise), for example.\footnote{See, for example, \textit{The Hidden Curriculum} (Snyder 1973) or more recently, \textit{Ideology and Curriculum} (Apple 2004) among others, for discussion of what is both implicitly and explicitly contained in curriculum and the consequences. As Apple describes, “the growing literature on the hidden curriculum shows…the forms of interaction in school life may serve as mechanisms for communicating normative and dispositional meanings to students. Yet, the body of the school knowledge itself—what is included and excluded, what is important and what is unimportant—also often serves an ideological purpose” (2004, p. 54).} In the directed readings that I chose to undertake in my course work—one on the history of publishing, one on rhetoric and genre, and one on theories of play—my understanding of “publish or perish” was informed further and became a concern that extended beyond the pragmatic issue of publishing credits on a literary or academic curriculum vitae and at the same time, caused me to question the implications and consequences of such pragmatic issues.
I shall return momentarily to these pragmatics and the directed readings, but first, there are issues of publishing and perishing related to changes in research funding policies and programs at the time (2004-2005), as it happened, that need to be weaved into the narrative of this chapter. In 2004 and 2005, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada was undergoing a transformation “From granting council to knowledge council.”\textsuperscript{15} Over the course of my doctoral studies, my scholarly, professional and personal interests became focussed on SSHRC, where changes underway first drew my attention because they suggested possibilities for new understandings of publishing and perishing. By the end of my doctoral studies (and informed by my doctoral studies), these same changes at SSHRC also suggested possibilities for new understandings about research and scholarship writ large, the changing role of universities, and the reach of research as a public good.

I.II
Social sciences and humanities research in Canada: “Get public or perish”\textsuperscript{16}

The University of Western Ontario was bustling with activity and buzzing with talk about SSHRC at the Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences in the late spring of 2005.\textsuperscript{17} In

\textsuperscript{15} In 2004-2005, SSHRC released a document in three volumes, all with the title, From Granting Council to Knowledge Council (Volume 1 containing the framework for the consultation process to be undertaken by them, Volume 2 with background information on the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada, and Volume 3 containing a report on the consultation). Detailed analysis of “knowledge mobilization” in Volumes 1 and 2 (and other SSHRC documents) will be presented in chapter three. All documents presented for analysis in this thesis are included in the Appendices.

\textsuperscript{16} In 2004, the President of SSHRC at the time, Marc Renaud, advised the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada to “get public or perish” (cited in Willinsky 2000, p. 91), referring to the need for social sciences and humanities research to reach wider publics, beyond academe.
January 2004, SSHRC had circulated *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council, Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada, Volume 1: Consultation Framework on SSHRC’s Transformation*. After a year of consultations, in January 2005, SSHRC released *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council, Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada, Volume 3: Report on the Consultations*. At Congress in 2005, SSHRC made several presentations about the report on the consultations and what this meant in terms of changes to SSHRC policy and programs. Also, SSHRC’s new strategic plan was in the making (to be released by the end of the year). As shall be discussed in detail in chapter two, SSHRC’s transformation was a source of debate among the optimistic and cynical, both. The SSHRC consultation report applauded social sciences and humanities research for the important and very much needed contribution it makes to society but at the same time, it alerted the research community to pressures for transformation in a “new world” with “new needs” (2004a, p. 7), with “a new university landscape” and “a new research environment” (2004a, p. 8) that required “interactive engagement” and “maximum knowledge impact” (2004a, p. 10). The document named “students, universities, scholarly and professional associations, governments, business enterprises, and community and other non-governmental organizations” as “stakeholder-partners” with which the social sciences and humanities research community needed to establish stronger links (2004a, p. 3). Social sciences and humanities research in Canada, according to SSHRC, were “a paradox of ubiquity and invisibility: present everywhere but, for all intents and purposes, visible almost nowhere” (2004a, p. 12).

---

17 Congress (formerly known as “The Learned”) is organized by the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences (CFHSS) and is known for bringing together thousands of delegates from across the social sciences and humanities disciplines to present their work, as Canadian scholarly societies that are members of CFHSS (69 at the time of writing) hold their annual conference and annual general meeting during the week-long Congress event.
The consultation report also outlined a number of ways that these links could be established and ways that “interactive engagement” and “maximum knowledge impact” could be achieved. Among these, according to SSHRC, was the establishment of “knowledge mobilization units” that would extend the reach and benefits of social sciences and humanities research to “organizations and groups outside of academia” (2004a, 15). The document also suggested a need for “scholarly-based journals for lay audiences,” which would require “a significant stable of professional writers” (2004a, p.16).

In reading the consultation framework, I saw possibilities that seemed well aligned to my personal, professional and scholarly interests. I was irrevocably drawn to the work of research and scholarship, I understood and had a deep fondness for the publishing profession, and I wanted to be involved in writing that permitted freedom with language that scholarly discourse did not often seem to permit. I became intensely interested in better understanding the boundaries of scholarly discourse, how they were drawn and could be redrawn, and what this meant in terms of possibilities for me as part of the next generation of social sciences and humanities researchers and scholars, in the “new university landscape” and “new research environment” described by SSHRC. To pursue this idea of “knowledge mobilization” was, for me, like following the yellow brick road.

18 These “other organizations and groups” were named as follows: “e.g., school boards, museums, private companies, municipalities, government departments, media” (2004a, p.15).

19 I should note, here, that I had started to find some scholarly discourse that permitted freedom with language—that did not require absolute conformity to a single model of discourse, of writing (and thinking)—by virtue of disciplinary diversity, in studies in media and popular culture, or arts-based research methodologies, for example. To my own surprise and for reasons that I do not fully understand, rather than diving in and participating in discourses that permitted certain freedoms, my interests were elsewhere, as I begin to describe here and elaborate on elsewhere in this chapter.

20 This reference to The Wizard of Oz can be applied on many levels. I leave the reader to entertain the many, possible parallels between the journey to (and return from) the Land of Oz and the journey undertaken in a doctoral program.
I.III

Tensions and intentions, resistance and persistence

What was a yellow brick road for me, however, was not so for everyone. As noted earlier and to be discussed in detail in chapter two, tensions arose in the “transformation” process for SSHRC and “knowledge mobilization” met with resistance from the social sciences and humanities research community. To be fair, it is true that I was looking for promising possibilities for scholarly discourse in the SSHRC transformation, that I saw in the idea of knowledge mobilization a movement of knowledge that had parallels, however faintly visible, to the movement in knowledge that had come with the printing press. Again (and still), I was aware that my personal, professional and scholarly interests together were moving me forward in my doctoral work.

When I approached my doctoral supervisory committee early on with my interest in investigating “knowledge mobilization” of social sciences and humanities research, I was met by similar responses by all three committee members. Each of them, on separate occasions, more than once, in one way or another, responded with the question: But what does “knowledge mobilization” mean? I didn’t have an answer. I thought, how could I possibly want to devote my thesis to “knowledge mobilization” when I did not even know what it was, really? No doubt, the members of my supervisory committee thought the same thing (and suggested as much, gently at first and then, in rather blunt terms).

---

21 I should add here (though I revisit this in chapter two) that in other fields of research—most notably, the health sciences—there are terms akin to “knowledge mobilization” (such as “knowledge transfer” and “knowledge translation”), though with some notable differences (this too, I revisit in chapter two). I was aware of this at the time, but the question for the social sciences and humanities research community, as I saw it, was, what does “knowledge mobilization” mean for SSHRC, because what it meant for SSHRC would most strongly determine what it meant for the social sciences and humanities research in Canada.
It was in an attempt to find out what “knowledge mobilization” meant that I began reading and re-reading SSHRC documents: the three volumes of From Granting Council to Knowledge Council, the strategic plan that was released in July 2005, and other documents (such as media coverage and SSHRC press releases). Although the term “knowledge mobilization” and variations on it appeared again and again in these documents, try as I might, I found no answer to the question, What does “knowledge mobilization” mean? The members of my supervisory committee then began asking other questions: what did knowledge mobilization look like, who did it, how did they do it, how did you know if “knowledge” had been “mobilized” and why did all of this matter, anyway? I had no answers. If it had not been for the unusually strong hold that “knowledge mobilization” had on me, I would have let it go.

At the time, I interpreted the barrage of questions from my committee as an indication that I should abandon “knowledge mobilization” but I would later understand that these questions were meant to help me move forward. Movement would come, eventually, but at the time, there I was, required course work done (along with a qualitative research methods course), with comprehensive examinations as the next item on the doctoral program agenda, but I did not have my research question and I had no answers to the questions my committee was asking of me. Directed readings courses were called for, I determined, and each member of my committee agreed to undertake one with me.

I.IV

Negotiating ir/reconcilable differences

The first directed readings course that I undertook was on the history of publishing. The history of publishing in many ways is a history that celebrates the advent of the printing
press in Europe as having elevated all of western civilization, by virtue of changing what was previously limited access by the elite few to hand-copied manuscript texts, to widespread access to printed texts by diverse publics, far and wide (and eventually, widespread literacy). At the same time, however, the history of publishing also tells a very different story: of censorship and corruption, power and privilege, discipline and punishment. To publish, historically, could also be to perish. This applied not only to printers in the book trade, but also, to authors in the early days of print, which, as I shall revisit later on, would be derided as “hacks”—whether the “Grub Street hack” or “scientific hack”—if they chose to write (and have published) texts that were frowned upon by the “intelligentsia” of the time. In the history of publishing I was able to see divides among authors and readers, publishers and publics, which were not unlike those between and within the literary and scholarly publishing worlds. Highly regarded work published in one arena was not necessarily highly regarded in another. There were also hints of similar divides in the concept of “knowledge mobilization:” the research community and the organizations and groups that SSHRC referred to as “stakeholder-partners” were also very different from each other, in terms of authors and readers, publishers and publics. And here too, highly regarded work in one arena was not necessarily highly regarded in another.

---

22 This accreditation is given to Gutenberg in 1450, though increasingly, movable type as originating in the far east is recognized and also given attention.

23 This play on words, on Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish*, is an intentional allusion to, for example, historical records showing that 40 percent of those imprisoned in the Bastille at the time of the French Revolution were there on charges of infringements to state-controlled book trade regulations, which were largely based on lists of censored titles and printing privileges purchased from the state (see Birn 1989, p. 51 in Darnton and Roche, Eds., *Revolution in Print: The Press in France, 1775-1800*).

24 Elizabeth Eisenstein, in her seminal works (1979, 1983 and 1992), discusses “Grub Street hacks” and similarly, in the history of science (see, for example, Gates 1997), “popularizers” are referred to as “scientific hacks.”
My directed readings course on genre and rhetoric brought some explanation for the divide between the Grub Street hack and the *bona fide* literary author, between the scientific hack and the scientist or scholar. There was, of course, the explanation of elitism as the primary cause of such divides, a point about which Veblen, for example, is quite convincing in his discussion on the “leisure class” and the “devout observances” of elitism.\(^{25}\) Among the literati and in academe, equally, I had witnessed (and was also guilty of participating in) elitist judgments about written work. And I must admit that I remain convinced that I need to make the decision, more often than I would like, that *some* texts, I am not willing to read (shortness of life being what it is and individual interests and preferences being what they are).\(^{26}\)

What was unfamiliar to me, as I lived and worked between the world of literary publishing and the world of academe, was the vast difference between the literary texts that were favourably judged and the scholarly texts that were favourably judged, in terms of the writing. Perhaps I should not have been so taken by surprise (how naïve I was!) to discover that what is applauded as an excellent, contemporary scholarly text is very, very, very different from what is applauded as an excellent, contemporary literary text. I was not so naïve that I

\(^{25}\) Veblen suggests, for example: “Classic speech has the honorific virtue of dignity; it commands attention and respect as being the accredited method of communication under the leisure-class scheme of life, because it carries a pointed suggestion of the industrial exemption of the speaker. The advantage of the accredited locutions lies in their reputability; they are reputable because they are cumbrous and out of date, and therefore argue waste of time and exemption from the use and the need of direct and forcible speech” (1998 [1899], p. 400). In his discussion of higher education, he offers this observation: “New views, new departures in scientific theory, especially new departures which touch the theory of human relations at any point, have found a place in the scheme of the university tardily and by a reluctant tolerance, rather than by a cordial welcome; and the men [and women, even more so, one could argue] who have occupied themselves with such efforts to widen the scope of human knowledge have not commonly been well received by their contemporaries” (p. 380).

\(^{26}\) Forgive me for such judgments, but in my participation in decisions on manuscript acquisitions, I was taught that such judgements are par for the publishing course and what’s more, the same judgements are fundamental to establishing the editorial identity and reputation of a publishing house. As any reviewer or editor for a scholarly journal or book will know: not all manuscripts, it is often decided, are judged as worthy of publication.
did not think there would be any difference. I did understand that literary and scholarly work were meant to be different, to serve different purposes. But still, their purposes were not altogether different: both were meant and able to convey complex and nuanced ideas, both were authored by writers very serious about their work, both had historically been recognized as highly important texts for learning, education, edification. The difference that was so striking, though, if I may be permitted a candid remark: I did not expect that highly respected, contemporary scholarly texts would often be, by literary standards, so poorly written.27 In how scholarly work is “written up,” I was soon (forced) to learn, it seemed there was little appreciation for the plurality of possibilities in language. How unfortunate, how unpleasant, how unnecessary, I thought (and I still do, truth be told). Not that I do not appreciate a concise sentence, paragraph, article, book. I do. Not that I am failing to understand that what is required and expected in literary texts is different from that of scholarly texts.28 I do understand such things, truly. But witnessing (and experiencing) what scholarly writing often does to language, however, was something I could not simply ignore.

It was here that I took some comfort from genre theory, though, which provided an account for the differences between scholarly work and literary work by virtue of differences in genre. Fair enough, enough said. Almost. The genre theorists also describe what a genre does to both writer and reader, through generic conventions, limitations (and, to be fair,

27 I would later encounter the example of Judith Butler’s highly-publicized “Bad Writing” award by the journal, *Philosophy and Literature*, in 1999. I return to Butler later, to both support and question her response, to consider the consequences of published work that is accessible (or inviting) for very few readers.

28 A word or two on the idea of what is expected: An interesting article was published in the *Harvard Educational Review*—“Thinking Collaboratively About the Peer-review Process for Journal-article Publication”—describes scholarly journal publishing in terms of “a community of scholarship that has a tradition of delivering what is expected and accepted” (Kumashiro et al 2005, p. 269), which is discussed in terms of what is sometimes left out (or kept out) of scholarly discourse. I would later draw on this article (and very quote) for a paper in one of my PhD courses that I would be fortunate enough to later have published in the *McGill Journal of Education* under the title, “Skeletons in the Classroom Closet: Presence/absence in the Public Sphere of the Academy.”
possibilities also). Evidently, there is a “tyranny of genre” (Coe 1994, p. 188) and what’s more, according to Kenneth Burke, “principles reside in the genre only by residing in individuals that compose the genre” (1946, p. 276, cited in Coe 1994, p. 184). To write (and to publish) in a particular genre, then, was to allow the principles of the genre to reside with me, in me (well, things do not get much more significant and intimate than that, I thought).

Genre theory, for me, begged the question: what would perish, in writing (and publishing) by the tyranny of a particular genre? Genre theory also made me very seriously question whether or not I was willing to reside with language in the ways that seemed necessary to become a successful scholarly writer, an academic. A fine time it was to find all this out, the required course work for the PhD completed, directed readings courses almost done, comprehensive examinations looming. My understanding of publishing and perishing had again been informed (and transformed) and I was deeply conflicted.

Was that it, then? Was it necessary to just reconcile myself to living by a genre and dying by a genre? Perhaps. It certainly was beginning to look that way. Genre, I discovered, was not to be underestimated. Yet, I was determined to somehow move forward, not to be cornered by genre. Certainly, I had witnessed and admired the work of others who succeeded in scholarly genre-bending, finding a way to reside with the generic elements of scholarship with bold moves and/or careful measure, in terms of what would be lost in either conforming too much (just how much generic restraint was acceptable before it

---

29 I recognize here that linguistics, literary theory and cultural theory (among other fields of study) take up these issues in great depth and breadth, whether in terms of relationships between language and psyche; literature and identity; orality, literacy and epistemology, for example. My inclusion of details that touch on these matters in the introductory narrative of the thesis, as noted at the outset, is meant to provide and unfolding of context for the questions that are taken up in depth in later chapters. Although linguistics, literary theory and cultural theory are not in the foreground of the work presented in the thesis, I make reference to them here because they are important elements of the background and periphery. I recognize that I am making only peripheral reference to substantial bodies of work in fields beyond the scope of what is being discussed in this thesis.
became tyranny?) or not conforming enough (just how much non-conformism was acceptable before it became academic suicide?). Indeed, I was attempting such balancing acts, myself.\textsuperscript{30} In my interest in better understanding the boundaries of scholarly discourse, in how they were drawn and could be re-drawn, when genre theory led me to rhetorical theory, the balancing act was extended in a way that both encompassed and permeated genre.

I became convinced by the end of my directed readings that rhetoric was a kind of universal solvent: perhaps I would live by a genre and die by a genre; but rhetoric, it could be used to dissolve anything. Rhetoric also seemed equally able to fortify anything. This characterization can perhaps be accepted (or expected), given that the rhetorical tradition can not only be traced to Ancient Greece, but also, the “rhetorical construction of knowledge”\textsuperscript{31} is one of the silver bullets in the arsenal of modern and post-modern rhetorical theory. From genre theory, I gained a better understanding of the generic boundaries of discourse, how they were drawn and could be re-drawn. From rhetorical theory, I was able to look more

\textsuperscript{30} As I completed my directed readings course on genre and rhetoric, some of the references to “theories of play” that Suzanne de Castell had made in the courses I had taken with her and in our conversations since the start of my program led me to thinking about playfulness in language, in writing, in texts, in reading, in understanding, etcetera. Suzanne had for some time engaged in research with theories of play and digital games, which involved, for example “re-theoriz[ing] questions about what is ‘educational,’ and how and in what ways that relates to the ludic” (de Castell \textit{et al} 2007). I became curious about possible parallels for questions related to discourse, because in academe, it was my experience that the ludic and “play” were not permissible (or did not seem to be encouraged, at least) in the language of scholarly discourse, given how rigid the rules of discourse appeared to be in scholarly monographs and journals. As a consequence, the directed readings course that I would do with Suzanne was an introduction to theories of play. It would not be until later in my program, after my comprehensive exams, having periodically thought about theories of play, that I would turn to game theory and then, discourse theory, which would lead me to my thesis. I include these details in a footnote, rather than integrating them into the main body of the narrative of this chapter, because the influence of theories of play would surface only from time to time and therefore, I do not think it can be placed in the linear chronology of the narrative being presented in this chapter, without bringing confusion. I do include it here as a brief aside/interruption in the narrative, however, because although theories of play surfaced only periodically and the influence was subtle and peripheral; just as an object that comes to the surface of water, from time to time, nudges what is on the surface in one direction or another (or sometimes can pull it below the surface), the effect(s) can be of much significance, and so, I think it important to note that significance of theories of play, here.

\textsuperscript{31} From Bizzell \& Herzberg (2001), whose summary of the rhetorical tradition is revisited in chapter three.
closely at discourse itself, whether from the Aristotelian perspective of rhetoric as an art\textsuperscript{32} or from more contemporary perspectives, describing rhetoric as “situational” and describing discourse in terms of “rhetorical action.”\textsuperscript{33}

I.V

SSHRC, rhetorical situations, rhetorical actions

Rhetoric (and rhetorical understandings), I found, held interesting possibilities in terms of better understanding “knowledge mobilization” in the SSHRC documents that I had read (and re-read, and re-read). There was hope, at last, in finding an answer to the question my committee had been asking me: \textit{What does “knowledge mobilization” mean?} How were the SSHRC documents rhetorical actions and how were those rhetorical actions situational, I wondered. Back to the documents I went. The documents that I had in hand—SSHRC’s consultation framework, consultation report, strategic plan, for example—as their titles suggest, were documents of a particular kind (and I elaborate on the significance of this in chapters two and three): They were funding policy documents, rhetorically constructed for the audience of the research community (and others)\textsuperscript{34} as much (if not more) than for the members of the funding organization itself. In a rhetorical understanding of a text, the audience is fundamental to the rhetorical action and rhetorical situation, and fundamental also to an understanding of those situations and actions.

\textsuperscript{32}In Aristotelian understanding, rhetoric is art, characterized in part by the “the three kinds of hearers to which speeches are addressed” (1960 [1932], p. 16): (1) deliberative, for “counsel or advice”; (2) forensic, for “prosecution and defence”; and (3) epideictic, for “praise or blame” (1960 [1932], p. 17). These are discussed in further detail in chapter three.

\textsuperscript{33}These references to “rhetorical action” and rhetoric as “situational” are borrowed from Carolyn Miller (1984) and others cited in her work, including Bitzer (1980) and Campbell & Jamieson (1982), among others. Their work will also be revisited in chapter three.

\textsuperscript{34}I shall return briefly, before the closing of this chapter, to the significance of the status of these documents as \textit{funding policy documents} in regard to my decisions to undertake a rhetorical analysis of them (and specifically, Burkean pentadic rhetorical analysis).
Whether from the Aristotelian perspective or from more contemporary perspectives on rhetoric, it is commonly understood that the audience is of central importance, but a brief elaboration, here, may be useful. From the Aristotelian perspective, the “means of persuasion” in the art of rhetoric are of “three kinds” and these are: (1) by the character of the speaker, who makes himself/herself \(^{35}\) “worthy of belief” from the perspective of the audience (as “hearer” or “judge”); (2) as “effected through the audience, when they are brought...into a state of emotion” and (3) as “effected by the arguments, when we demonstrate the truth, real or apparent” (Rhetoric 1.2, 1960 [1932], p. 8-9). In each of these three “means of persuasion,” while the rhetor’s character, argument and ability to engage the emotions of the audience are necessary, the audience is of equal importance, as the audience judges the character of the speaker and the argument (and as affected by emotions in such judgements). With contemporary rhetorical theory, the importance of the audience is carried forward. With modern and post-modern understandings, the speaker/writer are seen “as situated and participating in cultural forces,” and “interpretation [is] inherent in meaning” (Scott and Brock 1972, p. 123-124). Contemporary perspectives on rhetoric describe it in terms of a “social epistemic” that:

is seen as a product of a specific time and place, with meaning always changing as a result of interaction of the writer, the discourse community and the social, political, material, and historical context in which discourse takes place. Knowledge is found in the dialectic among the writer, community, and context.” (Babin and Harrison 1999, p. 243)\(^ {36}\)

---

\(^{35}\) In Aristotle’s Rhetoric, like most texts at the time and for centuries afterward (millennia, even, rather unbelievably), although there is little mention of women (persons referred to and personal pronouns used are predominantly, if not uniformly, male), I use “him/her” in my discussion. I mention that this is my own modification because I do not want to mislead the reader about the language of the original text.

\(^{36}\) As an example, in her discussion of contemporary rhetorical perspectives used in the field of higher education, Thomas gives the following examples: “the relationship between rhetoric and technology, teaching methodologies, research methodologies, broader issues of educational practice, professional communication, and ethics” (2007, p. 1).
With regard to SSHRC and knowledge mobilization, at least two important aspects arise with such considerations about the rhetor and the audience, rhetorical action as situational, rhetoric as social epistemic, knowledge as found in—and created by—a dialectic among the writer, community, and context. The first aspect pertains to how “knowledge mobilization” is presented in the SSHRC documents as a research and funding priority and policy; and the second aspect pertains to what “knowledge mobilization” can be understood to mean in the SSHRC documents. Both of these aspects must take into account how SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community are situated in relation to each other and to the broader context of the research landscape, nationally and internationally.

My earlier references to some of the language of the SSHRC documents offer introductory glimpses to discussion of these issues (presented in chapters two and three), but for the moment, what needs to be noted is how rhetorical analysis, as one contemporary extension of the rhetorical tradition, serves as a valuable research method to investigate the issues at hand. Although “there are many approaches indeed to rhetorical analysis, and no one ‘correct’ way to do it” (Selzer 2004, p. 283), the various forms of rhetorical analysis share in common the aim of using the principles of rhetoric and the concepts found in the rhetorical tradition to arrive at an informed and nuanced understanding of a text (its possible meanings, implications, consequences). Further, as I. A. Richards famously described it, the principles and concepts of the rhetorical tradition are most valuable as they can be drawn on to prevent misunderstanding (1964). It seemed that misunderstandings were many in the case “knowledge mobilization” as presented in the SSHRC documents, given that what was

---

37 An overview of various approaches to rhetorical analysis is presented in chapter three but briefly, here, some of these include: cluster criticism, fantasy-theme criticism, feminist criticism, generic criticism, ideological criticism, metaphor criticism, narrative criticism, generative criticism and pentadic criticism are the more widely recognized forms of rhetorical criticism used for textual and discourse analysis (Foss 2004).
meant by the term “knowledge mobilization” could not even be clearly discerned. After careful consideration of the different kinds of rhetorical analysis (and review of examples of analyses that employed them), I came to the decision that *Burkean pentadic rhetorical analysis*\(^{38}\) would be the most useful in my aim to arrive at an understanding of what “knowledge mobilization” meant for SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community.

Burkean pentadic rhetorical analysis identifies the five pentadic elements—*act*, *agent*, *agency*, *scene* and *purpose*—in a text and how the rhetor situates them in relation to each other. Hallelujah, I thought, upon finding Burke’s pentad. At last, I could almost make out a light at the end of the PhD tunnel, as pentadic analysis seemed perfect for the barrage of questions that my committee had asked earlier: What does “knowledge mobilization” mean and further, what does it look like, who does it, how do they do it, how do you know if “knowledge” has been “mobilized” and why did all of this matter, anyway? Thank you, thank you, Kenneth Burke.

Finding Burke and the pentad provided me with an important step forward, but after one year spent on coursework, another year and a half on the three directed readings, I was rather anxious that I still did not have my thesis, with comprehensive exams looming, closer than ever (they seemed to be pounding at the door, really). It made little sense to try to complete comprehensive exams when I had not yet established my thesis: without the thesis, was it even possible to do the exams? I was closer, certainly, but I told my committee that as things stood, I was not ready to do the comprehensives. On the suggestion of Heesoon Bai,

---

\(^{38}\) The “Burkean” here refers to Kenneth Burke, author of numerous, important works in the fields of literary theory and rhetoric, such as *Counter-Statement* (1931), *A Grammar of Motives* (1945), *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1950), and *Language and Symbolic Action* (1966). Burke and his work are credited for launching the “New Rhetoric” as a critical and contemporary turn in the rhetorical tradition. Burke’s “dramatistic pentad” is widely cited as a concept and framework for investigating questions on the motives and meanings of language as symbolic action.
to me and to the other members of my committee at that time (Rowland Lorimer and Suzanne de Castell), a decision was made that in my case, the comprehensive examinations would be used to achieve something different from the customary literature review of theory, method and research findings needed to support the thesis. Instead, the best purpose that the exams could serve in my case, Heesoon suggested, would be to move me forward in establishing my thesis. It was agreed that the exams would be explorations as needed to get my thesis statement in hand. I suggested to my committee that the first exam be an exploration of the history of “the making public of scholarship” in contrast to the making public of work that was not deemed to be “scholarship,” from Gutenberg forward; and that the second exam would be an exploration of discourse theory and a preliminary round of Burkean pentadic rhetorical analysis of SSHRC documents.

By the end of the exams, mission accomplished, the thesis statement was in hand. Rhetorical analysis of the SSHRC documents revealed that according to SSHRC, knowledge mobilization required communication and collaboration, or further, “systematic interaction” (SSHRC 2005a, p. 10) between the research community and other “stakeholder-partners” (recall, these were government, industry, media, for example). I knew from witnessing and participating in the balancing act of confronting the boundaries of scholarly discourse (and in moving from the literati to the academy), that there was one rather significant problem:

39 I owe much to Heesoon Bai for this suggestion because this approach to my comprehensive exams, although unconventional, was precisely what was needed. I also appreciate the willingness of Rowland Lorimer and Suzanne de Castell to support the idea. The exploration on the history of “the making public of scholarship” was particularly challenging for those involved—me as the writer and Rowland, Suzanne, and John Willinsky as the readers—but with the freedom given to me and the helpful comments from them, I am happy to report, I was fortunate to have a revised version of the first exam accepted for a special issue on the theme “publish” in M/C Journal, under the title, “Ghosts in Machines and a Snapshot of Scholarly Journal Publishing in Canada.” As for the rhetorical analysis of the SSHRC documents, although my efforts at getting it published have not been successful (in jest, I ask, come on, who doesn’t want to know more about SSHRC rhetoric?), the second exam was an absolutely fundamental exploration and investigation of the documents and it brought me directly to my thesis statement.
communication and collaboration across communities is a fine ideal, but if members of the literati and the academy appeared almost to speak different languages (not to mention the sometimes hostile differences across disciplinary lines even within the academy), what communication and collaboration would be possible between the academy and the “stakeholder-partners” that SSHRC had named? Further, given that work that is highly regarded in one discourse community would not necessarily be highly regarded (if regarded at all) in another discourse community, would members of the social sciences and humanities research community be willing to risk their time and their tenure in traversing such boundaries? The “knowledge mobilization” solution to the “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility” of social sciences and humanities research did not appear to be a solution, but rather, it presented another problem, another paradox.

The thesis statement, therefore: SSHRC’s knowledge mobilization imperative—meant to address a “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility”—inadvertently results in another paradox for the social sciences and humanities research community: the paradox of a “zero-sum language game.” Briefly put, this paradox shows that while there is increasing pressure on Canada’s social sciences and humanities researchers and scholars to succeed in mobilizing knowledge across the stakeholder communities named by SSHRC—government, media, community organizations and publics—to do so would come at the cost of success in contributing what is recognized as legitimate knowledge within academic discourse communities.

So much for the yellow brick road, I thought. I would concern myself with the bricks on the road later, but for the moment, at least I had one mission accomplished: the thesis
The thesis statement held together, but there were several issues that needed to be addressed, in the main: (1) I needed to clearly explain what was meant by “zero-sum language game” and how I arrived at the concept; (2) I needed to provide evidence of such a “zero-sum language game” and how it was related to SSHRC’s “knowledge mobilization” imperative; and (3) was I able to suggest possible ways that the paradox of this “zero-sum language game” could be addressed? These issues are to be taken up in chapters four, five and six. In brief here, however, a few words about evidence of “zero-sum language games.”

I.VI

**Discourse communities, knowledge mobilization and zero-sum language games**

Rhetorical theory and analysis, as noted thus far, take up questions on “discourse” and some of the theory and research on such questions fall under the heading of “discourse theory,” offering much insight on ideas about how discourse communities are formed and function. Detailed discussion on “discourse communities” is presented in chapter three but can be defined briefly here as, “a group of people who share certain language-using practices. These practices can be seen as conventionalized in two ways. Stylistic conventions regulate social interactions both within the group and in its dealings with outsiders” (Bizzell 1992, p. 222). In discourse theory, there is a good deal of focus on conventions, on what they regulate and how. In a given discourse community, evidently, there are rules to be followed. To break those rules, is to risk falling out of favour with a given discourse community or worse, to fail to even be recognized as a member of that discourse community. The rules, as they say, is

---

40 “Not so fast” are not the words of my committee members, as they were much more precise, of course. I should note also, that after my comprehensive examinations, in light of changes and turns they brought on, my committee was now comprised of Heesoon Bai (supervisor), Sean Zwagerman and Norm Friesen.
the name of the game. And different discourse communities have different rules, different games: language games.

Just as it is often said that all knowledge can be thought of as a footnote to Plato, all things termed as “language games” can be thought of as footnotes to Wittgenstein.\(^{41}\) In this thesis, however, the concept of a “language game” is taken up, specifically, to focus on the activities of members of a discourse community, “performing acts according to rules,” as Searle describes (1969 [1970], p. 36-37) or as Foucault extends the discussion: “in analyzing discourses themselves, one sees…the emergence of a group of rules proper to discursive practices” (1972, 48).\(^{42}\) The acts performed (symbolic, rhetorical, recalling Burke and others), the discursive practices (as per Foucault), and the rules that govern them, vary from one discourse community to another. Discourse theory illustrates how rules of discourse govern the kinds of “moves” that are made in the language game(s) of discourse communities.

Just as the rules that govern the literary publishing community are significantly different from those that govern the scholarly publishing community (much to my surprise, as you may remember, from the opening of this chapter), so too, for the groups and organizations named by SSHRC: governments, industry, media, community organizations,

\(^{41}\) In this thesis (and beyond it), although certainly much is owed to Wittgenstein, I hold him here, in a footnote, because his description of language games is drawn on only as a point of departure: “There are…countless different kinds of use of what we call ‘symbols’, ‘words’, ‘sentences’…but new types of language, new language-games, as we may say, come into existence, and others become obsolete or forgotten” (Wittgenstein 1958 [1953], p. 11). Further discussion on philosophy of language, linguistics, or semiotics, for example, is not taken up in the work of this thesis. Yet, since the work of this thesis is concerned with language games as related to discourse communities (scholarly or otherwise, as the narrative of this introductory chapter comes to momentarily), a footnote in honour of Wittgenstein must be given a place here.

\(^{42}\) I should also note here that although this thesis makes mention of Foucault, Foucault does not figure prominently in this dissertation. I recognize that Foucault could be drawn upon in several ways; however, the work of Lyotard more directly takes up “language games” as needed for this thesis and so, Lyotard displaces Foucault. As an aside and on a personal note, in some of the choices that Foucault makes in terms of his discursive practices (in particular, what according to literary sensibilities could be referred to as “voice”), for some readers (and I am among them), these choices make for rather uninviting discourse. Otherwise put: Foucault’s work is to be respected, certainly; but his voice offends my ears.
etcetera. It is in part because of these differences across discourse communities—differences in discursive practices—that the social sciences and humanities research community is caught in a paradox of ubiquity and invisibility: the language, the rules, the game of scholarly discourse that academics play, is different from the language, the rules, the game of discourse played in different discourse communities.

Knowledge mobilization, SSHRC has suggested, can address this problem, the paradox of ubiquity and invisibility, through communication and collaboration, through systematic interaction between academe and other stakeholders. But in this communication and collaboration, SSHRC does not suggest what language game is to be played, what language game rules are to be followed, the discursive practices of which discourse community are to be used. The scholarly discourse community can no more be expected to suddenly adopt the discourse/rules of governments, industry or media than governments, industry or media can be expected to suddenly adopt the discourse/rules of the scholarly discourse community.

Such sudden (and systematic) adaptation is unlikely for at least two reasons. First: becoming adept with discursive practices takes time and skill and it is difficult enough to become adept with the practices of a single discourse community, never mind a multiplicity of them. Second: if members of a given discourse community are to be given recognition for contributions to that discourse and community, they cannot reasonably be expected to engage in discursive practices that are not recognized as legitimate within that discourse community. To more directly illustrate the paradox of knowledge mobilization, this second

---

43 This is understood well in the literary publishing community, which is why the following, statement is met with knowing scepticism: “When I retire as a [add here a profession, though the most usual is “doctor”], my plans are to write a novel.” The usual retort tends to be something like: “Yes, and when I retire as a novelist, my plans are to perform [insert whatever surgical procedure here: open heart surgery, brain surgery, etcetera].”
point can be rephrased as follows: Academics are unlikely to engage in discursive practices—such as those necessary for knowledge mobilization—that are not valued in their own discourse communities.

It becomes evident when considering tenure and promotion evaluations that certain discursive practices are valued more highly than others: single-authored scholarly work that is peer-reviewed and published with highly regarded scholarly journals or highly regarded scholarly presses is privileged over other forms of contributions to discourse within academe and most certainly beyond it (in chapter four, I illustrate this by examining tenure and promotion policies in faculty collective agreements at 38 Canadian universities). Yet, SSHRC’s focus on knowledge mobilization places increasing pressure on the research community to make contributions that extend beyond academe: hence, the paradox of knowledge mobilization. With this, again, I thought, well, was that it, then? Was this a “damned if you do and damned if you don’t” scenario? And here, theories of play surfaced once again, nudging me this time toward game theory because as I looked at the knowledge mobilization scenario, my non-conformist tendencies also surfaced as I wondered if and how certain rules could be changed. Game theory, I would discover, had much perspective to offer: on games and rules, on making moves, and on zero-sums.

In chapter three I provide an overview of some of the fundamentals of game theory alongside further discussion of discourse theory in order to explicate what is meant by the

44 In chapter four, the examination of tenure and promotion policies, alongside an overview of what is written in the research literature on the subject of tenure and promotion, serve as evidence of the “zero-sum language game” (for which my committee had asked earlier).

45 Here, also as asked by the committee, is an explanation of the links between SSHRC’s knowledge mobilization imperative and the “zero-sum language game.” Elaboration is provided in chapter three.
term, “zero-sum language game” as it is proposed in this thesis. For the purposes of the introductory narrative of this chapter, however, a few fundamental terms in game theory should be introduced. First, according to game theory, games can be categorized in multiple ways. One of the most important distinctions is between zero-sum games and non-zero sum games. Chapter three discusses how the language games of discourse communities present speakers and writers with a zero-sum predicament: as a consequence of discursive choices, some things are lost and others are gained. Second, chapter three brings together game theory and discourse theory to illustrate that the rules of academic discourse being what they are, discursive choices that gain success in one discourse almost invariably come at the cost of a loss in another discourse community.

In the case of knowledge mobilization, in short: The rules being what they currently are, one must choose between success at mobilizing knowledge in a discourse community beyond the academy or success in contributing knowledge to a discourse community within the academy. In knowledge mobilization, you cannot have your cake and eat it, too. Of course there are exceptions but for the most part, as chapters three and four illustrate, knowledge mobilization and recognition within one’s own academic discourse community are mutually

---

46 In the event that “such language” is offensive to the reader, my defence, leaving aside freedom of expression, academic freedom, and much else: this is a phrase handed down by my grandmother (and many other grandmothers, no doubt) as a description that in some circumstances, is perfectly à propos (her religious devotion notwithstanding, I might add) and I stand by her and the phrase, both.

47 Zero-sum games are those in which payoff by one player are possible only at the cost of the other player(s). Non-zero-sum games, by contrast, are those in which gains by one player need not result in a loss by the other player(s). An adaptation of this understanding (to be explained in chapter three) is one of the basic principles underlying the concept of “zero-sum language games” presented in this thesis.

48 The zero-sum predicament can also be extended to language more generally and I revisit and elaborate on this also in chapter three, and present examples of what can be both lost and gained.

49 As with any choice, of course, some things are lost and some things are gained. With the concept of “zero-sum language games” proposed here, the issue is that what is to be lost or gained is success in contributing what is recognized and valued as a legitimate contribution to a particular discourse community.
exclusive: it is a zero-sum equation (the rules being what they are). This begs the question: Must the rules be as they are? And another: Can’t the rules and the equation be changed?

I.VII

Moving beyond zero-sum language games: Changing some rules

Although the yellow brick road of “knowledge mobilization” seemed to come to an abrupt end (off a cliff, no less!) and it appeared that an attempt at knowledge mobilization could turn out to be attempted academic suicide, in discourse theory and game theory, both, there was still hope (especially when the two theoretical understandings were brought together). Moves could be made and rules could be changed that would in turn change the language game of discourse communities, and this could in turn, provide alternatives to the zero-sum equation of knowledge mobilization.

In chapter six I suggest some possibilities. In the first set of suggested possibilities are practical considerations that involve looking more closely at “service” in the tripartite model of faculty responsibilities, as “knowledge mobilization” seems in some ways most sensibly to fit within the service category.50 Similarly, I suggest giving more than what is described in the research literature as “lip service” to the “service” category in the tripartite model of faculty responsibilities.51 Extended further, “Scholarship of Service” could be advanced (just as “Scholarship of Teaching” has been advanced in recent decades) by recognition and support for research and practice that contributes to better understanding

50 In chapter four I also discuss the service category in the context of examining tenure and promotion policies in faculty collective agreements. In looking at the wording in the agreements, “knowledge mobilization” seems to fit most neatly into the “service” category.

51 In chapter four, there is discussion of the marginalization of service activities. In one research study, for example, “the impression of [30] interviewees [in a study involving institutions in the UK, US, Canada, Australia and southern Europe] is that lip service is paid to the importance of service in university life. Most were dubious that ‘service’ contributions are really rewarded in career terms” (Macfarlane 2007, p. 267).
and better success in activities such as “knowledge mobilization” that aim to extend the reach and benefits of research as a public good. I further suggest the possibility of providing a place within academic faculties and departments—permanent, academic appointments—for members of the social sciences and humanities research community to engage in the scholarship of service within their discipline.\(^5^2\)

The second set of suggested possibilities is somewhat more abstract and asks members of the social science and humanities research community—whether scholars and researchers, those who make the rules of academic administration, or those who fund social sciences and humanities research—to reflect on certain dispositions (and positions) and to consider what changes need to be made in order to arrive at a solution to the “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility” as well as the zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization. In looking to the research literature on the changing role of the university, these changes include, for example, issues of: academic identity and academic citizenship (from graduate education forward); mutual respect and trust within the academy and beyond it to other discourse communities; better and more equitably acknowledging and appreciating (formally and informally) different approaches to knowledge as legitimate. All of these are important to knowledge mobilization and to extending the reach and benefits of research and scholarship as a public good.

\(^{52}\) This suggestion of permanent, appointed faculty members who engage in the “Research of Service” is modelled after similar kinds of positions for faculty hired on as permanent, appointed Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, found in many departments at many Canadian universities. The responsibilities of Lecturers are primarily teaching, then service (and they are not required to do research or publish research findings). The responsibilities of the proposed “Service Faculty” (or however else they could be called) would complement this: their primarily responsibilities would be service and research (they would not be required to teach). The two complementary roles could address some of the problems that many departments confront in terms of pressures to improve teaching and to increase contributions to service.
In the brief, concluding narrative epilogue, I return to the personal, professional and scholarly interests first introduced in the opening, narrative chapter, to provide a closing, candid snapshot: of the doctoral work, of the academy, and of next steps envisioned. At present, however, now that the unfolding narrative of this chapter has (I hope) allowed a certain acquaintance, it is time to turn to the rather less gentle business of the critical pendulum as it passes over the theory, the method, the data, the analysis and detailed, further discussion in the chapters that follow.

---

53 This mention of the “critical pendulum” is made in reference to Nietzsche quote that opened the chapter.
II

THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES
RESEARCH COUNCIL OF CANADA AND
THE “PARADOX OF UBIQUITY AND INVISIBILITY”

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a general discussion of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada’s transformation “from granting council to knowledge council” as it appeared in documents released by SSHRC in 2004-2005 and as was taken up by the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada in several issues of University Affairs during that time frame. This discussion is presented within the historical context of SSHRC policy since the Council was established in 1977 and within the international context of a shift toward extending the reach of research as a public good.

In January 2004, SSHRC released the first volume of From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada. This first volume (of three) presented a “Consultation Framework on SSHRC’s Transformation” and described how SSHRC is part of a “larger system” within a “new world” with “new needs” (2004a, p. 7). The document then proceeded to describe how SSHRC’s transformation would be one of “reaching beyond” through “interactive engagement” across the disciplines and across stakeholder communities in Canada and internationally, through “maximum knowledge impact” made possible by building a “greater capacity for understanding research and its applicability” (2004a, p. 10). There was also a need for transformation, SSHRC claimed,
because social sciences and humanities research in Canada\textsuperscript{54} were “a paradox of ubiquity and invisibility: present everywhere, but for all intents and purposes, visible almost nowhere” (2004a, p. 12).

To address this paradox of ubiquity and invisibility, SSHRC policy documents (and also, to some extent, SSHRC funding envelopes) in recent years have placed increasing focus on “knowledge mobilization” of social sciences and humanities research. Policy documents, however, tend to be rather opaque as a genre of text and as a consequence, although the term “knowledge mobilization” and variations on it appear repeatedly in SSHRC policy from the date of SSHRC’s “transformation” (2004) to the present (2009), the meaning of “knowledge mobilization” in these documents is far from clear.\textsuperscript{55} This absence of clarity presents a challenge for the current and next generation of social sciences and humanities researchers and scholars: if what is meant by “knowledge mobilization” is at once unclear and increasingly important in SSHRC policy, how to know what knowledge mobilization means for the work and practices or research agendas and careers of those working in the fields of social sciences and humanities research and scholarship? The opacity of the term also invites criticism of SSHRC from the social sciences and humanities research

\textsuperscript{54} According to the Canadian Federation of Humanities and Social Sciences (CFHSS), in 2005-2006, 20,592 of the 38,298 full-time faculty members in Canadian universities were working within the social sciences and humanities research fields. This does not include part-time faculty or the 294 faculty members who did not identify their discipline (MacIsaac, E. Personal communication. 19 December 2008).

\textsuperscript{55} It is worthy of note that “knowledge mobilization” is also referred to in funding policy research literature and in funding policy documents internationally as “knowledge transfer” or in the case of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), there are “Knowledge Synthesis” and “Knowledge to Action” grants, for example. In the case of CIHR, however, there are institutionalized, professional practitioners in the field of medicine and “knowledge transfer” is particularly strongly taken up in the research literature in the field of nursing. While some fields of social sciences and humanities research—such as education and social work, for example—also have institutionalized, professional practitioners, the diversity of research and scholarship found in the social sciences and humanities creates a challenge with regard to knowledge mobilization or knowledge transfer. This is no doubt part of the difficulty for SSHRC in terms of addressing the need to extend the reach of social sciences and humanities research as a public good, and in terms of how this can variously be understood and accomplished across the social sciences and humanities disciplines beyond traditional methods of publications, conferences and teaching.
community, with “knowledge mobilization” and SSHRC policy more generally at risk of being dismissed as little more than empty rhetoric.

Although criticism of the policy document genre as rather more diffused with rhetoric than other genres is certainly not unwarranted, dismissing SSHRC policy and “knowledge mobilization” as little more than rhetoric prevents the social sciences and humanities research community from recognizing the significance of the international and historical context that places increasing importance on extending the reach of university-based research as a public good and the significance also, of how SSHRC and social sciences and humanities research are situated in that context. These are important understandings not only for questions of the individual careers of social sciences and humanities researchers and scholars, but so too, for university department policies and university mission statements, for the changing expectations that governments, professionals and publics have of universities (and what is required to successfully defend the need for ever larger taxpayer-funded research funding envelopes) in Canada and elsewhere. Better understandings of “knowledge mobilization” also have implications for philosophical questions on the epistemological heterogeneity and legitimacy that can be either celebrated or marginalized in social sciences and humanities research and scholarship.

Before proceeding to the rhetorical analysis of “knowledge mobilization” as it appears in SSHRC documents (chapter three) or to the theoretical framework used to discuss what is meant by “zero-sum language game” (chapter four), this chapter provides some broader, historical and international context for SSHRC’s transformation and knowledge mobilization imperative. What this chapter offers, therefore, are some details of how SSHRC is situated as a funding body in Canada. Further, in order to provide perspective on how SSHRC’s transformation was taken up by the social sciences and
humanities research community in Canada, the chapter gives some focus to how SSHRC is presented in *University Affairs* at the time of the transformation, from early 2004 to early 2005. Finally, some attention to historical and international context is provided, as necessary to understand the current shift in extending the reach of research as a public good.

The increasing focus by SSHRC on “knowledge mobilization” can be better understood by tracing the two key themes/dimensions of SSHRC’s focus on knowledge mobilization—(1) collaboration across stakeholder communities; and (2) knowledge delivery (though both of these are variously named)—as they appear in earlier documents from SSHRC, to provide historical context and understanding of what has changed and what has remained constant at SSHRC with regard what is now termed as “knowledge mobilization.”

To provide international context for an understanding of the shift to further extend the reach of research as a public good, some attention is also given to recent documents from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). This chapter therefore attempts to show how SSHRC’s “transformation” of 2004-2005 can be understood within the context of changes evident since the Council was first formed and in response to changes in the international research community.

II.I

**SSHRC situated – A few words and numbers**

In a recent “Statement to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada” entitled, “Moving Forward As

---

56 Identifying collaboration across stakeholder communities and knowledge delivery as two key dimensions in knowledge mobilization is derived from the rhetorical analysis undertaken for (and presented in) chapter three. In light of some of the resistance to “knowledge mobilization” that I noticed, I became curious about whether or not traces of “knowledge mobilization” could be found in SSHRC documents, historically.
The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) is an arm’s length federal agency that promotes and supports university-based research and training in the social sciences and humanities. Created by an act of Parliament in 1977, SSHRC is governed by a 22-member Council that reports to Parliament through the minister of industry. (2006a, p. 1)

The Statement later refers to social sciences and humanities research and scholarship as an investment “in people and knowledge about people” (p. 2). This investment is a somewhat cautious though explicit contrast or more properly, complement—and one that is argued as necessary if Canada is to be able to respond to the changing needs of changing societies—to what in Canada and internationally is an already well established and supported investment in “competitiveness through science and technology” (SSHRC 2006a, p. 2).

In SSHRC’s 2007-2008 budget, this investment took the form of 312.7 million dollars (2009a) as compared to a budget of 958 million dollars for the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council (NSERC 2009) and 869.5 million for Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR 2009) in the same year. Given that the social sciences and humanities account for more than half of all graduate students and faculty (MacIsaac 2008), the discrepancy in annual budgets no doubt is not lost on SSHRC. It is not surprising, then, that SSHRC presents itself as a research funding body that requires an investment alongside what the government invests in “science and technology” in order to enable SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community to “ask questions that inform understanding and decisions about issues such as immigration, education, monetary policy, the environment, justice and human rights, and culture” (2004a, p. 2).

In light of SSHRC’s position in relation to the government that decides its financial fate, in the climate and culture of “accountability” that had taken hold of governments and
those funded by them, in 2004-2005, SSHRC’s transformation “from granting council to knowledge council” (recall, this phrase was in the opening title of all three “transformation” documents) is fitting enough. The purposes of the 2005 consultation on the transformation was made clear in the opening “Message from SSHRC’s Council” in the consultation framework document: “to facilitate collective discussion about how to chart the future of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) and thus, in important ways, the future of the social sciences and humanities research enterprise in Canada” (2004a, p. 2).

Collective discussion indeed took place after the first volume of From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada, Volume 1: Consultation Framework on SSHRC’s Transformation was released. A summary of the formal discussion of the consultation process would later appear in the third volume, From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada, Volume 3: Report on the Consultations, released by SSHRC in January 2005 and detailed attention to this and other SSHRC documents will be provided in the rhetorical analysis presented in chapter three. First, however, some attention to the somewhat more informal discussion of the SSHRC documents, as found among members of the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada, provides a sense of both the resistant and supportive responses to SSHRC’s transformation “from granting council to knowledge council.”

II.II

SSHRC’s “transformation” in University Affairs, 2004-2005

From the time the SSHRC consultation began in early 2004 to the release of the report on the results in early 2005, updates on and discussion of SSHRC’s transformation were
published in *University Affairs*. Examination of this “coverage” in some detail provides a useful perspective—and an alternate perspective to that presented in SSHRC’s report on the consultation—on how SSHRC’s transformation was publicly taken up by the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada. In the January 2004, June/July 2004, August/September 2004, October 2004, January 2005 and March 2005 issues of *University Affairs*, the SSHRC transformation was the main subject of at least one article or opinion piece.

In the January 2004 issue, in an article entitled, “SSHRC begins transformation with letters to 10,000 researchers,” *University Affairs* reports on the launch of SSHRC’s consultation as follows:

SSHRC says its “way of doing business” for the last 25 years no longer is adequate for two reasons. It doesn’t foster a culture of collaboration within and across academic disciplines or among researchers and users of research. And secondly, the humanities and social sciences research community isn’t organized in a way to produce and deliver “the knowledge that Canadians need to build a better society.” (Berkowitz 2004a, p. 32)

Berkowitz, author of the article an editor of *University Affairs*, responsibly and even-handedly reports on the release of the consultation document and on an interview with SSHRC President at the time, Marc Renaud, who explains that, “SSHRC is trying to mobilize people” (Berkowitz 2004a, p. 32). The above passage is notable in its mention of SSHRC’s “way of doing business” as inadequate in terms of collaboration and knowledge delivery.

---

57 *University Affairs* is a reputable bi-monthly periodical, published by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada since 1959, and widely regarded as Canada’s foremost trade publication for administrators, faculty, graduate students and other academic professionals working in universities in Canada.

58 For example, in *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada, Volume 1: Consultation Framework*, the following “avenues for solutions” to the problematic ways that SSHRC has been “doing business” are listed as possibilities: (1) confederations of learning; (2) more formal institutes; (3) knowledge mobilization units; (4) web-facilitated communities of practice; (5) a clearinghouse for advanced expertise; (6) exchange/mobility programs; (7) enriched and connected postsecondary training environments; (8) a human sciences foundation; and (9) scholarly-based journals for lay audiences (2004a, p. 14-16).
because the language of the “research enterprise” and the integral role of collaboration and knowledge delivery for SSHRC’s future become established as themes in the months and years that follow. Berkowitz ends the article on an encouraging note with regard to the kinds of discussions to be undertaken over the course of the consultation process.

A few months later, in the June/July 2004 issue of University Affairs, in another interview with Berkowitz, Renaud says, “All of Canada’s universities joined in our talks, which I must admit pleasantly surprised us” (Berkowitz 2004b, p. 28). Berkowitz also reports, however, that “Several observers, both inside SSHRC and at universities, said that the exercise was viewed with some skepticism at the start but scholars became more engaged as it continued” (Berkowitz 2004b, p. 28). Although the report on the consultation had only begun to be prepared, according to SSHRC at the time of the June/July 2004 publication of University Affairs, consultations had shown that the transformation of SSHRC from “granting council” to “knowledge council” required two fundamental changes:

First, the community needs to get more exposure for its research findings and more understanding of their importance – the way the public intrinsically understands and supports research in medical and health fields...[and] second...[we must] find ways for Canadian researchers to intensify their connections – both within and between disciplines, institutions, sectors and countries. This idea also resonated with some, but not all, respondents. (Berkowitz 2004b, p. 28)

59 A couple of remarks need to be made in response to this quote, with regard to how the public “intrinsically understands and supports” the importance of some research (medical and health research are suggested above): (1) Although medical and health research is, arguably, appreciated by the public because members of the public have their own medical and health issues and therefore see an intrinsic value in medical and health research; it is also important to recognize that medical and health research are framed as intrinsically valuable by the media and government; and (2) in the current political and economic climate of accountability, there is an increasing focus on the need for public support for university-based research (and for universities at all, for that matter) and to some extent, this is particularly acute for the social sciences and humanities, in terms of public understanding that social sciences and humanities research differs in the questions it asks and the answers it offers, making for a usefulness that is different from but equal to that of science, medical and health research.

59
The earlier identified need for collaboration and knowledge delivery is carried forward in the above passage. Some of the skepticism referred to above also carried forward, in particular, in two opinion pieces published in *University Affairs* later the same year. The two opinion pieces also offer an indication of the kind of informal debate and discussion on SSHRC’s transformation that could be heard among faculty across the disciplines and across the country at the time.

In the August/September 2004 issue of *University Affairs*, an opinion piece by Dr. Ron Melchers (Professor of Criminology, University of Ottawa), opens as follows:

> It is hardly surprising that 81 of 92 member institutions in the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada heeded the call for submissions on the proposed transformation of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada...[because] the stakes are high for universities. (2004, p. 36)

Melchers argues that “[g]enuine transformation of SSHRC must challenge traditional beliefs underpinning academic life” and that the “academy devalues research results communicated by non-traditional means, even when those means are appropriate to users of the research” (2004, p. 36). In Melchers’ view, the “academic career incentive structure and the internal functioning of academic disciplines and communities—not human needs—drive the institutional processes that govern university research” (2004, p. 36). Further, says Melchers, the academic community “must address how research is measured and learn to distinguish between revenues and results and between outputs and impacts. Counts of dollars and pages in peer-reviewed publications reflect neither the volume of research activity nor its impact and value” (2004, p. 36).60

---

60 *University Affairs* includes at the conclusion of the “opinion piece” the conventional, “Opinion pieces do not necessarily represent the views of *University Affairs* or the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.” Certainly Melchers’ views are both presented as (given that they fall under the “opinion” column) and read as...
As is often the case with (or even the intention of) opinion pieces, Melchers is provocative and in some ways, what he says is controversial. It is not surprising, then, that in the very next issue of *University Affairs* a response to Melchers was published. In the October 2004 issue of *University Affairs*, Dr. John Osborne, who was the Queen’s University representative to SSHRC during the consultation process, provides a response in an opinion piece entitled, “Our obligation is to broaden understanding.” Osborne agrees that faculty members “had mixed feelings about the ideas presented in SSHRC’s discussion documents” (2004, p. 39). Osborne responds to Melchers’ concerns that SSHRC’s transformation and social sciences and humanities research is “about ‘career decisions’” and suggests that a more significant concern that SSHRC’s transformation raises is “about the role that a university should play in our society. Are we a place to which governments and industry simply contract out their research needs?” (2004, p. 39). Osborne’s answer is that, “If governments and industry need specific bits of research, then let them hire researchers to do this...[and further,] does ‘external accountability’ mean serving the social policy needs of government departments and the research needs of business?” (2004, p. 39). Osborne’s response captures a line of questioning, like that of Melchers, that could be heard (and still can be) in both less and more formal discussions about SSHRC, about research funding, its conditions and all that is entailed in applying for and getting funding (and to a lesser degree, reporting on how funds are spent).

The Melchers-Osborne exchange is characteristic of an understood need for social sciences and humanities research funding but also, of the tensions arising from research priorities, whether

opinion that contributes to discussion about the academy, social sciences and humanities research and the place of SSHRC’s transformation in them. That said, according to the conventional wisdom (and professional practices) of reputable publications, the views found in opinion pieces, if not an accurate representation of the community of readers served, do raise questions that are held as important by that community.
shaped by pressures from internal, institutional expectations or external, political demands. This exchange of opinions in *University Affairs* is also characteristic of the tensions that tend to arise in discussions of SSHRC’s role and what is meant by its “transformation,” in particular with regard to pressures imposed by governments and industry, which is a source of debate and concern or for some, a cause for cynicism. On the one hand, a more active role for SSHRC is not always unwelcome and the idea of fundamental changes to how research is funded, conducted and delivered to society is taken as important and necessary, given the changes (and need for change) in the academy and in society. On the other hand, there are concerns that a more active role from SSHRC, under pressure from governments and industry, would be an intrusive one and that changes to how research is funded, conducted and delivered (beyond what seems to be near-consensus on the need to provide more open access to scholarship) would translate to little more than compromising the autonomy and standards of the social sciences and humanities research community. As Melchers notes, “the stakes are high for universities.”

Just how high the stakes are becomes evident in the January 2005 issue of *University Affairs* in two articles entitled, “Federal granting councils face possible budget cuts” and “Research spending put under the microscope.” The first article reports that in “an attempt to cut $1 billion annually in spending” by the federal government, “research granting agencies could see the first cuts to their budgets since the federal government began to significantly reinvest in university research in 1998” (Charbonneau and Berkowitz 2005, p. 30). The second article opens with the question, “Will university research win or lose in government spending review?” and provides the answer that it “depend[s] ultimately on how research ranks against other national priorities such as health, child care and cities” in government plans to reallocate 12 billion dollars in the federal budget (Lawes 2005, p. 30).
As it happens, two months earlier, a November 2004 article, “Taxpayers’ group lambastes SSHRC grants” described how “the Ottawa Citizen reported that the federal government ‘handed out $86 million yesterday for a host of exotic university research projects’ and singled out six for special attention based on odd-sounding titles” (Berkowitz 2004c, p. 47). 61 It is not insignificant that at the time, the publisher of the Ottawa Citizen also owned one of the two national newspapers (The National Post) and numerous other print and television media holdings. 62 This is all to say that with the concentration of media ownership in Canada, “bad press” for SSHRC runs the risk of being far from “here today, gone tomorrow” or “yesterday’s news.” It is also worthwhile to note that the January 2005 University Affairs articles on funding cuts and scrutiny of research spending were published in the same month that SSHRC released its report on the 2004 consultations on its “transformation.”

In the March 2005 issue, University Affairs covered the report on SSHRC’s 2004 consultations, noting that the consultations had “led SSHRC to think differently about the relationship between scholars and the broader community” (Berkowitz 2005, p. 28). The broader community referred to by SSHRC includes other “stakeholders” in social sciences and humanities research, or as SSHRC Christian Sylvain (then SSHRC Director of Policy, Planning and International Affairs) described:

We used to call it the “user world” and now we see it’s not just a user world anymore. It’s a world where knowledge gets generated, where knowledge gets

61 The title of the September 24, 2004 Ottawa Citizen article is “$86M doled out for ’wonky’ social research” and the funded research projects that were criticized include the following: (1) “Sex work and intimacy: escorts and their clients” (2) “Understanding feelings of guilt in a retail purchase context” and (3) “Violence in Canadian ice hockey: an examination of social tolerance toward a culturally protected phenomenon.” There is a similar bashing by Robert Fulford in the October 13, 2007 edition of the The National Post.

62 The holdings of CanWest Global have changed over the years, after they acquired more than 200 publications from Conrad Black’s Hollinger Incorporated in 2000, but CanWest Global remains among the largest media companies in Canada.
put into practice – and not just in a linear fashion. We see now we don’t have a monopoly on knowledge production. (Berkowitz 2005, p. 28)

The position and role of SSHRC in this changed conception of and perspective on social sciences and humanities research is one in which, as SSHRC reports, there is a “genuine consensus” for “two expanded roles for the council: as a convener, to bring together researchers with each other, with students and with other stakeholders; and as a disseminator, taking a lead role in orchestrating a greater impact for research findings” (Berkowitz 2005, p. 28).

The “genuine consensus” that SSHRC reports to have found among members of the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada may be something of an overstatement, however, given the views expressed in the Canadian Association of University Teachers Bulletin. In the September 2004 CAUT Bulletin, for example, the author(s) of “CAUT critical of proposed SSHRC transformation” describe SSHRC’s transformation as “a thinly disguised implementation of the federal government’s commercialization agenda that the majority of academics firmly rejected when it was advocated…[in 1998 by an] Expert Panel on the Commercialization of University Research” (2004a, p. A1). The unnamed CAUT Bulletin author(s) note that there is a need and interest for continued and increased government support for social sciences and humanities research; however, SSHRC’s proposal “go[es] too far in trying to please political authorities” and does so at the cost of “undermining peer review” (CAUT 2004, p. A1).

Indeed, for the universities and for the social sciences and humanities research community, both, the stakes are high. With high stakes, tensions also tend to run high, so perhaps it could be expected that the social sciences and humanities research community would sound alarms at the imperfections of SSHRC policies and programs, at the sign of
threats to academic freedom and peer review (as the CAUT quote, above, suggests). Certainly, it is not difficult to find cause to criticize the manner in which SSHRC negotiates its position and role vis-à-vis the social sciences and humanities research community, not to mention, government, industry, the media and Canadian publics. It is necessary, of course, that the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada gives sufficient and critical attention to the workings of SSHRC in order that the 1977 act of Parliament meant to ensure that SSHRC “promotes and supports university-based research and training in the social sciences and humanities” is not betrayed.

That said, it is also important to remember, in the shared interests that SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community have in “university-based research and training,” that SSHRC must negotiate a position between the government that decides on annual budgets and the research community to which those budget funds are dispersed. This has been the case since SSHRC was established by an act of Parliament in 1977. Further, in looking to SSHRC’s past there is evidence of ongoing positioning, as necessary to protect the interests of the social sciences and humanities research community while, at the same time, defending the need for an investment in social sciences and humanities research as necessary for the shared interests of Canadian society at large (recall the earlier, chapter one, footnote reference to the Massey Report, for example). In addition, traces of “knowledge mobilization” can be found in earlier SSHRC documents and here, some attention is given to several of those documents.

II.III

Traces of “knowledge mobilization” in SSHRC documents: 1979, 1989 and 1996

An interpretation of SSHRC’s transformation in the early 21st century needs to be informed by an understanding of historical context for SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities
research community in Canada. SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community, by virtue of the act of Parliament that binds them together, are also bound to changes in political climate and changing expectations of the Canadian public(s) whose tax dollars fund and support social sciences and humanities research in Canada. The argument has of course been made, in response to SSHRC’s transformation, that the research community must guard itself against being “reduced to the logic of the neoliberal market...[and] a university environment that sees education and scholarship as primarily economic commodities and commodifiers” (Milz 2005, p. 128) in a quest for Canada to “build up its research-intensive universities in order to become globally competitive” (Milz 2005, p. 130). Indeed, this is a serious and justifiable concern; however, the three volumes of From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada released by SSHRC in 2004-2005 need to be considered within the context of similar kinds of documents released by SSHRC since it was formed in 1977.

Attention is therefore given here to several SSHRC documents that can be considered as precursors to the “transformation” documents: (1) A proposed five-year plan for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (1979); (2) Taking the pulse: Human sciences research for the third millennium (1989); and (3) Striking the balance: A five-year strategy for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada: 1996-2001 (1996). Together these SSHRC documents provide a perspective, over the course of the past 30 years, on the issues of collaboration and knowledge delivery that are identified as key priorities in SSHRC’s 2004-2005 transformation from “granting council to knowledge council.”

In A proposed five-year plan for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (1979), under the section on “The Current Situation of Canadian Research in the Social Sciences and
the Humanities,” ten problems are identified and one of these is the “limited communication of results” (p. 11). The problem is described as follows:

To be effective, research results must reach scholars and the interested public. At present, the social sciences and the humanities have little visibility for the public. It is therefore urgent that means be found to facilitate broader awareness of research results and their significance. This would not only heighten cultural enjoyment, but also provide a new input into informed decision-making. (p. 11, italics mine)

Although the question of whether or not research (in particular, the language that tends to be used in communicating it) is likely to bring “cultural enjoyment” to its readers is given some attention in the narrative introduction and epilogue of this thesis, the present focus in the above passage is on the issue of visibility of research results and their significance, deemed “urgent” as long ago as 1979 (only two years after SSHRC was established by an act of Parliament). The visibility of social sciences and humanities research, while a fundamental part of SSHRC’s 2004-2005 transformation, clearly is not a new idea, yet, it remains contentious. It should come as little surprise, then, that of the four priorities identified in the 1979 “proposed five-year plan” one is the “communication of results of research both to the scholarly community and to the interested public” (p. 30).

The themes/dimensions of collaboration and knowledge production/delivery are carried forward in Taking the pulse: Human sciences research for the third millennium (The Institute for Research on Public Policy 1989). The document contains proceedings and papers from a

---

63 With this mention of “cultural enjoyment,” recall the chapter one footnote on the Massey Report.

64 The issue of the “visibility” and “significance” of social sciences and humanities research is controversial and extends from discussion of bibliometrics for scholarly journals to “measuring the impact” of research in wider Canadian society. The issue is controversial not only because of the risk of such “measures” as arbitrary and flawed, but also, because of the prescriptive and reductive approach that such measures impose on social sciences and humanities research, given that it is notably distinct from the approach to research “trials” and “results” in the natural sciences (and this is exacerbated by the tendency of some in the social sciences disciplines to adopt the research paradigm(s) of the natural sciences in order to gain “scientific” currency and legitimacy).
conference held in collaboration with SSHRC in January 1989. The “Summary of the Discussion” held at the conference notes:

[R]epeated emphasis on dissemination, communication, diffusion of research results:

- to spread results and achieve knowledge transfer
- to increase understanding and build constituencies
- to package results of fundamental research for political use (which in most cases is...[not] easily done...)
- to access to databases, models. (p. 2)

In addition to these traces of the ideas of collaboration and knowledge delivery in the summary, similarly, the author of the opening address, Paule Leduc, refers to the sometimes “invisible” work of social sciences and humanities research as “one of the challenges that face us at this conference and afterward, the whole community” (p. 4). The paradox of ubiquity and invisibility that SSHRC describes in 2004 evidently is a paradox that has been long in the making.

Collaboration and knowledge delivery are similarly identified as priorities in Striking the balance: A five-year strategy for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada: 1996-2001 (1996). The balance referred to is one of “multiple needs and interests” found in “the complexity of the new social environments we are creating” (p. 3). The multiple needs and interests identified that must be balanced, according to SSHRC, are those of the general public and government (p. 8) in the context of the “changing nature of research” and “changing university environment” in which “possibilities for collaboration...are dramatically expanding” (p. 6-7). The five-year strategy identifies three SSHRC priorities, as follows: (i) research excellence, innovation and integration; (ii) diversity of research training; and (iii) knowledge transfer between the research community and Canadian society. Collaboration and knowledge delivery appear in the description of each of these priorities,
though most explicitly in the third, in which SSHRC describes its “particular concern” with the following:

- knowledge transfer which improves the dialogue – among researchers, stakeholders and other interested parties – about research results and new research that needs to be undertaken;
- knowledge transfer which feeds research findings into the policy and decision-making process;
- knowledge transfer which, by providing broader access to objective analysis of key issues, helps to nurture the thoughtfulness of public debate. (p. 16)

Evidently, collaboration and knowledge delivery as priorities for SSHRC (and by extension, the social sciences and humanities research community) has remained consistent since the act of Parliament that bound SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities together more than 30 years ago.

By situating SSHRC’s transformation and the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada within the context of SSHRC policy over the course of its history, the priorities of collaboration and knowledge/research transfer in SSHRC documents in 2004-2005 can be understood somewhat differently, perhaps, than in the way that the CAUT in 2004 described above as a “thinly disguised implementation of the federal government’s commercialization agenda.” The SSHRC transformation can also be understood differently when considered within the context of international research priorities (and by extension, funding for those priorities). As with the historical context provided by looking to earlier SSHRC documents, the international context also needs to be considered when interpreting SSHRC’s position and how it negotiates that position relative to the social sciences and humanities research community and changing research and funding priorities in the international community. Some attention is given here to that international context.
II.IV

Tracing “knowledge mobilization” in the context of research priorities in the international research community

It is understandable that the immediate pressures of SSHRC’s funding policies and priorities are primary concerns for the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada and that a SSHRC “transformation” would draw the critical attention of the research community that SSHRC is meant to serve. It is equally understandable that the policies and priorities of the international research community do not always appear on the radar of the research agenda at home (whether the home department, home university, home funding body) unless they are clearly relevant to one’s own discipline; or until they gain momentum after a number of years (if not decades); or unless they are related to what are recognized as urgent issues, such as human rights, for example. Identifying and drawing attention to urgent issues is the primary concern of organizations such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), however.

For example, UNESCO’s “Relevant Reference Literature on Research-Policy Linkages” (2005) provides a useful, 27-page bibliography of published works, conferences and organizations, ranging in temporal scope from 1970 to 2005 (the year the document was published), and this list alone provides an informed understanding of the seriousness of

65 I must reference here the work of John Willinsky, who has for more than ten years advanced the cause of the open access movement in scholarly publishing. Although my thesis does not discuss open access publishing, there are important parallels (and intersections) between my thesis and Willinsky’s work in this area, as the following quote suggests: “It is hard to imagine that researchers actively engaged in work that bears on human-rights issues would want anything but the widest possible public presence for their findings. Their work is work that might serve as background and context; it might be used by those who are skilled in turning it into practical advice, policy initiatives, legal suits, and political campaigns, if not always in ways that the researchers can foresee or would approve of. It might be directed at preventing and addressing immediate situations…[,] I want to reiterate that a right to know is not solely about having access to knowledge that will prevent harm or reduce suffering. Rather, the right to know…is about having fair and equitable access to a public good. It is about the responsibility of researchers and scholars to ensure that there are no unwarranted impediments to the widest possible circulation of the ideas and information with which they work” (2006, p. 146).
strengthening collaboration and the links between research and society. From the work of the Department for International Development (DFID), “whose purpose is to enhance the use of knowledge by DFID and others in support of the elimination of poverty” (p. 24) to the Support for Analysis and Research in Africa (SARA) project, which aims “to improve policies and programs in health and basic education” (p. 26), UNESCO not surprisingly includes in its “Relevant Reference Literature on Research-Policy Linkages” a list of publications that use the language of “users of research” (Cherns 1970), “usable knowledge” (Lindblom & Cohen 1979), research and/or knowledge “utilization” (Kerr 1981; Backer 1991; Landry et al 2001; ), and research “impact” or “knowledge transfer” (Garret 1998; Rynes et al 2001; Arundel & Geuna, 2001; Nutley et al, 2003; Court & Young, 2003; MacGregor, 2004).

The UNESCO documents given attention here, to situate SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community within context of research priorities for the international community, are: (1) World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-first Century: Vision and Action and Framework for Priority Action for Change and Development in Higher Education (1998); and (2) Diversification of Higher Education and the Changing Role of Knowledge and Research (2004).

The World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-first Century: Vision and Action and Framework for Priority Action for Change and Development in Higher Education was published after the World Conference on Higher Education was held in Paris in October 1998, which was attended by more than 4000 delegates, representing 182 member states (UNESCO, 1998b). In the opening lines of preamble of the Declaration, an understanding of changes in higher education and research is made clear:
...higher learning and research now act as essential components of cultural, socio-economic and environmentally sustainable development of individuals, communities and nations. Higher education itself is confronted therefore with formidable challenges and must proceed to the most radical change and renewal it has ever been required to undertake. (p. 2)

This change has taken the form of an “increase in student enrolments worldwide, from 13 million in 1960 to 82 million in 1995” but also an increase in “socio-economic stratification and greater difference in educational opportunity” both within and between nations (p. 2). The Declaration proceeds to describe what can be expected as a consequence of these changes:

Considering that a substantial change and development of higher education, the enhancement of its quality and relevance, and the solution to the major challenges it faces, require the strong involvement not only of governments and of higher education institutions, but also of all stakeholders, including students and their families, teachers, business and industry, the public and private sectors of the economy, parliaments, the media, the community, professional associations and society as well as a greater responsibility of higher education institutions towards society and accountability in the use of public and private, national or international resources. (p. 3)

The Declaration contains 17 articles and attention is given here to the two articles that address the issues of collaboration and knowledge delivery most directly, which are, “Article 6: Long-term orientation based on relevance” and “Article 17: Partnership and Alliances.” Article 16 opens with a description of what is meant by “relevance” and reads as follows:

“Relevance in higher education should be assessed in terms of the fit between what society expects of institutions and what they do. This requires...a better articulation with the problems of society and the world of work, basing long-term orientations on societal aims and needs...” (p. 5, bold font in original). The article states that higher education “should reinforce its role of service to society...mainly through an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approach in the analysis of problems and issues” (p. 6, bold font in
original). SSHRC’s priorities of collaboration and knowledge delivery can both be found in the Articles of the Declaration.

In “Article 17: Partnerships and alliances,” the issues of collaboration and knowledge delivery are articulated further:

Partnership and alliances amongst stakeholders—national and institutional policy-makers, teaching and related staff, researchers and students, and administrative and technical personnel in institutions of higher education, the world of work, community groups—is a powerful force in managing change. Also, non-governmental organizations are key actors in this process. Henceforth, partnership, based on common interest, mutual respect and credibility, should be a prime matrix for renewal in higher education. (p. 10, bold font in original)

The Declaration also includes several pages on the “Framework for Priority Action for Change and Development of Higher Education,” which provides direction to “states, including their governments, parliaments and other decision-makers” in order that the goals set out in the articles may be met (p. 11). The Declaration identifies “priority actions” to be undertaken at the level of systems and institutions, at the national level and at the international level. Certainly the Declaration addresses issues other than those of collaboration and knowledge delivery in higher education and research; however, as a declaration made more than one decade ago, it provides perspective on how SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities community have been situated for some time. As a declaration, however, the document presents guiding principles and priorities rather than discussion. Discussion, of course, is necessary. The next document given attention here, 66

The problems and issues named in Article 6 include “eliminating poverty, intolerance, violence, illiteracy, hunger, environmental degradation and disease” with a further aim “at the creation of a new society—non-violent and non-exploitative—consisting of highly cultivated, motivated and integrated individuals, inspired by love for humanity and guided by wisdom.” The final phrase, in particular, indeed is much to ask of institutions of higher education in the name of “knowledge mobilization” or in John Willinsky’s terms, as “the right to know.”
therefore, offers some discussion of changes identified by UNESCO’s 1998 World Conference on Higher Education and the implications for SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community as they relate to issues of knowledge mobilization.

*Diversification of Higher Education and the Changing Role of Knowledge and Research* is a collection of papers presented the 2004 UNESCO Regional Forum of the Second Scientific Committee Meeting for Europe and North America. The focus here will be on two papers in the document,67 as they provide succinct overviews of recent and current “changes” and important context with which to consider the issues under debate in SSHRC’s transformation as presented in *University Affairs* and elsewhere, as was discussed earlier in this chapter.

The Teichler paper opens with reference to the widely recognized “long-term trend of expansion of higher education” (2004, p. 2). The paper describes higher education as “a system that for centuries catered to a very small fraction of the population” but that now serves “about one half of each generation [in Europe and North America]” (2004, p. 29). As a consequence:

Research has experienced a similar growth...[and] as higher education institutions become more influential because research and scientific values become more widespread in society, they also become exposed to a stronger and more diverse influence from their surroundings – a steadily more informed and better educated public. Thus there is a two-way development of steadily stronger inter-relationships and mutual influences. The development also affects our notions about what research and academic activity is all about. Although this may expose universities to a pressure to be more useful, this utilitarian pressure is not uniform because the needs of those who express them are more varied than ever. (Teichler 2004, p. 29)

---

67 These are: (1) “Changing Structures of the Higher Education Systems” (contributed by Ulrich Teichler from the Centre for Research on Higher Education and Work, University of Kassel, Germany); and (2) “Diversification of Higher Education Systems (contributed by Ivar Bleiklie from the Rokkan Centre for Social Studies, Department of Administration and Organizational Theory, University of Bergen, Norway).
In one sense this change and growth in higher education can be interpreted as a grand success, in a shift from the tutelage of the elite few, to the teaching and learning of the many. It can therefore be expected that the conceptions and expectations of higher education and research are being negotiated. In Teichler’s words, “Put differently: as society becomes more ‘knowledgeable’, higher education comes under pressure to expand the kinds and types of knowledge it provides and to diversify the criteria by which it is judged. This takes place through a series of interrelationships between universities and society” (2004, p. 30).

Interrelationships between universities and society can be seen in SSHRC’s transformation and in how the transformation is taken up by the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada. Given that SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community are situated in the midst of changing and expanding expectations and needs of society, it should not be surprising that higher education as well as conceptions of “knowledge” and how it is “mobilized” are also changed.

Teichler also notes a shift in the 1990s from “national to supra-national policies” in the field of higher education and research (2004, p. 9). Both expansion and internationalization, says Teichler, have led to a “growing complexity of the major underlying forces” (2004, p. 10) that affect higher education and research, and that as a consequence of a “growing complexity of forces, [there is a] decreasing predictability of results” (2004, p. 12). The Bleiklie paper discusses the growth of higher education and its internationalization, the resulting “changes in the relationship between higher education, state and society” (2004, p. 18) and the “the significance of an extended concept of knowledge” (2004, p. 28).

Bleiklie elaborates on the notion of an “extended concept of knowledge” and it is worthy of consideration here. He refers to the work of Gibbons et al (1994) and their
distinction between two modes of “knowledge:” one that focuses on outcome and another that focuses on procedure (p. 28). Bleiklie elaborates thus:

...we may illustrate what is implied in terms of research in the presumed movement away from a basic and disciplinary research mode in which the researcher defines the research problem, directs the research process and communicates findings to the public through scientific publication. The movement goes in the direction of an applied trans-disciplinary mode in which the research problem may be defined by wider teams of people and where the customer or end-user takes part in the definition of the research problem, monitors and takes part in the research process and may influence when and how the results are communicated. (2004, p. 29)

While the language of the “customer” or “end-user” justifies objections noted earlier with regard to reductive conceptions of research that are aligned with an ideology that places higher education as a cog in the wheel of a market economy, an “expanded” conception of research and “knowledge” described above is well known and understood in the field of education, for example, given that “field work” in education is often in a classroom, where teachers and students have long been understood as research “participants” who contribute to the “knowledge” that is generated by the research.68 Similarly, notions of “meaning-making” and the “construction of knowledge” have proliferated across the disciplines, yet

68 The field of education also has a long history of research that has required a collaborative approach to educational issues, involving university faculty as well as schools, school districts, ministries of education, and other organizations involved in continuing and community education initiatives. As noted earlier in reference to the many “knowledge transfer” activities in the field of nursing, the field of education (like nursing) has a large body of professional practitioners with whom links can be formed, whether in small groups or in terms of broader policy changes. This is not the case for all disciplines in the social sciences and humanities, however. That said, the situation in education is far from perfect: in the research literature in the field of education there is also much discussion of the surprisingly long time needed after research is conducted to see any change effected in education, in the actual schools, districts, ministries. There are also cases where no amount of research seems able to effect change: the proliferation of testing and school ranking are two examples of this, as both have been highly criticized (for decades), with warnings that the proliferation of testing results in teachers “teaching to the test” and students preparing to be tested (rather than engaging in meaningful learning), for example. Still, in my own experience as a research assistant on projects taking place in schools and involving teachers and students (“The Multiliteracy Project” at UBC with Margaret Early and the “Paying attention to attention” research project at SFU with Suzanne de Castell), I have witnessed that much change can be effected by individual teachers who are interested in being involved in research, as this research informs their practice, just as their practice informs the research, in particular when researchers involve others as “research participants” rather than as “research subjects,” as was once more commonly done.
there seems uneasiness with SSHRC’s claim that the research community does not “have a monopoly on knowledge production” (Berkowitz 2005, p. 28). SSHRC also does not have a monopoly on federal budget funding dollars.

That said, in Canada as in other wealthy nations, the “size of higher education budgets has gone from an insignificant fraction to a considerable percentage of public budgets...[making] higher education much more visible and for that reason more politically salient” (Bleiklie 2004, p. 31). As a consequence, there is a “struggle to define the true nature of knowledge between actors such as states and politicians, institutional leaders and students, researchers and intellectuals, consultants and business leaders. Knowledge interests are therefore the key, together with the linked concepts of knowledge alliances and knowledge regimes” (Bleiklie 2004, p. 32). According to Bleiklie (and by extension, to some extent, according to UNESCO) publicly-funded higher education institutions, the research conducted in them and the knowledge produced by them is governed by “public managerialist [knowledge] regimes...driven by university-state alliances, political-administrative interests and a semi-competitive logic based on incentive policies where part of the public support depends on teaching and/or research performance” (2004, p. 33).

Although neither SSHRC nor the social sciences and humanities research community may be altogether pleased with the idea that what they do is part of a knowledge regime—and a public managerialist one at that, still, this is perhaps preferable to the alternate, “academic

---

69 Although a more philosophical discussion of the “true nature of knowledge” is not being taken up here, earlier in the UNESCO document, an “extended concept of knowledge” and the “tension within the concept of knowledge itself” are described by Gibbons et al, as follows: “Broadly speaking, there is one category of definitions that focuses on knowledge as some kind of outcome. What is called ‘practical knowledge’ or generally ‘utility oriented’ knowledge belongs to this category. As a contrast there is a definition that focuses on knowledge as procedure. This defining characteristic is shared by definitions that focus on knowledge as a process either widely defined as a set of cultural activities or as a specific procedure like in traditional definitions of scientific method. A number of frequently used pairs of concepts in the literature reflect this shared underlying distinction between knowledge as outcome and knowledge as procedure (Bleiklie 2004, p. 28).
capitalist regime, driven by university-industry alliances, economic interests and a commercial logic” (Bleiklie 2004, p. 32)—evidence of how SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community are situated in such a “knowledge regime” can be found in each of the three SSHRC documents give attention earlier in this chapter. In light of the documents considered in this chapter, it is perhaps worthwhile to seriously examine and question claims such as the following:

While [research] projects which involve and/or represent community interests should be encouraged, demanding that scholarly research be available for direct translation into action or immediately “useful” information is tantamount to a lack of appreciation for the critical thinking, textual analysis, artistic ventures and archival research in which scholars routinely engage and which provide the foundation for most advances in knowledge... stipulating conditions whereby social science and humanities research are required to have a visible and direct application amounts to an insidious form of anti-intellectualism. (CAUT, 2004)

Given that the influence of corporate interests on research and on government tends to be viewed with suspicion and distrust—and in many, if not most cases, justifiably so—the above criticism from CAUT is not without cause. That said, in light of what is found both in early SSHRC documents and recent discourse from the international community, the CAUT response (above) to calls for stronger links between university research and society seems rather short-sighted. Further, to suggest that a mandate to make the benefits of research increasingly visible and accessible for the benefit of society is equivalent to “an insidious form of anti-intellectualism” is to make (and perpetuate) presumptions about research and society that deny considerable possibilities for both the research community and the public.70

---

70 For example, that “critical thinking, textual analysis, artistic ventures and archival research... provide the foundation for most advances in knowledge” is problematic in that it implies that only certain persons and certain kinds of activities are valued as making contributions to epistemological understandings. The tendency for fundamental understandings (such as how to define what is “useful”) to be differently understood from one discourse community to another (or even for discourse communities to be dismissive of each other), is wound up in issues to be taken up in later chapters: in discussion of discursive practices and understandings as they...
The above quote from CAUT does, however, reflect some of the kinds of tensions arising from the SSHRC’s transformation and the feared implications that the transformation could have for social sciences and humanities research.

These kinds of concerns and tensions are not new to the social sciences and humanities and the situation is not unique to the research community in Canada. Interestingly, in a description of the “emergence of professional social science” in Europe and the United States, Haskell describes the turn of an earlier century:

…the nineteenth century was a period of growing interdependence among all the components of society, individual as well as institutional. By the term “interdependence” I mean to refer to something quite exact: that tendency of social integration and consolidation whereby action in one part of society is transmitted in the form of direct or indirect consequences to other parts of society with accelerating rapidity, widening scope, and increasing intensity. A society is interdependent to the extent that its component members or parts influence and are influenced by each other. (1977, p. 28-29)

This sense of “interdependence” is important when considering the SSHRC transformation and the increasing focus on “knowledge mobilization” for the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada. The description given in the above quote illustrates, as the earlier SSHRC documents illustrated (as well as the note on the Massey Report), that the mutual interests of the social sciences and humanities research community and society have long been understood as interdependent.

That said, SSHRC’s focus on “knowledge mobilization” needs to be better understood, in the interest of these long standing interdependencies, in the interest of social sciences and humanities research, and in the interest of research as a public good. The shape and are shaped by discourse communities (chapter four) and in discussion of issues of trust and identity in the academy (chapter six). Further, the above quote makes the presumption that an interest in “usefulness” of research is necessarily an “anti-intellectual” position. Certainly, urgent issues of human rights, for example (as mentioned earlier in the chapter), are in need of research that can be used to address urgent problems, but they do not necessarily stem from an anti-intellectual position.
chapter that follows aims to arrive at a necessary and improved understanding of knowledge mobilization as a research funding policy and priority, informed by (Burkean pentadic) rhetorical analysis, which that identifies act, agent, agency, scene and purpose in “knowledge mobilization” messages as they appear in the SSHRC documents.
III

“KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION” AND SSHRC:
RHETORICAL ANALYSIS AND UNDERSTANDINGS

The previous chapter provided context for SSHRC’s “transformation” of 2004-2005, described as an “evolutionary process of [SSHRC] transforming itself from a granting council that principally funds excellent research to a knowledge council equally concerned with ensuring the impact of research in society” (SSHRC 2005c). One consequence of this has been an increasing focus on “knowledge mobilization” as a priority for the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada. As the previous chapter makes evident, however, this focus on knowledge mobilization can be variously interpreted (and embraced or resisted). The purpose of this chapter is to draw on rhetorical theory and analysis to arrive at an informed understanding of what is meant by “knowledge mobilization” in the SSHRC documents; and secondly, to arrive at a better understanding of the implications of SSHRC’s knowledge mobilization imperative for the social sciences and humanities research community.

III.I

The rhetorical tradition, rhetorical situations, rhetorical understandings

The rhetorical tradition can be drawn on to accomplish many things, not least of which, is to arrive at informed understandings and to prevent misunderstandings. Looking to rhetoric as an approach to studying “misunderstanding and its remedies” is borrowed from I. A.
Richards, who is famously known for holding the view that, “We struggle all our days with misunderstandings, and no apology is required for any study which can prevent or remove them” (1964, p. 3). Given the discussion in the previous chapter of SSHRC’s transformation and how it has been taken up in the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada, there appears to be a need to dispel misunderstandings about “knowledge mobilization” and how SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community are situated in relation to what has both changed and remained consistent over the course of recent years and decades (or even, the past century, as illustrated in the closing of the previous chapter).

Ironically enough, rhetoric continues to be engaged in struggles of being misunderstood, often regarded as “mere ornamentation or manipulation” thereby reducing rhetoric to an untrustworthy and contemptible “trickery” (Nelson, Megill and McCloskey 1987, p. 3). Yet, the rhetorical tradition—however appropriated and condemned for its abuses—continues to hold together and in recent decades has been taken up with revived interest. What follows here is a brief overview of some of the basic tenets of the rhetorical tradition as they originated in Aristotle’s Rhetoric, followed by key rhetorical understandings found in contemporary rhetorical theory, as these together provide useful context for the rhetorical analyses of the SSHRC documents that are presented later in this chapter.

As mentioned briefly in the introductory narrative chapter of this thesis, from the Aristotelian perspective, rhetoric is understood as an art. The three kinds of rhetoric that Aristotle defines are deliberative, forensic, and epideictic and of these, the most relevant for considering what is found in SSHRC documents, generally, and in how SSHRC presents
“knowledge mobilization” in particular, is “deliberative” rhetoric. Some attention is given here to each of the three kinds of rhetoric described by Aristotle, with more detail and discussion of the “deliberative,” as it is most relevant to the present discussion of SSHRC, the social sciences and humanities research community, how they are situated in relation to each other, and how they are situated in relation to “knowledge mobilization” as a research and funding priority.

For each of the three kinds of rhetoric described by Aristotle, there are corresponding characteristics related to the time, place and aims for which they are suited. The aims of forensic rhetoric “concern justice and injustice” (Rhetoric 1.3, 1960 [1932], p. 18), with its corresponding place as the legal arena, and its corresponding time as the past, “for it is always with regard to things already done” (Rhetoric 1.3, 1960 [1932], p. 17). The aims of epideictic rhetoric “concern honor and dishonor” (Rhetoric 1.3, 1960 [1932], p. 18), with its corresponding place as the ceremonial arena, and its corresponding time as the present, “for everyone praises and blames with regard to existing conditions” (Rhetoric 1.3, 1960 [1932], p. 17). The aims of deliberative rhetoric concern “counsel or advice” (Rhetoric 1.3, 1960 [1932], p. 17) and “advantage and injury” (Rhetoric 1.3, 1960 [1932], p. 18), with its corresponding place as the political arena, and its corresponding time as the future, because the rhetor “gives advice about things to come, exhorting or dissuading” (Rhetoric 1.3, 1960 [1932], p. 17).

---

71 As with many other academic disciplines, rhetoric has also been criticized for its notably or even notoriously male-centric (Lunsford 1995) and Euro-centric (Tyler 1987) perspectives and approaches and for its battles across disciplinary divides (Goggin 2000).

72 Although the aim of all of these three forms of rhetoric is persuasion, to defend “truth and justice” (Rhetoric 1.1, 1960 [1932], p. 5) and for the purposes of “instruction” (Rhetoric 1.1, 1960 [1932], p. 6), the three types are characterized according to particular matters, whether judicial, ceremonial or political (as Aristotle describes in Rhetoric 1.3, and as discussed, here, momentarily).
Certainly, there is some relevance of forensic and epideictic, as well as deliberative rhetoric when considering SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community—the past, present and future are all considerations, for example—but the SSHRC documents, as policy documents, fall most clearly within the category of deliberative rhetoric. The three volumes on SSHRC’s *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council*, as documents on SSHRC’s transformation, while they must recall the past and comment on the present, they clearly are aimed at the future, and this most certainly is the case with SSHRC’s strategic planning document. SSHRC’s transformation and claims that the “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility” must be addressed can be understood to fall within the aims of deliberative rhetoric in that they are concerned with “advantage and injury” (in terms of the consequences of the “ubiquity and invisibility” paradox), as well as with “counsel and advice” (in terms of the need for “knowledge mobilization” in order for the social sciences and humanities research community to address this paradox).

Just as Aristotle’s forensic, epideictic and deliberative rhetoric are described within the context of different kinds of situations, contemporary perspectives on rhetoric also note the significance of a given situation in terms of arriving at informed, rhetorical understandings. For example, in an article entitled, “The Rhetorical Situation,” Bitzer makes the case that it “seems clear that rhetoric is situational” in the sense that it is “a response to a situation of a certain kind”—a rhetorical situation—“obtain[ing] its character-as-rhetorical from the situation which generates it” (1995, p. 3). In at least two important ways, this understanding is relevant for the present discussion of SSHRC and knowledge mobilization: (1) according to SSHRC, knowledge mobilization as a research and funding priority is a response to the situation of the “ubiquity and invisibility” paradox; and (2) as the discussion of the previous chapter illustrated, knowledge mobilization as a research and funding priority
is also a response to the situation of historically important links between research and larger society, as well as recent discourse with regard to changes in higher education and the needs of society, internationally.

Bitzer also describes how “a situation is rhetorical insofar as it needs and invites discourse capable of participating with the situation and thereby altering its reality” (1995, p. 5). This too, is relevant, as the SSHRC discourse on knowledge mobilization engages with the situation (of ubiquity and invisibility as well as the historical and international context) and offers advice on how to alter that situation in the future. Carolyn Miller, in her discussion of genre, responds to Bitzer that, “What is particularly important about rhetorical situations...is that they recur” (1984, p. 156). Miller describes genre as “typified rhetorical action” (drawing on Kenneth Burke’s *Language as Symbolic Action* and other work). SSHRC’s transformation documents (as well as the strategic plan), as examples of the policy document genre, can therefore be understood as typified rhetorical actions. This is not to suggest that the SSHRC documents be regarded as insignificant, as “little more than the typical rhetoric” (an interpretation that has unfortunate consequences, as noted in the opening narrative chapter of this thesis). On the contrary, the situation that SSHRC is participating in is one that, as the discussion of the previous chapter illustrated, has historical precedent, international urgency and much significance for the social sciences and humanities research community, in terms of research and funding priorities, changes in the academy and also, as shall be discussed in later chapters, changes to perspectives on research more broadly.

In relation to changed perspectives on knowledge, before turning to the rhetorical analysis of the SSHRC documents, one further understanding derived from contemporary rhetorical perspectives deserves attention here. As Bizzell ad Herzberg describe in their authoritative volume on the history of the rhetorical tradition, referring to the work of
Mikhail Bakhtin, Virginia Woolf, I.A. Richards, Kenneth Burke, Chaim Perelman, Michel Foucault, Wayne C. Booth, Henry Louis Gates Jr., Gloria Anzaldúa, and Stanley Fish (among numerous others), they describe how modern and post-modern turns in the rhetorical tradition, through philosophy, theory and method, disrupt and call into question:

…the status of knowledge and its relationship to language…[as] epistemic questions raised by the human sciences and even the natural sciences point to the need to study speech acts and speech genres, discursive formations and discourse communities, the dramatic scenes of communication, the linguistic construction of consciousness, and the rhetorical construction of knowledge. (2001, p. 15)

This most recent turn in the rhetorical tradition raises some issues that are highly relevant to a rhetorical understanding of knowledge mobilization. The status of knowledge and its relationship to language, discourse communities, the dramatic scenes of communication, and the rhetorical construction of knowledge all are important considerations. Those involved in knowledge mobilization would be better able to address the “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility” of social sciences and humanities research if, for example, the relationship between language, knowledge and how knowledge is mobilized were given closer attention. So too, if closer consideration were given to the rhetorical construction of knowledge and how this construction occurs (and differs) within the context of dramatic scenes of communication across discourse communities. Necessary, close attention given to SSHRC’s discourse on knowledge mobilization is precisely what is provided in the rhetorical analysis of the SSHRC documents presented, below.

---

73 As noted earlier, discussion of discourse communities and the construction of knowledge in those communities shall be elaborated upon in chapter four.
Methodological decisions: Burkean pentadic analysis and SSHRC documents

In making methodological decisions about rhetorical analysis, it is useful to keep in mind, as noted earlier, “there are many approaches indeed to rhetorical analysis, and no one ‘correct’ way to do it” (Selzer 2004, p. 283). That said, Selzer places approaches to rhetorical analysis on a continuum: at one end is textual analysis, the “careful analysis of a single symbolic act considered on its own discrete terms” and at the other end is contextual analysis, which “regard[s] particular rhetorical acts as parts of larger communicative chains, or conversations” (p. 283). Contemporary rhetorical analysis/criticism tends to hold some level of contextual analysis as necessary.

Some contemporary and contextual approaches to rhetorical criticism (described in Foss 2004) include: cluster criticism (examining “associational clusters” in order to define terms); fantasy-theme criticism (examining worldview of a group); feminist criticism (a “distinct rhetorical genre” examining rhetoric as persuasive violence); generic criticism (examining rhetoric in genre-specific situations); ideological criticism (identifying the marginalized versus the dominant); metaphor criticism (examining reality constructed by metaphor); narrative criticism (identifies and examines narrative elements); and pentadic (identifying act, agent, agency, scene and purpose in a text).

Although rhetorical analysis/criticism using any of the methods described above could offer insightful interpretations of the SSHRC documents, the purpose of the rhetorical analysis undertaken here is to arrive at a better understanding of what is meant by the term “knowledge mobilization” in the SSHRC documents and its implications for the social sciences and humanities research community. As discussed in the introductory narrative chapter of this thesis, given the questions that needed to be asked—what does “knowledge
mobilization” mean, what does it look like, who does it, how do they do it, how do you know if “knowledge” has been “mobilized” and why does all of this matter—and given that the SSHRC documents, on the surface of the text, did not provide responses to these questions, upon considering possible methods to investigate what is beneath the surface of the SSHRC documents, Burkean pentadic rhetorical analysis provides possibilities that other methods would not, in terms of responses to the above questions and of equal importance, in terms of understanding how SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community are situated in relation to each other and in relation to knowledge mobilization as a funding and research priority.

Burke’s pentadic variables—agent, act, scene, agency, and purpose—provide responses to the questions being asked, as necessary to consider the implications and consequences of “knowledge mobilization” for the social sciences and humanities research community. Pentadic analysis is particularly appropriate given that there appears to be a need to understand the “act” of knowledge mobilization, who performs that act and how—this is evident in the debate about the role of SSHRC in research—and to understand the workings of “knowledge mobilization” for social sciences and humanities—this is evident in SSHRC funding programs that attempt to describe what a “knowledge mobilization initiative might ‘look like’” (SSHRC 2005c) but offer little in terms of describing how “knowledge mobilization” happens. The opening of Burke’s A Grammar of Motives is useful here, in asking: “What is involved, when we say what people are doing and how they are doing it? An answer to that question is the subject of this book” (1962 [1945], xvii). Burke elaborates on the pentadic terms:

We shall use five terms as the generating principle of our investigation. They are: Act, Scene, Agent, Agency, Purpose. In a rounded statement about motives, you must have some word that names the act (names what took
place, in thought or in deed), and another that names the scene (the background of the act, the situation in which it occurred); also you must indicate what person or kind of person (agent) performed the act, what means or instruments he used (agency), and the purpose...[this] will offer some kind of answers to these five questions: what was done (act); when or where it was done (scene), who did it (agent), how he did it (agency) and why (purpose).

(xvii)

As Burke describes, above, rhetorical analysis is able to provide “some kind of answers” to the questions raised through analysis using the pentadic terms. In the case of the analysis undertaken in this chapter, the pentadic questions are used to arrive at (or at least, to move closer to) answers about knowledge mobilization. Burkean pentadic analysis serves as an interpretive framework to examine SSHRC messages on knowledge mobilization, in particular by asking what is done (act), when or where (scene), by whom (agent), how (agency) and why (purpose) in “knowledge mobilization” as described by SSHRC.

Pentadic analysis was undertaken with seven SSHRC documents released between January 2004 and January 2007, selected for content that explicitly conveyed messages about “knowledge mobilization.” The first analysis conducted was of the "Message from SSHRC's Council" in From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada, Volume 1: Consultation Framework on SSHRC's Transformation as a general framework for the SSHRC mandate (2004a). The second analysis conducted was of sections in this same first document on: “maximum knowledge impact,” “knowledge mobilization units” and “exchange/mobility programs.” One year later, in January 2005, SSHRC released the third volume, From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada, Volume 3: Report on the Consultation (2005a). The third analysis conducted

74 Although several publications and documents have been released by SSHRC since 2007, they are not as formal as the documents under analysis in this chapter. That said, “knowledge mobilization” has remained a visible priority for SSHRC from 2007 to the present, 2009.
examines sections on: “the importance of engagement and impact in a knowledge society,” “mobilizing knowledge for maximum impact,” and “striving to mobilize all forms of knowledge.” In July 2005 SSHRC released their strategic plan, informed by the consultation and the three volumes of the *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council* document. The fourth analysis conducted was taken from SSHRC’s strategic plan, *Knowledge Council: SSHRC, 2006-2011* (2005b) and in particular, sections on “making an impact,” “bottom lines,” “mobilize knowledge for greater impact” and “Future knowledge: We know how to shape our future so what’s stopping us?” The fifth analysis conducted was on the “Statement to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance” with focus given to sections on “maximizing the impact of research” and “the way forward” (2006a). The sixth and seventh analyses conducted were of documents written about or by SSHRC president, Chad Gaffield, who began his term in late 2006. The two documents, “New SSHRC president’s first priority is to demonstrate value of existing research” (2006b) and “Research and Innovation in Canada: A Brief History” (2007a) offer some insight into the most recent perspective(s) of the new president and his intended direction for SSHRC.

### III

#### Act, agent, agency, scene and purpose in SSHRC’s “knowledge mobilization” messages

The first step of pentadic analysis is to identify the *act* (what is taking place?), *scene* (where or when?), *agent* (who is performing the act?), *agency* (by what means is the act performed?),

---

75 Formal analysis on the second volume of the consultation document, *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada, Volume 2: Background Facts for the Consultation on SSHRC’s Transformation* (2004b), was not done. It was reviewed, however, because it provides data on demographics of the social sciences and humanities community in Canada; figures on funding from government to SSHRC, NSERC and CIHR; SSHRC’s budget allocations; research publications and international collaboration.
and purpose (why?) from the perspective of the rhetor as suggested in the text (Burke 1962 [1945], p. xvii). The second step is to identify which of these terms is dominant (again, from the perspective of the rhetor—in this case, SSHRC—as suggested by the relations of the terms to each other in the text). The dominant term is identified by pairing the five pentadic terms (for a total of twenty combinations or what Burke refers to as ratios) and determining which term dominates over the others (again, from the perspective of the rhetor as suggested by the relations of the terms in the text). A term in a pentadic ratio is dominant if it is the “dominating influence” or “determining factor” of the two (Keith 1978, p. 132) or as Hübler describes, it is “a term to which all of the others might be reduced” and he provides the following example: “Agent is the root term in the great American success drama. The rugged, bootstrapped individual (agent) dominates the action of this drama by overcoming unfortunate circumstances (scene), exploiting limited resources (agencies) and finding her own purpose” (2005).

Sample passages from the documents selected for analysis are presented here, each accompanied by pentadic analysis presented in tabular form, with the first table identifying pentadic variables and the second table providing pentadic ratios. Passages and tables are

---

76 It is important to acknowledge, of course, that the person undertaking the analysis has an effect on the results, as with any other interpretation of meaning and therefore, as Birdsell describes, “to produce conclusions that are unique to a rooted pentadic perspective, a pentadic analysis must conform to its own logic. Since in large part that logic is evolved by the critic, this requires the critic to arrive at the most complete and consistent explanation for a text, and then lay the logic out for inspection” (1990, p. 205). Analyses of several SSHRC documents are presented here in order to arrive at a consistent understanding of how social sciences and humanities researchers are situated in the “knowledge mobilization” imperative described by SSHRC. The excerpts under analysis, the pentadic ratios and the full texts in the appendices are presented as a way to lay out the interpretation for inspection.

77 Burke also provides a framework that identifies the dominant pentadic term and draws on it to “identify the philosophical system to which it corresponds, with that system generating ideas about the definition of the situation, its meaning for rhetors and audiences, and its possible consequences” with the following dominant terms and their corresponding philosophical systems: act/realism; scene/materialism; agent/idealism; agency/pragmatism; and purpose/mysticism (Foss 2004, p. 389, citing Burke 1962 [19450, p. 128-30). Although further analysis in this fashion certainly could prove insightful, the purpose of the analyses here was not to venture into (worthwhile, though messy and problematic) discussion of “philosophical systems.”
accompanied by a brief discussion of the analysis undertaken. Please note that the focus of this section is on the pentadic terms. As Burke notes, however, “ideally, [it] is the case with our pentad of terms, [that it is] used as a generating principle. It should provide us with a kind of *simplicity that can be developed into considerable complexity*, and yet can be discovered beneath its elaborations” (1969, p. xviii, italics mine). This kind of complexity can be arrived at when considering the perspectives of the rhetorical tradition and rhetorical theory presented in this chapter, as well as when considering the historical and international context presented in the previous chapter.

While it is important to note that the tables below represent my own interpretation of how the rhetor (SSHRC) identifies act, agent, agency, scene and purpose in the sampled texts, multiple interpretations can be brought to bear and indeed, pentadic analysis invites such plurality. It should therefore be noted that the tables below are presented in the interest of arriving initially at the simplicity that Burke describes above, a simplicity that is necessary in trying to find answers to the rather more complex questions being asked: What does “knowledge mobilization” mean, what does it look like, who does it, how do they do it, how do you know if “knowledge” has been “mobilized” and why does all of this matter, anyway?

Identifying the pentadic terms and the relation that they have to each other in the SSHRC documents provides a level of analysis that permits useful understandings in terms of what SSHRC claims needs to be done (act), by whom (agent), how (agency), where (scene) and why (purpose). An understanding of the SSHRC documents in these terms, within the larger context of historical, international and rhetorical understandings discussed earlier, can help the social sciences and humanities research community to consider the “knowledge mobilization” research and funding priority and policy as more than mere
rhetoric, but instead, as significant, given the current situation and the importance of addressing that situation with an informed understanding of it.

The first document under analysis is *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada, Volume 1: Consultation Framework on SSHRC’s Transformation*. The following selection from this document is illustrative of how “knowledge mobilization” figures in it:

The role of researchers is not only to develop knowledge, although this is very important in and of itself. They must become far more proficient at moving the knowledge from research to action and, in the process, to lining up with a broad range of researchers and stakeholder-partners across the country. However big the challenges, researchers have to add new and different connections to those they have already built.

At the same time, SSHRC must revisit its own role and responsibilities. For 25 years, the Council has focused on its granting function and on researchers and students as its primary, if not sole, clients. It now must take a much larger view and examine its place in a complex system that includes other organizations that fund research, students, universities, scholarly and professional associations, governments, business enterprises, and community and other voluntary, non-governmental organizations. (2004a, p. 3)

In the above passage and elsewhere in the document, SSHRC describes the need for change within the Council, given “its place in a complex system.” The complex system to which SSHRC refers is one encompassing Canadian public(s) and governments, the professions and business, as well as the international community. Yet, while SSHRC claims that social sciences and humanities researchers “must become far more proficient at moving the knowledge from research into action,” they give little indication of how “moving the knowledge” is to be accomplished and similarly, what is meant in terms of “lining up” with others.

Although the language of the SSHRC documents makes certain meanings rather vague—moving research to action and lining up stake-holders, for example—the pentad
allows a better understanding of how social sciences and humanities researchers are situated in relation to knowledge mobilization as a research and funding priority. From this understanding of the situation (and their place in it), the social sciences and humanities research community can then move forward with SSHRC to try to find answers together to the questions that the pentadic analysis raises, such as: how is the research to be moved into action, or what does the “lining up” of stakeholders entail? The pentadic terms in the first volume of From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 – Pentadic terms in From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada, Volume 1: Consultation Framework on SSHRC’s Transformation (2004a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pentadic Term</th>
<th>Pentadic term as identified in the text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>Rethinking roles and examining the place of social sciences and humanities research in a complex system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Lining up with a broad range of researchers and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene</td>
<td>A complex system that includes numerous organizations in Canada and internationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To move knowledge from research to action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this first analysis, SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community together are agents that must perform the act of moving knowledge from research to action, through the agency of “lining up” with other researchers and stakeholders, for the purpose of adding connections in a “complex system” (scene) that includes numerous organizations.

---

78 In chapter six some discussion of the questions raised by the pentadic analysis is presented; however, the purpose of the analysis in this chapter is to identify the pentadic terms and ratios in order to arrive at answers to the first set of questions that pentadic analysis raises, which, in terms of knowledge mobilization, are: what needs to be done (act), by whom (agent), how (agency), where (scene) and why (purpose).
A few observations are perhaps worthy of note. First, when it comes to knowledge mobilization, SSHRC takes on the role of agent alongside the social sciences and humanities research community. SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community, as agents of knowledge mobilization, must perform the act of revisiting and rethinking their roles (independently and in relation to each other) to move knowledge from research into action. A second noteworthy point draws attention to the act, which is to revisit and rethink roles and to move knowledge from research into action. Putting “research into action” would seem to require, in the case of knowledge mobilization, that the act SSHRC must perform is something more than funding research; and the act that researchers must perform is something more than conducting research.

Here, one important question that the pentadic analysis raises is: what qualifies as “research into action” and how is this accomplished, beyond what the social sciences and humanities research community already does? In the above passage from SSHRC are early indications of the “transformation” from granting council to knowledge council. It is noteworthy also that the act of rethinking and moving research into action is performed through the agency of “lining up” with a broad range of stakeholders. As we shall see in later documents, lining up can be understood as collaboration and communication, which are fundamental to knowledge mobilization.

The pentadic ratios for the above message offer an indication not only of which pentadic term is dominant but also, further understanding about the position each holds in relation to the others. The pentadic ratios for the above passage are presented in Table 2.

79 As mentioned in the previous footnote, this and other questions raised by the pentadic analysis shall be discussed in chapter six.
In the ratios above, “unclear” is noted where there is an ambiguity with regard to which of the pentadic terms is dominant, as both seem to be in equal measure determining factors for the other (and of course, the argument could be made that in some cases each of the terms is a determining factor in equal measure to all the others). For example, in the agent-scene ratio, with SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community identified as agents and scene identified as a complex system that includes numerous organizations in Canada and internationally, it is unclear which more profoundly affects the other. In SSHRC’s description, they appear to equally influence each other: as agents, SSHRC and
social sciences and humanities researchers can effect change in the national and international scene in which they are situated; but at the same time, that scene places demands and expectations on SSHRC and social sciences and humanities researchers as agents.

As Burke suggests, however: “instead of considering it our task to ‘dispose of’ any ambiguity…it is in the areas of ambiguity that transformation takes place...” (1969, p. xxi). It can be expected that in SSHRC’s “transformation from granting council to knowledge council” there will be some ambiguities and similarly so, for “knowledge mobilization” as a priority in that transformation, given the complexity of the matters at hand. As the data and analyses of this chapter show, transformation does take place in the ambiguities and in the subtle changes, and these can be uncovered through rhetorical analysis of SSHRC documents.

Although at first glance, there may not appear to be a notable transformation between what appears in the first volume of From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada and what appears in the third volume, the Report on the Consultations, upon closer examination and through pentadic analysis, significant transformation become evident. The report on the consultation process was released by SSHRC in January 2005 and contains analysis of input collected from the social sciences and humanities research community after “months of intense discussion, hundreds of meetings, and thousands of pages of reports and studies” (2005a, p. 2). The following passage—an abbreviated version of what SSHRC refers to as “three overriding messages [that] emerged from the consultations (2005a, p. 4)—is a good example of how “knowledge mobilization” is presented in the document:

1. Canada depends on social sciences and humanities research. In a time of rapid change and growing social, economic and cultural complexity, the need for understanding is tremendous and often unpredictable. There is
an urgency among public, voluntary and private organizations to understand the ever-evolving environment in which they work, to develop tools to analyze vast amounts of data with confidence, and to be able to respond to challenges that seem to come out of nowhere...

2. **Social sciences and humanities research is no longer just academic.** Because of this demand for evidence, analysis and understanding, organizations that would never have done so in the past...are now conducting social science and humanities research...[and] are building or seeking to build the capacity to carry out and apply the results of social sciences and humanities research, often in partnership with university researchers.

3. **Researchers recognize the need to maximize the impact of their work on Canadian society.** As a result of these changes, researchers in universities and non-academic organizations alike are addressing new subjects, adopting new approaches and applying new methodologies. At the same time, scholars who use traditional research methods are also seeking to communicate their work more effectively and to broader audiences...(2005a, p. 4, bold font in original).

In this passage and elsewhere in the report, there is evidence of a transformation: from SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community as agents that must rethink their roles and move research into action (as found in the earlier consultation document) to a focus on the changing scene, in which agents include multiple stakeholders who, through the agency of collaboration, are motivated to act to address a shared purpose, which in essence is to respond to the needs of the changing scene of “rapid change and growing social, economic and cultural complexity.” The pentadic terms identified in the third volume of *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada* are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 – Pentadic terms in *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Reviewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada, Volume 3: Report on the Consultations* (SSHRC, 2005a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pentadic Term</th>
<th>Pentadic term as identified in the text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Researchers in universities and non-academic organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>Addressing new subjects, adopting new approaches and applying new methodologies, seeking to communicate social sciences and humanities work more effectively and to broader audiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In SSHRC’s report on the consultation, the scene—of rapid change and growing social, economic and cultural complexity—takes on the dominant role and all other variables in the pentad are configured to respond to the scene. In the above excerpt (and elsewhere in the report), the changing scene requires that the social sciences and humanities research community and other researchers, as agents, also change. Such change must come not only in the acts of “addressing new subjects, adopting new approaches and applying new methodologies,” but also, in more effectively communicating research to broader audiences.

This change, suggests SSHRC, can be made through the agency of an increased capacity to conduct and apply the results of social sciences and humanities research. In this change (of scene, act, agency) there is evident a transformation, not only of the social sciences and humanities research community, but also, transformation of SSHRC’s role from granting council to knowledge council, because although SSHRC is absent from the excerpt above, SSHRC is of course present as authoring the consultation report document, where they articulate the “new values” of their mandate of “interactive engagement” and “maximum knowledge impact” (2005a, p. 2).

Further, the “new leadership role for SSHRC” draws on suggestions of scholars regarding the role that SSHRC has to play: “(1) advancing discussion on the value of public scholarship, (2) developing tools for improving the communication skills of individual researchers, and (3) developing tools to maximize the effectiveness of university-community partnerships” (2005a, p. 8). While each of these enumerated “leadership” roles is not as
clearly defined as they could be, they do reflect a changed approach to the place of SSHRC and the place of research in society and they offer an indication of what is needed, if research is to be mobilized. The pentadic ratios for Volume 3 of *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Reviewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada* are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 – Pentadic ratios for *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Reviewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada, Volume 3: Report on the Consultations* (SSHRC, 2005a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pentadic Ratio</th>
<th>Dominant Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scene-act</td>
<td>Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene-agent</td>
<td>Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene-agency</td>
<td>Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene-purpose</td>
<td>Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act-scene</td>
<td>Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act-agent</td>
<td>Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act-agency</td>
<td>Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act-purpose</td>
<td>Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent-scene</td>
<td>Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent-act</td>
<td>Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent-agency</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent-purpose</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency-scene</td>
<td>Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency-act</td>
<td>Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency-agent</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency-purpose</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose-scene</td>
<td>Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose-act</td>
<td>Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose-agent</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose-agency</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Tables 3 and 4 (above), the dominant pentadic element is the scene. In contrast to the earlier analysis of the knowledge mobilization messages of *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Reviewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada, Volume 1: Framework of the Consultation*, there is less ambiguity in determining which term is dominant in each of the ratios and the which term is dominant overall. There are numerous possible
reasons for this movement toward clarity, but one or two possibilities are worth noting, perhaps. Consider first that the situation for SSHRC in releasing the first volume was rather different from that of the third volume. With the first volume, SSHRC needed to provide the social sciences and humanities research community with a document that would present a framework for the consultation process, a process that they certainly would have wanted the social sciences and humanities research community to receive favourably. Some ambiguity in such a situation can be useful in terms of ensuring that the consultation process would be perceived as an open consultation that had established a framework, but that was not rigid or absolute, either in terms of the discussions that would take place or in the outcome. Consider also, then, that after the consultation process less ambiguity could be expected (and hoped for, even), given that the consultation was intended to inform SSHRC, to provide some answers, some clarity. What is significant is that after the consultation process, according to the rhetor—according to SSHRC—the transformation from granting council to knowledge council and the focus on “knowledge mobilization” is clearly a response to the changing needs of a changing scene (of the research landscape, as evidenced in chapter two’s discussion of changes in higher education, as well as changes in research and funding priorities).  

---

80 Although in the SSHRC documents, with regard to changing landscape, SSHRC gives focus to the changing expectations in terms of ensuring that continued (and growing) government funds can be justified and secured for social sciences and humanities research, it is important to note, within the context of the discussion in chapter two on the international research community (as scene), that there is also the issue of the responsibility—political, humanitarian, ethical—of the research community to ensure that the privileged freedom of engaging in research and scholarship provides benefits that serve the public good, whether the public of the immediate community, region or country in/with/on which the research is done, or across national boundaries where research is much needed, but the means and/or freedom to conduct it are limited. The research landscape is changed not only in the sense that “research as a public good” is becoming more widely recognized as a priority, but also, because the means of extending the reach of research—whether technological (as with open access) or socio-political (as with international exchange of ideas), although still with limitations, are more open than in previous generations). SSHRC does make some reference, albeit limited, to this element of the changing landscape.
The third and final selection of data included in this chapter is taken from analysis of SSHRC’s strategic plan, *Knowledge Council: SSHRC, 2006-2011*. SSHRC’s strategic plan was released in July 2005 and no doubt borrowed from and informed by the consultation report released earlier that year. The document opens with a section entitled, “Preface: Future Knowledge – We know how to shape our future, so what’s stopping us?” and in this preface, social sciences and humanities research is described as providing the “knowledge required to build a just, prosperous, sustainable and culturally vibrant world” (2005b, p. 2). The following passages are taken from the document and offer an indication of how “knowledge mobilization” activities are situated as the solution to the rhetorical question, “We know how to shape our future, so what’s stopping us?”

Today research is taught in university classrooms, published in academic journals and books, and shared at academic conferences. On an ad hoc basis, research ideas, discoveries and knowledge trickle into the public forum through the work of research consultants to government or private sector organizations. But these activities do not go far enough in getting research knowledge to Canadians – they do not give us systematic interaction between the research community and the rest of society (From “Context,” 2005b, p. 10).

Canada needs systemic vehicles that, on a timely basis, enable stakeholders to connect with experts on key issues and problems, access relevant research results and syntheses on specific topics, and understand the applicability and implications of this knowledge for their own sphere of interest...SSHRC will introduce new mechanisms to create bridging platforms and arenas among academics, government and communities that will greatly improve the ability of social sciences and humanities researchers to impact policy and decision-making (From “Plan: New programs, new approaches” under the subheading, “Mobilize knowledge for greater impact,” 2005b, p. 15).

In these passage and throughout the strategic planning document, the focus on scene as evident in the previous document (the report on the transformation/consultation) remains; however, it is explicitly linked to agency: SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada—through the agency of knowledge mobilization
“mechanisms” that create “systematic interaction between the research community and the rest of society”—are described as capable of “build[ing] a just, prosperous, sustainable and culturally vibrant world.” There are two keys questions raised by this analysis: What are the “mechanisms” to which SSHRC refers and what form and process are needed for “systemic interaction” to take place (further, what is necessary to establish this interaction and what barriers are there to this interaction becoming established)? Again, some discussion of these questions is presented in chapter six, but for the purposes of this chapter, the pentadic terms identified in Knowledge Council: SSHRC, 2006-2011 are presented in Table 5.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pentadic Term</th>
<th>Pentadic term as identified in the text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>SSHRC and members of academic, political community, media and public stakeholder groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>Enable stakeholders to connect with experts on key issues and problems, access relevant research results and syntheses on specific topics, and understand the applicability and implications of this knowledge for their own sphere of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>New mechanisms that bridge platforms and permit systematic interaction between the research community and other stakeholder groups that put research into practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene</td>
<td>The future and linked academic, media, political and public arenas in Canada and internationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To improve the ability of social sciences and humanities researchers to impact policy and decision-making in order to build a just, prosperous, sustainable and culturally vibrant world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a strategic plan, it can be expected that the scene is that of the future because a strategic plan, after all, is a plan for the future. As in earlier documents, the scene is also given focus in terms of the response of SHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community to the needs of the scene, whether this is the scene in which research itself is conducted, the multiple arenas and stakeholder communities with which SSHRC wants to
establish stronger links, or the national or international stage of a world that has increasing need for social sciences and humanities research.

In *A Grammar of Motives*, in his chapter entitled, “Container and thing contained,” Burke describes the scene as the “*genius loci*”—the spirit of the place—in which other pentadic terms are inextricably linked (1969, p. 6). It can be expected, then, that scene tends to figure prominently in pentadic analysis. In the strategic planning document, however, the dominant term is agency. This too can be expected. In a strategic plan, the agency is in the strategy and in this case, with regard to knowledge mobilization, agency rests in “systemic vehicles” and “new mechanisms” or “bridging platforms” across “arenas.” All of these result in effecting change to the scene. The strategic plan moves forward from the previous document—in which a changing scene demands changes in agent, act, agency and purpose—to a focus on agency (of knowledge mobilization), through which agents are able to act for the purpose of effecting change in the scene. In the earlier document, the “spirit of the place” was one that demanded change. In the strategic plan, the spirit of the place is one that is changed through agency.

This is in keeping with what is articulated in the title of the opening section of the document, “Preface: Future Knowledge – We know how to shape our future, so what’s stopping us?” in which the agency to effect change is central. The pentadic ratios for *Knowledge Council: SSHRC, 2006-2011* are presented in Table 6.

---

81 As noted earlier, recall that in Burke’s view, the dominant pentadic term can be identified with “the philosophical system to which it corresponds, with that system generating ideas about the definition of the situation, its meaning for rhetors and audiences, and its possible consequences” with the following dominant terms and their corresponding philosophical systems: act/realism; scene/materialism; agent/idealism; agency/pragmatism; and purpose/mysticism (Foss 2004, p. 389, citing Burke 1969, p. 128-30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pentadic Ratio</th>
<th>Dominant Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scene-act</td>
<td>Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene-agent</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene-agency</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene-purpose</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act-scene</td>
<td>Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act-agent</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act-agency</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act-purpose</td>
<td>Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent-scene</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent-act</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent-agency</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent-purpose</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency-scene</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency-act</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency-agent</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency-purpose</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose-scene</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose-act</td>
<td>Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose-agent</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose-agency</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the strategic planning document, agency becomes dominant not only in terms of effecting change to the scene, but also, the agency (which exists in “new mechanisms” for “systematic interaction”) is dominant relative to the agents (SSHRC, social sciences and humanities researchers, and other stakeholders in social sciences and humanities research), to the acts of accessing and extending research, and to the purpose of increasing the impact of social sciences and humanities research to improve society.

Although the five pentadic terms—agent, act, agency, purpose and scene—are defined with some variation throughout the texts under analysis and although the same pentadic term is not dominant in all documents, as a whole, the messages are relatively consistent. The pentadic analysis provides the following rhetorical understanding of
knowledge mobilization as a research and funding priority: The SSHRC messages on “knowledge mobilization” describe the changing needs of the scene/world (present and future) and the role of the agent (SSHRC, the social sciences and humanities research community and other stakeholder groups) to perform the act of mobilizing social sciences and humanities research knowledge, through the agency of collaboration, meaningful connections, systematic interaction, and for the purpose of social sciences and humanities research serving to attain a just, prosperous, sustainable and culturally vibrant world. This message can be either well-received or criticized, as have SSHRC’s documents themselves and SSHRC’s transformation from granting council to knowledge council. Earlier discussion—of the rhetorical tradition, rhetorical theory, rhetorical understandings, as well as historical and international context—provides important considerations in terms of how to receive and/or criticize what appears to be the message that SSHRC is sending with regard to knowledge mobilization.

Further discussion is presented below in order to consider still more closely the implications of these understandings for the social sciences and humanities research community. Not least among these implications is that SSHRC’s focus on knowledge mobilization as a research funding policy and priority, meant to address the “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility” that SSHRC describes, inadvertently presents the social sciences and humanities research community with another paradox: they are confronted with the paradox of a “zero-sum language game” in which they succeed at mobilizing knowledge across stakeholder communities at the cost of their success in contributing what is recognized as legitimate knowledge within academic discourse communities. A detailed explication of this paradox is presented in the next chapter; however, what follows here is some preliminary framing as derived from the analysis of the data presented in this chapter and in the discussion presented thus far.
III.IV

The “knowledge mobilization” situation, discourse communities, and language games

In the rhetorical analysis and discussion above, in the “knowledge mobilization” situation, there is an evident shift from a focus on the needs of society and the world (scene), to SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community (agent), to a focus on knowledge mobilization mechanisms (agency), as necessary in an “ever-changing” world (a return to scene). The agency of knowledge mobilization is found, according to SSHRC, in collaborative and systematic interaction with diverse stakeholder communities, which would extend the reach and benefits of social sciences and humanities research. Recalling from Bitzer that “rhetorical discourse comes into existence as a response to situation” (1995 [1968], p. 5), “knowledge mobilization” as a funding and research priority must be understood as a response to the situation of the scene of the changing world, which, as the pentadic analysis is able to show, is where the SSHRC research funding priorities and policies begin and end.

Recalling Bitzer also provides a reminder that rhetoric—in this case, SSHRC’s rhetoric about the current situation for social sciences and humanities research—is a “discourse capable of participating with the situation and thereby altering its reality” (1995 [1968], p. 6). Social sciences and humanities scholars and researchers, arguably, are particularly well suited to consider rhetorical understandings of the current situation, if, as Farrell (1999) suggests, “social knowledge…[is] a kind of knowledge particularly appropriate to the art of rhetoric” (p. 140) because “social knowledge depends upon…a personal relationship to other actors in the social world” (p. 143). This is very much in keeping with SSHRC messages, in particular where they place agency: the agency of knowledge
mobilization exists through meaningful connections and interaction across stakeholder communities.

Although SSHRC messages on “knowledge mobilization” may be objectionable in some ways for members of the social sciences and humanities research community (as discussed in the previous chapter, use of the language of the “research enterprise” and the privilege of measured research outputs are perhaps the most glaringly objectionable)\(^82\) in other ways, the SSHRC messages are in keeping with social sciences and humanities approaches to research: the importance of scene and the researcher as situated within it is integral to contemporary work in social sciences and humanities research as is the idea of collaboration and meaningful connections between researchers and members of other communities. Similarly, SSHRC’s knowledge mobilization efforts aim to address issues of diversity and sustainability, ethical debates and changes to work and family life, and providing “knowledge about the world we live in and our place in it” (20006a, p. 3), which is very much in keeping with questions asked and answered by social sciences and humanities researchers and scholars and their work.

In the current “knowledge mobilization” situation, the place (and worth) of social sciences and humanities research may be well understood and appreciated by SSHRC and social sciences and humanities scholars and researchers, but the problem SSHRC draws attention to is that policy-makers, the media, community organizations and the tax-paying

\(^82\) It is important to note, once again, differences across discourse communities. The language of the “research enterprise” and “measured research outputs” is fundamental to how a funding body such as SSHRC rhetorically constructs the need for a government (in particular, a Ministry of Industry) to continue to supply taxpayer dollars for social sciences and humanities research. Further, as was made evident in The National Post and Ottawa Citizen examples of the previous chapter, the language of “scholarly inquiry” in the social sciences and humanities is not always well received outside of academic discourse communities. Yet, differences in discursive practices aside, in the shared rhetorical situation of government-funded research, though not articulated as effectively as it needs to be, there is a shared understanding that dollars must be spent responsibly and in the interest of research that makes a contribution that is valued.
public may not understand or appreciate this research enough (or even at all). For a funding body (SSHRC) and public institutions (the universities) supported by government policy and tax dollars, the problem is described by SSHRC, as noted earlier, as a “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility” for social sciences and humanities research.

According to SSHRC, the “knowledge mobilization” situation requires that social sciences and humanities researchers must, either as former SSHRC president Marc Renaud articulated, “Get public or perish” (cited in Willinsky 2000, p. 90) or as current president Chad Gaffield suggests, “get [public] support from Canadian taxpayers” (SSHRC 2007b, p. 1) or perish. Indeed, in his March 2007 tour of Canadian universities (in a series of talks called “Framing Our Direction: From a Strategic Plan to an Action Plan at SSHRC”), Gaffield repeatedly told his audience (at Simon Fraser University), “I need your help” and key to this help was to “tell stories” of social sciences and humanities research. As variously interpreted as this message may be, what is significant, once again, is that this is the message that the president of SSHRC is sending and it is a message about how social sciences and humanities research “must demonstrate AND be seen to have demonstrated that social sciences and humanities contributes significantly to Canadian society (has an IMPACT)” (14 March 2007 handout at Simon Fraser University talk, upper case in original). When I attended the Simon Fraser University talk, one of the questions I asked of the SSHRC President was to whom he was urging us to “tell the stories” of social sciences and humanities research and his response was, “To anyone who will listen, to each other, to people involved in making decisions about funding for social sciences and humanities research” (and on the handout, this last group was described as government and media). Certainly, the telling of stories is of great importance (and a reminder of this is necessary for those in the research community who may be inclined to forget the significance of telling
stories), but there is one complication that must be noted: there are differences among “anyone who will listen” or “other social sciences and humanities researchers” or “people involved in decision-making about funding for social sciences and humanities research” that must be recognized, respected, addressed. As discussed in the introductory narrative chapter of this thesis, differences across discourse communities are significant, not only in terms of how discourse is constructed, but in the case of telling stories, it is important to remember that different discourse communities are receptive to different kinds of stories and it is reception of the stories as much as the telling of them that is necessary for “knowledge mobilization.”

The significance of how the stories of social sciences and humanities research are told and how they are received can be properly recognized as highly significant when rhetorical understandings of the situation are brought forward.

According to Scott and Brock, for example, it is important to consider how the speaker and writer are “situated and participating” (1972, p. 123) in how meaning is formed. For SSHRC and the “telling of stories” what this means is that both the social sciences and humanities research community and other discourse communities must be understood as “situated and participating” not only in how the social sciences and humanities research stories are told but also, in how they are received and interpreted, in how they are valued and carried forward. Scott and Brock note the “complexities of context and process as important considerations” (1972, p. 124) and this figures into how social sciences and humanities research stories are told and how they are taken up (or not taken up, for that matter). SSHRC must not underestimate the importance of the context and process of how stories are told (and how knowledge is mobilized) and how these differ across discourse communities.
It is precisely in the relationship between the telling of stories and how they are heard, in knowledge delivery and reception, that SSHRC’s knowledge mobilization imperative—meant to address the “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility”—inadvertently presents another paradox to the social sciences and humanities research community. Although SSHRC draws attention to the need for collaboration and communication across stakeholder communities as the agency by which knowledge mobilization is to occur, SSHRC does not acknowledge that the different stakeholder communities that they name must also be recognized as different discourse communities. Different discourse communities (as noted in the introductory chapter and elaborated on in the next chapter) participate in different kinds of discursive practices, governed by different rules, in what can be understood as different language games. As a consequence of failing to acknowledge and address such differences, SSHRC presents the social sciences and humanities research community with a paradox of a zero-sum language game.83 SSHRC’s knowledge mobilization discourse, however, as rhetorical discourse, is perfectly “capable of participating with the situation and thereby altering its reality” (as Bitzer described earlier). Such an alteration is possible if consideration is given to the differences between what is regarded as “knowledge” and how it is mobilized in different discourse communities. Otherwise put, participation in the “knowledge mobilization” situation and altering the reality of the situation, can be achieved by considering how knowledge mobilization entails language games, but more fundamentally, by understanding how the rules of language games differ across discourse communities. Then, from there, SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research

83 Although this will be discussed in detail in the coming chapters, a zero-sum language game is evidenced in the privileging of scholarly journal articles and monographs in academic discourse communities in contrast to policy papers, media stories and industry/community reports for government, media and community organizations, for example, which are privileged discursive forms in these other discourse communities.
community can consider how to negotiate those differences and arrive at shared understandings that are conducive to “knowledge mobilization” of social sciences and humanities research.

One such understandings is presented in the next chapter, which brings together discourse theory and game theory. The perspectives of discourse theorists are presented, in particular, for their discussion of “discourse communities” (what they are, how they are formed, the rules of their language games). Some fundamentals of game theory are also presented, as they provide important understandings about zero-sum games, rules and moves, and the significance of these for the concept of a “zero-sum language game” that is being put forward in this thesis. Bringing together these two disparate theoretical frameworks provides useful understandings of the current situation for SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community.
The purpose of this chapter is to explicate how “knowledge mobilization” as a SSHRC research and funding policy priority—meant to address the “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility” of social sciences and humanities research—inadvertently results in another paradox: the paradox of a zero-sum language game, in which social sciences and humanities researchers and scholars succeed in mobilizing knowledge across the communities (referred to as “stakeholder groups”) that are named by SSHRC—government, industry, media and community organizations—at the cost of their success in contributing what is recognized as legitimate knowledge within academic discourse communities. The concept of a “zero-sum language game” as presented here brings together two rather disparate theoretical frameworks: discourse theory and game theory.

This chapter provides an overview of some of the fundamentals of game theory: the difference between zero-sum games and non-zero sum games; the difference between cooperative and non-cooperative games; and the notions of rules and moves, plays and players. The chapter then identifies links between game theory and language games, followed by an overview of the research literature on discourse theory, in particular, as it discusses rules and moves, in which discursive choices and practices are understood as moves and plays, and speakers or authors are understood as players, making choices. Brought together
in this way, game theory and discourse theory offer an important understanding of language games as inherent in “knowledge mobilization” across discourse communities. Further, given the current rules of discourse in the academic discourse community (as distinct from other discourse communities), which the chapter shall illustrate and discuss, knowledge mobilization—as a research funding priority and policy—requires the academic discourse community to play what is shown to be a “zero-sum language game.” The chapter closes by acknowledging that although discourse theory and game theory as brought together here illustrate that a “zero-sum language game” could conceivably be at play as a consequence of what knowledge mobilization demands, it is also necessary to provide evidence that such a zero-sum language game is indeed at play. This evidence—found in tenure and promotion policies and in the research literature that takes up the issue of tenure and promotion—is then presented in the following chapter.84

IV.I

Some fundamentals of game theory and links to language games

Although game theory can be traced to James Waldegrave in the eighteenth century or further still, to Talmudic writings of the first century AD (Walker 2005), it was not until World War II, however, that game theory began to establish itself, principally among “leaders of theoretical physics. …[And] much of the appeal and promise of game theory is derived from its position in the mathematical foundations of the social sciences” (Myerson

84 It is important to note that while the sequence of activities in the doctoral work described here may appear to have first looked to theory and then, afterward, to have looked for “evidence” to support the theoretical claims and argument being made, the introductory narrative chapter presents a more accurate description of the sequence in the work undertaken. More specifically, what needs to be noted is that, in the experience of shifting from the world of literary publishing to the world of academe and trying to understand and negotiate the differences between them, the early theoretical inquiry of this thesis is grounded. In this sense, “evidence” of what I would later describe as “zero-sum language games” was already in hand very early on. In response to the
The publication of von Neumann and Morgenstern’s *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior* (1944) established game theory within the field of economics, followed by the Nobel Prize-winning work of John Forbes Nash, which has been described as, “one of the outstanding intellectual advances of the twentieth century…comparable to that of the discovery of the DNA double helix” (Myerson 1999, p. 1067).

An outline of some basic concepts in game theory is presented here in order to explicate what is meant by the concept of the “zero-sum language game” proposed in this thesis. Please note, in order to keep the focus of the present discussion on language and to prevent demanding too much of the reader (and/or demanding too much of the thesis), the discussion of game theory presented here makes reference to the narrative rather than mathematical excerpts in the game theory literature.

Myerson provides a definition of game theory that sets out in general terms some of the mathematical elements while offering non-specialists a description relevant to the social sciences and humanities:

*Game theory can be defined as the study of…conflict and cooperation between intelligent rational decision-makers…provid[ing] techniques for analyzing situations in which…individuals make decisions that will influence one another’s welfare. As such, game theory offers insights of fundamental importance to scholars in all branches of the social sciences, as well as for practical decision-makers. The situations that game theorists study are not merely recreational activities, as the term “game” might unfortunately suggest. “Conflict analysis” or “interactive decision theory” might be more descriptively accurate names for the subject, but the name “game theory” seems to be here to stay* (Myerson 1991, p. 1).

---

85 It should also be noted that game theory (as with any other theory) confronts criticisms. In the social sciences, in particular, there are advocates and critics, whether in relation to the use of game theory in game studies (on video gaming) or the limitations of game theory to construct true models of human behaviour (given that humans are not always “rational, decision-makers,” for example).
Several important elements of game theory relevant to the present discussion are either presented or suggested above, most notably: intelligent, rational decision-makers. In game theory, the notion of an intelligent, rational decision-maker is based on the assumption that in a game, a player who is intelligent and rational will make “decisions consistently in pursuit of his own objectives… [which are] to maximize the expected value of his own payoff, which is measured in some utility scale” (Myerson 1991, p. 2). Slantchev describes the relationship between payoff and utility as follows: “we assume that given several outcomes [payoffs], individuals have preferences over them that allow them to rank the outcomes with respect to each other [utility]. That is, for each pair of outcomes, a player can say whether he likes one better than the other or whether he is indifferent between the two” (2004, p. 1). Although detailed discussion of the parallels and links between game theory, language games and discourse communities follows in the next section, in light of the discussion of previous chapters, it is worth drawing attention to a few points of interest: the notion of individual preferences (and how they differ, depending on the discourse community one belongs to or aspires to belong to); that decisions are made in pursuit of objectives (which, in the case of discourse communities, include recognition for having made valuable contributions to the discourse and the community); and that decisions may result in a plurality of possible outcomes (this can include, for example, one’s discursive choices being received well or poorly, and the corollary consequences).

The decisions made and the plurality of the outcomes of those decisions are discussed in the game theory literature with regard to “interdependence” (which, incidentally, harkens back to earlier discussion on the “growing interdependence among all the components of society, individual as well as institutional”).
the basic problem of human interaction...is to determine the behaviours and actions of two or more individuals or organisations (such as firms, political parties and governments) when the behaviours and actions of all these parties potentially affects each party’s welfare (or payoff). Much human interaction (be it economic, political or social) is of this type; that is, a party’s welfare (or payoff) depends not only on his or her actions but also on the actions of other parties. (Muthoo 2000, p. 2)

Consider here how the behaviours and actions of SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community, for example, can be understood in terms of how they potentially affect each other’s welfare and the welfare of the communities that could benefit from knowledge mobilization. Consider also that game theory describes how “players might seek to transform a game by trying to communicate with each other and coordinate their moves, perhaps even by formulating contractual agreements” (Myerson 1991, p. 244). Again, further discussion on these considerations in presented in the section to follow. At present, however, there is one more reference to the game theory literature that must be made.

In their landmark text, von Neumann and Morgenstern’s narrative explanation of the relationships between games, play, rules and moves, provides an outline of some other fundamentals of game theory that are useful to a discussion of language games and discourse communities:

First, one must distinguish between the abstract concept of a game, and the individual plays of that game. The game is simply the totality of rules which describe it. Every particular instance at which the game is played—in a particular way—from beginning to end, is a play. Second, the corresponding distinction should be made of the moves, which are the component elements of the game. A move is the occasion of a choice between various alternatives, to be made either by one of the players, or by some device subject to chance, under conditions precisely prescribed by the rules of the game. The move is nothing but this abstract “occasion,” with the attendant details of description;—i.e. a component of the game. The specific alternative chosen in a concrete instance—i.e. in a concrete play—is the choice. Thus the moves are related to the choices in the same way as the game is to the play. The game consists of a sequence of moves, and the play of a sequence of choices. (1953 [1944], p. 49)
Here, again, although detailed discussion of language games and discourse theory is presented in the section that follows, it is worthwhile to draw attention to a few key terms in the above passage: (1) rules (which, as mentioned earlier, govern—or “prescribe” in the wording, above—what the possible choices are); and (2) the game itself, as “a sequence of moves” and as occasioned by choices.

The game theory literature offers discussion (and mathematical equations) on many different kinds of games that can be played but for the purposes of this thesis, it is important to distinguish between zero-sum and non-zero sum games. Zero-sum games are commonly understood as those in which payoff (gain) by one player is possible only at the cost (loss) of the other player(s). Non-zero-sum games, by contrast, are those in which a payoff (gain) by one player need not result at the cost (loss) to the other player(s). Similarly, there is an important distinction between non-cooperative and cooperative games, though the distinction is somewhat more nuanced. Non-cooperative games are those in which players may cooperate but such cooperation is self-governed, rather than enforced, as is the case with cooperative games, where enforced cooperation comes at the hands of external forces, either by contract or by governing bodies.

All of these terms are discussed in relation to discourse communities in the section that follows. Here, however, in order to further link the notions of intelligent, rational decision-makers, zero-sum or non-zero sum games and cooperative or non-cooperative games to a discussion of language games and discourse communities, consider the work of linguists drawing on game theory. For example, Alonso-Cortes:

brings together the fields of economics and linguistics on the topic of the origin of language...[and] shows how some features of language can be adequately understood as a result of coordination games...argue[ing] that modern language originated as a consequence of trade relationships and the division of labour involved by early humans around 40,000 years ago. As an
economic activity, both trade (or exchange) relationships and the division of labour call for coordination. The outcome is that games and economic behaviour have significant causal relationships to general properties of the linguistic symbol. (2007, p. 49)

In the above passage, language, understood in terms of a “coordination game” provides interesting historical context with which to consider the earlier discussion and warnings of the “logic of the neoliberal market...[and] a university environment that sees education and scholarship primarily as economic commodities and commodifiers” (Milz 2005, p. 128). This is not to diminish criticism of approaches to education that reduce learners to consumers and scholarship to a commodity; however, it is to suggest that links between linguistic practices (including those in higher education and research) and economics are not the recent creations of a funding body such as SSHRC.

An extension of the link between linguistics and economics and the economics of language games and/or discourse can also be found in Bourdieu, who describes “what circulates on the linguistic market” as discourses “stylistically marked both in their production…and in their reception” (1991, p. 39). Whether the discourses circulating on the linguistic market (as Bourdieu suggests) or with the linguistic exchanges that are part of an economy of coordination games (as Alonso-Cortes suggests), the concept of “language games” can be understood to involve:

exchanges [of] things…thereby deeming them to be valuable. But what value, exactly, gets attributed to the content of an exchange will depend on how it is framed. Participants in a textual exchange always need to negotiate its terms with regard to framing factors. (Reid 1992, p. 13)

Reid describes the framing factors as characteristics of the text and notes the importance of the “semantic evaluation” (p. 13) of the text by the reader (note the parallels here to the earlier discussion on rhetoric, in terms of the significance of the evaluation of a text by the
Issues of what is valued in an exchange is significant not only in terms of considering parallels between game theory and language games (as well as earlier discussion of rhetoric), but also, as they are related to discourse communities (and knowledge mobilization across discourse communities): a text must be assigned sufficient value by a reader if the “knowledge” it holds is to be “mobilized”\textsuperscript{86} from one discourse community to another.

With an outline of some of the fundamentals of game theory in hand and parallels between game theory and language games now drawn, this chapter turns to a detailed discussion of language games, in particular, as they relate to discourse communities. From there, the chapter turns to discussion of academic discourse communities as distinct from other discourse communities and how, in the differences across discourse communities, zero-sum language games must be negotiated, if “knowledge mobilization” as SSHRC describes it, is to be achieved.

IV.II

**Language games and discourse communities**

As noted in the introductory narrative chapter of this thesis, the work of Wittgenstein is taken only as a point of departure to consider how language games are at play within and across discourse communities. Lyotard (taking up Wittgenstein) elaborates on the dynamics of language games and their rules and makes “three observations about language games…[1] rules do not carry with them their own legitimation, but are the object of a contract, explicit or not, between players…[2] if there are no rules, there is no game…[3] every utterance

\textsuperscript{86} The words “knowledge” and “mobilize” are set off in quotation marks here as a way of acknowledging the complexity of both terms and in particular, the complexity inherent bringing them together. In neither case is the implied meaning reductive, but instead, the expansive, nuanced and always changing meaning is implied and understood.
should be thought of as a ‘move’ in a game” (Lyotard 1997 [1979], p. 10). Interpreting Lyotard, the rules of language games (and discourse communities, as shall be discussed below) can be understood as collectively constructed, observed, maintained (and changed, for that matter, as shall be discussed in chapter six). Otherwise put: “Language use is like making moves in a game. The structure of meaning and interaction are dependent on rules shared with others…[and] rules underpinning the game…govern the movements of the players” (Fierke 2002, p. 337). In terms of language games, the movements of the players are the “utterances” (as Lyotard calls them) made as a consequence of the discursive choices being made by the players (as speakers or writers).

Or as Foucault extends the discussion: “in analyzing discourses themselves, one sees…the emergence of a group of rules proper to discursive practices” (1972, p. 48). In the language of discourse theory, discursive practices can be understood as “instances of purposeful human behavior” (Fish 1980, p. 107) and as “performing acts according to rules” (Searle 1969 [1970], p. 36-37). This is not to suggest that discourse communities be understood as “mere playgrounds.” On the contrary, “what the allegory between games and language teaches is a serious and deep-seated philosophical problem concerning the relationship between thought, language and reality” (Pietarinen 2007, p. 6). Understood in the context of language games, discourse communities can be seen as rule-bound, as sites of discursive moves with purposeful actions and profound consequences. As noted earlier, the term “discourse community” is widely used, across the disciplines in the social sciences and humanities, and as one author suggests, this:

testifies to the increasingly common assumption that discourse operates within conventions defined by communities…that discourse is a means of maintaining and extending the group’s knowledge and of initiating new members into the group, and that discourse is epistemic or constitutive of the group’s knowledge. (Herzberg 1986, p. 1, cited in Swales 1990, p. 21)
Foucault’s description of “the group of rules proper to discursive practices” and Herzberg’s description of discursive “conventions” are both significant for discourse communities, which Bizzell defined (earlier) as “group[s] of people who share certain language-using practices…conventionalized in two ways[:]…[to] regulate social interactions both within the group and in its dealings with outsiders” (1992, p. 222). The “history of the notion of discourse communities,” according to Prior, “is relatively clear:”

The focus on community emerged as part of a general reaction against cognitive accounts of writing processes based on laboratory research. In 1982, Bizzell, Heath, and Nystrand separately published articles that related interest in the social contexts of writing/literacy to notions of community (see also Beach & Bridwell, 1984; Gere, 1980). …Bizzell (1982) apparently coined the term discourse community…. She talked about discourse communities in terms of conventions, habits of language use, “traditional, shared ways of understanding experience…shared expectations, and patterns of interaction with the world.” (1998, p. 9-10)

The language game(s) of a discourse community can be understood as the totality of the rules of discursive practices, conventions of language-using practices or habits of language use (in the words of Foucault, Bizzell and Prior). Further, playing the language game of a given discourse community consists of a sequence of choices and moves. The discursive practices of discourse communities—the conventions and habits of language use that characterize them—must be recognized not only as constitutive of the discourse and the discourse community, but also, as fundamental to the rules of what is permissible and valued in a given discourse community. Bazerman offers a further elaboration in describing, “the different choices made in formulating knowledge under different conditions…[and] the regularization of choices and contexts within communities” (1988, p. 24). With this, Bazerman offers insight for an understanding of the rules of language games in discourse communities: Members of a discourse community make discursive choices in formulating what is recognized as “knowledge” within that discourse community.
While the overview of discourse theory presented thus far provides a description of the theoretical framework used to consider how discourse communities can be understood as involving language games, Swales suggests somewhat more concrete characteristics that can be used to identify “a group of individuals as a discourse community,” as follows:

1. A discourse community has a broadly agreed set of common public goals…
2. A discourse community has mechanisms of intercommunication among its members…
3. A discourse community uses its participatory mechanisms primarily to provide information and feedback…
4. A discourse community utilizes and hence possesses one or more genres in the communicative furtherance of its aims…
5. In addition to owning genres, a discourse community has acquired some specific lexis…
6. A discourse community has a threshold level of members with a suitable degree of relevant content and discoursal expertise. (1990, p. 24-27)

Describing a discourse community in concrete terms in this way presents a set of rather concrete questions that can help to identify the defining characteristics of a given discourse community. Drawing directly on Swales’ six criteria, above, there are six (though certainly more) questions that can be asked: (1) What is the broadly agreed upon set of common public goals of the discourse community? (2) What are the mechanisms of intercommunication among members of the discourse community? (3) What are the processes of feedback provided through the participatory mechanisms of the discourse community? (4) What are the genres of the discourse community and how are they used to further its aims? (5) How can the lexis of the discourse community be characterized? (6) What is a “suitable degree” of expertise in the discourse community and how is this threshold level of “expertise” maintained? Clearly, the answers to these questions will
depend on the discourse community about which they are asked. For the purposes of this chapter, the discourse community being considered is the academic discourse community.

IV.III

Academic discourse communities: Defining characteristics

There is debate, of course, on the question of whether or not, given the diversity of discursive activities, conventions of language, and habits of language use that can be found in diverse academic disciplines—whether in the sciences, social sciences or humanities—there is a discourse community that is identifiable as academic, as distinct from other discourse communities. Further, there is also the issue of considering the multiple discourse communities that co-exist in academe, something understood well by those involved in writing pedagogy and teaching writing across the disciplines, or by those involved in multi- or inter-disciplinary research. Even within a discipline, there are highly diversified discursive practices, from preparing lectures for undergraduates, to writing research funding proposals, to interactions with university administration. The discursive practices in these contexts most certainly are governed by different conventions, yes.

That said, the discussion that follows here (for the purpose of considering the implications of “knowledge mobilization” as a research and funding priority and policy), places focus on illustrating that indeed, there is an identifiable “academic discourse community” as distinct from discourse communities outside of academe. Consider the views of Zamel on this question, in her discussion of what can be termed as “academic discourse:”

Much discussion surrounds how to determine and define what academic discourse is (see, for example, Bartholomae, 1986; Bizzell, 1988; Coles and Wall, 1987; Elbow, 1991; Harris, 1989; Rose, 1985). At the most general level academic discourse is understood to be a specialized form of reading, writing, and thinking done in the “academy” or other schooling situations. It has been referred to as the “peculiar way of knowing, selecting, evaluating, reporting, concluding and arguing that define the discourse of our
community” (Bartholomae, 1986, p. 4). Because it appears to require a kind of language with its own vocabulary, norms, sets of conventions, and modes of inquiry, academic discourse has come to characterize a separate culture, one within which each discipline may represent a separate cultural community. It is from this notion of a separate culture that we get the terms discourse or interpreting “community.” (1998, p. 187).

Hints of Swales’ criteria can be found in the above quote from Zamel: common public goals, intercommunication, feedback, genre, lexis and expertise are all suggested. Swales’ criteria can be interpreted as parameters or rules that govern the language game(s) of a discourse community.

Responses to the questions posed by Swales’ criteria are presented, below, by looking to the research literature for an indication of how an academic discourse community can be characterized in terms of: (1) shared public goals; (2) mechanisms for intercommunication among members; (3) feedback provided through those mechanisms; (4) genres; (5) lexes; and (6) how expertise is maintained. Once such a characterization is in hand, discussion can move forward to consider how members of academic discourse communities can be understood as players in language games, and the possibilities that such an understanding offers in terms of: (a) moves and rules for “knowledge mobilization” as a research and funding priority and policy; (b) addressing the “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility” that SSHRC describes; and (c) extending the reach of research as a public good.

According to Prior, Bizzell “referred to the university as the academic discourse community” (1998, p. 10). Similarly, “academic discourse community” in this chapter refers to members of the academy, whose discourses are defined by the shared discursive practices of university researchers and scholars. Some historical context is useful here. Russell describes changes in academic discourse at the turn of the 20th century as follows:

The new text-based scholarship, along with a new differentiated academic structure, changed the nature of the academic game. Oral performance for a
local academic community demanded only a display of learning, but the new text-based standards demanded an original contribution to a disciplinary community in written form: a research paper. The American scholarly journals, which developed late in the nineteenth century, contain a great deal more transcription of oral discourse (discussions, speeches, lectures) than do contemporary journals. But disciplines quickly evolved the text-based apparatus of modern scholarship: discipline-specific conventions of argument, style, documentation, and format. (2002 [1991], p. 80)

In this description several of Swales’ (and others’) characteristics of a discourse community are evident and it is interesting to note the changes Russell describes and to consider how the discursive practices evolving at the turn of the twentieth century had become firmly established by the turn of the twenty-first century. Formal intercommunication among members of an academic discourse community, to a significant extent, currently consists primarily of publishing research papers in scholarly journals, having evolved from printed speeches and lectures (evolved in turn from correspondence by letter-writing, which preceded the publication of the first scholarly journals of seventeenth-century Europe). The research paper is identifiable as one of the most significant and recognizable academic genres and implicit in this is an identifiable lexis (as Swales and others note as distinguishing features of a discourse community).

Some attention to the significance of genre is useful here. Bazerman describes genre as: “not just mean[ing] the formal characteristics that one must observe so as to be recognized as correctly following the visible rules and expectations” (1998, p. 24). The significance of genre in questions of discourse and knowledge, epistemology and ontology, are not to be underestimated, as Paré reminds us:

[T]he automatic, ritual unfolding of genres makes them appear normal, even inevitable; they are simply the way things are done. And their status as historical practice within institutions or disciplines makes them appear immutable and certainly beyond the influence of the transitory individuals who participate in them, and who become implicated in the subtle ideologies they enact. (2002, p. 59)
Implicated in genre and by extension, in the conventions of discourse communities and the rules governing them, is yet another dimension of the differences in the language games at play across discourse communities, as Hariman articulates:

...genres of discourse often contain, as a crucial element, an attribution of status. That is, the act of comparing discourses implies both manifest definitions of substance and latent attributions of status for each genre, and the disputes about categorizing discourses are often concerned more with questions of status than of substance. Status is the determination by one's associates of one's worth relative to their worth, and includes one's rank, reputation, respect, esteem, privilege, or place. The attribution of status to genre is a device for establishing privileges—and powers—of those discourses...[and] the particular dynamic of empowering through status can be identified: as superior status is a condition of social privilege, so inferior status is a condition of social marginality, and we empower discourses by imposing social order upon the world that relegates words, writers, and speakers to zones of centrality or marginality. (1986, p. 38-39)

The attribution of status and issues of centrality or marginality in academic discourse communities are high stakes, as is particularly visible in the hierarchy of “contributions” that is part of the genre of the scholarly curriculum vitae (and in tenure and promotion policies, an issue taken up in the next chapter), both of which clearly privilege some genres (single-authored journals articles and scholarly monographs) over others (such as policy papers or authored work in the mainstream media). According to Bakhtin, such “stratification [of language] is accomplished first of all by the specific organisms called genres” (1981, p. 288). And, as shall be discussed in the next section, given that what is a privileged genre in one discourse community can often be a marginalized genre in another discourse community, the result is the situation of a zero-sum language game found across discourse communities.

Both beyond and integral to genre, there are other defining characteristics of academic discourse, which Hyland describes as follows:

In terms of language, the fact that we are able to talk about “academic discourse” at all means that the disciplines share prominent features as a
register distinct from those we are familiar with in the home or workplace...[and there are] three key areas: [1] high lexical density...[2] high nominal style...[3] impersonal constructions. (2006, p. 13-14)

Elbow offers an example: academic convention is characterized by “more formal language and longer and more complex sentences with more subordinate clauses (for example, calling that kind of language ‘the employment of hypotaxis rather than parataxis’)” (1998, p. 159).

With regard to Swales’ other criteria, the published research paper, through peer-review, also provides a process for feedback and for maintaining levels of expertise:

Academics negotiate the status of their knowledge claims with their peers through the medium of research articles, and success is at least partly dependent on...a writer's systematic appeal to the disciplinary meanings and values that they [the members of the discourse community] hold (Bazerman 1988; Bizzell 1992; Brufee 1986). (Hyland 1998, p. 352)

The shared public goal in an academic discourse community is to make an “original contribution” (in the form of published research). While making an original contribution is certainly recognizable as a common goal, there appear other goals that are perhaps less publicly recognized, though still shared in an academic discourse community. In his description of the student-instructor dynamic, Fish suggests that much more is quite literally at play:

My student’s understanding of what she could and could not get away with, of the unwritten rules of the literary game, is shared by everyone who plays that game, by those who write and judge articles for publication in learned journals, by those who read and listen to papers at professional meetings, by those who seek and award tenure in innumerable departments of English and comparative literature, by the armies of graduate students for whom knowledge of the rules is the real mark of professional initiation. (1980, p. 343)

In addition to the goal of making an original contribution, in the above passage there are hints of another goal that is understood among members of the academic community: to successfully play what is a kind of game. And although what Fish describes, above, can be
interpreted as slightly pejorative and suggestive of “unwritten rules” of more than one sort, the rules of the game being described to a great extent are part of the language game(s) of an academic discourse community.

If the academic discourse community can be understood as playing a language game, by extension, other discourse communities can also be understood as playing language games, wherein they have “texts and practices in common, whether it is a group of academics, or the readers of teenage magazines” (Barton 1994, p. 57 [cited in Hyland 2006, p. 40]). Clearly, beyond what is shared among discourse communities (such as the rules of language and that there are consequences for breaking such rules), the language game that academics are playing is considerably different from the language game(s) being played by other discourse communities, with an admittedly rather extreme contrast found between academic versus teen magazine discourse communities, as Barton suggests in his example, above. Similarly, there are different language games played by the discourse communities—referred to as “stakeholder groups by SSHRC—considered necessary participants for knowledge mobilization efforts to succeed: government, industry, media, community organizations, and the public.

If academics, policy-makers, industry, the media, community organizations and the public—as members of different discourse communities—are playing different language games, communication and collaboration can be highly challenging. Indeed, some of these challenges are discussed in the literature on the communication of science and in the literature on what has been described as the “research-policy nexus” (Stone 2002, p. 285). Research on the communication of science gives much attention to the uptake of science by
the media (see, for example, Gregory and Miller 1998; Bauer and Bucchi 2007; Hollman et al 2009). Important lessons can be learned from that research: for example, there are also games at play, as Bauer and Bucchi describe, in how “increasing private patronage of scientific research changes the nature of science communication by displacing the logic of journalistic reportage with the logic of corporate promotion” (2007, p. 1). Similarly, the literature on research in policymaking discusses “gaps” and other obstacles—such as the “policy agenda”—in moving research into the policy arena (see, for example, Albaek 1995; Booth 1990; Friedman & Farag 1991; Ouimet et al 2004; Lavis et al 2003; and Nutley, Walter & Davies 2003).  

In both arenas—media and policy—there are also issues of de-contextualized research, and therefore, misunderstood meaning and messages. Related to this are challenges of time and space, as research projects can span a timeline of many years with the results published in numerous articles and books, versus the monthly, weekly, daily or hourly timelines required in science journalism or policy-making.

Some explanation for these kinds of challenges is provided by Lyotard in his description of differences between different kinds of narrative:

…science and nonscientific (narrative)…are [both] composed of sets of statements; the statements are “moves” made by the players within the framework of generally applicable rules; these rules are specific to each particular kind of knowledge, and the “moves” judged to be “good” in one cannot be of the same type as those judged to be “good” in another, unless it happens that way by chance. (1997 [1979], p. 26)

---

87 Elaborating on some of the possibilities presented in the introductory narrative chapter to this thesis, chapter six presents some suggestions on how to address the challenges of needing to communicate and collaborate across discourse communities, as needed for knowledge mobilization.

88 Investigating more closely the “research-policy nexus” is part of the planned research for my postdoctoral work, in particular, in terms of the capacity and/or limitations of open access journal publishing to extend the reach of research as a public good. The research, planned in collaboration with John Willinsky, would involve interviews with policymakers in Canada and the US and would use Burkean pentadic rhetorical analysis of the interview data and documents of participating government departments.
Here, Lyotard provides a description of what is proposed in this thesis as the “zero-sum language game” at play across discourse communities. As a consequence of the “framework of…rules…specific to each kind of knowledge” (as Lyotard describes, above), within and across different discourse communities, a player (or writer or speaker, as an intelligent, rational decision-maker) makes a discursive move that results in a payoff or gain (of his/her work being judged as “good”) in one discourse community at the cost or loss (of his/her work being judged as not “good”) in another discourse community.

A long list of possible examples is brought to mind by the quote from Lyotard, above, in his reference to science and nonscientific narrative: most notable, perhaps, is the ongoing rivalry (and mutual disdain, to some extent) between the humanities and the natural sciences (with the social sciences sometimes on one side and sometimes on the other). Although the struggle of new fields of research—women’s studies is among the most obvious (and absurd) examples—to become established as legitimate is also a prominent example of what Lyotard describes. In terms of knowledge mobilization as a research and funding policy and priority, useful perspective is provided by historians of science, who describe how “the popular purveyors of scientific culture [were]…the butt of derision…the scientific ‘hacks’” (Gates 1997, p. 182). There is indeed a long history of how the moves judged to be good in one discourse community have not been of the same type as those judged to be good in another. From the earliest days of print, there was a clearly divisive “distance which separated the most eminent cultural heroes, such as Erasmus and Voltaire, from the unknown Grub Street hack” (Eisenstein 1983, p. 98-99). The author of From Grub

---

89 Recall also the Chapter One discussion of moving from the literary publishing community to the academic community as example of differences across discourse communities with regard to what is considered “good.”
Street to Fleet Street: An Illustrated History of English Newspapers to 1899 describes the “Grub Street hack” as follows:

Grub Street is a metaphor for the hack writer. The word ‘hack’ derives from Hackney, originally meaning a horse for hire and later a prostitute, a woman for hire. Finally, it was applied to a writer for hire, a newspaper writer or a literary drudge. Paid by the line, scratching a precarious living from the lower reaches of literature, including journalism, the Grub Street hack received no public acclaim, other than the sneers and jibes of his more successful contemporaries who, by a mixture of ability and sycophancy, had found the security of a patron. (Clarke 2004, p. 5)

Clearly, there is evidence of differences across discourse communities (and the consequences of those differences) in the early days of print that are not unlike the differences separating present-day scholars and “popularizers.” There are discernable parallels in contemporary academe: in a sense, status-seeking, “acclaim” or patronage can be found tenure and promotion, grant funding and other awards, and in publishing hierarchies.

Further, in the history of science journalism, there are “warn[ings] [to] fellow editors never to employ an expert, scientific or otherwise, to write a popular article on his own area of research” (Lightman 1997, p. 188). Yet, it is important to note that by the nineteenth century, scientists recognized popular periodicals as “important platforms for addressing a non-specialist but culturally powerful public,” as the popular media were seen as public “performances [that] fulfilled important functions in making the claims of science heard among the ruling élite” (Dawson et al 2004, p. 11). The “history of science” as a field of inquiry and research literature offers a number of lessons that could bring perspective to the present-day social sciences and humanities research community, in particular in the context of “knowledge mobilization” as a research and funding policy priority. Although the history of science is not the focus of this chapter or thesis, it is worth noting that, in the eighteenth century, while a “science-hungry and science-fearful public” pursued the “laborious and
sober inquiry of truth” (Gates 1997, p. 179), over the course of the nineteenth century:

the authority of science grew...[and] it became increasingly important for intellectuals, scientists, and social groups to fix the boundary between legitimate and illegitimate scientific knowledge and to locate themselves firmly within the domain of scientific orthodoxy. (Lightman 1997, p. 10)

Here, again, is some possible explanation for resistance to “knowledge mobilization” in that it suggests work that appears to fall outside of scholarly orthodoxy. As shall be noted in the concluding narrative, however, the history of science illustrates the importance of telling stories (as Chad Gaffield reminds us) across discourse communities (something SSHRC does not sufficiently address) in the success of establishing what has been described as “the empire of science” (in contrast to what is not regarded as science).

While these examples and discussion thus far have presented a framework for discussing what is meant by the concept of the “zero-sum language game” being put forward in this thesis, further and more direct attention needs to be given to the “zero-sum” of the language game presented by knowledge mobilization as a research and funding priority and policy. Discussion can then move forward in the next chapter, to evidence of this zero-sum language game as found in the research literature and faculty policies on tenure and promotion.

IV.IV

The zero-sum of the “knowledge mobilization” language game

Vygotsky heralds a reminder that “as soon as the game is regulated by certain rules, a number of actual possibilities are ruled out” (1978, p. 95) and Lyotard observes that “[s]cientific knowledge requires that one language game...be retained and all others excluded” (1997 [1979], p. 25). Lyotard’s claim that, for scientific knowledge (which can be extended here to include research in the social sciences and humanities, given its placement
by SSHRC under the auspices of the “research enterprise”) there is one language game retained and all others excluded, is precisely a description of a zero-sum language game.

Similarly, the rules of discursive practices, conventions of language-using practices or habits of language use in academic discourse clearly rule out some possibilities of play, as Vygotsky suggests, in the language game(s) of an academic discourse community, at least for rational decision-makers who want to succeed in the academic game. Without explicit reference to language games (and game theory) or discourse communities, in his widely cited work examining genre and rhetoric in scholarly texts, Bazerman’s observation serves as an elaboration:

Writing is choice making, the evaluation of options. To view writing from the prospect of language users is to consider the benefit of some choices over others…[t]o study choices is to notice what they accomplish and what they don’t…[and] practical goals necessarily provide an evaluative framework for the entire scholarly endeavor. (1988, p. 13)

Bazerman’s work is useful here in several ways in terms of understanding what is meant in this thesis by the zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization. Members of an academic discourse community evaluate writing options and make choices, discursive moves (as do members of other discourse communities, but the choices and the discursive moves vary, from one discourse community to another). Similarly, members of an academic discourse community evaluate the benefit of some discursive choices over others, according to an estimation of what a particular discursive choice and move can and cannot accomplish (again, so too for members of other discourse communities, but the choices are evaluated differently, as different discursive moves are valued differently, from one discourse community to another).

It is important to be reminded, of course, that the “zero-sum language game” concept being put forward here is fundamental to language itself: one chooses, for example,
to use one word in place of another; to write a sentence in third person in place of first person; and for those fortunate enough to speak more than one language, a choice is made in whether to speak or write in the *lingua franca* of a given discourse community (which, in the current state of scholarship, for better and/or for worse, is the English language) or to use the language of a minority. The zero-sum of language games being suggested here, in this sense, is not a matter of two speakers (or authors) competing against each other, but rather, it is a matter of one speaker (or author) needing to make a choice: a choice by which, inevitably, some things are lost and some things are gained.\(^\text{90}\) This notion has been and shall again be quietly revisited, but the focus here is specific to the question of the zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization as it involves discourse communities and the choices that must be made with regard to making a contribution that is recognized in one discourse community rather than another.

In a zero-sum language game within and among discourse communities, because the rules of discourse differ, discursive activities accepted in one discourse community are not necessarily accepted in another discourse community. The earlier reference to an academic discourse community and the discourse community of a teen magazine offers a good example of rules of discourse and illustrates the important distinction between constitutive rules and preference rules, which are described by Apple in his discussion of the “hidden curriculum:”

\(^{90}\) Drawing on the examples above, one possibility of what is lost and gained is as follows: In the decision to write in third person in an academic text, one gains the likely, favourable reception that comes with conforming to what is still the academic convention to write in third person; but this decision comes at the cost of losing what writing in first-person brings (such as the ability to say, “I do not want to write in third person because I do not think of myself as removed from my text as I write it, nor from my thoughts as I compose them.” This example illustrates one reason why the introductory and closing narrative chapters, only, are written in first person.)
These rules [of hegemony] serve to organize and legitimate the activity of the many individuals whose interaction makes up a social order. Analytically, it is helpful to distinguish two types of rules—constitutive or basic rules and preference rules [McLure and Fischer, 1969]. Basic rules are like the rules of a game; they are broad parameters in which action takes place. Preference rules, as the name suggests, are the choices one has within the rules of the game...The rules of the game implicitly set out the boundaries of the activities people are to engage or not to engage in, the types of questions to ask, and the acceptance or rejection of other people's activities. (2004, p. 80-81)

In both an academic discourse community and a teen magazine discourse community, for example, carrying forward Barton’s earlier comparison, there will be constitutive rules of a shared language game on a very basic level: whether English or any other language, there are constitutive rules of grammatical structure or in terms of written texts, rules of whether texts are read left-to-right, right-to-left, or vertically, for example.

Similarly, in both an academic discourse community and a teen magazine discourse community, there will be preference rules with which members of a discourse community make choices: the vocabulary and style of academic discourse as described by Searle and Hyland earlier can be considered in contrast to the preferences and choices of members of a teen magazine discourse community, for example, in the following lead line for an article entitled, “We got the beat.” “Downtown Manhattan's Burberry store was jumping last Wednesday night as young Hollywood, New York teens and fashion world fixtures danced to the beat of their own drum at the launch of the new Burberry fragrance”(teenvogue.com 2008). Although the contrast between teen lingo versus academic prose is clearly an extreme one, it is also clear that the discursive choices that are valued in the one are not valued in the other. Bazerman offers more nuanced comparisons, in his widely cited work, in which “sample articles…[he] examined from literary studies, sociology and biochemistry played different moves in different games, on different game boards” (cited in Martin and Veel
1998, p. 26). The same principle applies for other discourse communities, including government policy, industry, media and community organizations named by SSHRC as necessary collaborators for successful knowledge mobilization of social sciences and humanities research.

The zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization described here can be variously interpreted and approached. One the one hand, the situation can be interpreted as hopeless, with members of different discourse communities necessarily positioned in a zero-sum language game because:

> the weight of certain institutions imposes limits on the games, and thus restricts the inventiveness of the players in making their moves...[and] privilege[s] certain classes of statements (sometimes only one) whose predominance characterizes the discourse of the particular institution: there are things that should be said, and there are ways of saying them. (Lyotard 1997 [1979], p. 17)

On the other hand, the situation can be interpreted, as noted earlier by Bitzer, as rhetorical and therefore “capable of participating with the situation and thereby altering its reality” (1995, p. 6). As Kindi observes: “Communication between people committed to different or even incompatible language games is not barred...language games are open-ended and may interact. Or people may share language games other than the one that keeps them apart, by way of which they can communicate” (1995, p. 88-89).

Earlier in this chapter reference was made to the distinction between zero-sum and non-zero sum games, as well as non-cooperative and co-operative games, as elements of game theory relevant to the present discussion of how social sciences and humanities researchers and scholars are positioned in a zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization. Returning to these distinctions provides useful considerations for how knowledge mobilization can be something other than a zero-sum language game. In the
current situation, changes in the knowledge mobilization game are possible; however, not without changes to the rules of the game and/or change that brings about cooperative play.

One way to change the knowledge mobilization game from a zero-sum game to a non-zero sum game would be to acknowledge what Levine describes as a “plurality of privileged forms of knowledge” (1986, p. 272) and for SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community to “communicate with each other and coordinate their moves” (borrowing from Myerson’s game theory work). This is precisely what is necessary for knowledge mobilization to succeed, to move beyond a stalemate, to position social sciences and humanities researchers and scholars (and members of the media, government, industry and community organization discourse communities) in something other than a zero-sum game.

Further, as noted earlier, a non-cooperative game is one in which players may cooperate but such cooperation is self-governed, rather than enforced, as is the case with cooperative games, where enforced cooperation comes at the hands of external forces, either by contract or governing bodies. Although certainly there is need for scrutiny and criticism of policy changes and funding programs brought forward by SSHRC, some of the changes of recent years can be understood as moves and plays to encourage cooperative play. That said, as noted earlier, while SSHRC refers to multiple stakeholders in social sciences and humanities research, in the SSHRC documents under analysis in the previous chapter, the term “discourse communities” is not used. SSHRC must acknowledge the significance of differences across discourse communities in order to understand what is necessary for the “systematic interaction” across stakeholder-partner communities that they claim is necessary for knowledge mobilization (whether to address the paradox of ubiquity and invisibility or to extend the reach of research as a public good).
That said, the source of the knowledge mobilization paradox does not rest with SSHRC alone (though no doubt, SSHRC detractors may well be quick to claim it so). Academe—both individual academics and the institutions that house them—play their part in upholding the rules that maintain the current zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization. This is evident in hiring practices, in tenure and promotion policies, in research funding proposal adjudication, in what is recognized as a contribution to scholarly discourse by virtue of its publication in scholarly journals and books.

Tenure and promotion policies, in particular, offer a useful and valuable public record that serves as evidence that the zero-sum language game being put forth here is indeed at play in the academy. An examination of tenure and promotion policies, therefore, is provided in the next chapter. Further evidence that a zero-sum language game is at play is presented through an overviews of contemporary perspectives on the issue of tenure and promotion in the academy.

The purpose of the next chapter is to provide evidence of the zero-sum language game described in this thesis but also, to consider possibilities for moves that can be made and rules that can be changed, to turn the current zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization into a non-zero sum language game. Such a change would allow the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada to communicate and collaborate across the discourse communities necessary for knowledge mobilization—government, industry, media and community organizations—and to engage in discursive practices necessary for that communication and collaboration to succeed, without the cost of sacrificing success within the academic discourse community.
V

TENURE AND PROMOTION AND

THE TRIPARTITE MODEL OF FACULTY WORK

The purpose of this chapter is to provide evidence of the “zero-sum language game” presented in this thesis and in that evidence, to identify possibilities in moving beyond the paradox of knowledge mobilization as a zero-sum language game (of knowledge mobilization). The necessary evidence is presented, first, by the various perspectives found in the research literature on questions of tenure and promotion and the tripartite model of faculty work. Further evidence of the zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization is presented by examining tenure and promotion policies in the collective agreements of faculty associations at more than half (38) of Canada’s English-language universities.

Attention to tenure and promotion policies provides an understanding of how the academic community is responding (or not) to changing expectations that governments, industry, community organizations, students, parents and other publics have of universities. An examination of the collective agreements, placing focus on the responsibilities of faculty and criteria for tenure and promotion, indicates that academic work that makes a contribution within the academic community is clearly articulated and privileged, while work that involves communication of research across the discourse communities of government, industry, media and community organizations (as necessary for knowledge mobilization)
remains relatively unarticulated as contributing to research and/or knowledge, but rather, is marginalized, if articulated at all.

V.I

Tenure, promotion and faculty responsibilities: Research, teaching and service

The first chapter of Recognizing Faculty Work: Reward Systems for the Year 2000 opens thus: “No process in higher education receives more attention, generates more debate on individual campuses among faculty and administrators, or creates more frustration than the promotion and tenure system” (Diamond 1993, p. 5). Diamond remarks further that there is also “growing concern over the criteria used in the tenure process, criteria that have carried over to the promotion and merit pay areas as well” (1993, p. 5-6). It is perhaps of little surprise, then, that there is a growing literature that raises issues of both the processes and the criteria for evaluation, tenure and promotion of university faculty. Research studies that have investigated questions related to tenure and promotion have, for example, been motivated by “a specific question about whether teaching and service affect tenure and merit pay decisions at a research university and from a more general concern with rewards and sanctions in educational institutions” (Kasten 1984, p. 500). In her research, Kasten cites several studies (Fulton and Trow 1974; Katz 1978; Rossman 1976; Siegfried and White 1973; Tuckman et al 1975, 1976, 1977) that indicate that merit pay and promotion are directly affected by the research and publication records of faculty. In her own study of “one division of a large, midwestern [US] research university” (1984, p. 502), Kasten found that “in department after department, faculty stated that research is the most important consideration in tenure decisions…[as is] excellent scholarship—which means the faculty member is nationally or internationally recognized as adding to accumulated knowledge in the discipline” (1984, p. 506). Kasten found similar consensus with regard to the position of teaching as “second in
importance to research (1984, p. 506) and “that service has almost no impact on tenure decisions” (1984, p. 507).

The near-consensus on the value assigned to research and scholarship can, of course, be variously interpreted. One possible interpretation is to see such consensus as a source of “institutional and professional homogenization” as evidenced by a study of more than 4000 tenure-track faculty in US colleges and universities, examining “the relative importance of teaching, research, administration, and service in determining basic salary” (Fairweather 1993, p. 603). In his study, Fairweather found that:

The research and scholarship-oriented reward structure for faculty is dominant in academe, enshrined in all types of four-year institutions and across program areas, irrespective of professed institutional mission or disciplinary focus, faculty who spend more time on research and who publish the most are paid more than their teaching-oriented colleagues. (1993, p. 620)

The privileged position of research relative to teaching is the subject of a decades-old debate in the field of education. Curiously enough, as Froh, Gray and Lambert discuss, there was once “nearly universal agreement” (1993, p. 97) that, in the words of the Harvard College President in 1869, “regular and assiduous teaching” was the “prime business” of professors in the US (Froh et al citing Boyer 1990, p. 4). It was not until the turn of the 20th century, that “the notion of scholarly research began to be included as a component of faculty work and, in some cases, even attained supremacy” and after World War II, “research began to overwhelm teaching and service” (Froh et al 1993, p. 98).

Given the momentum and privilege of research as a faculty activity over the course of the past century, it is not surprising (returning to Fairweather’s study) that present-day

91 Note that the size of the academic community in the US is much larger than in Canada. Some reference to the Canadian academic context is included in this chapter, in particular with the work of O’Neill and Sachis, mentioned later on.
“academe is moving toward (and may have reached) a single faculty reward structure, one dependent on publishing...[and] spending time on research” (Fairweather 1993, p. 620). Fairweather argues that the result is homogeneity not only of reward structures, but also, of faculty activities and one consequence of this, he warns, “may be a loss of legitimacy among groups that have supported higher education because of its instructional and service missions” (1993, p. 621). Although the instructional and service missions of the university are manifest in the tripartite model for tenure and promotion in many (if not most) universities in Canada and elsewhere, universities have also been “told that they have lost touch with their central mission of teaching and serving their communities” (Diamond 1993, p. 6) and this presents a problem: higher education and universities have for some time been confronted with the challenge (or even demand) for change.

One of the most well known and widely referenced of these challenges is found in the work of Boyer, in particular, Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (1990). In the preface of Scholarship Reconsidered, Boyer writes that “the most important obligation now confronting the [US] nation’s colleges and universities is to break out of the tired old teaching versus research debate and define, in more creative ways, what it means to be a scholar” (xxi). Boyer proposes four categories of scholarship, summarized as follows:

- the Scholarship of Discovery (inquiry regarding knowing) – discovering and advancing knowledge, original research and artistic expression;
- the Scholarship of Integration (inquiry regarding meaning) – synthesizing knowledge in creative ways that may bridge fields or disciplines;
- the Scholarship of Application (inquiry regarding practice) – applying knowledge to practical, real world problems and situations in a reasoned manner; and,
- the Scholarship of Teaching (inquiry regarding teaching/learning) – understanding the teaching/learning transaction with respect to both its process and outcome. (Fiddler et al 1996, p. 132, italics mine)
Although Boyer’s model is not without imperfections, reference to it is made here as a useful preface for discussion of the tripartite model—of research, teaching and service—commonly adopted in delineating faculty responsibilities and in tenure and promotion criteria. The first two of Boyer’s categories—the “scholarship of discovery” and the “scholarship of integration”—may indeed by now, almost 20 years hence, seem to offer little of the reconsideration suggested in Boyer’s title. Certainly, the “scholarship of discovery” as described by Boyer represents the long-standing tradition of discovery and research as making contributions to one’s academic field. The “scholarship of integration” extends the activities of research and discovery across disciplinary boundaries (and although cross-disciplinary inquiry has gained much currency in the past 20 years, as noted in earlier discussion of discourse communities, cross-disciplinary inquiry continues to draw attention to the need to reconsider scholarship). The “scholarship of teaching” has gained favour over the course of the past 20 years, as is evidenced in a body of literature of the same name and as shall be noted later in this chapter, as evidenced in the faculty association collective agreements, when “scholarship of teaching” is either referred to indirectly or mentioned by name with regard to faculty responsibilities and tenure and promotion criteria.

The “scholarship of application,” however, has not enjoyed the same growing currency of either the scholarship of teaching or the scholarship integration. As the description of the “scholarship of application” would suggest, this category is most relevant for knowledge mobilization as a research and funding priority and policy. As the research literature on issues of tenure and promotion illustrate, however, the scholarship of application (which most clearly falls under the category of “service” in the tripartite model of faculty work) is still given relatively little currency or value, in the various ways that scholarship has or has not been reconsidered over the course of the past 20 years.
While the “scholarship of discovery” remains privileged as “research,” advocates of change persist in their support for “multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems” and a recent study by O’Meara captures some of the sustained interest in this pressing issue. O’Meara cites a literature that encourages multiple forms of scholarship (Diamond 1999; Driscoll and Lynton 1999; Glassick, Huber & Maeroff 1997; Hutchings & Shulman 1999; Rice 1996; Rice & Sorcinelli 2002) and reports on the results of her own study, “based on the responses of 729 or 50% of the CAOs [Chief Academic Officers] of the 1,452 [US] not-for-profit 4-year colleges and universities identified by the 2000 Carnegie classification system” (2005, p. 487). O’Meara’s “guiding research questions for this study” were as follows:

To what extent have 4-year institutions initiated policy reforms to acknowledge and assess a broader definition of scholarship? Did making formal policy changes to encourage multiple forms of scholarship influence (a) expectations for faculty evaluation (i.e. what counts) (b) the faculty evaluation process (i.e. criteria used to assess scholarship) (c) promotion and tenure outcomes (i.e. chances to be promoted) and/or, (d) institutional effectiveness (i.e. ability to meet goals and objectives) in 4-year non-profit institutions over the last decade? Finally, how did the extent of reform and influence of reform differ by institutional type? (2005, p. 485)

O’Meara concludes from the study that: “the majority of CAOs at traditional institutions noted the traditional criteria as influences on promotion and tenure (i.e. whether scholarly products are published (91%), where scholarly products are published (85%), and impact on the disciplines (85%))” (2005, p. 493). While “reform institutions” also “reported these traditional criteria as influences, they also identified...teaching and engagement...as equal or greater influences on evaluation of scholarship” (O’Meara 2005, p. 493). The evaluation of scholarship, however, continues to be an issue of much debate. As Matusov and Hampel remark, “colleagues differ sharply in their notions of how scholarship should be evaluated.
They agree on the importance of high-quality work, but they disagree on how to determine whether high quality has been achieved” (2008, p. 37).

Different ideas about what is considered “high quality” was discussed in the introductory narrative chapter of this thesis, carried forward in chapter four’s discussion of discourse communities, and carried forward again here, in considering the criteria commonly adopted for evaluating faculty work. This must be taken into account when considering the zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization (and how it can possibly be changed) because, as the present discussion illustrates, some contributions to discourse clearly are more valued than others. In the academy (as in other discourse communities), evidently, not all discourse is valued equally.

V.II

The evaluation of scholarship: Some scholarship is “more equal” than others

While it may indeed be the case that “discussion about broadening the definition of scholarship has traveled far since [Boyer in] 1990” (Huber 2002, p. 74), it may equally still be the case that “service, teaching and creativity are risky priorities for faculty members seeking promotion or tenure at many institutions” (Diamond 1993, p. 7) because, according to recent accounts, “influential people” continue to express “serious difficulties with the evolving character and broadening range of what their own larger disciplinary community [has] counted as acceptable forms of scholarly work” (Facione 2006, p. 40). The tension arises from what has been described as the long-waged debate regarding:

92 This phrasing, to be sure that I give credit where it is most certainly due, is a reference to George Orwell’s satirical novel, Animal Farm. In the novel, the original “Seven Commandments” (written on a wall by the animals for their self-government), over time, were removed (by the animals), until finally, “There was nothing there now except a single Commandment. It ran:

ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL
BUT SOME ANIMALS ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS”
what it means to be a scholar and, more specifically, what constitutes acceptable scholarship for those in the professoriate. Traditionally, scholarly work has been defined as that which makes a lasting contribution to the larger body of knowledge within a given field of study and is generally characterized as discipline-based, linked to theory, and incorporating recognized research methodologies. (Fiddler et al 1996, p. 127)

Although the focus in this thesis is on the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada, it is worth noting, as Kindelan describes the situation in the international community (referring specifically to the situation in Spain), that research policy “has moved scholars to publish internationally and adopt the linguistic and rhetorical conventions that characterise the discourse of the international English-speaking community” (2009, p. 89). As Braxton and Del Favero argue, scholarship and scholarly performance have “traditionally been assessed by ‘straight counts’…of publications, such as articles in refereed journals, books, monographs, book chapters, and presentations at professional meetings” (2002, p. 20) and they cite numerous sources to support their argument: Braskamp and Ory (1994), Centra (1993), Miller (1987, 1972), Lindsey (1980), and Seldin (1985).

Boyer had noted the importance of publications in 1990, presenting comparative data from The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1969 and 1989 National Surveys of Faculty. Table 7, below, presents the data on the responses of faculty who claimed to “strongly agree” that in their department it was “difficult for a person to achieve tenure if he or she does not publish” (Boyer 100, p. 12).

Table 7 – Faculty who “strongly agree” that in their department, it is “difficult for a person to achieve tenure if he or she does not publish” (Boyer 1990, 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>1969 Survey</th>
<th>1989 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate-granting</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is worthy of note that value is assigned to “the number of publications, the form of publications, and the prestige afforded the publication outlet” (Braxton and Del Favero 2002, p. 23). O’Neill and Sachis (1994, p. 427) remark, however, that “publication remains plagued with controversy. Some claim, for example, that publication is measured by the number, not the quality of articles published (Broad, 1981; Crase, 1987; Dennis, 1981; Fox, 1983; O'Rourke, 1981; Soderberg, 1985).” O’Neill and Sachis also refer to a study showing that “publishing in journals is ranked highest among all activities…specifically, 89% of the respondents regarded refereed publications, ‘...as significant evidence for making promotion and tenure decisions’” (1994, p. 428 citing Suppa and Zirkel 1983, p. 739).

In their own study, O’Neill and Sachis draw on a sample of 139 administrators (deans and department chairs) in Canadian graduate-level programs in schools or faculties of education to examine the importance of refereed versus non-refereed journals in tenure and promotion decisions and they determined that the two forms of publication are clearly distinguished from each other (1994, p. 434). Given the value of research and published work for faculty, it is of little surprise, perhaps, that Hemmings, Rushbrook and Smith, in their study of 205 academics in an Australian university, the question, “What factors within your working environment encourage you to produce refereed publications?” yielded the following responses (2007, p. 316):

**Incentive:** 48.2% and this includes promotion (17.1%), intrapersonal (16.7%), financial (12.5%) and working with others (1.9%)

**Pressure:** 28.2% and this includes collegial (18.5%), university management (7.4%), and pressure to raise the profile of the school/university (2.3%)
Support: 23.6% and this includes collegial encouragement (11.1%), opportunities for discussion (6.9%), research workload (4.2%), and financial (1.4%).

Hemmings et al, citing Sullivan (1996, p. 40), remark that, “[p]ublication in recognised scholarly outlets is the prime indicator of academic worth, paving the way to rewards such as promotion, tenure, and research funding…scholarly publishing…remains both the bedrock and the currency of academic life” (2007, p. 308).

Fiddler et al (and others) argue, however, that a statement such as this about “the bedrock and currency of academic life” raises questions and issues about “assumptions and beliefs regarding the role and purpose of the academy” (1996, p. 127). Further, as Fiddler and his colleagues elaborate, “there is an increasing recognition that current definitions and measures of scholarly activity may be too narrow and that such definitions preclude institutions of higher education from fully and adequately responding to the needs of the larger society” (1996, p. 128). Huber identifies in particular the work of Diamond and Adam—The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding Scholarly, Professional and Creative Work of Faculty (1995)—in which US scholarly societies across the disciplines were asked to propose “frameworks to encompass the full range of scholarly work in their field…[and] almost all the participating societies agreed that scholarship meant more than the published results of basic research” (2002, p. 75).

Huber also cites the 1992 survey of US college and university provosts by The Carnegie Foundation, which reported that “redefining faculty roles had been a focus of their review and 78 percent said that the definition of scholarship was being broadened to include the full range of activities in which faculty are engaged” (2002, p. 76). Huber also notes, however, that “many faculty still perceive a disconnect between policy and practice and
consider the real measure of success to lie in how well the various forms of scholarship fare in appointment, promotion, tenure, and annual reviews” (2002, p. 78).

This discussion and overview of the literature is not intended to diminish what is gained and what is quite rightly valued in the peer-review process: whether for tenure and promotion or for publishing, peer review accomplishes a great deal both in terms of recognition for the effort, accomplishments and contributions that a member of the academic community makes to a discipline and to knowledge more broadly; as well as providing a valuable means of improving on that work, as thoughtful peer review is able to do. That said, when “[e]nergies…[are] diverted from types of research that do not fall within the traditional publication realm” (Diamond 1993, p. 8), the zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization comes into play, which is evident in the tripartite model of faculty work and the tenure and promotion criteria that adopt that model and value (or do not value) faculty work accordingly.

V.III

The imbalanced tripartite model of faculty work and tenure and promotion criteria

It would appear from the above discussion of the research literature on issues of tenure and promotion and evaluating faculty work that the privileged position of research and refereed, scholarly publications for tenure and promotion presents clear “disincentives for…useful work for nonacademic audiences” (Rhodes 2006, p. 27). Rhodes’ *In Pursuit of Knowledge: Scholars, Status, and Academic Culture* (2006) is quite clear on the “pragmatic as well as intellectual reasons” why academics do not write for non-academic audiences: “Popular writing will not build a tenure file or influence a field. And it takes time away from other more pressing research, teaching and administrative demands” (p. 119, italics mine). Both the pragmatic and intellectual “disincentives” described by Rhodes provide evidence of the zero-sum
language game of knowledge mobilization. First, in terms of pragmatic reasons, time spent on knowledge mobilization activities (which require contributing to what is recognized as discourse communities beyond academe) amount to time not spent on contributions to academic discourse. Second, in terms of intellectual reasons, although recognition for contributing to “popular” (or non-academic) discourse may be gained within that discourse community, the same work is not likely to be recognized in a tenure file in an academic discourse community. Or in Duszak’s description, “In effect, what is an acknowledged form of behavior in one community may be dispreferred or discredited in another” (1997, p. 29). The zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization, evident in the academic culture as described by Rhodes, is suggested also by Elbow:

Academic discourse also teaches a set of social and authority relations: to talk to each other as professionals in such a way as to exclude ordinary people…academics are professing that they are professionals who do not invite conversation with nonprofessionals or ordinary people. (1998, p. 159)

This plays out visibly in the scholarly journals, some of which are so specialized as to be addressed to and read by a very small, specialized discourse community.

One well-known and controversy of the tendency of academic discourse to exclude “ordinary people” is discussed in Just Being Difficult: Academic Writing in the Public Arena (edited by Culler and Lamb 2003), published after the well respected social theorist, Judith Butler, was awarded the highly-publicized Bad Writing award by the journal, Philosophy and Literature, in 1999. Butler defends “the values of difficulty” in a chapter of the same name, discussing the importance of confronting “epistemological horizons” (2003, p. 206) and the value of “the anxiety and promise of what is different, what is possible, what is waiting for us if we do not foreclose it in advance” (2003, p. 209). Yes. Most certainly. Indeed. This same rationale, however, could also be used to ask Butler (and others) to consider the
epistemological horizons, the promise and possibility of what is different, in permitting into academic discourse a certain discursive freedom, a freedom of style and voice, that breaks with (or in the language of post-modern theory, “disrupts” commonly (and often rigidly) held academic discursive conventions. Further, while an understanding and appreciation of what is difficult, which Butler justifiably defends (and the language she uses to convey it), may be valued in academic discourse, academic language can send the message that, as Elbow suggests, “We don’t want to talk to you or hear from you unless you use our language” (1998, p. 159).

The linguistic divides evident between academic discourse communities and non-academic discourse communities are also conceivably exacerbated by “the growing dominance of specialization…[which] has contributed to a process of homogenization on college and university campuses alike, where support for certain modes of scholarship too often leads to the devaluation of most other kinds of academic work” (Damrosch 1995, p. 5). Cornwell and Stoddard describe this as “disciplinary chauvinism” (2001, p. 170). As Toulmin describes the situation: “All accredited members of a scientific institution may, in theory, be equal; but some turn out to be ‘more equal’ than others” (1972, p. 142, cited in Czubaroff 1974, p. 157). Czubaroff elaborates thus:

---

93 Perhaps it is the spirit of this particular sentence, with these thoughts of style and voice, but I am compelled here, to offer a brief aside. The freedom of style I refer to includes not only individual writing style, but also, citation style. Bazerman, for example, suggests the following: “the [APA] style embodies behaviorist assumptions about authors, readers, the subjects investigated, and knowledge itself. The prescribed style grants all the participants exactly the role they should have in a behaviorist universe. To use the rhetoric is to mobilize behaviorist assumptions” (1994, p. 259). And the irony of my use of APA in this thesis is not lost on me. The freedom of voice I refer to here includes first and third person (as well as second person, tricky as it is) but I refer also to the freedom to have an individual voice as a scholarly writer, in contrast to what Young describes as: “allegedly dispassionate speech styles…[which] often correlates with other differences of social privilege. The speech culture of white, middle-class white men tends to be more controlled…[the] speech culture of women, ethnicized or racialized minorities, and working class people, on the other hand, often is, or is perceived to be more excited and embodied, values more the expression of emotion, uses figurative language, modulates tones of voice… (2000, p. 39-40). This aside is not to suggest that Judith Butler does not appreciate...
But what of the person who finds himself [or herself] unable or unwilling to identify with the proper symbols of respectability? As Ball [1970] notes, he [or she] is likely to suffer a social penalty, for the offended institution or social group must ensure that the deviant member is not taken seriously by other members...Standards of respectability are social mechanisms for maintaining the traditions and the authority structures which constitute particular institutions or groups. The individual who fails to be accepted as respectable is either punished by or completely ostracized from the offended group. (1974, p. 156-157)

Punishment, in the tripartite model of faculty responsibilities and evaluation of those activities for tenure and promotion, is the punishment of marginalization of certain kinds of faculty work and therefore assigning only marginal value to it (and only marginal recognition in terms of promotion, never mind tenure). As Cornwell and Stoddard note:

It is the senior peers of the discipline who judge the legitimacy of the methods, and these are people who have been thoroughly disciplined to stay within bounds...[and] anyone who has earned a PhD in a discipline has internalized rigid notions of what counts and what does not count as legitimate scholarship. (2001, p. 161)

Issues of legitimacy and assigning value to (or devaluing) different kinds of academic work is evident in what Mireille Mathieu has referred to as “the paradox of the innovative university” (2003, p. 35). Mathieu describes the paradox as follows:

Over the last decade society’s expectations of universities have changed significantly, as have many institutions’ mission statements and practices, both in North America and in Europe. These changes have rarely been accompanied by equally substantial changes in recognition and reinforcement criteria. (2003, p. 35)

Mathieu discusses how, in the collective agreements of universities in North America, the marginalization in particular of “the administration and community service” does not reflect such freedoms. On the contrary. What I am suggesting, however, is that Butler is not immune to the power of the rhetoric of scholarly discourse or scholarly convention.

94 This discussion of punishment harkens back to the introductory narrative chapter and links between “publishing and perishing” and “discipline and punishment.”
changes to many university mission statements or the European Community’s Sixth Framework Programme, which emphasizes the increasing importance of the “transfer of knowledge” and “harmonious relations between science and society” (2003, p. 26-27).

Mathieu offers examples of how the “paradox of the innovative university” is evident in the divergent priorities, policies and practices of universities. For example, while she describes “new practices” as distance learning, lifelong learning, team research, doctoral theses in the form of articles, interdisciplinary research, research partnerships with industry or cultural organizations, knowledge transfer/outreach, social innovation and the establishment of international networks; the “criteria or expectation” in many departments are contradictory, as they privilege research above teaching, single-authored publications, traditional criteria for evaluating publications, marginalization of service, inadequate support and infrequent recognition for work that is in keeping with the notion of “the innovative university” (Mathieu 2003, p. 36).

Although Mathieu’s description offers useful examples of how a paradox of the innovative university is evident in the divergent and changing expectations that society has of universities and as a consequence, the changing priorities in university mission statements versus relatively unchanged practices within university departments, in particular with regard to tenure and promotion, Mathieu does not offer any references to particular university documents or collective agreements. It is in the absence of such details, therefore, that a review of the faculty association collective agreements at 38 (of the 56) English-language or

---

95 The European Union (EU) has now adopted a “Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development. This is the EU’s main instrument for funding research in Europe and it will run from 2007 to 2013” and the “4 main blocks of activities forming 4 specific programs” are: cooperation, ideas, people and capacity (European Commission 2009).
bilingual post-secondary institutions classified at the beginning of 2008 as a “university” in Canada was undertaken for this thesis. A list of these universities is presented in Table 9.

Table 9 – Canadian university collective agreements (N=38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Name</th>
<th>University Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acadia University</td>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop's University</td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon University</td>
<td>University of Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock University</td>
<td>University of Guelph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Breton University</td>
<td>University of Lethbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton University</td>
<td>University of Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia University</td>
<td>University of New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie University</td>
<td>University of Northern British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakehead University</td>
<td>University of Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurentian University</td>
<td>University of Prince Edward Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster University</td>
<td>University of Regina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial University</td>
<td>University of Saskatchewan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Allison University</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Saint Vincent University</td>
<td>University of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s University</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Francis Xavier University</td>
<td>University of Western Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Mary’s University</td>
<td>University of Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Rivers University</td>
<td>York University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the structure of the collective agreements was not uniform from one university to the next, for the purposes of this research, two key sections that were clearly identifiable in all the collective agreements were reviewed: (1) early in the agreements, the section describing “faculty responsibilities;” and (2) the section (or sections) on tenure and promotion. Although reviewing only these two sections of the collective agreements did result in limitations in terms of what would be found, these sections also are the most appropriate for examining the details of the tripartite model of faculty activity.

There were initially two items of interest in these collective agreements: (1) the description of faculty responsibilities; and (2) whether definitions of “research” or “scholarship” explicitly identified work that reached beyond academic arenas. After
commencing the review of the collective agreements and noting that in many cases, the
criteria for evaluating research and teaching were articulated in considerable detail, a third
item of interest was added: (3) whether definitions of “service” included reference to non-
academic audiences. Table 10, below, presents data on the 23 (of the 38) university faculty
association collective agreements and/or policy documents that offered details on research
or service beyond academe.

Table 10 – Reference to “research” and “service” aimed beyond academe in faculty collective
agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Faculty Association</th>
<th>Details of “research” beyond academic arenas?</th>
<th>Details of “service” beyond academic arenas?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acadia University</td>
<td>Yes (Appendix I)</td>
<td>Yes (Appendix I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon University</td>
<td>Yes (Article 8.2)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock University</td>
<td>Yes (Article 12)</td>
<td>Yes (Article 21.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Breton University</td>
<td>Yes (Articles 29.4.1 and 31.9)</td>
<td>Yes (Article 18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (Article 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakehead University</td>
<td>Yes (Articles 16.03.04 &amp; 16.03.05)</td>
<td>Yes (Article 16.05.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurentian University</td>
<td>Yes (Article 2.00)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Allison University</td>
<td>Yes (Article 17.10)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Saint Vincent University</td>
<td>Yes (Article 20.32)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (Article 1.3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Rivers University</td>
<td>Yes (Article 6.10.5.3)</td>
<td>Yes (Article 6.10.5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>Yes (Article 4.03)</td>
<td>Yes (Article 4.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Calgary</td>
<td>Yes (Articles 6.7.8.5 and 6.7.8.6)</td>
<td>Yes (Articles: 6.7.7.4, 6.7.9, 6.7.9.1 and 6.7.9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Guelph</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (Article 10.08.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Lethbridge</td>
<td>Yes (Article 12.01.2)</td>
<td>Yes (Article 12.01.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Manitoba</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (Articles 19.A.2.4.3.3 and 20.A.1.2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern British Columbia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (Article 21.1.9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ottawa</td>
<td>Yes (Section 23.3)</td>
<td>Yes (Section 23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (Articles A8.4 and E.2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Victoria</td>
<td>Yes (Article 13.1.2)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
<td>Yes (Policy 77, Article 3)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier University</td>
<td>Yes (Article 18.2.5.1)</td>
<td>Yes (Article 15.7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York University</td>
<td>Yes (Article 11.01)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tables above (and the collective agreement policies themselves) can, of course, be variously interpreted. Focus is given here to three significant findings from a review of collective agreements and/or policy documents for faculty associations in Canada’s English-language universities. First, descriptions of research and scholarship in fewer than half of the cases—only 17 in the 38 sampled—make reference to work aimed at non-academic audiences. This finding would suggest validity to Huber’s claim, as noted earlier, that there is a “disconnect between policy and practice” with regard to “how well the various forms of scholarship fare in appointment, promotion, tenure, and annual reviews” (2002, p. 78).

Further (and ironically), in the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada grant applications, peer-reviewed, scholarly work is clearly privileged above other work in the curriculum vitae form that grant applicants are required to complete.

The second finding worth noting is how little articulation is given to the faculty responsibility categorized as “service” and this perhaps is because “service” is “a relatively ambiguous concept in the higher educational lexicon” (Cummings 1998, p. 72). In the collective agreements reviewed here, again, fewer than half—only 16 of 38—contain details of “service” beyond academic arenas. In most cases, the description of “service” clearly does not appear to have addressed issues raised in the research literature with regard to changing expectations of universities over the course of the past 20 years.

The third significant finding was the surprising level of articulation given to teaching and in particular, reference to the “scholarship of teaching” in the collective agreements. As discussed in the next chapter, this is significant, particularly given how, in the research literature, discussion of faculty “service” is variously described: as “outreach,” as “academic citizenship” and in the case of the social sciences and humanities in Canada, as “knowledge
mobilization” (which is a variation on the term, “knowledge transfer,” used in other fields as note earlier).

Some attention is given here to the content of the collective agreements in order to offer examples of the details of definitions of “research” or “scholarship” that explicitly identified work that reached beyond academic arenas, and whether definitions of “service” included reference to non-academic audiences. With regard to the general description of faculty responsibilities, the “service” category was in almost all cases, listed third and in some cases (Bishop’s University, Brandon University, McMaster University, University of Lethbridge, University of Ottawa, University of Victoria, and University of Western Ontario), service was not listed at all. Also noteworthy was whether or not those that listed “service” qualified the term either as: (1) service to the university (25 percent of the documents did this); (2) as service to both the university and the community (41 percent of the documents did this); or (3) not qualified either way (31 percent of the documents did this). In terms of recognition for faculty activity that involves work beyond the academy, the finding of 41 percent seems to offer some hope; however, it is worth keeping in mind that this 41 percent includes only those agreements that name service at all. If including all 38 collective agreements reviewed here, the figure drops to 34 percent. There also remains the question of how well “service” is articulated in the agreements, beyond the naming of it. As the table above and the discussion below both illustrate, there is some recognition for “service” work, but not enough.

96 As noted, this includes a review of the sections of the collective agreements on the description of faculty responsibilities, which for the universities listed above, are the following sections in the collective agreements as provided in the reference list: Bishop’s University, Article 7.0.1; Brandon University, Article 8.2; McMaster University, Section III; University of Lethbridge, Article 11; University of Ottawa, Section 18.2; University of Victoria, Article 13.1; University of Western Ontario, page 8). As noted above, the review of the agreements places focus on this section because it is key in naming and setting out the expectations for faculty with regard to the tripartite model of faculty activity.
That said, in many of the collective agreements, however, there was recognition of
the pluralism of “knowledge” in faculty work, including phrasings about what “varies from
discipline to discipline” (as found, for example, with Acadia University, Brock University,
Thompson Rivers University, Wilfrid Laurier University, University of Ottawa). The
following is an excerpt from the faculty collective agreement at Thompson Rivers University:

The varied nature of the academic and professional disciplines within
the University requires flexibility in the nature, assessment and weighting
of the criteria for tenure and promotion. Boundaries between categories
are not always clearcut, and…descriptions of categories are intended only as
guidelines for the development of more specific criteria. (Article 6.10.1)97

It is worth noting that Thompson Rivers University (TRU) had previously operated as the
University-College of the Cariboo (1999-2004) and before that, as Cariboo College (1970-
1994) and as such, TRU has well established trades, professional and academic programs in
which faculty must be recognized for notably diverse work.

Some of the collective agreements, as noted above, also included details of research
and/or service extending beyond academic arenas. In the 17 of the 38 agreements in which
reference was made to research aimed at non-academic audiences, some offered details
about genre of contribution beyond the academic genres of the peer-reviewed article and
scholarly monograph, for example. At the University of Ottawa, explicit mention is made
not to “limit the meaning of dissemination to publication in refereed journals or any other
particular form or method” (Section 23.3). Similarly, at York University, the collective
agreement notes that faculty members “shall endeavour to make the results of such work
accessible to the scholarly and general public through publications, lectures, and other
appropriate means” (Article 11.01). At Lakehead University, even further detail is given:

97 This text is also found, verbatim, in the collective agreement at Wilfrid Laurier University (Article 15.7.2).
It is recognized that a level of scholarly competence may be achieved by a faculty member such that, without extensive publication, he/she becomes an acknowledged authority in his/her field, and is regularly consulted by established researchers or authorities outside the University. Evidence of such extensive use as a research resource shall be accepted as evidence of scholarly activity. (Article 16.03.05)

While the above excerpt makes provisions to recognize something other than publication as a measure of scholarly contributions, the excerpt below, from the University of Waterloo, is rather more detailed in terms of what is to be recognized and given merit:

Consulting reports and planning documents that are accessible for peer review may also be submitted as evidence of a candidate's scholarly contributions. Other evidence of activity and standing as a scholar includes supervision of student research, invitations to present "keynote" addresses, election to and awards received from professional and disciplinary societies, service as a referee for journals and granting councils, and membership on government or professional committees. (Policy 77, Section 3)

Naming “consulting reports and planning documents” as “evidence of a candidate’s scholarly contributions” spells out quite clearly that research and scholarship does not only take the form of peer-reviewed journal articles and scholarly monographs. The excerpt above, though it stands apart from the collective agreements reviewed here, can be seen as a significant “move” (to recall the game theory language) in recognizing the value of and need for scholarly work that is directed beyond the academy.

Linked to this recognition of research that extends beyond academic arenas, as noted above, 16 of the 38 agreements contain details of “service” beyond academic arenas. Again, a few excerpts are provided here as illustrative examples. The University of British Columbia, for example, refers to the need for faculty to have “demonstrable impact in a particular field or discipline, peer reviews, dissemination in the public domain, or substantial and sustained use by others” (Article 4.03). Similarly, Brock University requires that faculty “shall make reasonable efforts to make the results of such work accessible to the scholarly and general
public through means appropriate to the discipline or field" (Article 12.05). The University of Manitoba describes “Community service” as follows: “work within the community at large that enhances the reputation of the University because the individual faculty member makes an essentially non-remunerative contribution by virtue of special academic competence” (Section 19.A.2.4.3.3). Wilfrid Laurier University takes a step further in naming the stakeholders beyond the academic arena, encouraging service to “the government or other commissions in a professional capacity, consulting work which involves more than the routine application of the existing body of knowledge, and contributions in a professional capacity to the community-at-large and to cultural, community and service organizations” (Section15.7.2). The University of Calgary, however, is exceptional in the language used and in what is articulated:

The University also recognizes the legitimate role of academics as 'knowledge brokers' in transferring state-of-the-art knowledge to persons in government, business, industry, the professions and the wider community through the organization and presentation of seminars, workshops, and short courses for persons outside programs leading to degrees. (Article 6.7.7.4)

In the 38 collective agreements reviewed, this excerpt is by far the most notable example of reflecting the changing expectations and the changed landscape for universities.98

Although the collective agreements offer some indication that the issues related to “knowledge mobilization” have become visible on the radar of the research community in Canada, this chapter’s discussion of the literature and review of the collective agreements of

98 One question that arises in this, of course, is how much the policy is effective for practice. For example, how often are these sorts of faculty activities undertaken and how often is the policy of a collective agreement drawn on to defend the worth of such activities in actual tenure and promotion decisions? To answer such a question would require, in the least, research ethics approval that is not in hand (nor planned) for this thesis and also, even if ethics approval and consent of faculty on a series of tenure files could be attained, questions of privacy for tenure files could interfere with investigating the question in this way. Certainly, the feasibility of such research is worth investigating, but for the purposes of this thesis, investigation remains with the policy documents.
many of Canada’s faculty associations illustrate evidence that the zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization being put forth in this thesis is indeed at play. As the research literature shows, discourse valued in one community tends to be devalued in the other. Recall what Mathieu (2003) describes as the “paradox of the innovative university:” scholarly activity that is most needed to address an international shift in the changing expectations that governments and the public have of universities—collaborative work, knowledge transfer/mobilization beyond academe—is the least valued in tenure and promotion evaluation, which continues to privilege discipline-based research and single-authored scholarly publications. In chapter two, in reference to SSHRC’s transformation, one contemporary Canadian academic is quoted as saying that “[genuine] transformation of SSHRC must challenge beliefs underpinning academic life” (AUCC 2004).

As noted earlier, beliefs underpinning academic life changed considerably at the turn of the 20th century and it would appear no less considerable a change is evident with the turn of the 21st century. In the current situation, which SSHRC describes as the “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility” for social sciences and humanities research, there is a possibility to move beyond the paradox by changing the kinds of “moves” permitted in what currently remains a zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization. Some of the examples from the collective agreements offer promise, as they represent “moves” that indeed can change the rules and change the game from a zero-sum language game to a non-zero sum language game (which is discussed in the next section). What is required to accomplish this (as noted at the close of the previous chapter) is that members of the academic community, as Myerson suggests, “communicate with each other and coordinate their moves” in order that members of the academy acknowledge what Levine (among others) remind us is a “plurality of privileged forms of knowledge.”
Lyotard suggests that: “there are two different kinds of ‘progress’ in knowledge: one corresponds to a new move (a new argument) within the established rules; the other, to the invention of new rules, a change to a new game” (1997 [1983], p. 43). Consider what this could mean for changing knowledge mobilization from a zero-sum language game to a non-zero sum language game. The decision by a member of the academy to participate in and contribute to a discourse beyond academe would not come at the cost of lost merit within academe. For example, to write a feature or open editorial piece in a newspaper or magazine would not be dismissed as the mere popularizing of a “hack” (as described by Eisenstein and Clarke, earlier); or reports for government or community organizations would not be relegated to the bottom of the curriculum vitae hierarchy on funding applications (especially given increased priorities of funding bodies for evidence of the “impact” of research beyond the academy).

In such a changed game, a social science and/or humanities scholar’s contribution to “service” beyond the academy—such as producing documents or making presentations according to the discursive practices (and needs) of discourse communities beyond the academy—would not be considered marginal, but rather, would be considered integral and necessary, as evidenced by the value they are assigned and the rewards they garner in the meritocracy of academic evaluation, that is, in the promotion and tenure processes. Lyotard offered the reminder (more than 25 years ago, I might add), that, “the pragmatics of scientific research, especially in its search for new methods of argumentation, emphasizes the invention on new ‘moves’ and even new rules for language games (1997 [1983], p. 53).
Discussion in this chapter has provided evidence of some new moves and new rules, in both
the research literature taking up issues of tenure and promotion criteria and in those criteria
in faculty collective agreements, but the same literature and policies also provide evidence of
the zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization. It is worth noting that Lyotard also
offers the following cautionary note:

Countless scientists have seen their “move” ignored or repressed, sometimes
for decades, because it too abruptly destabilized the accepted position, not
only in the university and scientific hierarchy but also, in the problematic [or
area of research inquiry, itself]. The stronger the move, the more likely it is to
be denied the minimum consensus, precisely because it changes the rules of
the game upon which consensus had been based. But when the institution of
knowledge functions in this manner, it is acting like an ordinary power center
whose behavior is governed by a principle of homeostasis.

Such behaviour is terrorist…. By terror I mean the efficiency gained by
eliminating, or threatening to eliminate, a player from the language game one
shares with him [or her]. He [or she] is silenced and consents, not because he
[or she] has been refuted, but because his [or her] ability to participate has
been threatened (there are many ways to prevent someone from playing).
(1997 [1983], p. 63-64)

If there is truth to this, perhaps it can offer some explanation for what Mathieu described as
the “paradox of the innovative university” and some explanation also, for resistance to
knowledge mobilization as a research and funding priority and policy. Although Lyotard’s
language of terrorism may seem rather extreme, he does draw attention to the significance of
being silenced or being threatened to conform to the rules of a language game. His mention
of the stability of established consensus is also important as a reminder that scientists—
extended here to include social sciences and humanities researchers and scholars—can be
expected to have characteristics (both strengths and weaknesses) that are recognizable as
human, including an aspiration and proclivity for consensus and homeostasis, with the costs
and benefits that those states of being bring, in discourse and in society.
Mention of “consensus” is also relevant to another key concept of game theory discussed earlier: the distinction between non-cooperative and co-operative games. Recall that non-cooperative games are those in which players cooperate but such cooperation is self-governed, rather than enforced, as is the case with cooperative games, where enforced cooperation comes at the hands of external forces, either by contract or governing bodies. In non-cooperative games, there is, in a sense, a self-governed “consensus” between players: consensus about what the rules are and about which moves are permissible, for example.

It is evident in some of the collective agreements reviewed earlier in this chapter—those naming and thereby assigning value to research and service activities that extend beyond academic arenas—that there has been some level of consensus and co-operative play in the academy in Canada with regard to new moves and a changed game that recognizes that at home and abroad, to refer back to the rhetorical analysis of chapter three, the scene for universities is changing, both in terms of how universities are situated in that scene and in terms of what is expected of them. That said, recognition of this change appears in fewer than half of the collective agreements reviewed in this chapter and further, as the literature suggests, such moves and change are often little more than “lip service” to give the impression that diversity in academic work is respected. Further, collaboration and communication across the discourse communities of government, industry, media and community organizations remain insufficiently unarticulated as contributions to research and/or knowledge, but rather, tend to be relegated to the marginalized “service” category of faculty responsibilities, if articulated at all.

Although critical engagement with SSHRC priorities and policies is certainly needed and calling SSHRC into question is warranted on more than one count, policy changes by SSHRC that reward and require “knowledge mobilization” appear to be, in the language of
game theory, enforced cooperation at the hands of external forces (either by contract or governing bodies). That said, although SSHRC may bring about enforced new moves and changed rules in the social sciences and humanities research community, for many, self-governed cooperative play may be preferable (and perhaps part of the resistance to SSHRC stems from its role in enforcing a change in rules). It is worth considering how “cooperative play” among members of the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada—whether self-governed or enforced—could very well resolve the paradox of “ubiquity and invisibility” that SSHRC describes, by a change in moves or change in game/rules that in turn, would change the zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization into a non-zero-sum language game.

The next chapter presents a discussion of two sets of possibilities for “cooperative play” that would be able to effect such a change. The first of these involves the place of the “service” category in academe and some suggestions are made on how it needs to be revisited and re-situated within the context of current and changing expectations (and needs) beyond academe. The second set of possibilities asks for more abstract and philosophical dimensions of academic work and life to be revisited and re-situated, from issues of mutual respect and trust, to issues of academic identity and citizenship. The chapter closes by returning to some of the questions that arose earlier in the rhetorical analysis of the SSHRC documents and elsewhere: (1) What does the “lining up” of stakeholders entail? (2) What qualifies as “research into action” and how is this accomplished, beyond what the social sciences and humanities research community already does? (3) What are the knowledge mobilization “mechanisms” to which SSHRC refers and what form and process is needed for “systemic interaction” (further, what is necessary to establish this interaction and what are the barriers to this interaction becoming established)? Although this thesis does not
promise complete and final answers to these questions, it is worthwhile to revisit them in hope of taking a step or two toward the answers or at least, determining how best to ask these very questions of SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community.
In order to move beyond the current zero-sum language game of knowledge mobilization, as discussed thus far, some changes need to be made. The purpose of this chapter is to offer two sets of possible changes, which are supported by findings in the research literature. With these considerations in mind, this chapter can then revisit some of the questions raised by the earlier (chapter three) rhetorical analysis of the SSHRC documents, taking further steps toward addressing the paradox of knowledge mobilization as a zero-sum language game. The two sets of changes put forward in this chapter—one pragmatic and one philosophical—both require the social sciences and humanities research community to revisit and re/construct different aspects of academe.

The pragmatic considerations involve links between knowledge mobilization and the “service” category of faculty and university activities. The philosophical considerations present a somewhat uncomfortable look at the academy, at what it means to be an academic. These considerations are presented and supported by findings in the research literature and they inform the chapter’s return to the questions raised by the rhetorical analysis of the SSHRC documents. In some sense, this is also a return to the barrage of questions first introduced in the narrative chapter of this thesis: What does “knowledge mobilization”
mean, what does it look like, who does it, how do they do it, how do you know if “knowledge” has been “mobilized” and why does all of this matter, anyway? The final question in the list is italicized here because it is important one more time to be reminded—now that the theory, the method, the data and the analysis have been presented—why an inquiry into knowledge mobilization of social sciences and humanities research matters.

VI.I

Revisiting and re-situating “service” in academe:
Modest and sensible, but also, “destabilizing” changes

The changes regarding the “service” category of faculty work that are being put forward in this chapter range from what could be considered modest and sensible to what Lyotard described earlier as abruptly destabilizing and therefore unlikely to gain consensus.99 An effort is made here to suggest both the modest and destabilizing changes not necessarily in the interest of consensus, but rather, to contribute to and advance the revisiting and re-situating of “service” as others in the research literature on higher education already have. Every effort will be made not to be “abrupt” in either the modest or more destabilizing changes being suggested here. The changes put forth here are supported by findings in the research literature, in particular, on the role of the university in society (carrying forward discussion from chapter two on the international and historical context for considering “knowledge mobilization” as a research and funding priority and policy).100

99 In his discussion of the abrupt destabilization of some “moves” in language games, Lyotard, as the reader may recall, also makes reference to the “terrorist” behaviour of silencing the person(s) making such moves. Here, once more I note my gratitude to the committee that supervised the writing of this thesis—Heesoon Bai, Sean Zwagerman and Norm Friesen—because they did not silence me (but their queries ensured that the sometimes “destabilizing” discussion taken up here would be defensible in a PhD thesis).

100 Although the reader may have already inferred this, the changes being put forth here are linked to my own scholarly, professional and personal interests described in the opening narrative chapter of this thesis. That said, a sincere effort has been made on my part to sufficiently distance myself from my scholarly, professional and personal self-interest as needed to have the necessary perspective on the issues at hand.
The modest and sensible changes are straightforward and begin with SSHRC: The existing “Canadian Common CV” used for all SSHRC applications and numerous other research funding agencies, needs to integrate into the hierarchy of listed research activities and contributions, categories of work that are clearly identifiable as “service” beyond academe. At present, “service” is suggested in the “supervisory experience” section and in the 400-character limit “description of activities at place of employment other than Canadian post-secondary institution” (SSHRC 2009). Although the value of graduate supervision is of great importance and is fundamental to continued scholarly work in any field, it more properly qualifies as “service” within academe, than beyond academe. In the case of employment outside of post-secondary institutions in Canada, although this category permits “employment” beyond academe to be included in the CV, it does not invite a description (particularly with the 400-character limit) of “service” beyond academe for those who are employed by post-secondary institutions.

Although such small changes may seem sensible and modest enough, one concern, admittedly, is that the Canadian Common CV took many years in the making (as it required the various funding bodies, such as SSHRC, NSERC, CIHR and others) to arrive at a format that was agreeable to all. Still, the suggested change is modest enough for it to be considered sensible. Another question that arises from this is the extent to which such a change, if it were made, would influence peer-review grant proposal adjudication and ultimately, research funding decisions. As discussion in this thesis has shown, conventions of discourse communities tend to be reluctantly and slowly changed, so it is difficult to know if social sciences and humanities researchers and scholars are prepared to acknowledge and invite changes to what is recognized (and awarded) as a legitimate and valuable research activity. That said, a reminder here of two items noted earlier: first, there is increasing pressure within
and beyond the social sciences and humanities research community to change what is recognized, valued and supported as legitimate faculty work; second, a change in policy—such as a change in the Common CV—that did not relegate “service” to a status of marginality could be used to defend the value of that work by faculty members committed to it.

The second, modest and sensible change being put forth here is one that can be undertaken one faculty union at a time. Admittedly, “faculty union” and “change” appearing in the same sentence suggests something that is not quite modest, but that does not preclude it from being sensible (or possible, for that matter). Modifying faculty collective agreements so that they not only name, but also, articulate in detail the importance of “service” beyond academe for tenure and promotion evaluations is a sensible (and possible) change that has been made at some Canadian universities already, as discussed in the previous chapter. This change would represent an important step toward giving more than what is described in the research literature as “lip service” to the “service” category in the tripartite model of faculty responsibilities (as discussed in the previous chapter). Although (also as noted earlier) it is difficult to know how much such a change would translate into an increase in faculty service activities beyond academe, “service” articulated in this way in tenure and promotion policy documents would provide important substantiation for the need to formally recognize (in tenure and promotion practices) the value of “knowledge mobilization” work by faculty choosing to engage in that work.

Now, to the somewhat more “destabilizing” changes being put forth in this chapter: (1) to establish the “Scholarship of Service” as an important field of inquiry and research (akin to what has been accomplished with the “Scholarship of Teaching” in recent decades); and (2) to establish permanent, academic appointments in university departments and
faculties in order to encourage and enable researchers and scholars to engage in work that focuses on “service” beyond academe. With regard to the “Scholarship of Service” (and it’s fitting acronym of “SOS”), although over the course of the past 20 years, the literature in a number of research disciplines has increasingly included work that could be placed in the category of “Scholarship of Service”—from research on “service learning” to “knowledge transfer” to “research impact” (and some of this work is discussed in the next section)—this work is not held under an umbrella that is recognized as “Scholarship of Service.” This may seem at first glance to be rather trivial, a small issue of semantics, but wait: from Shakespeare’s question of “what’s in a name”\textsuperscript{101} to the vocabulary used in faculty collective agreements, calling something by one name or another is clearly far from a trivial matter.\textsuperscript{102}

This change of making more recognizable a “Scholarship of Service” is made possible one research contribution and one researcher at a time. Perhaps it is not altogether destabilizing, in that sense, in that all it asks is for researchers and scholars who are engaged in work that extends the reach and benefits of their research beyond academe—to publics, professionals, governments, media—to include the words “Scholarship of Service” when describing the contribution of their work and the ways that their work can be understood as valuable. This may seem to be a small, rather insignificant change, but again, wait: consider how this might affect journal database (and other) search results and how, when discourse that takes up—in ways as diverse as the disciplines—what is recognizable as a shared concern or research question, it becomes recognized as a “body of literature” or a field of

\textsuperscript{101} This reference, of course, is from \textit{Romeo and Juliet}: “What’s in a name? That which we call a rose / By any other name would smell as sweet.” As the well-known story goes, however (the smell of roses aside), the family names of the Shakespearean characters bring them to their demise.

\textsuperscript{102} While the previous footnote makes reference to a poetic understanding of what is in a name, it is worth noting here that from questions of etymology and linguistics to socio-cultural theory and media studies, what is in a name must not be underestimated.
inquiry. This is what the “Scholarship of Service” needs (just as the “Scholarship of Teaching” did), both to advance scholarship on better extending the reach of research beyond academe (which in turn, informs and improves that work, just as scholarship of teaching informs and improves teaching), and to establish it as a recognizable and legitimate field of inquiry across the disciplines.

This mention of relevance across the disciplines is directly linked to the final “destabilizing” change being put forward here: to establish permanent, academic appointments for faculty interested in engaging in the “Scholarship of Service” as the primary focus of their research. Just as addressing the need to improve teaching is important across the disciplines, so too, for service. This is a change that can be made one department or faculty at a time. Faculty appointed to the positions proposed here would be required to have a doctorate degree and their primary responsibilities would be research and service, in much the same way that faculty appointed to permanent positions as Lecturers (and Senior Lecturers) have teaching and service as their responsibilities. Those appointed to the proposed positions—under a name such as “Research and Service Faculty”—would be required to meet the expectations of a bipartite instead of tripartite model of faculty responsibilities (just as Lecturers do). While the tripartite model is used for faculty required to conduct research, to teach and to engage in service activities, a bipartite model requires only two of these. In the change being put forward here, “Research and Service Faculty” would be housed within individual departments to engage in “Scholarship of Service” in their respective departments and disciplines and to extend the reach of research beyond academe to governments, professionals, media and publics. Just as Lecturers appointed for their excellent teaching skills address the common problem that faculty that are highly competent researchers are not always competent teachers, “Research and Service Faculty”
would address the common problem that faculties may have competent researchers and
teachers but there is a need for more research activities aimed at service (particularly, beyond
academe). Integrating positions such as these into academic departments would assist in
moving the university, research and scholarship forward in the service of the public good, which is
a move that is increasingly necessary, given the current pressures on universities. Some of
these pressures have been discussed thus far; however, in the interest of more clearly
situating the above proposals within the context of current discourse on the role of the
university in society, further attention to that discourse is given here.

VI.II

Changed and constant expectations and needs:
The university, research and scholarship in the service of the public good

In the previous chapter, some details of what Mathieu has described as the “paradox of the
innovative university” (2003, p. 35) were presented. Mathieu also claims that in recent years,
“university professors’ careers have undergone a change approaching a true revolution”
(2003, p. 25) and similarly, Lyall claims that universities are in a “process of being
‘reinvented’ for the future” (1997, p. 7). The discussion in the research literature on the
reinvention of the universities for the future and the revolution this brings for faculty (and
administrators and students) offer important context for the changes proposed above as well

Mathieu elaborates as follows: There is “a major diversification in career models, from fundamental research
to professional innovation to knowledge transfer; increased use of computerised tools and the Internet in both
teaching and research; the all but mandatory requirement to form research teams and networks, often
multidisciplinary in nature; the growth in partnerships with industry for both training and research; and ever
more complex and demanding regulations governing intellectual property. We also see more competition, often
ferocious, among universities and between academe and private companies to attract the most promising
candidates. In this context, it has become more vital than ever before for universities to put in place
reinforcement systems that are both fair and capable of motivating excellence and of attracting and retaining
the best people” (2003, p. 25).
as for an understanding of knowledge mobilization as a research and funding priority and policy to meet “the knowledge needs of society” (Amey 2002, p. 34). For example, in her discussion of how faculty activities are defined and valued, Amey, who also cites Boyer (1990), Edgerton (1993), Fear and Sandmann (1995), Ramaley (2000), and Votruba (1997), argues the following:

Those committed to a different organizational orientation for postsecondary institutions suggest that it is time to seriously consider using new labels and creating acceptable procedures to evaluate professionally grounded faculty work that may fall outside of—or weave through—the traditional tripartite of teaching, research, and service…[as] appropriate [to the] positioning of colleges and universities in the twenty-first century. (2002, p. 33)

Some such new labels have been suggested in this chapter’s discussion of the “service” category in the tripartite model of faculty responsibilities, as well as in the broader discussion of knowledge mobilization in this thesis. There is a challenge with these new labels, of course, which Macfarlane describes well:

Few have addressed the more complex question of evaluating contributions for the collective good via academic citizenship. Academic citizenship is no less valuable simply because it might be perceived as harder to “measure” or evaluate. If universities fail to take up this challenge it will make it harder to maintain the quality of internal and external service activities and, ultimately, public support and understanding for the role of higher education in a free society. (2007, p. 271)

Concern about public support for universities is important in Canada (as elsewhere) where there is a history of publicly funded universities and an emergence in recent years of private post-secondary institutions and “diploma mills.” There is also the issue of insufficient university budgets to meet set goals, with the corresponding need for increased philanthropic support and turning to corporate sponsorship; both of which rest on the perceptions of universities and their value in contemporary society (or in markets, as the case may be when it comes to incentives for corporate sponsors).
According to Ramaley, there is currently a “public disinvestment in higher education” and as a consequence, “higher education institutions have been introducing models of both education and research that increasingly comingle public and private benefits. …which create[s] the capacity to recognize and contribute to the public good” (2006, p. 169). Extending the role of the university and faculty activities as presenting clear benefits to larger public(s) has also been referred to as “outreach,” when “faculty teaching and research reconnect the institutional mission to the knowledge needs of society” (Amey 2002, p. 34). Ramaley describes this kind of work as “engaged scholarship” with a goal “not to define and serve the public good directly on behalf of society but to create conditions for the public good to be interpreted and pursued in a collaborative mode with the community” (2006, p. 165). Ramaley extends the notion of engaged scholarship to the university as a whole:

[With the] concept of the “engaged university”…the classic traditions of research, teaching, and service will be changed, with significant implications for faculty scholarship, the design and intentions of the curriculum, and the mechanisms by which knowledge is generated, interpreted, and used. (2006, p. 162)

The concept of the “engaged university” brings together changed ideas of what is recognized as legitimate faculty work and how that work is rewarded. The concept of the engaged university also draws attention to “academic citizenship…[and] different interpretations of the civic purposes of the university” (Macfarlane 2007, p. 261), a theme that has been historically constant, but with changes, in terms of the role of universities.

In describing the changing demands on universities by students, industry, governments and also, by some university administrators and faculty, Chen et al note:

Whether these changes have been the result of pragmatic adjustment to shifting socioeconomic circumstances, or the outcome of thoughtful analysis
that has sought to respond to the perceived shortcomings of conventional educational assumptions is of course, a significant question that we must address. But whether or not we in the academy understand ourselves to have awakened to the need to be more effective participants in the realities of contemporary, market-driven life, or have offered an alternative and imaginative vision that can guide us with the use of new principles and innovative practices, it is clear that our institutions have changed and will continue to change. (2001, p. 328)

Clearly there are shifting socioeconomic circumstances—from changes in university and research funding models, to increased numbers of students, to decreasing numbers in tenure-track positions for faculty—and it is equally clear that there are shortcomings in conventional educational assumptions—as raised in the discourse on democracy of education and critical pedagogy or evident in the shift away from the banking model of education toward dialogue and service learning as integral parts of curriculum, for example—but the extent to which the social science and humanities research community (or the academy at large) understands itself or has become awakened to contemporary realities remains in question.

Yet, in the field of higher education, there is a growing understanding of the need to recognize and address the changing expectations made of universities and of university faculty. As Ramaley describes the current situation:

Societal demands have broadened the role of academic institutions to include a multitude of requirements. These demands have confused and blurred our expectations about what we want from higher education: (1) a means to the preparation of leaders for our society; (2) a vehicle for the advancement of opportunity in a democratic society; (3) a focus for the conduct of research and advancement of knowledge; (4) a way to contribute to economic job development and job creation; and (5) a partner in community development. (2006, p. 158)

Each of the roles of the university described above by Ramaley reflect an increasingly “wider set of obligations to society” and indeed, “the idea that universities have a civic role has been
a feature of their rhetoric” (Arthur 2005, p. 2). How that civic role has been described and configured has changed; however, the following is a suggested characterization of the shifts in higher education according to four models:

1. “higher education as private interest”: with focus on the pursuit of knowledge, on academic community, on student engagement as rite of academic passage;
2. “higher education as public interest”: with focus on departments as “cost and revenue centres” and student experience as “instrumental” experience;
3. “higher education as public direction”: academic work is strategically directed to meet state and public interests and graduate work is “useful and relevant” with regard to “practical application and economic return”; and
4. “higher education as market driven”: academic activity and curriculum are directed by a marketplace of students, industry and other outside forces. (Middlehurst and Barnett 1994, p. 57-58)

Although Middlehurst and Barnett are describing higher education in the United Kingdom, the social sciences and humanities research community in Canada and the academy at large (both in Canada and internationally) can be understood as situated in some ways in each of the models described above. As Pusser suggests, however, “one of the enduring dilemmas in higher education research has emerged from efforts to conceptualize the role of higher education in serving the public good” (2006, p. 11).

As private interest, public interest, public direction or market driven, the shifting role of universities can be understood as rhetorically constructed descriptions of how universities must contribute to the public good. As a private interest, higher education can be seen as serving the public good, both by way of students as private individuals who are informed public citizens, as well as through the academic communities to which they belong, in the contribution to public knowledge. As a public interest, higher education can be seen as serving the public good by providing fiscally responsible programming that is responsive to
student needs. As a public direction, higher education can be seen as serving the public good by ensuring that undergraduate and graduate work offers practical and economic benefits to both the student and society. As market driven, higher education can be seen as serving the public good by acknowledging (for better or for worse) that students and the institutions are situated in a market economy and by ensuring that curriculum takes into account the demand(s) of that economy. The notion of the university in the service of the public good, however, requires further attention and discussion that includes but also extends beyond university mission statements, to actions taken by faculty, administrators, students and the institutions that fund the universities. An understanding of the university in the service of the public good also requires an understanding of how present-day universities are situated within the larger publics that are both supportive and critical of them.

Present-day universities are situated in regional, national and international contexts that are drastically changed from the contexts in which they were first established. Further, with the funding that is required for increasing numbers of students, faculty and universities, it is not surprising, as one author suggests, that since:

many of today's societal problems reflect poor understanding of what is going on, critics ask what the universities are doing about these problems. The answer is too often “very little”. So especially of late the cry arises for universities to be more relevant. (Cummings 1998, p. 73)

To those (of us) who have committed to a career and life in the academy for the purpose of contributing to society (a vocation that in its unique ways, requires no small sacrifice, I might add), to be confronted with cries to be more “relevant” and to be told that we are doing “very little” can seem like little more than a proverbial slap in the face. It is understandable, then, that pressures by governments, the public, the media, or industry are not always embraced by faculty. In response to a growing chorus for change to universities, Tierney
suggests that one “problem is that what most of us in academe have been doing is fixing a flawed process rather than rethinking the process itself” (1999, p. 162). Ramaley comments with optimism, however, that: “It is possible that a concern for the public good will become the pathway to a fresh interpretation of the role of higher education in the twenty-first century. It also may serve as a starting point for thinking differently about the meaning of faculty work” (2006, p. 165).

The pragmatic changes put forth earlier in the chapter, with regard to the service category in the tripartite model of faculty responsibilities, represent a rethinking of academe and academic processes. The second set of changes to be put forth in this chapter involve some philosophical considerations that permit further rethinking of academe and academic processes. These include issues such as resistance, reconstructing academic agency and (public) trust, changing epistemologies and graduate education. Some attention is given here to these issues before returning to the questions that arose from the rhetorical analysis of the SSHRC documents and to the conclusion of the chapter.

VI.III

Resistance to change, existing limitations and re/constructing academic agency

The set of philosophical considerations presented here, as noted in the opening of the chapter, present a somewhat uncomfortable look at the academy and what it means to be an academic. A call for change is made here, and as is often the case with change, some resistance can be expected. In this thesis there has been mention of resistance more than once: resistance to “knowledge mobilization” as a research and funding priority and policy; resistance to challenged traditions and conventions of scholarly discourse; resistance to moves in a language game that destabilize it. These all represent resistance to change, change that could one way or another, alter the rules of play. A useful explanation for such
resistance is provided in what Fierke describes as a perceived relationship between logic and conformity:

> The fixity of any particular game is in part a function of the degree to which actors assume the logic [of the game] represents the world “as it is,” thus requiring their conformity. Transition or movement toward a new set of rules often requires a challenge to the prevailing necessity and a willingness to act as if a new logic were possible. (2002, p. 338-339)

The actors (or players), in the present discussion, include university faculty and administrators who together have agency (to borrow from the pentadic analysis of an earlier chapter) to reinforce the logic of the academy “as it is” by conforming to the established rules of play governing the academy, thereby building on and preserving valued traditions; however, they also have the agency, as Fierke describes, to “transition” through “movement toward a new set of rules” about what is acceptable, valuable or even necessary as legitimate academic work in a changing academy and society.

In changes to policies and funding programs, SSHRC appears to have at least made a move in challenging prevailing ideas about what is necessary and SSHRC also appears willing to at least entertain the possibility of a new logic (though to be fair, this willingness may be of necessity, given pressures by government to account for the funding dollars spent). Yet, as discussed in earlier chapters, there has been resistance to changing the rules of what is expected of researchers and scholars. Bourdieu also offers a possible explanation for this:

> The secret resistance to innovation and to creative intellectual activity, the aversion to ideas and to a free and critical spirit, which so often orientate academic judgments…are no doubt the effect of the recognition granted to an institutionalized thought only on those who implicitly accept the limits assigned by the institution. (1988, p. 95)

The limits of the academy can be found at the institutional level and within disciplines and departments, in how the academy “promotes a win/lose situation, i.e., one function wins at
the expense of one or more other functions” of research, teaching and service as “hardening categories” (Fear and Sandmann 1995, p. 111-112).

There are also possibilities, however, of moving beyond such limits, with an understanding that:

There is not a single, unified public role to be played by social scientists...depending on the circumstances in which they are operating and the goals they are striving to meet...[yet] they are also complementary in many respects and provide an important starting foundation for contemporary scholars seeking to better understand the public dimensions of their work. (Gattone 2006, p. 129)

For faculty with an interest in exploring (and pursuing) the public dimensions of their work, as discussed earlier, the decisions to do so may come at a cost, given that, “evaluations of colleagues for promotion and tenure involve some of the academy’s most fundamental assessments of legitimacy” (Hearn et al 2002, p. 506). According to Czubaroff, “those persons (past, present, and future) who wield magisterial authority in a discipline establish, interpret, and defend the canons of the discipline in terms of which members evaluate each others’ conduct and work” (1974, p. 158). Czubaroff draws on Toulmin to elaborate further that:

A new concept, theory, or strategy, for example, becomes an effective “possibility” in a scientific discipline, only when it is taken seriously by influential members of the relevant profession, and it becomes fully “established” only when it wins their positive endorsement. (Toulmin 1972, p. 266 cited in Czubaroff 1974, p. 158)

While changes in SSHRC funding envelopes and research reporting requirements in recent years may suggest that new concepts, theories and strategies are being taken up with regard to social sciences and humanities research, as noted earlier, the curriculum vitae that is used for SSHRC applications—in marginalizing service—seems to contradict any such possible shift toward new concepts, theories and strategies in terms of what is valued as legitimate
academic work. Similarly, as Mathieu has noted (and as discussed in the previous chapter), in the “paradox of the innovative university” there is not enough evidence that the possibilities presented by new concepts, theories and strategies for research and scholarship are being “taken seriously” by influential members of the academic profession.

These contradictions offer evidence of the tensions and boundaries inherent in issues of institutional change and as Evans and Henrichson (2008, p. 113), citing Mann (1978, p. xii) note, “a common mistake made by change agents in education ‘lies in applying methods that are largely educational to situations that are fundamentally political.’” The changing landscape for higher education in Canada (as elsewhere) is notably political, given the changing demands and expectations made by students, parents, industry, community organizations and not least, by the governments that provide public funds to universities. Evans and Henrichson offer some useful reminders in such a context:

In higher education today, an institution’s success—indeed its very survival—may depend on its ability to keep pace with the ever-changing environment. Yet significant change in higher education does not come quickly, easily, or by happenstance. Bringing about consequential change requires strategic planning, much work, and considerable patience. (2008, p. 124)

Approaches to change in higher education are similarly a concern for O’Meara (citing numerous others, as noted earlier), who summarizes some suggestions for policy reform as follows: “revising or amending institutional mission and planning documents…[and] amending promotion and tenure or contract language and criteria…or…providing incentive grants to support multiple forms of scholarship” (2005, p. 481-482). Each of these has been discussed thus far, as has the question of the extent to which policy reform translates to reformed practice. These issues also raise questions about how the university can become “more engaged with society in new ways” and by extension, how to “link the institution
more meaningfully to the larger community” (Ramalay 2006, p. 161-162). Institutional change is inextricably linked to issues of changing discourse and epistemologies and the research literature offers some insight on these issues, in terms of the past and future of universities as well as the question of what changes the next generation of researchers and scholars can expect (or hope) to find in an academic career. As this chapter turns toward its conclusion, it is worthwhile to first collect from the literature some key ideas about what appears on the horizon for universities and academic discourse and culture, from changing epistemologies to graduate education, as they further inform how “knowledge mobilization” as a research and funding priority and policy can be understood and approached as something other than a zero-sum language game.

VI.IV

Changing epistemologies and regaining (public) trust:
From “symbolic universes” to graduate education

In We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the University, Damrosch discusses “questions of the construction and uses of scholarship” and notes the importance of “institutional history and the institutional structures, within which ideas about scholarship have been played out…[as] closely dependent upon ideas about scholarly community” (1995, p. 5). As discussed earlier, ideas about scholarly community and scholarship, are strongly linked to and formed by the discourse within a given community. Further, Russell notes that, historically, faculty have:

…engaged in written discourse primarily within a discipline, not among disciplines, and expected their students to do the same… [because]…there were powerful reasons why scientists and scholars should not step outside their respective symbolic universes…. scholars saw little need to enter other symbolic worlds, little benefit in making their own discourse accessible to outsiders. (2002 [1991], p. 11-12)
The historical precedent described by Russell clearly remains evident to the present day in how it reproduces a discursive homogeneity and reinforces discursive conventions within academic disciplines (and by extension, within academic discourse when compared to discourse beyond academe). Yet, over the course of the past 20 years, there is also evidence of powerful reasons—whether from international higher education and research policy changes or from funding programs within Canada (both discussed in previous chapters)—to turn toward research that works across the disciplines and beyond academe and therefore, there are reasons for scholars to step outside their own symbolic universes.

Clearly, not only knowledge mobilization, but also, what Evans and Henrichson described earlier as the “survival” of higher education, both depend on a willingness and ability of scholars to move beyond the confines of the disciplinary, symbolic universes that served to define the changed structure of universities more than one hundred years ago. Further, according to Delanty, it is important to recognize that the relationship between universities and knowledge has changed and he identifies three key shifts:

1. “the changing role of the state…[as] no longer the sole financier of knowledge”
2. “established patterns of knowledge production are entering a crisis…[and] new knowledge producers are emerging”
3. knowledge “has become a major site of contestation…apparent in the increasing demands on science to be made accountable to society…[and] in a shift from the politics of production to the politics of the application of knowledge.” (2001, p. 103-104)

Although Delanty describes the situation and the “production of knowledge” in political and post-industrial terms, without attention to changes in philosophical or social constructivist approaches to knowledge, the shift in paradigm is noteworthy, nonetheless.

In *Audience and Rhetoric: An Archeological Composition of the Discourse Community*, Porter offers what may serve here as a useful reminder (in his discussion of Kuhn), that a
“paradigm’s vitality requires change and growth...[and] members of a paradigm may also transport methods and concepts from one community to another, and in that way facilitate the growth of the paradigm” (1992, p. 110). An important lesson on the “transport of methods and concepts” can be learned from multi- and interdisciplinary research, as “interdisciplinary collaboration transcends the comparison or juxtaposition of two ways of knowing two cultures” or taken further, it serves to “radically revalu[e] one’s own inquiry to incorporate questions, methods and perspectives of others, to perceive the partiality of disciplinary practices” (Cornwell and Stoddard 2001, p. 162). While a turn toward collaborative research across the disciplines seems to embrace (and even reach) the goals of extending inquiry across disciplinary boundaries (and questioning cultures and epistemologies within disciplines), in moving beyond academic discourse—crossing boundaries to government, community, media and industry domains—there remain obstacles related to issues of what is recognized as legitimate academic work.

In language that is perhaps less polite (though more direct) than what is found in other descriptions of epistemological divides, Porter offers the following, which is quoted at length because it captures and summarizes some of the thinking found in the literature with regard to perspectives on changes in research/scholarship and epistemologies (and offers a reminder of the importance of rhetorical considerations):

To see the audience as a dumb presence, a passive receptor of an already determined meaning is to imagine a system in which the construction of truth is the responsibility of an already established authority—the philosopher-king or, perhaps, in our terminology the so-called expert—someone who already possesses truth (knowledge) and passes it on to those less informed...In this conception of communication, the rhetor analyzes audience, but only to determine the most efficient means of constructing the message, which exists as a simple medium for meaning already formed...A poststructuralist view has in common with social constructionism the position of seeing audience as collaborative writer, as a force that shapes and influences the writer and hence the inscribed text. This audience already
exists before the writer puts pen to paper—not as a dumb, shapeless mass or as a group of people but as a vital force of beliefs, attitudes, knowledge, existing in writing, in pre-texts that the willing writer can consult…the act of rhetoric begins not with the rhetor persuading the audience but with the rhetor being persuaded by—in Burke’s term, identifying with—social norms, customs, in another sense, the audience. (1992, p. 114-115)

The above passage uncovers several important steps to be taken to overcome obstacles of communication and collaboration across discourse communities as necessary for knowledge mobilization. In the above passage, there is a recognized need to question the presumed authority of academic/research knowledge and what Cooter and Pumfrey describe as “the positivist diffusion model,” which “excludes both popularizers and the reading public from the production of knowledge” (1994, p. 251, cited in Lightman 1997, p. 188-189).

This kind of model of “knowledge” production and circulation is confronted by the need to recognize the consequences of claiming epistemic authority and “holding to authoritarian theories of knowledge” (Willinsky 2000, p. 105). In claiming the authority to assign a certain role and value to one’s own discourse community while diminishing the role and value of different discourse communities (and the individuals in those communities), such presumptions result in failure, in (at least) two ways: (1) it prevents the knowledge(s) of diverse communities to enter into a shared discourse and arrive at shared understandings; and (2) it fails to recognize the need for researchers/scholars to understand and identify with individuals in discourse communities beyond academe in the interest of arriving at changed understandings.

In Trust and the Public Good: Examining the Cultural Conditions of Academic Work, Tierney describes trust as “a shared experience” and “a learned experience” (2006, p. 182-183) and it is perhaps worthwhile to consider how his discussion of trust can offer insight to a discussion of research trusted as a public good. Tierney notes that, “Trust does not come
about without a framework and language for common understanding...[and] trust occurs when both parties share interests such that what is good for one is good for the other” (2006, p. 182). Trust between and among members of different discourse communities is clearly an important step towards communication and collaboration (and by extension, toward knowledge mobilization), as well as a step towards mutual respect and shared understandings across epistemological differences. Tierney’s description of organizations (educational or otherwise) “as social structures that individuals construct and reconstruct” is also useful, in terms of possibilities for change. He notes further that:

In this framework...individuals become social decision makers...[and this] view enables the researcher to see the organization in much more fluid terms. Organizations simply do not bend one way or another but have ideological parameters framed in part by the larger social structure. The challenge for the researcher, then, is not figuring out how to align individuals with predetermined social structures but instead figuring out how relationships that build commonalities across differences might be developed, promoting agency within individuals. (2006, p. 181)

Recall from the Burkean pentadic analysis that in SSHRC’s knowledge mobilization messages, agency is found through collaboration, meaningful connections, and systematic interaction. Tierney offers the reminder of the importance of trust, not only among individuals across discourse communities, but also, the importance of a trust that the universities (and other organizations) permit (or even encourage) a fluid approach to change that recognizes how individuals, practices, policies, epistemologies and ideologies, together reconstruct the university and the relationships between the university and other organizations. In this sense, the university, research and scholarship need to be understood as held in mutual trust with the public (and with the public interest and needs as priorities).

In his discussion of the transformation of universities, Damrosch suggests that, “Real changes can only come about if people on particular campuses get together to discuss
such issues” (1995, p. 157). Damrosch links the history of universities to the tensions that come with changes to present-day universities: “For the better part of a century, we have been selecting for certain kinds of alienation and aggression on campus. We need to reconsider the sorts of academic personality we encourage—and even create—through our extended rituals of training and acculturation” (1995, p. 9). As discussed thus far, there is alienation evident in the discursive boundaries that result from disciplinary divides within the academy and even more so, between academic discourse communities and discourse communities beyond the academy. Also discussed thus far is the aggressive approach to academic success, evident in the zero-sum premise of who is published and who receives research funding, and equally evident in the zero-sum language games that assign value to some discourse while marginalizing other discourse. Thus far in this thesis only very distant and careful reference has been made to the “sorts of academic personality” that Damrosch mentions, though certainly issues of trust and authority as discussed provide links worth consideration, for those (among us) willing to hold up the looking glass to the self, the department, the university, the academy.

The “extended rituals of training and acculturation” that Damrosch names above are of particular concern here. In his discussion of the next generation of academics, Damrosch “propose[s] to examine the structuring of academic work, looking at its history and its present political economy, and to outline a series of fundamental reforms, both in our teaching of students and in the ways we develop and circulate ideas” (1995, p. 3). He notes further the need for such change in order for universities “to gain a better purchase on general public problems” and to improve “communication across the lines of differing bodies of knowledge” (1995, p. 4). There is a sufficient body of research to offer evidence that there have been some changes in what is expected of universities, but also, that present-
day universities confront challenges in adapting, particularly given the wavering support—fiscal and otherwise—for universities in Canada (and internationally). Perhaps in overcoming these challenges, graduate studies must be a focal point, if indeed, it is true, that “any fundamental reform in scholarly work must be built around substantial changes in graduate education” (Damrosch 1995, p. 140). Damrosch, of course, is not alone in his focus on graduate education.

In a series of monographs Damrosch edited on “Rhetoric, Knowledge, and Society,” Bazerman offers the following in his introduction to one of the titles in the series:

Graduate education is nothing so neat as the training of individuals in a fixed and disciplined practice. It is rather the messy production of persons in situations…we are all constantly being produced as authors by the situations we find ourselves in and put ourselves into…by constantly engaging in the process of disciplinarity through writing ourselves into disciplinary being, we rewrite ourselves and rewrite those around us who share the disciplines we believe we subscribe to. (1998, p. viii)

The introduction is for Prior’s Writing/Disciplinarity: A Sociohistoric Account of Literate Activity in the Academy and although the focus of the text is on the relationship between academic disciplines and how academics are brought into being, this understanding can be extended beyond the boundaries of academic disciplines, to the boundaries between academic discourse communities and non-academic discourse communities. This raises questions about the “rituals of training and acculturation” that are (or are not) integrated into the curriculum of graduate studies programs.

Bocock and Watson describe the curriculum as “a source of renewal” and a “profoundly democratic area of activity” (1994, p. 133) and this holds some promise for how universities can confront the challenges of changed expectations that governments, community organizations, students, parents and publics have of present-day higher education. Yet, there are tensions here, too. If an established hierarchy that greatly privileges
certain forms of academic work and discourse (the peer-reviewed article and scholarly monograph) is situated in a changing context where that hierarchy is being challenged, how best to re/configure graduate studies in such a way that prepares the next generation of graduate students for success? It is useful to consider the insight that Bakhtin can offer:

In any given historical moment of verbal ideological life, each generation at each social level has its own language; moreover, every age group has a matter of fact its own language, its own vocabulary...at any given moment of its historical existence, language is heteroglot from top to bottom: it represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between different epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth. (1981, p. 290-291)

The above quote offers insight in more than one arena of the discussion presented thus far in this chapter (and previous chapters). Discussion of academic training tends to describe how tradition is passed down from established researchers and scholars to novice or apprenticing researchers or scholars. As Bakhtin suggests above, however, the next generation of researchers and scholars arrives at and moves through graduate school with a vocabulary and language that is to some extent socio-ideologically distinct to their generation and their community. It is also well-known that more and more graduate degree holders pursue careers either outside traditional faculty roles or outside the academy altogether. This line of thinking raises interesting possibilities in light of the earlier discussions on conventions of discourse, discourse communities and academic culture in the sense that is allows for possibilities about what can be recognized as legitimate discourse and a cross-generational approach to epistemology.

104 Note also that in research on the sociology of education, “generation theory”—stemming from Mannheim’s “The Problem of Generations” in his Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge (1952)—takes up not only issues of language (as Bakhtin does, above), but also, issues of demography, intergenerational relations, cultural philosophy, and psychoanalytical theory, for example.
Indeed, the heteroglossia Bakhtin refers to (above and see also, the 1934 essay, “Discourse on the Novel”) can be found in research and scholarship. This is evident, for example, in inter- and multi-disciplinary work and in the unique struggle of this work to gain recognition within the disciplines they traverse, given the disciplinary languages and tensions between them. A similar observation can be made in successive generations of scholarship, as some vocabulary and conventions fade away and others remain or are modified (take, for example, the effect of gender studies on discourse, academic or otherwise, and challenges to the dominant, masculine, third person singular pronoun). There are also possibilities, here, in terms of a more formal examination of academic training and the relationship between established and apprenticing researchers and scholars, with regard to exchange, rather than the positivist-diffusion model of expert-to-novice as critiqued, above. These kinds of possibilities—such as recognizing the legitimacy of the changing discursive conventions and epistemologies of the next generation of researchers and scholars and considering what is to be gained from drawing on these, rather than requiring mere acculturation—bring a return to the discussion of language games (and in a sense, of course, that discussion has remained throughout).

Recall from Bazerman that there are “different moves in different games, on different game boards” (Bazerman 1998 cited in Martin and Veel 1998, p. 26) and how cross-generational heteroglot language and discourse offer possibilities for different moves and movement across epistemic boundaries. It is useful also to be reminded that, although there are rules that govern discourse:

This does not mean that these rules and the practices they authorize are monolithic and stable...within any community the boundaries of the acceptable are continually being redrawn...the point is that while there is always a category of things that are not done (it is simply the reverse or flip
side of the category of things that are done), the membership in that category is continually changing. (Fish 1980, p. 343)

Given the changing expectations made on universities and university faculty, there clearly appears to be a need for ongoing reconsideration of the things that are done and the things that are not done, whether in university mission statements, in the tripartite model of research, teaching and service, in tenure and promotion policies and practices, in graduate programs.

This becomes increasingly important, argues Duszak, “In a world of growing international contacts, [where] academic communities are in a state of constant definition…[and] the production, and interpretation, of academic texts requires negotiation of textual and interpersonal values in reporting research” (1997, p. 35). Whether or not universities, departments and graduate programs want to acknowledge it or not, the rules of play for higher education and research have changed. So, too, has the discourse about research and higher education. If it is true that “texts and communities of discourse, in short, interactively reconstruct one another” (Hunter 1990, p. 18), the changed discourse need not be understood only as a source of tension, as the nuisance of needing to adapt, yet again, to changing demands. Understanding changed discourse (and changed rules of language games) as possibilities for interactive reconstruction of discourses and epistemologies permits the possibility of challenging “the extent that a particular way of producing knowledge is dominant” (Gibbons et al 1994, p. 2). Gibbons et al offer an elaboration and a useful reminder:

In the extreme case, nothing is recognisable as knowledge can be produced outside the socially dominant form. This was the situation that confronted the early practitioners of the “new” science when they confronted the Aristotelian Peripatetics at the beginning of the Scientific Revolution. It seems to be a recurrent historical pattern that intellectual innovations are first described as misguided by those whose ideas are dominant, then ignored and,
finally, taken over by original adversaries as their own invention. Part of the explanation of this phenomenon derives from the fact that it is necessary to begin by describing the characteristics of the new in terms of the old. (1994, p. 2).

Here and in previous chapters an attempt has been made to describe “the characteristics of the new in terms of the old,” with regard to discursive practices and epistemologies and how they shape and are shaped by discourse communities, both within and beyond the academy.

An understanding of how knowledge is mobilized is not possible without an understanding of the differences in discursive and epistemological practices across the discourse communities from and to which knowledge is to be mobilized, or more properly (as Hunter describes, above), how both the knowledge and the discourse communities “interactively reconstruct one another.” Just such an understanding has been attempted here. Such an understanding recognizes that, “As knowledge production moves out of the university, and accordingly as a whole range of knowledge users outside of the university become increasingly involved in determining the nature of knowledge, the university is forced to occupy the ground of reflexivity” (Delanty 2001, p. 102). In her discussion of genre, Perloff describes this ground of reflexivity as a “longing for a both/and situation rather than one of either/or” (1989, p. 3 cited in Devitt 2000, p. 701), and this approach to discursive practices extends also to the interactive reconstruction of discourse communities and epistemologies. Bazerman, once again, provides insight:

Symbolic systems react to experiences and situations, to contact with different communities and the formation of new communities, to struggles with old meanings deemed inadequate to account for emerging ideas and experiences, to the need to create shared understanding and agreement where none existed previously. The world of symbols and consciousness here is no blindfold, but a dynamic means of acting in the world. (1988, p. 21).
Contact with and the formation of different and changing discourse communities is both made possible and makes possible interactive reconstruction of discourse communities and epistemologies that are as fundamental to something called “knowledge mobilization” as they are to the “struggles with old meanings deemed inadequate” and the “world of symbols and consciousness” that Bazerman describes. Indeed, “how knowledge circulates has always been vital to the mind, which all of us share, just as it is vital, ultimately, to the well being of humanity” (Willinsky 2006, 207). Although the well being of humanity is not given as much attention in the SSHRC policy documents as the concerns arising from “ubiquity and invisibility” of social sciences and humanities research, as the rhetorical analysis of those documents has shown, knowledge mobilization as a research and funding priority, holds the possibility of addressing both of these pressing concerns. The SSHRC documents are not altogether clear, however, on some of the particulars about how this is to be accomplished (as evident from the rhetorical analysis presented earlier).

Informed by the discussion of the pragmatic and philosophical considerations presented in this chapter (and the discussion presented earlier in this thesis), this chapter returns to some of the questions that were raised by the rhetorical analysis. A return to these questions is presented here as we move toward the chapter’s end, before the closing, narrative epilogue. The return to these questions is not with the expectation that definite answers are to be found, but in the interest (and hope) of moving a step (or two) closer to answers or, as noted earlier, closer to knowing which questions need to be asked of SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community.

105 As noted earlier, John Willinsky has put forth the argument that “the circulation of research and scholarship should figure explicitly in human-rights discussions of knowledge” (2006, p. 143). His work in this area has focused on open access to journals but the motivation and rationale clearly extends beyond the hardware and software of journal publishing technologies.
VI.V

Moving toward answers and why all this matters, anyway

Discussion thus far has provided some answers (or more properly, in Burke’s words, “some kind of answers”) to the questions: What is knowledge mobilization, what does it look like, who does it, how do they do it, how do you know if “knowledge” has been “mobilized” and why does all of this matter, anyway? The answers to these questions have, in turn, raised further questions. In very brief terms, summarizing the lengthy discussion of this thesis, the answers (and new questions) are as follows:

1. Knowledge mobilization, in SSHRC policy, refers to “moving the knowledge from research to action” (2004a, p. 3). The question then is, what is meant by “moving research into action” beyond what researchers already do?

2. Knowledge mobilization, according to SSHRC, is done by social sciences and humanities researchers in collaboration with stakeholder-partners beyond academia (such as those in governments, industry, media, and community organizations). What this “looks like” and how to know if it has been done, remain unclear; and

3. Knowledge mobilization happens, according to SSHRC, through “new mechanisms to create bridging platforms and arenas among academics, government and communities” (2005b, p. 15) that permit “systematic interaction” (2005a, p. 10) between researchers and these other communities. The questions then, are: what are these new mechanisms and what kind of systematic interaction is SSHRC referring to?

And the question, why does all of this matter, anyway? The closing remarks of the chapter revisit some of the many answers to the question of why knowledge mobilization matters.

First, the question of what is meant by “moving research into action” beyond what researchers and scholars already do? A few (rather informal) words about what researchers and scholars already do are needed here. In the professoriate—on only rare occasions (thankfully), I might add—as among other groups of professionals, individuals with a less than stellar work ethic (in a word: “slackers”) can be found. By and large, however,
academics are over-worked (sometimes to the extreme) and when compared with the private sector (from the skilled trades to corporations), they are also rather significantly underpaid, given the level of expertise that they have and the hours put in (with the exception of those who are either selling patents and services and perhaps also, for those who are close to the top of the 20-year tenure track salary ladder, though the top of the ladder is far from extravagant). 106 Given how much time, energy and thought (and their lives!) that academics already invest—in everything from research grant proposals and projects; to writing, reviewing and editing scholarly work; to planning and teaching courses; to serving on faculty and student committees—it seems rather unreasonable to ask them to do more that they already do in “moving the knowledge from research to action.”

Yet, research “moved into action”—whether informing government policy-making processes, professional development in industry, questions raised in the media, issues for community organizations, to the private lives of members of diverse publics—has clearly been called for in recent years. Some of the SSHRC funding envelopes, in particular those that focus on community partnerships, help to “move research into action” by providing funding for work that involves non-academic organizations in all phases of a research project. There are also “outreach” offices in many universities. Further still, as noted earlier, in some disciplines—such as education—there is a body of professionals whose work informs and is informed by academic research. But knowledge mobilization as a research and funding priority and policy would suggest that this is not enough. And indeed, it does not appear to be enough (and beyond the truth of such a statement, appearances are also significant, of course). Possible further steps to be taken, as put forth in this chapter, are to

106 The Simon Fraser University faculty salary scale in 2009, for example, begins at $57,228 and has a ceiling of $133,045 (see: http://www.sfu.ca/policies/files/Academic_Policies/20_series/JUL_2009_Faculty.pdf).
revisit the “service” category and to make a place in universities (and their budgets) for “Research and Service Faculty” who would be devoted to moving “research into action” in their discipline and department.

Second, on the question of knowledge mobilization as collaboration with stakeholder partners beyond academe (such as those in governments, industry, media, and community organizations), what this looks like and knowing when it has been done, although left unclear by SSHRC, “university outreach” and “academic citizenship” or “knowledge transfer” and “knowledge mobilization” offer some indications. As it turns out, knowledge mobilization looks different with different stakeholders, or more properly understood: knowledge mobilization looks different in different discourse communities. Sometimes it looks like a policy document or an industry report; it can look like a community organization “fact sheet” or an article in a newspaper or magazine. The difficulty is that these genres of discourse (including the discursive conventions they follow) are notably different from the genre of a scholarly article or monograph, which academics painstakingly spend their careers not only trying to master, but to collect as publishing credits for tenure and promotion (and the climb up the modest steps of the faculty salary pay scale ladder). Again, a possible answer has been suggested in this thesis: revisit the “service” category in tenure and promotion policy documents for faculty who are interested in engaging in this kind of work. Further, make a place in the university for “Research and Service Faculty” to devote their time and skills to knowledge mobilization in their discipline and department, in whatever way it needs to look like for the non-academic discourse communities involved.

Third, what are the new mechanisms and what kind of systematic interaction does SSHRC refer to in their knowledge mobilization policy? Again, while the changes in funding envelopes that encourage and provide support for research in partnership with non-
academic organizations can be seen to function in this capacity, these can also be seen only as first steps and certainly, many steps away from the “systematic interaction” that SSHRC claims is needed. SSHRC has also established a “Knowledge Mobilization and Program Integration” Division. As well, there are academic activities that can be seen in some sense as knowledge mobilization mechanisms—from the work of university research centres with a mission to extend the reach of research beyond academe, to research projects to fund that kind of work, to the blogging or other such activities by individual researchers and scholars—but this is all rather ad hoc. Systematic interaction is achieved when changes in practices are integrated into policy, when what is done on an ad hoc basis becomes integrated into default protocol, and don’t forget, when budget allocations are committed to sustaining such changes in how things are systematically done. A third time, the proposed changes with regard to the “service” category of faculty work and “Research and Service Faculty” are put forward here as possible steps toward the systematic interaction that SSHRC describes.

The fourth and final question to be revisited here is: “Why does all this matter, anyway?” Here, as a stepping stone to the short, concluding narrative epilogue of this thesis, I would like to—quite possibly, I may need to—return to first person narrative mode to answer this question, if I may. For me, as the author of this thesis, the answers to the question of why knowledge mobilization matters, are so many and so obvious that I find it very difficult to know where to begin.

From the perspective of the international community and historical understandings about the role of the university, knowledge mobilization matters because, among other things, it can be used to protect human rights and the environment; it can inform negotiation involving politics, culture and religion; and it can help to bring important
understandings about the complexities and nuances of what is referred to as “knowledge” in the world.

From the perspective of the research community in Canada, knowledge mobilization of social sciences and humanities research matters—in a sense not at all intended as simplistic or facetious, here—because SSHRC says it matters and this is significant because SSHRC is situated between the Government of Canada (in all its various incarnations, some more supportive than others), where budget dollars are allocated for research funding, and the research community where those dollars are spent. It is and always has been the responsibility of SSHRC to be situated in this position and to be informed about changing priorities, in terms of the needs of the people of Canada (where the funding dollars originate, let’s not forget) and the changing context of social sciences and humanities research with regard to the international research community. It is the responsibility of the social sciences and humanities research community to monitor SSHRC policies and programs and to engage in discussion to ensure that the policies and programs accomplish what is necessary. That there is sufficiently critical attention to SSHRC, clearly, is not a concern. And some criticism is put forth in this thesis. That critical attention to SSHRC, however, needs to be sufficiently well informed. This thesis is an attempt (in some ways modest, in other ways less so) to contribute to discourse that informs discussion about and responses to changes in SSHRC policy and programs, by illustrating that knowledge mobilization for our research community matters not only because of optics issues such as “ubiquity and invisibility” but also because our research community must take into account the changing needs of the public whose dollars support the research we undertake, to ensure that our work is done in the public trust.
Finally, from the perspective of academic freedom and diversity, knowledge mobilization of social sciences and humanities research matters because it calls into question and calls attention to what it means to be a researcher and scholar, on so many levels. Knowledge mobilization brings much-needed attention to the service category of faculty work and by extension, to the evaluation of that work, to how it is recognized or marginalized, how it is regarded as legitimate or illegitimate. In this, knowledge mobilization also (perhaps less directly) calls attention to the culture of the academy, to academic identity, and to how culture and identity in the academy are constructed and reproduced.

In this way, therefore, knowledge mobilization matters because it requires a closer look at the rules of academe, it questions whether (and how) the rules could (or need to be) changed, and it invites a discussion of what might be possible if some rules were to be changed. Among these (and arguably, chief among these) are the rules of language games. Again, as the author of this thesis, it is difficult for me to know where to begin (again) when thinking about the language game of knowledge mobilization, about its zero-sum, about the tyranny of certain rules of academic discourse. Perhaps, then, it is best to think about how to end, rather than thinking about how to begin, again. Before turning to the narrative epilogue of the next chapter, perhaps one more attempt to answer the question of why knowledge mobilization for social sciences and humanities matters: It matters because it reaches from the most intimate place of how “knowledge” resides with a person (in a person, through a person) and how it is constructed and reconstructed between and among people, across time and space, to others, where it is taken up, taken apart, and put back together again, and in so doing, also residing with (in, through) others, and then extending again, in turn, to others, and others, and others. *Ad infinitum.* That *must* matter. That *needs* to matter.
VI.VI

Conclusion: The in/visible, the im/possible, the un/changed

The reasons why knowledge mobilization of social sciences and humanities research matters, I hope, are no longer in question. Before ending this thesis with a closing narrative epilogue, briefly here, I trace the steps from the answer(s) to why knowledge mobilization matters to the paradox of “ubiquity and invisibility” that it was meant to address, to the “soul of the matter” that opened this thesis. The first step to trace is to recognize that knowledge mobilization as a research and funding priority and policy must be understood within the context of what has both remained constant and changed in academe, from its role in society to how academic work reaches society. The importance of social sciences and humanities research carries forward as does the civic role of the university in society.

One important change, however, is in how social sciences and humanities research fulfils its civic role, as civil society changes. Rhetorical understandings of how SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community are situated in relation to each other, to society and to knowledge mobilization as a research and funding priority and policy makes visible the significance of knowledge mobilization and the role of discourse in it. Discourse—whether in academe, government, industry, media or elsewhere—is governed by rules, however, and rules across discourse communities must be understood and discourse communities must be traversed, if knowledge mobilization efforts are to succeed.

One critical problem with knowledge mobilization as a policy aimed at addressing the paradox of ubiquity and invisibility is that because some of the rules of discourse communities within and beyond academe are incommensurable, knowledge mobilization becomes a “zero-sum language game.” Members of academic discourse communities succeed in mobilizing knowledge beyond academe, but as a consequence, this work is not
recognized as a legitimate contribution to discourse within academe. This is evident in tenure and promotion criteria, which clearly privilege certain kinds activities (research and teaching) and certain kinds of discourse (the scholarly journal article and monograph) over others.

The perspectives of game theory and discourse theory, brought together, make visible some possible solutions to the paradox of knowledge mobilization as a zero-sum language game. Games need not be zero-sum and rules can be changed. Moves in language games can be made and conventions of discourse can evolve. Two sets of possible changes are proposed in this thesis. The first requires that the “service” category of faculty work be revisited in order to have it better articulated in tenure and promotion policy documents and further, a place (and budget allocation) for “Research and Service Faculty” as permanent, academic appointments is proposed. The second set of possible changes requires a willingness by social sciences and humanities scholars (as well as administrators and funding bodies) to permit philosophical considerations to destabilize rigidly held views that prevent changing possibilities for research and scholarship from being visible. These include revisiting (and re-visioning) the rules of academe and academic discourse.

The question then becomes, are social sciences and humanities scholars (as well as administrators and funding bodies) willing to do this: to loosen their grip, at least, on rigidly held views that keep so many possibilities invisible? And with this question, a respectful (though rather abrupt) response: Our research community must be willing to consider new possibilities because the paradox of ubiquity and invisibility of social sciences and humanities research is a problem that is not going to go away just because too few are willing to see it.

I won’t return here to the significance of what resides within discourse and persons, to the importance of academic diversity and freedom, to the need to defend funding dollars, or even to the ability of social science and humanities research to address issues of human
rights. These, among other things, I hope, have been sufficiently illustrated as “the soul of the matter” being taken up in this thesis. Instead, I conclude this chapter with an account of how Thomas Edison’s scientific work came to be understood:

Late nineteenth-century newspapers, the financial markets, technical journals, the inner circles of industrial financiers and so on each identify specific discursive realms on which Edison had to represent himself and his project appropriately and successfully for all the parts of this large techno-social-legal-financial-industrial-commercial undertaking to come together in the construction and use of the material system of electric power delivery – the wires, transformers, generators and light bulbs along with the buildings that house them and the workers to operate them. (Bazerman 1998, p. 25)

I bring this quote to close the present discussion because it offers metaphorical (and the stronger for it!) parallels between Edison’s contribution to science and the wires, transformers, generators, light bulbs, buildings and workers in social sciences and humanities research. I want to add to this, whether as a curiosity or of more serious consequence, that centuries earlier, Francis Bacon had described how the dissemination of science would turn “ordinary men” (and women, Francis, ahem) into “merchants of light” who would use “the books, and abstracts, and patterns of experiments” in everyday work and life (Bacon 1659, cited in Jacob 1997, p. 30). This, among other contributing factors, led to the “cultural ascendancy of science in late seventeenth-century Europe and its colonies” (Jacob 1997, p. 373) that in many ways has carried forward today.

It should come as little surprise, then, that SSHRC’s recent focus on knowledge mobilization, two hundred years hence, attempts to address the “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility” of social sciences and humanities research in Canada. There is so very much “light” that social sciences and humanities research can bring to our complex and changing world. This is well understood by those (of us) who are members of the social sciences and humanities research community (in Canada and elsewhere), but this most certainly is not
understood well enough by governments and publics, in part as a consequence of zero-sum language games in which, regrettably, much is lost. One move at a time and one rule at a time, this can change (and is changing) but not to the extent that it needs to be.
AN EPILOGUE: ON WHAT IS WRITTEN UNDER THE SKIN

It’s one of those things a person has to do; sometimes a person has to go a very long distance out of his way to come a short distance correctly. (Edward Albee, *The Zoo Story*, 1958)

Shortly after I began my doctoral program, in describing to a friend and colleague from the literary publishing world how constrained I felt—personally, professionally, academically—not only in what and how I was permitted to write, but also in how I was permitted to be in the academy, she asked, “Well, you know what they say? Either the academy will change you or you will change the academy, so the question is, which is it going to be?” My intuitive response was that if I remained in the academy, it would certainly change me, but at the same time, I did not think I could remain in the academy unless I were able to make some change in it, at least in how I could write and in how I could be.

---

107 This phrasing is a variation on the title of the Jeanette Winterson novel, *Written on the Body*. The novel opens, thus: “Why is the measure of love loss?” and further down the first page: “Love demands expression. It will not stay still, stay silent, be good, be modest, be seen and not heard, no.” I borrow from the title because what I described earlier as my inconvenient love of language fits well with this. On Winterson’s web page, she excerpts the novel: “Written on the body is a secret code only visible in certain lights: the accumulations of a lifetime gather there.” There is a parallel here, too, for what doctoral work writes onto a person. Winterson describes *Written on the Body* and her other work as follows: “All of my books are about boundaries and desire—the boundaries we should try to cross.” In this, too, are parallels to the work of this thesis and my experiences—personal, professional and scholarly—over the course of my doctoral program.

108 I refer to my trusted friend and colleague, Melissa Edwards, with whom I worked at the BC Association of Magazine Publishers from 1999-2002 and with whom I have been fortunate again to work at the Canadian Association of Learned Journals since 2006.
Now, five years later, I know how true it is that the academy would change me. It is difficult to find words to describe the change. I can feel the effects of what is now written under my skin and I can see the effects on the pages that I write and read (for better and for worse). As a reader, as is par for the academic course, I am much better able to critically engage with a text. Yet, I only very rarely find (or make) time to read contemporary literature, which I miss terribly. As a writer, I have learned (and continue to learn) the rules that govern academic texts, rules to be followed if I am to have published what are recognized as academic texts. That said, as the well known adage goes, you need know what the rules are in order to know how to break them.

I am not interested in breaking the rules (contrary to appearances, perhaps), because in these five years of doctoral study I have learned to appreciate what is involved in the research, writing and publishing of scholarly work. And I mean this not only in terms of recognizing the importance of practices such as peer review in requiring an academic writer to defend the claims being made in his or her written work, but also, in terms of better understanding how personal and philosophical disposition, or research interests and agendas can play a significant part in how an academic writer is required by others to defend his or her claims. Otherwise put: peer review accomplishes much more than I had previously appreciated, but it has also become abundantly clear that there can be a tyranny to it (with regard to genre, as discussed earlier, and extended in so many other ways: epistemological, ideological, ontological, etcetera). I sometimes wonder, now, though, when thinking of symbolic universes, of zero-sum language games, of knowledge mobilization rhetoric: what sense is there to this painstaking effort, this particular kind of careful attention to text and to thoughts, the tyranny and acrobatics of social sciences and humanities research, if it is not able to reach further than it currently does?
There have been other changes to me and in me, but I do not want to linger on them, other than to note that what I have witnessed in the academy and in those here—on personal, professional and scholarly levels—while giving me one sensibility, has taken from me another. After years of my own resistance, I have finally become convinced, at last, that certain aspects of who I am must be carefully guarded (or locked away), if I want to survive in this place called the academy. Some of this is a welcome return to a state of being that I have known before, a way of being sometimes necessary to ensure survival and success, certainly. This way of being removed or untouched, is not unfamiliar to me, nor is it to others, no doubt, as we all have our armour. It is my experience, however, that the difficulty with such armour is that once it is on, it is not very easily removed and one concern that I have is that after a certain amount of time, removing it becomes quite frightening, if not impossible. On this, I elaborate no further as I expect that such acts of survival—personal, professional and scholarly—are recognizable to many (most, though I hope, not all) in the academic community.

The question of whether or not I have been or shall be able to make any change in the academy, while I can answer that I now see that it is changed by everyone in it, I have also become committed to changes that extend beyond what is necessary for me to want to be part of the academy. No more academic death wish for me, then, if I am serious in this commitment. But that does not preclude continued attempts of at least measured acrobatics, an academic balancing act, some discursive play, so to speak. Indeed, the truth of the matter is that the seriousness of such a commitment requires that I remain willing to make moves that hold the possibility of changing rules that in my view (and not my view alone, I might add), need to be changed.
While these changes begin with the moves that I make in the academic work that I choose to do (from the what and how of the texts that I write, to the courses I teach, to the research questions I ask, to the research I engage in, etcetera), I am not forgetting, of course, that the choices available to me are not merely of my own making. This is why I address in the pages of this thesis members of the social sciences and humanities research community in the various roles that they play—as writers, as reviewers, as editors, as grant application adjudicators, as members of funding bodies, as colleagues and members of a shared, academic discourse community—and I sometimes ask and other times insist, that some changes are needed, that some choices must be made possible.\footnote{This is also why I express my sincere gratitude to those who have made options available to me in the choices that they have made possible for me.}

Here, then, in this narrative epilogue, after discussion of theory and method, data and analysis, if I may, I would like to set out some of the changes that I hope to see as I finish my doctoral studies and take the next step(s) in my academic career. This is not to suggest that valued traditions, policies and practices simply be tossed and replaced. On the contrary, part of what is written under the skin over the course of a doctoral program, certainly, is an appreciation for certain elements of the academy as it is and has been. The research undertaken for the doctoral work of this thesis, however, brings forward an appreciation also for the situation—rhetorical and discursive, political and public—confronting the social sciences and humanities research community at this time and place, namely, in Canada as it is positioned within a larger international context just after the turn of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century.
VII.I

Making choices possible: Rhetorical and discursive, political and public

I am particularly concerned that understandings about the rhetorical, discursive, political and public implications and consequences of the international and historical context in which the social science and humanities research community in Canada is situated are not visible enough on our own radar. With regard to rhetorical understandings of a situation, they are as significant now as they were more than two thousand years ago. As I take my next steps in my academic career, one change that I hope to see is in SSHRC and the research community recognizing not only how they are in a shared rhetorical situation, but also, what is constant and changing in that situation. Also, it is with much astonishment as I come of age as a scholar, so to speak, that I see very little recognition of “knowledge” as rhetorically constructed. Such an acknowledgement need not be seen as a threat to the status of a particular knowledge, but rather, it can be understood as disclosure, as willingness to call the rhetorical universe of a given paradigm, discipline or discourse by its name as rhetorically constructed, negotiated, understood. ¹¹⁰

I would also hope to see in the constructions, negotiations and understandings of academic discourse possible choices for new freedoms of form and content, voice and style. There have been and continue to be changes, yes, that show promise in terms of possibilities and choices in academic discourse: whether in the movement toward open access publishing and multi-media content for scholarly discourse; in the recognition for inter- and

¹¹⁰ Besides the disclosure that rhetorical understandings bring, contemporary scholars in the field of rhetoric offer something else for which I am very thankful: for keeping alive what Barthes once described in/as The Pleasure of the Text (while still advancing academic discourse). In texts by contemporary rhetoricians, there is sometimes a sensibility, something recognizable as voice, as a voice with a particular element of life in it, a notably human and intimate touch of language and of text. In such texts, there is a sanctuary of sorts, set apart from the more usual language of academic writing; a sanctuary not unlike a secret room locking out Orwellian doublespeak, where words and discursive acts are not prohibited by thought police.
multidisciplinary work; in the admission, at last (though only by some), of the implications of requiring academic texts to be written, for example, as if one were always writing as and addressing a male author or reader because convention required that only be (not she) be recognized as author and reader. Yet, there remain rigid discursive conventions that restrict choice and limit possibilities.\textsuperscript{111} This is not to suggest that expectations become so loosened that scholarship be lost. I do, however, wish to call into question how limits in discursive choices, in turn, limit discursive possibilities not only for academic writers but also, for other possible readers of academic texts. I am not suggesting that the academic discourse community adopt practices of reckless abandon, that fields of scholarship become territories where “anything goes” or that academic texts become indistinguishable from other texts. I am not advocating extremism. But I am advocating a freedom in discursive choice that invites and allows possibilities for previously unmoved ground to be shaken—linguistic and textual, epistemological and ontological ground—for writer and reader both. Shaken ground, while destabilizing in some ways, is also sometimes necessary in order to move writer, reader and scholarship to understandings that have not yet been reached.

These rhetorical and discursive choices are linked also to implications of the public and political context in which the social sciences and humanities research community is currently situated. Although my earlier reference to the “yellow brick road” of knowledge mobilization describes my own personal, professional and scholarly interests, it is also clear when considering the present day academy—with the focus here on the social sciences and

\textsuperscript{111} One example, quite shocking to me, came in doing some editing work for a senior academic (circa 2006). A journal manuscript that the author had submitted came back from the peer review process, accepted for publication with almost no changes, other than to modify the author’s use of the first person singular (“I”) when referring to the author’s own, subjective experience in the field. I grumbled and asked the author, “Is this for real?” We made the changes, recognizing the absurdity of the situation, and the article was published.
humanities research community in Canada—that the political and public context is not something that I have simply dreamed up.

The political context may seem unlikely to be changed by the subtleties of rhetorical and discursive choices. Yet, I find such resignation difficult to accept. I remain steadfast in my commitment to subtle (and bold) rhetorical and discursive choices as possible ways to bring change in political arenas. This can include relatively concrete moves, such as increasing open access to scholarly journals or changes in the focus and scope of journals to reach beyond strictly academic audiences, for example. The first of these—open access to journals and whether or not this can have any effect on the political arena—I hope to investigate in my post-doctoral research. The second of these—journals extending their reach beyond academic audiences—I have witnessed (and continue to monitor) in my professional work with scholarly journals. Rhetorical and discursive choices and moves, in some sense less concrete perhaps, but equally significant, that I hope to see, involve the advancement of the “Scholarship of Service” (as noted earlier) and a re-thinking and in some ways re-making what it means to follow an academic career path. Whether one academic author and article at a time, or more boldly, one academic unit and university at a time, I very much hope to see (and fully intend to take part in) a sincere and serious commitment to making moves (rhetorical, discursive, political) that both advance and celebrate a changing

112 In my planned post-doctoral work I hope to be involved in research that investigates whether or not open access to scholarly journals results (or can result) in increased use of scholarly research in the policy-making process.

113 I have been involved with several open access periodicals during my doctoral program—Paidesis: International Journal in Philosophy of Education, Loading: The Journal of the Canadian Game Studies Association, Small Cities Imprint, and the SFU Educational Review—and in each case, particular care and attention were given by the editorial team to decisions on the focus and scope and on the content sections of the periodical, to ensure that authors and readers from beyond academe would be invited into the discourse community of those publications. Also, in my current work as Executive Director of the Canadian Association of Learned Journals, I am able to monitor from year to year how the member journals (125+ titles) identify their target readership.
culture of academic citizenship. And if I may be permitted a moment or two on the yellow brick road of knowledge mobilization, I would be delighted to see SSHRC invest in a pilot program to advance the “Scholarship of Service” in Canada by supporting individual researchers, departments and universities interested in investigating how those taking on “Research and Service” responsibilities can address the “paradox of ubiquity and invisibility” that continues to confront the social sciences and humanities research community.

Addressing the paradox of ubiquity and invisibility is as much about the public context as the political, of course, not only because of political decisions made about the public taxpayer dollars allocated to research, but also, because of the possibilities and responsibilities of the social sciences and humanities research community to extend the benefits of research to meet the changing needs of changing publics. As I take my next steps in my academic career, while I understand that academic discourse must be able to distinguish itself from public discourse—whether media discourse or the discourse of community organizations, for example—and what it can accomplish in doing so, I must also ask what could be accomplished by academic and other discourse communities learning from each other as discourse communities (rather than as research subjects and academic authorities, for example).

What I mean by this is moving toward a mutual understanding about what can be gained across discourse communities by appreciating what the discursive practices of a discourse community provides and permits. There is much, for example, that media discourse communities and the discourse communities of other publics stand to learn from the discursive practices in academe that guard against authors making unethical or false claims. By the same token, there is much that the academic discourse community stands to learn, for example, about the written word as something more than “a transparent recorder
of thought or physical reality [that] grew up with the scientific method in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries” (Russell 2002, p. 10).

Please understand: I am not presuming that all academic writers hold such a view and engage in discursive practices so limited. But in “writing up research” and accumulating publishing credits (as necessary to advance scholarship or build a promotion and tenure file), it is so easy to lose sight of what a text can possibly accomplish, how texts and the ideas they hold can engage and set alight something in people, can bring people together in their interest to move forward, in understanding and questioning, again and always. In the name of research. In the name of research as a public good.
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A Message from SSHRC’s Council

The purpose of this document is to facilitate collective discussion about how to chart the future of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) and thus, in important ways, the future of the social sciences and humanities research enterprise in Canada.

Humanities and social science research contributes in vital ways to wealth creation, forward-looking institutions, civic engagement, sustainability and geopolitical balance. It is scholars in these diverse branches of the research world who ask questions that inform understanding and decisions about issues such as immigration, education, monetary policy, the environment, justice and human rights, and culture. Human sciences knowledge is fundamental to creativity, innovation and to developing the skills of the next generation of Canadians—as workers, citizens and leaders, as people who can think critically, communicate effectively, synthesize complex information, and who have the flexibility and leadership to adapt to change and implement new ideas. Human sciences research helps forge strong media, nurture democratic debate, and inform policy. And, at a more personal level, it helps us engage and answer questions about the meaning of life itself.

The social sciences and humanities provide the missing link between a technologically advanced society and a successful one. In a world increasingly shaped by technology and global trends, these diverse disciplines help deliver social innovation and basic understanding. Human sciences research actively contributes to creating and sustaining a prosperous and creative society with a well-educated population and an engaged citizenry.

A key question that SSHRC must address is: “How can the humanities and social sciences ensure that technology and global change truly serve the common good and that our social organization gives us the means to pursue both prosperity and quality of life?” As Council members, we have a duty to ask whether SSHRC in its present form has the right structures, programs and responsive agility to meet the dramatically changing needs of both researchers and society.

A new spirit is taking hold: one more at ease with our linguistic duality, our diversity, our pluralistic society, indeed with the whole of the experiment we have taken so much further than any nation in the world. From this new and easier sense of self flows the exciting possibility of Canadians working together as never before.

Paul Martin, Making History: The Politics of Achievement, April 2003

In the academic world of the 1970s, the role of a university professor working in the human sciences was to teach and write books. Nobody observed, or foresaw, that a huge part of the job would be to get grants, find money for graduate students, stimulate discussions with external audiences, participate in national research teams or to work with other disciplines. Faculty certainly did not see sponsored research as a sine qua non.

By contrast, in the academic world of the 21st century, the responsibilities of university faculty extend well beyond students and postsecondary institutions. They are faced with new pressures. Two fundamental questions they must address are: “What difference does human science research make? Are the human sciences organized and
equipped to help our social structures innovate in tandem with technology in order to create a society that is successful in all its dimensions?"

The role of researchers is not only to develop knowledge, although this is very important in and of itself. They must become far more proficient at moving the knowledge from research to action and, in the process, at linking up with a broad range of researchers and stakeholder-partners across the country. However big the challenges, researchers have to add new and different connections to those they have already built.

At the same time, SSHRC must revisit its own role and responsibilities. For 25 years, the Council has focused on its granting function and on researchers and students as its primary, if not sole, clients. It must now take a much larger view and examine its place in a complex system that includes other organizations that fund research, students, universities, scholarly and professional associations, governments, business enterprises, and community and other voluntary, non-governmental organizations.

To use a cliché, what does it mean for us, as Canadians, to live in a “knowledge society?” And what does it mean for SSHRC to be a federal public institution serving the collective interest?

In this context, we ask stakeholders from all quarters to give us their input on and suggestions for what must be SSHRC’s role and responsibilities—as well as their own—in helping this knowledge society take shape.

Our dream is for this consultation to be at once visionary and pragmatic. There are two things, however, that the Council will not put on the table for negotiation. First: SSHRC, however transformed, will continue to support research excellence—from the most foundational to the most applied—as assessed through a competitive, peer-review process. Second: a transformed SSHRC will continue to provide a home for all scholars across the full range of social sciences and humanities disciplines.

Council hopes this framework document will spark a structured discussion around specific challenges and options that will lead to some basic agreements on the central role of human sciences research in this century and on how to heighten its excellence and impact.

SSHRC has made some real headway in Ottawa over the past several years. In fact, excluding the Canada Research Chairs Program, our budget has nearly doubled over the last five years, increasing from $99 million in 1995-96 to $197 million in 2003-04.

We all agree that there is a need for significantly more investment in social sciences and humanities research. With a bold plan and strong consensus across the country, the Government of Canada will continue to substantially increase its support for social sciences and humanities research. That said, there will never be unlimited money available for this or any other kind of research. In other words, SSHRC cannot be all things to all people. We will need everyone’s help to make wise choices.

Thank you in advance for your personal contribution and commitment.

Sincerely,

Marc Renaud, President, SSHRC on behalf of:

Marcel Boyer, Département de sciences économiques, Université de Montréal
Tim Bradhead, President and Chief Executive Officer, The J.W. McConnell Family Foundation, Montréal
Sean Caulfield, Canada Research Chair in Printmaking, University of Alberta, Edmonton
Richard Cloutier, École de psychologie, Université Laval
Jean-Douglas Comeau, Directeur, Écoles d’immersion, Université Sainte-Anne

Andrée Courtemanche, Département d’histoire et de géographie, Université de Moncton

Mary Crossan, Richard Ivey School of Business, The University of Western Ontario

Yves Gingras, Directeur, Centre interuniversitaire de recherche sur la science et la technologie (CIRST), Université du Québec à Montréal

Karen Grant, Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs, University of Manitoba

Gregory Halseth, Canada Research Chair in Rural and Small Town Studies, Department of Geography, University of Northern British Columbia

Linda Hughes, Publisher, The Edmonton Journal

Camille Limoges, Independent scholar and consultant

James R. Miller, Canada Research Chair in Native-Newcomer Relations, Department of History, University of Saskatchewan

Keren Rice, Canada Research Chair in Linguistics and Aboriginal Studies, Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto

Penelope M. Ayre Rowe, Chief Executive Officer, Community Services Council of Newfoundland and Labrador

Stan M. Shapson, Vice-President, Research and Innovation, York University

Martin Taylor, Vice-President, Research, University of Victoria

Vianne Timmons, Vice-President, Academic Development, University of Prince Edward Island

Catherine Wilson, Department of Philosophy, The University of British Columbia

---

THE CONSULTATION PROCESS: FEBRUARY-OCTOBER 2004

We will carry out the consultation process in several phases, starting in February 2004 with a "campus dialogue" at Canadian universities. Here are some key dates:

January  Meeting in Toronto of SSHRC campus representatives
February-April  Consultation on university campuses and with partners
March  National meeting of heads of scholarly associations
April  Meeting of holders of Canada Research Chairs
May  Consultation reports to SSHRC by universities and partners
June  Open meetings at the Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences and ACFAS to review consultation outcomes
October  Final report and recommendations to SSHRC Council

In addition, SSHRC will organize face to face or electronic meetings with the public, para public, voluntary, business and media sectors, as well as with think tanks. We are in the early stages of planning. For instance, we are also considering one or a series of roundtables with non-academic organizations that have a mandate to conduct social, economic and/or cultural research and that have demonstrated broad influence. Suggestions concerning these or other meetings are welcome.

Check our Web site (www.sshrc.ca) regularly for contact information, for a list of events and updates, and for background papers that we are preparing as complements to the Consultation Framework Document and its annexes.

At all times, individual comments can be sent directly to president@sshrc.ca

---
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A National Partnership for a National Consultation

SSHRC is pleased to be joined in these consultations by partners with invaluable perspectives on social sciences and humanities research in Canada. Their active engagement, along with that of our individual university partners, makes this a truly national undertaking.

Each partner has offered a public statement of support for these consultations and outlined their own involvement in the process (see pages 23-26).
Introduction

Canada is blessed with an impressive and growing cadre of researchers and scholars in the human sciences. Evidence of this fact includes rising student enrolments in those disciplines, the high quality of the research proposals internationally peer reviewed each year for SSHRC grant competitions, and an increasing research appetite that SSHRC just cannot fill. According to a Canadian study recently cited in the U.K., Canada ranked third in the world, after the US and Britain, in absolute number of research publications.2

The purpose of the present document is to inform an intensive reflection and consultation process about the future of SSHRC as the primary federal funding agency for the human sciences. In this context, the document discusses the changing circumstances, current context and challenges for human sciences research in Canada. It describes and assesses the related pressures and challenges that are driving SSHRC to transform itself from a granting to a “knowledge” council. The document proposes a guiding vision for a new council and its core values, then presents specific ideas and suggestions for programs, approaches and structures. Finally, the paper concludes by suggesting a series of questions to spark further discussion and input from all interested stakeholders.

By transforming itself into a knowledge agency, SSHRC can help Canada break the “knowledge barrier” by renewing human sciences research.

When the first plane broke the sound barrier in 1947, scientists learned something surprising: the controls didn’t work as expected. Flying faster than the speed of sound required new understanding, a new approach to aerodynamic design and controls. Failure to adjust would risk loss of control and endanger pilots’ lives.

Today, the exponential rate of technological, political and cultural change is driving society at incredible speed towards a promising but daunting future. Major upheavals in the wake of globalization, terrorism and new technologies pose a challenging human dilemma: do existing social arrangements still work? How can we make sense of clashing traditions and world views?

These are questions for the humanities and social sciences to help answer.
SSHRC: One Part of a Larger System

With a mandate and funding from Parliament as an arm's-length granting council, SSHRC has been a mainstay of support for university-based research for the past 25 years. Its grant and scholarship programs have helped produce a wealth of good research, research expertise and innovation. With the multitude of changes occurring—in the world, in the research environment and in universities—SSHRC’s traditional support mechanisms remain necessary, but are no longer sufficient.

To answer the question of what would be both necessary and sufficient, we must engage the issues from a systems perspective that takes into account the multiple players and stakeholders who are concerned with various dimensions of knowledge creation and use. SSHRC is one part, albeit an important one, of a much larger system. The funding of research cannot be separated from the rethinking of the roles of universities or from debates about how Canada can best benefit from more emphasis on research as it strives to improve society in a world that is much different from 25 years ago. In this context, SSHRC has a huge, heretofore untapped, potential to intensify connections among people, research, and the sharing and application of knowledge.

New world, new needs

Globalization and the knowledge economy, coupled with rapid and powerful technological change, are shaking the very foundations of society, culture and family. Numerous world leaders, including several Nobel laureates, argue that the explosive growth in knowledge and technology is profoundly changing the economic, social and cultural fabric of our societies, locally and globally. They assert that problems that lie ahead are socio-cultural more than anything else. September 11, 2001 has taught us that the only lasting “antidote” to terrorism is a continually renewed understanding of the complex world in which we live. These events have re-emphasized fundamental questions that have always been at the heart of the human sciences: What makes a vibrant civil society where people trust each other? What allows institutions to adapt well? How can global citizenship and tolerance become entrenched in human values everywhere? Under what circumstances do cultural differences enrich societies rather than pulling them apart?

From the computers on our desks to the light weapons used by terrorists, technological change is racing ahead, leaving our social institutions and policies far behind. We are in dire need of advanced social scientific knowledge to manage our affairs in an increasingly complex and unpredictable world, and SSHRC plays a vital role in fulfilling this need in Canada.

Thomas Homer-Dixon, SSHRC Annual Report, 2002

It is no coincidence that 2003’s “Most Newsworthy” lists highlight not bio-tech breakthroughs, but principally social innovations such as court-sanctioned same-sex marriage, reform of cannabis laws, reconstruction of so-called failed states, and so on.

Rapidly evolving circumstances increase pressure on the research community to build new knowledge to help Canadians understand and move to action, on universities to adapt their incentive systems, on policy makers to develop effective receptor capacities for new knowledge; and on
SSHRC, as the primary federal funder of human sciences research, to influence how research is understood and carried out.

A new university landscape

These and other developments are pushing universities to rethink their role in society. They cannot be “ivory towers,” disengaged from their community or the knowledge economy. They are called upon to be at the heart of both. As public trusts, universities are wrestling with the following questions:

- How to link scholarship with human needs, while treading the fine line between being too much a part “of the activities of the world” and being too “aloof” from them?
- How to meet government and public demands for accountability while preserving academic freedom and the primacy of intellectual curiosity as the mainstay of research?
- How to ensure that research enriches the education environment and education practice?
- How to strike the right balance, for faculty members, among teaching, research and service?
- How to train students through research for careers that are most often outside academe?
- How to make sure Canada’s entire postsecondary system (small, medium and large universities plus colleges) functions cohesively and offers equality of opportunity for Canadians?
- How to ensure that career incentive structures appropriately recognize new kinds of faculty contributions, including service to the broader society?
- How to help surrounding communities thrive and prosper?

Added to this situation are several new trends:

- an unprecedented wave of faculty retirements—one-third of approximately 35,000 full-time professors will leave over the next decade;
- rising student enrolments and pressures on universities to expand the total number of faculty in a highly competitive market;
- pressures on younger academics and their different expectations about the proper balance between teaching and research, and between work and family.

In sum, universities have to rethink their “contract” with society and how they organize themselves as corporate entities and institutions of higher learning.

A new research environment

In the past five years, the environment for research in Canada has dramatically altered as a result of renewed investments and the establishment of significant new funding initiatives by the federal government. In roughly chronological order, these measures include:

- establishment of the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI);
- consolidation of the Networks of Centres of Excellence (NCE) program;
- restoration of the pre-Program Review base budgets of all three federal granting agencies;
- creation of the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR);
- launch of the Initiative on the New Economy, developed and administered by SSHRC;
- launch of the Canada Research Chairs Program;
- new funding committed to support the indirect costs of research; and
- launch of the new Canada Graduate Scholarships (CGS) program.
At the same time, the nature as well as the culture of research and research training is transforming:

- There is an explosion of research activity across all university departments and outside the university walls (e.g., planning bodies, government departments, museums, non-governmental, and not-for-profit organizations). At SSHRC, there has been a relentless upswing of demand from growing numbers of university-based researchers, as well as an overall expansion of the humanities and social sciences research community, both within and without postsecondary institutions.

- Team research and networking have become more important aspects of the research enterprise than ever before.

- There is a continuing increase in problem-driven research. More and more disciplines are working together—sometimes in collaboration with partners from the natural and health sciences—to get at the multiple dimensions of these problems. In the process, existing disciplines change and new ones may appear.

- A new collective culture of “research entrepreneurship” is emerging as an important dimension of research activity in Canada. New research data centres have opened on nine Canadian campuses. New collective projects are underway to archive and access research data at the national level. New community-university research partnerships are creating new approaches to social and economic development.

- Sophisticated technology is proving increasingly important, in the humanities and social sciences alike, for accessing material and for manipulating large amounts of information. In addition, leading-edge research in several disciplines is itself shaping, even generating, new technological applications.

In sum, thanks to groundbreaking research, new ways of collaborating, access to new technologies and strong market demand for graduates, the human sciences in Canada are making inroads that are every bit as exciting, innovative and important as those made by the “hard” sciences.

### SSHRC as a Knowledge Agency

SSHRC has addressed these new challenges and trends to the extent possible within the context of its budget, its mandate and competing pressures.

Over the years, SSHRC has become proficient at supporting excellent investigator-driven research funded through rigorous and fair peer-reviewed competitions. SSHRC has also developed new programs, new models of research, new models for partnership, and strategically targeted research initiatives that alter how research is framed and the way it is carried out. For example, the Initiative on the New Economy, the Metropolis Project, Community-University Research Alliances, Major Collaborative Research Initiatives, Research/Creation Grants in the Fine Arts, and the forthcoming program to support research on Aboriginal issues all address complex social and economic issues, and are designed to have impacts outside the walls of universities. These programs forge new connections between researchers and knowledge users, between disciplines, sectors and regions, and offer outstanding new research training opportunities. They have taught us that things can be done differently and bring important new returns, including improved policy formulation and implementation.

These new programs also challenge SSHRC to go beyond current approaches to rethink its mandate to support research, scholarship, and graduate training in the human sciences. We cannot hope to address changing circumstances by tinkering around the edges, modifying a program here and adding a new one there. There are things that SSHRC is just not well equipped to deliver.
Radical change in the rest of the world calls for a willingness to consider radical measures. SSHRC must contemplate major transformations in order to engage the full range of stakeholders and satisfy the nation’s growing needs for knowledge and skills.

What we are aiming for is a new council—one that remains in charge of delivering grants awarded through peer review, but one that also directly supports and facilitates the sharing, synthesis and impact of research knowledge. In short, we are aiming for a knowledge agency. We need to work out concretely what it means for the human sciences to contribute to a knowledge society. Everyone has to take stock, both those who produce knowledge and those who rely on it to do their work effectively.

SSHRC’s Core Values

For 25 years, SSHRC has been committed to the following core principles:

**RESEARCH EXCELLENCE →** SSHRC funds excellence in research to international standards as determined by a rigorous, transparent peer-review process that is balanced by region, language, gender, discipline, and university size.

**COMPETITIVE FUNDING →** SSHRC awards can only be obtained through a competitive process at arm’s length from any political or bureaucratic pressures.

**INCLUSIVENESS AND OPENNESS →** SSHRC offers a home to all fields and types of research within its mandate, from foundational through applied scholarship. SSHRC is committed to the sharing of information and the free marketplace of ideas.

**INNOVATIVE CONTINUITY →** SSHRC fosters the constant renewal of Canada’s research capacity through training and institutional grants.

**ACCOUNTABILITY →** SSHRC is committed to the good stewardship of public funds and open reporting.

These core values will not change. We must, however, reassess how best to continue delivering on these core values under changed circumstances.

**Transformation: Reaching Beyond**

Above all, we must make sure that research is transformed into shared knowledge. To address the demand for knowledge, and not just the supply of research, SSHRC’s core values must expand to include two others:

**INTERACTIVE ENGAGEMENT →** The Council systematically supports larger, ongoing linkages and interactions through a mix of partnerships that span a diverse range of researchers, students, fields of activity, institutions, communities, regions, countries, etc.

**MAXIMUM KNOWLEDGE IMPACT →** The Council works with a range of interested parties to build greater capacity for understanding research and its applicability—and thus for maximizing the impact of knowledge—in government, business and elsewhere, in both the short and long term. As a corollary, the new council invites and takes up challenges for human sciences research that come from the non-academic sectors.

**Interactive engagement: national and international**

Canada is a will against geography. It has a relatively small population, mostly scattered across more than 5,000 kilometres. It is a federation of ten provinces and three territories, with numerous individual regions, a diverse range of First Nations peoples, two official languages, a multiplicity of cultures, 90 universities, and...
list could go on. It has no centres equivalent to Paris or London that naturally draw the best minds and greatest talents from intellectual, cultural, financial or other circles to meet and interact on a regular basis. It does not have the numerous institutions (academies, think tanks, foundations) the Americans have to move people and ideas around.

The net result for the Canadian human sciences community is that it is hard for people to know each other well, to trust each other and to work together over time and distance. Researchers and students working intensively on a given topic in one part of the country are often unaware of others who are tackling very similar or complementary issues in another part of the country. This is even true within some disciplines, contrary to the common but erroneous assumption that people should and do know each other without any particular effort.

This situation stands in sharp contrast to 20-year-old trends in the natural and bio-medical sciences, where systematic policy and financial support have made it possible for networking, shared material infrastructure, and high-impact, widely shared, knowledge-delivery systems to become the norm. For instance, in the 1980s, NSERC site visits across the country fostered personal linkages, gave a first-hand sense of how disciplines were evolving, and facilitated the development of research clusters around major equipment and facilities. More recently, programs such as the Network of Centres of Excellence (NCE) and the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) have provided additional momentum.

Creating equivalent approaches for the human sciences would dramatically increase their intensity, flexibility and capacity to address wickedly complex issues such as economic equity, wealth creation and redistribution, an increasingly fractured world, racial and ethnic discrimination, environmental sustainability, balancing of work and family, and so on. In many cases, larger and longer-term grants—but not necessarily team grants—will be necessary. There will always be a role for individual scholars. But “individual” does not mean “isolated.”

In fact, not only do human scientists need to network better throughout this country, they also have to connect more and more effectively with researchers in the rest of the world. Canada is affected by many situations, events and discoveries beyond its borders. Canadian researchers must establish an effective presence in the great

---

CANADIANS WANT MORE THAN NEW TECHNOLOGY IN THEIR FUTURE. THEY WANT KNOWLEDGE AND INNOVATION OF OTHER KINDS, INCLUDING:

- schools, universities and colleges that help young people acquire the digital literacy and cross-cultural fluency that the global knowledge economy demands;
- companies that are competitive internationally, rewarding places to work, and meet high ethical standards;
- a health care system that is innovative, caring and available when people need it;
- governments that plan for the short- and long-term using evidence obtained through research;
- safe neighbourhoods and prosperous communities;
- sustainable development and a pollution-free environment;
- a civil society that reflects their values and diverse heritages.

In short, Canadians want a society where rapid technological and commercial innovation is matched by responsive, compelling and effective social and cultural innovation in order to create not just wealth, but a better quality of life.
research centres of the world and in those international organizations (e.g., UNESCO, WHO, the World Bank, OECD) that make constant use of human science knowledge. Too much of the world’s population and too many of the world’s resources are at work beyond our borders for us to sit idle in this respect. The issues are often global in scale. We must take a proactive approach to becoming globally connected in research and discovery.

In this day and age, meaningful, intensive and fruitful connections—between researchers and students across disciplines, institutions, communities of all kinds, sectors and international borders—are a sine qua non for pushing back the boundaries of knowledge, building understanding and taking informed action.

**Maximum knowledge impact**

For more than two decades, SSHRC has supported the dissemination of human sciences research findings through traditional vehicles such as conferences and congresses, academic journals, scholarly books and meetings of academic associations. Notwithstanding some changes, SSHRC’s approach to supporting these efforts has remained fundamentally the same.

The assumption has been that as long as SSHRC supports excellent researchers and research projects, then “the system”—peer-reviewed journals, scholarly conferences, academic books and textbooks, as well as the mass media, think tanks, and students—will take care of disseminating research results. In other words, many or most of us have taken for granted that the knowledge produced will automatically trickle through to the rest of society.

This assumption does not hold. For example, as important as peer-reviewed journals continue to be, as vehicles for expert discussion, they cannot meet the needs of lay audiences. Similarly, the mass media, driven by time and market pressures, often lack awareness about what is going on in university-based research. By comparison with other countries, Canada is under-developed with respect to the kind of knowledge-brokering capacity supplied elsewhere by a range of think tanks, foundations, governmental councils, national academies and other vehicles.

[O]ur failures in the social realm stem from a failure of understanding based on informed inquiry. We cannot truly achieve the idea of a civil society until we possess the kind of deep, extensive knowledge born of research that would enable us to better understand ourselves, identify our values, define the problems, apply the solutions and construct the prosperous and humane society we all seem to aspire to.

Dr. Martha C. Piper, “Building a Civil Society: A New Role for the Human Sciences,” Annual Killam Lecture, October 24, 2002

The net result is that the human sciences in Canada are a paradox of ubiquity and invisibility: present everywhere but, for all intents and purposes, visible almost nowhere. If Canadians are to see, understand and value what these disciplines do, what they contribute, then researchers, when they define their research questions, must listen to the concerns of their fellow citizens. Researchers must also use new and different ways to share what they learn. This “two-way street” is a central requirement for enabling thoughtful public discussion, enhancing appreciation of cultural richness, and maintaining a democratic, civil society.

In its present form, SSHRC is not equipped to support the full “knowledge cycle,” from processing
requests for funding, to financing research and graduate study, to assisting knowledge take-up and use. To address the “new world, new needs” reality, SSHRC must concern itself directly with maximizing the impact of knowledge from the human sciences.

Expressed in graphic terms, there is a need for the human sciences to move:

From . . .
- geographically scattered research effort
- disciplinary silos
- disconnected from users
- fragmented knowledge-building
- isolated research agendas

To . . .
- ongoing connections across geography, institutions, and sectors
- integrated across disciplines
- integrated with decision-making, policy and practice
- synergistic research agendas
- fully connected to the world

Making this shift requires building a comprehensive understanding of the range of players and complex processes involved in using research results to generate broader understanding, more informed decision-making, enhanced wealth creation and better quality of life.

In a thought-provoking essay, “Helping Research in Education to Matter More,” a prominent Canadian researcher identifies a series of actors and processes through which research can make a difference to how people think and act. He distinguishes between research production (what research gets done, by whom, how and why), research use (who uses research, why and how) and the mediators that help in knowledge take-up (mass media, think tanks, scientific journals, lobbyists, policy entrepreneurs, Web-based communities, etc.). He emphasizes that connecting the three is far from being a simple or linear process.

As noted above, research does not automatically find its way to those who can apply and benefit from it. The situation calls for the creation of better, more systematic relationships or interfaces among producers and users of research knowledge. This includes circumstances where users would work directly with researchers to
produce knowledge, and where researchers and others, including knowledge mediators, interact regularly either informally or as members of a collaborative institution of some kind.

Again, in graphic form, we have to move:

In this context, what the Canadian human sciences research enterprise needs—and what SSHRC and others can develop—are programs and structures that would for the first time fully support the knowledge cycle by securing a cohesive and sustained movement from research to action and from action back to research. Examples of potential programs and structures are given below.

### Avenues for Solutions

There are two distinct sets of issues that need to be examined. First, this consultation is an occasion to discuss the transformation of SSHRC into a knowledge agency and the new structures and approaches that will best enable the human sciences to play their full role in the Canada of the 21st century. Second, we need to consider changes to existing approaches.

### Inventing new structures and approaches

We have argued that Canada needs to get better at connecting people and at creating more, and more effective, interfaces among producers, mediators and users of knowledge.

Some of SSHRC’s current programs have already begun to do this. In particular, the Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) program has been a spectacularly successful incubator and enabler of applied research projects that address the preoccupations of a wide variety of community organizations (including museums, municipalities, social service organizations, planning bodies, Aboriginal groups).

Several other possibilities exist:

1. **Confederations of Learning** groupings of people who share research interests beyond their disciplines, their scholarly associations, their universities or their regions. Such confederations would allow 20 to 30 researchers to interact regularly, for a certain period of time, amongst themselves as well as with various knowledge mediators, under
the guidance of a scientific director. The Canadian Institute for Advanced Research is the best example we have found of how such a confederation might work. For almost two decades, its various programs have assembled, for varying lengths of time, highly talented students and faculty to focus on complex problems—for example, the determinants of health, human development, economic growth, law and society, determinants of successful societies—and all of this in interaction with various “knowledge mediators,” private sector experts, journalists, civil servants, and so on. Confederations of learning would support people’s systematic and recurrent interactions, not their research.

2. **MORE FORMAL INSTITUTES** that focus on cross-cutting issues of major and immediate social or political importance (e.g., cities, governance, environment and sustainability, Aboriginal peoples). Institutes would typically provide a “home” to large groups of researchers (200-300) working on a given topic, would be headed by an academic director with some budget for strategic activities and would be supported by an expert council that brings in interested parties, researchers, knowledge mediators and knowledge users. Institutes would be created by SSHRC’s Board for a certain period (e.g., eight years), with explicit “sunset” provisions. SSHRC’s sister agency, CIHR, has adopted this as a model for all its activities. While the extreme diversity of disciplines and interests that fall within SSHRC’s mandate makes such a “wall-to-wall” approach impossible, with its Initiative on the New Economy, the Council is already experimenting with such a model.

3. **KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION UNITS** in universities, dedicated to the human sciences. Universities have experimented a lot over the last decade with “tech-transfer” offices in order to better commercialize the results of natural sciences research. There is no human sciences equivalent to date, only limited efforts to showcase particular researchers or research projects to the media. Yet, the array of “receptors” for human science expertise is huge. Dedicated knowledge mobilization units could look at all active researchers and work to make sure that research expertise is “made use of” in the best possible ways by organizations and groups outside of academia (e.g., school boards, museums, private companies, municipalities, government departments, media). There are several existing models available for consideration, notably Québec’s experimental Centres de Liaison et Transfert and the Université du Québec à Montréal’s Service aux collectivités.

4. **WEB-FACILITATED COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE** such as those so successfully developed by the World Bank in its efforts to become a “knowledge bank.” Using new Web-enabled technologies, the bank is able to leverage the knowledge of its employees in some 195 offices around the world and has reduced response time from nine months to as little as two days. SSHRC is already experimenting with such technology in the creation of a Web-enabled knowledge network to increase synergies among the large research teams funded through its Initiative on the New Economy (INE).

5. **A CLEARINGHOUSE FOR ADVANCED EXPERTISE** that, in collaboration with the above-mentioned knowledge mobilization units, would operate along the lines, for example, of the Brookings Institution in Washington. Such an organization could undertake as small a task as inviting a few researchers to discuss pressing issues with parliamentarians, or as large a task as staging an electronic multilingual “town hall” debate in CBC’s new facilities in downtown Ottawa.
This clearinghouse could also play the role of a speakers’ bureau. But above all, it would be an organization that would facilitate evidence-based decision making.

6. EXCHANGE/MOBILITY PROGRAMS 

that will dramatically increase, on the one hand, the number of scholars having direct, current experience of government and policy-making matters, and, on the other hand, the number of civil servants directly familiar with the latest developments in academia. Such programs could, for example, help scholars make arrangements to do postdoctoral work or spend a sabbatical in a federal, provincial or municipal government office, and encourage more civil servants to spend limited periods of time working in universities or colleges. Other programs could support ad hoc travel to working groups and establish internship programs to place graduate students and postdoctoral fellows in non-academic settings that would benefit both the students and the host institutions. The programs could operate as joint ventures between SSHRC and institutions such as the Privy Council, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) or the Conference Board of Canada.

7. ENRICHED AND CONNECTED POSTSECONDARY TRAINING ENVIRONMENTS 

funded competitively for a certain period of time. Presently, SSHRC supports graduate students through an effective but complex system that involves both universities and national assessment committees. Existing procedures focus on selecting the best and brightest applicants, but do not consider the research environment at their chosen institution. Long experience has shown, however, that performance in university departments varies a lot from one place to the next in terms of time to graduate degree completion, drop-out rates and employment prospects after graduation. The American National Science Foundation has for many years awarded “training grants,” by competition, to university departments and centres that offer the most effective training environments. The institutions that obtain such grants are then able to provide scholarships to recruit, retain and connect the best students. This approach acts as a system-wide incentive for improving graduate research training. CIHR is experimenting with a model along similar lines.

8. A HUMAN SCIENCES FOUNDATION 

funded through one or more endowments, would focus on increasing Canada’s capacity to “broker” or “mobilize” knowledge in the human sciences. Such a foundation would go some distance toward rectifying the current Canadian deficit of broad-spectrum think tanks and other organizations that are able to synthesize new ways of thinking and research breakthroughs for governments, businesses, voluntary sector agencies, media and the general public. The Trudeau Foundation and the Canada Health Services Research Foundation are two examples of independently managed organizations that have started to address these needs. A substantially endowed human sciences foundation with a broad mandate would go a long way towards creating the synergies needed to meet the country’s knowledge needs.

9. SCHOLARLY-BASED JOURNALS FOR LAY AUDIENCES 

to serve as Canadian equivalents of the New York Review of Books and the Harvard Business Review, both periodicals that render highly specialized knowledge into accessible prose for citizens and stakeholders. Producing this type of publication requires a significant stable of professional writers. Which audiences should be targeted? At least two such publications have been recently launched in Canada, but will market forces alone supply what is needed? Does SSHRC have a role to play here and, if it does, what kind of role?

SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL OF CANADA → CONSULTATION FRAMEWORK
Improving current programs

For such a knowledge council to become a reality will require new structures and approaches. Inevitably, any discussion of SSHRC’s transformation must also include a review of existing programs and how they can contribute to this larger goal.

Table 1 below summarizes SSHRC’s program structures. It shows that, over the years, SSHRC has evolved programs to accommodate junior and senior researchers, working individually or in teams or networks, in disciplinary or interdisciplinary modes, to answer pressing knowledge needs or to pursue matters of individual curiosity; to support doctoral and master’s students; and to facilitate research dissemination and capacity building. These programs have been managed through straightforward adjudication and administrative processes at a reasonable cost.

In discussing SSHRC’s transformation, we have to place several questions on the table:

1. SMALLER “OPERATING” GRANTS TO MORE PEOPLE? → Some people have repeatedly argued that SSHRC should handle the Standard Research Grants (SRG) program much as NSERC does its Discovery Grants program. The idea is to provide successful applicants with seed money—say $10,000 to $15,000 annually for three or more years—on the basis of the researcher’s track record rather than on his or her proposed program of research. Such a “seed funding” approach would allow SSHRC to support up to 60 or even 70 per cent of current applicants—compared to 40 per cent at present—within the existing budgetary envelope. Moreover, this approach would address the perennial problem of the “4A” category—proposals that are recommended by selection committees but not funded owing to SSHRC’s budgetary limitations. It would provide all recommended applicants with stable base funding to support research and research-related activities. Researchers who required additional support would have to apply for additional grants through other competitive programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE RESEARCH BASE</th>
<th>TRAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Standard Research Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major Collaborative Research Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Doctoral Fellowships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Postdoctoral Fellowships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Canada Graduate Scholarship program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGETED PROGRAMS</th>
<th>RESEARCH COMMUNICATION AND INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Initiative on the New Economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic Themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research Development Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community-University Research Alliances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conferences &amp; Congresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research and Transfer Journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SSHRC Institutional Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aid to Small Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aid to Scholarly Publications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. LARGER RESEARCH GRANTS TO FEWER PEOPLE? → Others have argued almost exactly the opposite: that the Council should support, but with more money, only the most obviously excellent programs of research. This could mean, for instance, that much more money would go into the MCRI (Major Collaborative Research Initiatives) program and less into Standard Research Grants (SRG). This would mirror the direction CIHR has been taking, which has the advantages of internationally competitive levels of funding, extremely favourable training conditions for elite students, and the consolidation of world-class expertise in certain nationally recognized centres.

3. SPECIAL SUPPORT FOR YOUNG SCHOLARS? → Sustaining the excellence of human sciences research over time depends directly on the continuous recruitment of new talent. Unlike the Fonds québécois de la recherche sur la nature et les technologies (previously FCAR), SSHRC has no program dedicated to supporting young scholars at the beginning of their careers nor does it have a specific program to provide research training opportunities for undergraduates during the summer months. Likewise, SSHRC has no mentoring programs for young faculty such as the Capacity for Applied and Developmental Research and Evaluation (CADRE) program of the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation. Should focused programs of this sort be introduced to boost the careers of talented new researchers or to encourage young people to plan a research career in the human sciences?

4. PROMOTE GREATER RELEVANCE, SYNERGY AND IMPACT OF STRATEGIC GRANTS? → Under current arrangements, SSHRC’s individual strategic grants programs operate in isolation from each other and from the Council’s other funding programs. Strategic programs are incubators for:
   - New research intended to inform decision making on issues of importance to society (e.g., literacy, the new economy, the environment, Aboriginal people).
   - Development of new research approaches and tools (e.g., CURA, Research Development Initiatives, Research/Creation Grants in Fine Arts) that change the way research is done.

Priority issues are usually identified by SSHRC’s Board, with the grants awarded, typically, to larger, usually multidisciplinary team projects. Some of SSHRC’s past joint initiatives have had demonstrable impact on policy making and capacity building. And the number of requests from organizations interested in partnering with SSHRC in this way has been steadily increasing. Should SSHRC invest more in targeted research? What can be done to build more far-reaching synergies that will link researchers funded under these strategic programs with researchers working on complementary topics funded under the Standard Research Grants program? How can SSHRC promote more stakeholder involvement in deciding priority areas for strategic investments?

5. DIFFERENT/NEW SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH COMMUNICATIONS? → Over the last decade, SSHRC’s programs for supporting research communications have remained essentially the same, with the same funding allocation. SSHRC provides limited, partial funding that helps successful applicants leverage additional support from other sources. The current system appears to work reasonably well, but may need revisiting to ensure its continuing effectiveness. For example, to what extent do current approaches take proper advantage of new communications technologies? What new approaches are there to organizing conferences and congresses that could increase their effectiveness and
impacts? What, if any, alternative structures or strategies could make the annual Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences a more effective vehicle for communicating research knowledge? Are the existing scholarly associations the best vehicles for this purpose?

6. NEW OR DIFFERENT SUPPORT TO INSTITUTIONS? At present, there are two programs that help Canadian postsecondary institutions develop their research capacity: SSHRC Institutional Grants (SIG) and Aid to Small Universities (ASU). SSHRC is the only federal granting council that offers such programs. What, if any, role should such programs continue to play? Should they be targeted to help universities overcome particular local or other barriers? Should they be restructured as “matching” programs that would require an equal contribution from provincial governments? Should they be phased out entirely? Should SSHRC devolve to universities more responsibility for deciding what activities receive funding?

7. DEVELOPMENT OF MORE COLLECTIVE TOOLS FOR RESEARCH? With the assistance of the Canada Foundation for Innovation, a number of collective tools for human sciences research have been developed over the last few years, where almost none existed before. The best known are the Research Data Centres that allow decentralized access to Statistics Canada longitudinal survey data, but there are others. Researchers are now asking SSHRC to play a role in developing additional collective tools and to look for new opportunities where such tools could be useful. For example, what about encouraging more “editorial projects” to apply to CFI? What about, in the context of an emerging culture of “secondary data analysis,” SSHRC establishing a pan-Canadian research data archiving system? The key question is: should SSHRC, in partnership with other institutions, do more to promote the development of collective tools and if so, how?

A New, More Flexible Knowledge Council

Over the past 25 years, SSHRC has responded to evolving needs much as a growing family might add to an existing house a room at a time to accommodate new family members. SSHRC
started out by offering essentially two funding programs: Standard Research Grants and Doctoral Fellowships. Thereafter, the Council added new programs and subtracted others, so that today it resembles a somewhat gerrymandered building that lacks overall coherence.

Continuing the architectural metaphor, what Canada needs today is a SSHRC that is more organically structured, that is “wired” for interactive engagement and maximum knowledge impact, and that offers adaptable “rooms” that can be readily “renovated” and adapted to accommodate changing circumstances.

The true extent of transformation into a knowledge agency would become apparent only over time. Imagine a new SSHRC five years after the beginning of its expanded mandate: by then, in addition to regular research funding support, the agency could have fostered the development of:

15-20 CONFEDERATIONS OF LEARNING ⇒ on topics as diverse as medieval history, science as a human construct, trade within the Americas, cultural diasporas, election reform, evolution of minority rights, synergies between humanities and social sciences methodologies;

5-8 INSTITUTES ⇒ dedicated to, for example, Aboriginal issues, language acquisition, governance and the polity, the future of cities, globalization and free trade, environment and sustainability;

2 OR 3 SCHOLARLY-BASED JOURNALS ⇒ on issues of interest to lay audiences in such sectors as government, business, social economy and education;

A PAN-CANADIAN CLEARINGHOUSE ⇒ for advanced expertise in the human sciences; and

MORE STABLE FINANCING ⇒ for a larger proportion of the human sciences research community.

SSHRC is commissioning “focus” papers to explore in greater detail some of the questions and possibilities outlined above and their implications for all stakeholders. We will publish these papers on SSHRC’s Web site as they become available.
Suggested Questions for Discussion

We would like to hear your views about and thoughtful reactions to the issues presented in this paper. To help spark spirited and creative discussion, we ask that you consider the following questions. You are free—and indeed encouraged—to provide additional comments and feedback on any other issues and questions that you think need to be addressed. Dare to think big!

**BASIC GOALS AND VALUES** → To what extent does the vision of a knowledge agency presented here—including its basic goals and values—resonate with your own sense of what Canada requires to strengthen human sciences research and training for the challenges of this century? We have suggested that such trends as problem-focused, multidisciplinary approaches, increased and more effective dissemination, mobilization and transfer of knowledge, increased “partnering,” a greater public presence for human sciences researchers and scholars, and knowledge brokering, are all fundamental for the future. How can researchers and their disciplines engage these trends most proactively and productively?

**NEW PROGRAMS AND APPROACHES** → What advantages and disadvantages do you see in the new adaptive structures that this paper outlines for a transformed SSHRC—the confederations of learning, institutes, knowledge mobilization units, Web-facilitated communities of practice, clearings houses for advanced expertise, exchange/mobility programs, the human sciences foundation, enhanced training environments and popular scholarly journals? What alternatives can you suggest? What importance do you attach to SSHRC investing in the full value chain of research—from the most upstream to the most downstream, from the most foundational to the most applied, from the most disinterested (knowledge for knowledge’s sake) to the most market- or client-driven, and from knowledge creation to knowledge brokering and mobilization?

**IMPROVING CURRENT PROGRAMS** → What do you think about funding a greater number of scholars through ongoing but small operating grants? Larger research grants for fewer researchers? Collective research tools? Research communications? Special support for young scholars? What kind? New synergies around strategic grants? How? New or different support for capacity building within institutions?

**INCREASING LINKAGES AND KNOWLEDGE FLOWS OUTSIDE UNIVERSITIES** → To what extent does the research with which you are familiar involve new kinds of research partners outside the university? What is working well and what isn’t? What kinds of support, financial or otherwise, could make these relationships optimally productive? What groups or institutions should the new knowledge agency partner with? What roles should be taken on by the various players: SSHRC, universities, disciplines, publishers, the voluntary sector, labour, business, think tanks, government organizations and the media? How can SSHRC help develop a greater receptor capacity for human science knowledge? What strategies and approaches could help to get better “mileage” and larger impact from the annual Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences and from the ACFAS congress?

**NEXT STEPS** → Assuming establishment of a full-spectrum knowledge agency, what new structures should it create first? And what should be the sequence of priorities thereafter?
Getting Your Ideas to Us

If you are working at or formally associated with a university:

Please convey your thoughts concerning the issues raised in this consultation document, as well as any additional issues you may wish to raise, through the SSHRC representative that your university has named to integrate all input from your campus. You can also write to us at president@sshrc.ca.

If you are an individual or group not associated with a university:

Please write to us with your input at president@sshrc.ca or contact SSHRC’s Corporate Policy and Planning Division (613) 992-5128 to organize a meeting. Check SSHRC’s Web site (www.sshrc.ca) for additional information and other opportunities to participate in the consultation.

How We Will Use Your Input

In summer 2004, SSHRC will undertake a synthesis of all the input received from university administrators, researchers, and students, as well as community organizations, government and all other institutions that look to human sciences research to inform their thinking, understanding and decision making. Check SSHRC’s Web site (www.sshrc.ca) for news and reports about transformation developments.

For more information on SSHRC and the human sciences research community, please refer to Background Facts for the Consultation on SSHRC’s Transformation, available on the SSHRC Web site.
January 12, 2004

To the Members of the Humanities and Social Sciences Community:

The Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences is pleased to partner with the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada in this very important consultation with the community. Through its members – 69 scholarly associations and 71 universities and colleges – the Federation represents over 30,000 researchers, practitioners and students in the human sciences and has advocated on their behalf since the 1940s.

We believe that the transformation of SSHRC, our primary granting agency, is one of the most important moments in the collective history of the human sciences in Canada. Without excellence in the human sciences, we cannot meet the needs of the next generation of Canadians. To achieve excellence we must have both the resources and the structures that will allow us to succeed. The Federation looks forward to working closely with our member associations, SSHRC and other bodies to cultivate an environment that enables research based on qualities of breadth (inclusiveness and flexibility), depth (sophistication and excellence), curiosity (foundational knowledge) and effectiveness (outcomes) – in short, research that makes a difference.

The manner in which the consultation evolves will have a profound impact on our research and pedagogy. This consultation must be transparent and open to the divergent ideas that will likely arise. It must also be inclusive and inviting to all women and men of varying race, ethnicity, disability and sexual orientation. Most of all, though, the consultation must be constructive and focussed on the end goal – effective levels of support via a variety of programs that produce leading-edge research. While the Federation will be consulted throughout the entire process, our specific role will be to lead the consultation with scholarly associations across the humanities and social sciences. This will include a meeting of association presidents in March as well as sessions at Congress. The Federation’s work with the community thus complements the SSHRC campus-based consultation and brings a distinctive and important perspective on the overall issue.

From the earliest discussions on the subject the Federation has been committed to two things. First, we strongly advocate that the federal government round out its significant investment in the post-secondary area by increasing the funds allocated to the humanities and social sciences. Second, we recognize that we must develop the structures to ensure that our community can make the most effective contribution to knowledge and culture possible. We have a vital role to play in Canada’s future and, as a community, we must discuss how best to fulfil that role in the 21st century.

Yours truly,

Doug Owram, FRSC
President
Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences
January 22, 2004

To the Members of the Humanities and Social Sciences Community

As the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada embarks on the national consultation phase of its process to transform into a knowledge council, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada is pleased to support SSHRC’s effort to engage a broad array of stakeholders in this important dialogue. Social sciences and humanities researchers make crucial contributions to a prosperous, innovative and caring society. Scholars in the human sciences explore questions of social, cultural, economic and political significance, which give Canadians the critical tools they need to make informed decisions in an era of constant change.

AUCC has consistently recognized the value and impact that this research has in helping Canadians understand and adjust to the changing world around them. Indeed, it was an AUCC member, Dr. Martha Piper, who catalyzed the discussion around the transformation of SSHRC through her 2002 Killam Lecture entitled “Building a Civil Society: A New Role for the Human Sciences”. Her widely read speech drew attention to the fact that increased research and scholarship in the social sciences and humanities is essential if we are to build a civil society.

Through this transformation exercise, SSHRC seeks to foster a culture of collaboration and interaction within and across academic disciplines and among researchers, communities and knowledge users, and to become an active player across the full cycle of knowledge. University administrators, as the strategic coordinators of research on their campuses and in affiliated institutions, will play an important role in helping SSHRC to realize these goals. As partners in the consultation process, AUCC members will facilitate innovative and interactive campus dialogues, whereby university researchers, administrators and local communities can discuss and debate the opportunities and challenges of transforming SSHRC into an active promoter of knowledge transfer and a catalyst for relationship-building.

AUCC looks forward to the results of this consultation process and will continue to underscore the importance of a properly funded social sciences and humanities council. We strongly believe that Canada must support and encourage human sciences research as it is vital to our understanding of ourselves, our communities, our country and our place in the world.

Yours sincerely,

Robert J. Giroux
President

600-350 Albert Ottawa ON Canada K1R 1B1
Phone/Tél.: (613)563-1236  Fax/Téléc.: (613)563-9745
www.aucc.ca
January 26, 2004

To the Members of the Humanities and Social Science Community:

The Canadian Association for Graduate Studies (CAGS) looks forward to being an interested and active partner in the consultation process to be undertaken by SSHRC as it renews its support for research and scholarship as well as graduate training in the human sciences. As an association dedicated to the growth of knowledge through the development of future generations of researchers, CAGS has followed the national discussion on the transformation of human science research from the moment Martha Piper introduced the concept in her Killam lecture delivered at the annual 2002 CAGS conference until today. We are strongly committed to Canada’s national agenda of producing highly qualified scholars and researchers who will move this country’s cultural and social agenda forward, today and for years to come.

Carving out a new and dynamic role for the human sciences in Canada will and, CAGS believes, must include a place of priority for the education of graduate students and the training of postdoctoral researchers. We encourage SSHRC to place issues surrounding graduate funding and graduate education centrally in the discussions that lead to its transformation. Among central issues for the future of the human sciences in Canada are various types of graduate student funding, new and innovative graduate training that leads to both cutting edge research and timely completion rates, and modalities for developing graduate student mobility. Our association encourages Canadian universities to engage CAGS members in the SSHRC campus-based consultation process so that we may together create this future in the most meaningful way possible. As an association, we will strongly encourage the involvement of our membership in the consultation process.

We anticipate that SSHRC’s consultation and renewal will stimulate a vigorous exchange of views and will lead to innovative ways of undertaking and utilizing research and scholarship in a peer-reviewed and knowledge-based context. To this end, CAGS has supported and continues to support appropriate levels of funding to the human sciences; levels that will permit both research students and researchers alike to help this nation assume social and cultural leadership on a world wide level. We believe the meaningful transformation of SSHRC has the potential to propel Canada forward into assuming such leadership at the highest levels.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

John Lennox,
President
Canadian Association for Graduate Studies
Montréal, 27 janvier 2004

To all ACFAS members in the social sciences and humanities:

The Association francophone pour le savoir is pleased to support the extensive consultations that the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council will be conducting with stakeholders in the social sciences and humanities.

For 80 years, ACFAS has been fulfilling its mission of fostering scientific activity, encouraging research and disseminating knowledge. Because it is well aware of the key role research plays in developing our society, ACFAS wishes to contribute to the process and give it added impetus and meaning by backing the SSHRC initiative.

In our view, the results of the consultations will have major impact on the continued existence and development of the knowledge-based society. Accordingly, in a spirit of partnership, ACFAS will make an information forum available to SSHRC during its annual conference.

The discussions and information sharing that are critical to the future of SSHRC will, we hope, focus on the challenges that must be met by all stakeholders in the social sciences and humanities in Canada.

Christine Martel
Directrice générale
Endnotes

1. The expression “human sciences” is used here as sciences humaines is used in French to capture both the social sciences and humanities disciplines. In doing so, we are reclaiming the definition of “science” as a structured way of knowing, rather than limiting it to a particular set of methods such as those used in the “natural sciences.” On this topic, see Open the Social Sciences: Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences, Stanford University Press, 1996. The term “human sciences” also provides a concise way to refer to all SSHRC-eligible disciplines.

2. Godin, Benoit, 2002. The Social Sciences in Canada: What Can We Learn from Bibliometrics? Working paper no. 1, as quoted in Commission on the Social Sciences: Great Expectation: The Social Sciences in Britain, March 2003, p.56. This study has been criticized for a number of methodological problems, including that the Social Science Citation Index does not fully capture citations and other indicators for publications in languages other than English. Moreover, it does not capture data on humanities disciplines.

3. In addition to SSHRC, the other two federal granting agencies are the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the latter of which was preceded by the Medical Research Council of Canada (MRC).

4. SSHRC now supports around 25 per cent of the 18,000 faculty members in human sciences. This is up from 15 per cent five years ago. With increases of 10 to 15 per cent a year in the number of applications to the Standard Research Grants program, SSHRC’s budget cannot fund the increasing number of high quality researchers.

5. With each new program introduced by SSHRC, it has been striking to see applications from whole new groups of academics and diverse clusters of non academics. The Initiative on the New Economy has been a major catalyst for an intensified research culture in business schools and faculties of education. The program in fine arts has enlarged SSHRC’s community to include artist-researchers. Our forthcoming targeted theme on Aboriginal people will similarly enhance research participation. The CURA program has made it possible for a range of research-oriented community organizations to participate, along with university researchers, in the SSHRC-supported research enterprise.
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Introduction

In January 2004, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) launched national consultations with the aim of renewing the social sciences and humanities research enterprise in Canada. Recognizing the crucial role these disciplines play in wealth creation, civic engagement, and the well-being of Canadians in an increasingly globalized world, where the most precious currency is knowledge, SSHRC asked its stakeholder communities: How can Canada most effectively develop and apply social sciences and humanities research and research training for the benefit of all? In this “transformation” initiative, the Council proposed extending its role from that of a “granting council” which promotes and supports research to that of a “knowledge council” which is also concerned with the influence and impact of the knowledge won through research.

SSHRC also asked researchers and users of research to reflect and comment on the addition of two new values to those that underpin the Council’s mandate: “interactive engagement” and “maximum knowledge impact.”

The Council was joined in this initiative by the Association francophone pour le savoir, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, the Canadian Association for Graduate Studies, and the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences. SSHRC also benefited from close collaboration with 81 universities, 71 scholarly associations, the Association of Community Colleges of Canada, the Canada Research Chairs Secretariat, the Centre for Voluntary Sector Research and Development, and the Fonds québécois de la recherche sur la société et la culture. Also involved were the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Canadian Federation of Students. In addition, SSHRC held direct consultations with voluntary and non-profit sector organizations, community-based research organizations, non-governmental organizations, philanthropic foundations, think tanks and federal government departments. Finally, the Council commissioned several studies to examine specific subjects relevant to the initiative.

Months of intense discussion, hundreds of meetings, and thousands of pages in reports and studies, resulted in a genuine consensus, among both researchers and research users, that SSHRC should add “interactive engagement” and “maximum knowledge impact” to its core values. In addition, stakeholders provided thoughtful suggestions for strengthening the foundations of scholarship and research training, building better connections among researchers and between researchers and users of research, and for maximizing the impact of social sciences and humanities research for the benefit of all Canadians.

The consultation has generated deep and broad support for an expanded role for SSHRC. The Council is grateful for the leadership and support of its partners and the thoughtful engagement of researchers and research users across the country. The commitment of these individuals and organizations made it possible to bring together scholars, students and citizens to discuss and debate a host of interrelated issues. This in turn led to the creation of new partnerships beyond academia and to a keener awareness of the social value of all social sciences and humanities research. Moreover, it reawakened a sense of pride in the Canadian research enterprise’s ability to address the most complex and critical issues facing society.

---

SSHRC now looks forward to fulfilling its role as a “knowledge council.” It took the first step toward doing so in summer 2004 by calling on the research community to start developing “strategic research clusters.”

The present document presents an analysis, from the Council’s perspective, of three key aspects of the consultation: (1) a “campus dialogue” that produced reports from universities and scholarly associations; (2) a “dialogue beyond academy” that generated reports from community colleges and researchers in the non-profit and voluntary sector, as well as summaries of roundtable discussions with other stakeholder groups; and (3) a series of commissioned studies on a number of key issues.

Five appendices supplement the analysis: Appendix 1 sets out SSHRC’s core values. Appendix 2 explains the engagement strategy used for the consultations. Appendix 3 lists the partners, collaborators and contributing organizations that participated in the consultation process. Appendix 4 lists the studies that SSHRC commissioned to supplement the consultations. Finally, Appendix 5 lists the proposals funded to develop a “strategic research clusters” program.
The Importance of Engagement and Impact in a Knowledge Society

Social sciences and humanities research informs all aspects of our lives, from understanding the causes of poverty to helping build more competitive industries. It provides the foundations for sounder social policies and for the human understanding on which true innovation depends. It enriches our knowledge of ourselves, our histories, our cultures, our successes and failures, our world.

Three overriding messages emerged from the consultations. Each underlines the importance of the Council’s efforts to support increased engagement and to maximize the impact of research knowledge.

1. **Canada depends on social sciences and humanities research.** In a time of rapid change and growing social, economic and cultural complexity, the need for understanding is tremendous and often unpredictable. There is an urgency among public, voluntary and private sector organizations to understand the ever-evolving environment in which they work, to develop the tools to analyze vast amounts of data with confidence, and to be able to respond to challenges that seem to come out of nowhere (as they did on September 11, 2001).

2. **Social sciences and humanities research is no longer just academic.** Because of this demand for evidence, analysis and understanding, organizations that would never have done so in the past—or would have never done so intensively—are now conducting social sciences and humanities research. Non-profit and voluntary sector organizations, philanthropic foundations and government departments—even those constrained by limited resources—are building or seeking to build the capacity to carry out and apply the results of social sciences and humanities research, often in partnership with university researchers.

3. **Researchers recognize the need to maximize the impact of their work on Canadian society.** As a result of these changes, researchers in universities and non-academic organizations alike are addressing new subjects, adopting new approaches and applying new methodologies. At the same time, scholars who use traditional research methods are also seeking to communicate their work more effectively and to broader audiences. Much is already being done on university campuses and elsewhere to maximize the impact of social sciences and humanities research; often, though, the effectiveness of these measures is constrained by very limited systemic support.

Taken together, these three messages reveal a nation in transition as Canadians seek to create a thriving knowledge society in a world of growing economic integration, increasing social complexity and rapid technological change.
Campus Dialogue

The analysis of reports from universities and scholarly associations reveals strong support for efforts to increase the broad impact of social sciences and humanities research on society. At the same time, however, there is considerable concern that a too-narrow definition of “impact” may devalue fundamental research—humanities research in particular—in a way that would unduly limit the diverse contributions of social sciences and humanities research to Canadian society.

A. Strengthening the foundations of research to enhance discovery and deepen understanding

University researchers point to the crucial importance of SSHRC’s system of independent peer-review as a guarantee of both intellectual rigour and the freedom to pursue diverse and innovative research agendas. They argue that their work already has a vital impact that is essential to preserve, both on the development of new knowledge within their disciplines, achieved through scholarly articles and conference papers, and on society more broadly, achieved through teaching, expert contributions to public debate and the mass media. Scholars assert that, collectively, their teaching and expert contributions are already indispensable for Canadians to understand a wide and unpredictable range of complex issues.

University researchers identify a number of factors that currently limit their ability to maximize the impact of the knowledge they have developed through research:

The single most important factor is the lack of funding for a sufficient range of fundamental, investigator-driven research. At present, SSHRC funds less than one-third of all eligible scholars and most of these do not receive continuous support. This leaves many excellent researchers, including large numbers of new scholars and researchers in smaller institutions, without sufficient support and, in many cases, without any support whatsoever. The result is research that is delayed or diminished, and scholars who are discouraged, disengaged, and ripe for departure to greener pastures. All this undermines the diversity, creativity and sustainability of social sciences and humanities research in Canada.

The lack of stable funding also limits researchers’ ability to conduct innovative, higher-risk research. Even modest levels of stable funding can sustain excellence in some disciplines, facilitate collaborative community-based research projects, and provide flexibility for institutions, communities and scholars seeking to establish their own research strengths. Without such predictable support for research, much innovative work and many training opportunities are lost.

New scholars—those taking up their first faculty positions—play a crucial role in developing innovative research. They bring new methodologies, approaches and subjects to the fore, while addressing new social problems and cultural questions. Today, new scholars make up a greater proportion of the scholarly community than ever before—and their numbers are growing. Yet, in securing research funding, they face daunting challenges: they must establish sometimes controversial research programs, prove their scholarly abilities, and carry heavy teaching, administrative and service loads—often while also raising young families. To ensure the future quality, creativity and impact of Canadian research, new scholars need support to establish their research and reputations.
Canadian communities of all sizes are increasingly turning to the country’s network of smaller liberal arts universities and university colleges for research knowledge as well as for teaching. Helping these institutions meet this rising demand, by contributing resources and expertise to strengthen their research cultures, can extend both the variety of social sciences and humanities research in Canada and its impact in all regions of the country. Realizing this potential represents both a crucial challenge and an important opportunity.

It is increasingly important for Canadians to participate in, learn from and shape national and international networks in and outside academe. These are the foundation for innovative and cutting-edge research of global importance and impact. Without such participation, we risk severely limiting Canada’s ability to exercise leadership on the international research stage. More importantly, perhaps, Canadian scholarship risks losing its vitality and its ability to contribute to the well-being of Canadians.

Finally, Canada lacks adequate infrastructure for innovative research in the social sciences and humanities. This applies to both the smaller-scale research that is not eligible for funding from the Canada Foundation for Innovation, and large-scale projects such as longitudinal surveys, major editorial projects and research data centres.

A knowledge society depends above all upon an innovative, vigorous and diverse knowledge base. Canada has already laid such a foundation, but one which, without regular maintenance and careful expansion, will not support the country in years to come.

B. Expanding learning and diversifying skills through research

Scholars also recognize the impact of their work in training graduate students as skilled researchers. The Council’s master’s, doctoral and postdoctoral awards programs (including the Canada Graduate Scholarships program) provide essential direct support for graduate students. This encourages and enables our best students to develop a diversity of research methodologies, approaches and subjects that stimulate innovation and maximize impact over decades. Moreover, in the case of students who, after graduation, move on to employment outside academe, their expertise builds the active capacity to conduct research and the receptor capacity to apply research in other sectors of society—a value-added that cannot be overestimated.

University researchers identify three key issues that currently affect research training:

Too often, high attrition rates and long time-to-completion characterize graduate programs in the social sciences and humanities. The deleterious effects on students, institutions and the national research culture are not surprising, though not readily quantifiable. At the same time, universities work to improve the quality of their graduate programs while struggling with record-high operating costs. It is clear that these problems cannot be overcome simply by increasing direct support for students. Rather, the Council needs to broaden its focus to consider the full training experience. This means finding new ways to support the creation of improved environments for training, with accountability at the institution or association level, so that students:

- have greater access to established professional networks;
- develop a wider range of expertise and broader experience;
- hone their skills for work in and outside academe; and
- have access to a larger network of colleagues.
Research training at the undergraduate level, once little considered, is now recognized as important in its own right. Such training supports the quality, range and impact of work done by scholars in institutions without graduate programs; it also prepares students for research careers as well as many other careers that require or benefit from a sound understanding of research. Supporting the integration of research training into undergraduate studies will substantially increase the capacity for undertaking and utilizing research in all sectors of society.

For their own part, many academic researchers indicate that they need to develop new skills throughout their careers in order to undertake new forms of research and to disseminate research results in new ways. These researchers call for greater opportunities to develop new skills—in interdisciplinary research, community-based research, and in knowledge mobilization—at various points in their careers.

Improving and extending support for research training will increase the quality and breadth of Canadian research and, in the long term, significantly improve public awareness, interest, understanding and application of research results.

C. Mobilizing knowledge for maximum impact

SSHRC’s transformation consultations show that many scholars—often without formal assistance or recognition—already work with community groups, communicate research results to a broad public and seek, in myriad ways, to contribute their knowledge directly to society. At the same time, scholars actively seek Council assistance in contributing more directly to public understanding and debate, government policy-making, and organizational decision-making.

University researchers argue that “maximum impact” of social sciences and humanities research depends on: (1) their own ability to disseminate their work more widely, (2) the ability of research users to understand the meaning and significance of research findings, and (3) the ability of research producers and users to regularly exchange knowledge in person, in print and through other media.

SSHRC can play a greater role in facilitating the exchange of researchers between disciplines, regions, and senior and junior levels, as well as the exchange of knowledge and experience between researchers and practitioners in all sectors of society. Such exchanges spark new ideas, stimulate new methodologies, and offer a breadth of new expertise and potential for rapid innovation. By building trust among participants, these exchanges also facilitate future communication and collaboration. At present, SSHRC’s travel grants for scholarly associations and its Aid to Research Workshops and Conferences in Canada program provide critical support for these activities, but they do not go far enough. In particular, there is a lack of exchanges among, and movement between, intellectual centres and the regions, French and English Canada, and non-academic and academic organizations.

The Council has long supported the exchange of research findings within the scholarly community through its support to scholarly associations, and through its Aid to Research and Transfer Journals and Aid to Scholarly Publications programs. For their part, scholars report that these programs no longer provide sufficient support for the exchange of ideas within the research community, let alone between researchers and the broader public. Scholars call on SSHRC to develop a system of support for scholarly associations, to modernize its criteria of support for electronic publications, and to create a searchable electronic database of scholars and their work for both professional and lay audiences. Such measures would substantially increase and diversify the long-term impact of research in the social sciences and humanities.
Scholars also seek ways to build more focused engagement among researchers working within and outside academe. The Community-University Research Alliances program, SSHRC’s Joint Initiatives programs and Canada’s many scholarly associations offer proven models for supporting relationships, linking people from different parts of the country and sectors of society, and building the visibility and impact of research. SSHRC needs to more systematically apply the lessons learned from these initiatives to its efforts in knowledge exchange and public dissemination.

Better “clustering” the nation’s research efforts—that is, systematically bringing together researchers and research users with shared interests and expertise in selected areas—can enrich and advance existing research, and maximize its impact both within and outside academe. Such “strategic clusters” would not necessarily fund research or involve researchers in excessive administration, but would add value to existing forms of engagement among academics and practitioners, and thereby increase the impact of research in areas of excellence and pressing social need.

Improving the mobilization of knowledge is essential to the development of a knowledge society.

D. A new leadership role for SSHRC

As an integral part of the university research community, SSHRC plays a critical role in maintaining public support for scholarship that is adjudicated and funded at arm’s length from political influence. The Council also plays a representative role that has increased as scholars expand their activities beyond the academic community and Canada’s borders. SSHRC works with researchers and practitioners in all sectors of society and liaises with scholars and granting agencies in other disciplines and in other countries. It seeks opportunities for Canadians, develops common policies and practices, and promotes Canadian research.

Scholars themselves suggest that the Council has a role to play within the Canadian research enterprise in (1) advancing discussions on the value of public scholarship, (2) developing tools for improving the communication skills of individual researchers, and (3) developing tools to maximize the effectiveness of university-community partnerships.

There is a strong consensus among scholars on the need for a more systematic and comprehensive approach to maximizing the impact of social sciences and humanities research. The impact of research does, and must, vary depending on the discipline, topic or issue, approach and methodology, as well as on the institution, community and intended audience. Impact is found in the perspective it provides individuals and communities, in the ideas it brings to public debate, in the evidence-based tools it makes available to policy makers and practitioners, and in new research projects. The impact of social sciences and humanities research is found in the knowledge and decisions taken by individuals and organizations in all spheres of human activity. In short, the impact and value of social sciences and humanities research pervades Canadian society. And the contribution this impact makes can only be developed through a concerted national effort that infuses every aspect of the Council’s activities.
Dialogue Beyond Academe

In the past decade, researchers and research users in community colleges, non-profit and voluntary sector organizations, business and labour organizations, philanthropic foundations, think tanks, museums and galleries, and government departments and agencies have significantly increased their involvement in social sciences and humanities research. Working both independently and in partnership with university researchers, they have broadened and deepened their engagement in applied social and cultural research, and have mobilized new knowledge to advance current social, economic and cultural objectives. Their collective effort represents both an important response to growing economic integration and social complexity and offers clear evidence that Canadians are building a knowledge society.

A. Conducting research in diverse contexts

Since the mid-1990s, the number of non-profit and voluntary sector organizations actively involved in research has increased significantly, while community colleges, philanthropic foundations, think tanks and government departments have all broadened and deepened their research activities. Although their interests and perspectives vary considerably, these organizations are committed to intellectually rigorous work that shapes public policy and improves social, business and cultural services in communities across the country.

This diversity represents an important strength for the social sciences and humanities research enterprise. It brings, to the subjects and methodologies employed, originality, breadth and responsiveness to societal needs while, at the same time, multiplying the avenues available for effecting change. Researchers in community colleges increasingly conduct pedagogical research and collaborate with local service organizations and businesses as an extension of curriculum and community development partnerships. Community-based organizations hire researchers and partner with universities in order to better address pressing local needs. Philanthropic foundations focus resources on community concerns, transdisciplinary methodologies, research evaluation and effective dissemination methods. Think tanks advance policy alternatives through in-house research, funded scholarship and extensive social networks. Government researchers develop and evaluate public policy and practice, fund research projects, maintain contacts in all sectors and contribute a deep understanding of the research-policy interface.

Maximizing such diverse organizations’ potential to conduct and mobilize applied research represents one of the principal challenges and opportunities for Canada in the years ahead. This entails recognition of the value and distinctive characteristics of applied social and cultural research, and a concerted effort to build on the strengths and surmount the limitations of all organizations engaged in it.

Applied research often creates new knowledge by developing practical applications for the findings of fundamental research. There are, however, important distinctions to be made between fundamental and applied research, including the definition of research, the development of research topics, the choice of methodologies, the participation of research subjects, and the recognition and communication of research findings. Most importantly, engagement with users or beneficiaries of research knowledge is central to the design of applied social and cultural research projects, and it is this that drives dissemination efforts. Evaluation criteria and indicators need to be developed to take these dimensions into account.
B. Building research capacity through partnerships

Colleges, universities, non-profit and voluntary sector organizations, philanthropic foundations, think tanks and government departments all bring different strengths and limitations to applied social and cultural research. All, however, are handicapped by the lack of a concerted multi-sectoral effort to train researchers and research users in, and provide funding for, applied research.

Some universities collaborate with other organizations to offer internships for faculty and graduate students outside academe, and for non-academic researchers on campus. These initiatives broaden the skills of academics working off-campus and build the capacity and the personal and institutional connections for conducting and using applied research. However, there are too few such programs moving people and ideas between organizations to support a thriving knowledge society.

While many non-academic organizations have begun increasing their capacity to conduct and use applied social and cultural research, all lack the resources to adequately invest in it themselves. Most organizations—including governments—restrict their activities to specific projects that respond to the most immediate needs of their constituencies. Longer-term work, larger projects, comparative research, syntheses of existing studies and methodological research go largely without funding.

Researchers and research users outside academe call for an allocation of Canada Research Chairs that can begin to address these issues. A number of philanthropic foundations have already indicated their willingness to partner with government to support funding for such applied research.

To compensate for the overall lack of funding, organizations frequently form partnerships with university researchers. Non-profit and voluntary sector organizations and universities themselves rely heavily on SSHRC’s small Community-University Research Alliances program to fund such initiatives. However, the program’s resources severely limit the number of potential collaborations. Yet all organizations, even those that command their own resources, report there is scope to improve how research partnerships are developed and how they work.

Most notably, organizations that seek to develop research partnerships with academics, consistently report difficulties in identifying those scholars who are doing the most innovative—and often still little known—work. They also report that it is equally or more difficult to engage researchers in policy relevant work when they have scant professional incentive to do so. These same organizations call on SSHRC to work with the university community to address these issues. They also call on the Council to foster the exchange of ideas and the formation of professional networks that cross sectoral and regional boundaries.

Non-academic organizations emphasize that mutual trust and understanding are prerequisites for successful collaboration. With this in mind, many recommend that SSHRC facilitate the development of partnership protocols that all partners entering into research collaborations agree to in principle and respect in practice.
C. Striving to mobilize all forms of knowledge

More, and more effective, partnerships among researchers in universities, colleges, research institutes, non-profit and voluntary sector organizations, philanthropic foundations, think tanks and government departments, and between researchers and research users in all sectors, hold tremendous potential for mobilizing all forms of social sciences and humanities research and thereby maximizing the impact of the Canadian research enterprise.

Canada needs to expand the scope of all research and dissemination activities in order to increase the knowledge base on which organizations, on and off campus, can draw to address social, economic and cultural issues, both in the short and the long term. Government researchers, in particular, point out that broadly disseminating the results of research in a given area, whether fundamental or applied, is often the first step in building public awareness of an issue and a necessary precursor to the more direct impact of policy-relevant research.

Increasing the direct impact of social sciences and humanities research depends also upon building the capacity of non-academic organizations to access and apply research results in their work. This capacity can be built by: (1) equipping more researchers and research users with the necessary skills; (2) facilitating the exchange of people and ideas among researchers and research users in different sectors and regions; (3) involving research users in defining and designing projects; and (4) ensuring sustained professionally-supported research and dissemination that are rooted in multi-sectoral clusters.

Non-academic organizations call for SSHRC to adopt a comprehensive approach to mobilizing knowledge throughout Canadian society, one that integrates the two broad approaches summarized in the two foregoing paragraphs. They note, in particular, the benefits of research users contributing to shaping research questions, approaches and dissemination strategies, and the need for professional incentives that encourage scholars to adopt a broad approach to knowledge mobilization. Non-academic organizations themselves would participate in this initiative and in the larger research enterprise by contributing (1) sensitivity to current social, economic and cultural issues; (2) knowledge of the public policy cycle; and (3) opportunities for researchers to access a broader range of research users, with the concomitant potential for enhanced visibility and impact of social sciences and humanities research as a whole.
Commissioned Studies

SSHRC commissioned a range of studies to complement the consultation process and to further understanding of what, in practical terms, might follow from, and support, the new core values of “interactive engagement” and “maximizing knowledge impact.” The most important conclusions from these studies are as follows:

- SSHRC should develop Canadian capacity to conduct research and to apply the results of research by offering (1) awards for undergraduate research, (2) mobility programs that enable students to gain experience outside academia, and researchers and practitioners from other sectors to gain experience inside academia, (3) graduate awards in areas needing further development, and (4) grants to train students and researchers to carry out team research projects.

- SSHRC should complement existing funding mechanisms by offering small “development grants” which scholars could use, very flexibly, to develop innovative research programs and approaches.

- The mass media, think tanks and international collaboration represent huge reservoirs of untapped potential to enhance the impact of Canadian research. In this regard, SSHRC can (1) more directly assist researchers to develop effective skills for communicating with the public, (2) create incentives for universities to play a more active role in promoting social sciences and humanities research—humanities research in particular—by establishing something along the lines of “knowledge mobilization offices,” and (3) make it easier for stakeholders in all sectors to identify researchers with expertise in particular areas.

- Through SSHRC’s ability to bring together parties with common interests, think tanks and foundations could play a greater role in connecting researchers to policy makers in both government departments and non-governmental organizations.

- SSHRC can and should play a greater role in building bridges between, and creating forums for, researchers and government policy makers.

- SSHRC needs to adopt a formal international strategy and resource it appropriately. This policy should focus on enhancing opportunities for research collaboration and student mobility, and should rely on well-established mechanisms for international collaboration.

- There is an urgent need for SSHRC and the social sciences and humanities research community to develop more appropriate ways to measure the impact of research.

---

2 The list of studies is included in Appendix 5. Summaries are available on SSHRC’s website: www.sshrc.ca. The full text of studies is available upon request.
Conclusion

The SSHRC transformation consultations revealed a remarkably strong consensus, within and outside academe, in favour of the Council adopting “interactive engagement” and “maximum knowledge impact” as new foundational values. The consultations also advanced the Council’s understanding of engagement and impact and how they can be achieved. Intellectual freedom and a vigorous, more diverse, knowledge base are necessary. More skilled, mobile people are required. And every element, every participant in the research enterprise must be more closely linked. Transformation requires viewing all SSHRC’s activities—and many that go beyond the Council’s current mandate—through a lens that focuses on knowledge mobilization.

Today, SSHRC and its research community stand at a crossroad. Dramatic change in the research environment, in the scope of the research enterprise, and in public demand for understanding have created huge pressures for funding and innovation. SSHRC must equip itself with the tools needed to renew the social sciences and humanities research enterprise so that a truly Canadian knowledge society can flourish. Only then will Canada’s investment in the social sciences and humanities yield maximum benefit in communities across the country and in the way our presence is felt around the world.

SSHRC is firmly committed to the pursuit of this vision by transforming itself into a true knowledge council. To this end, it will publish a new strategic plan in the spring of 2005 and an operational plan, detailing programmatic approaches and implementation strategies, in the fall of 2005. With the support of the entire research community, individuals across the country, and government, SSHRC will begin putting the vision in place by 2006.
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CORE VALUES OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL

For 25 years, SSHRC has been committed to the following core values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research excellence</td>
<td>SSHRC funds excellence in research to international standards as determined by a rigorous, transparent peer-review process that is balanced by region, language, gender, discipline, and university size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive funding</td>
<td>SSHRC awards can only be obtained through a competitive process at arm’s length from any political or bureaucratic pressures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusiveness and openness</td>
<td>SSHRC offers a home to all fields and types of research within its mandate, from foundational through applied scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of inquiry</td>
<td>SSHRC is committed to the sharing of information and the free marketplace of ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative continuity</td>
<td>SSHRC fosters the constant renewal of Canada’s research capacity through training and institutional grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>SSHRC is committed to the good stewardship of public funds and open reporting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These core values will not change. However, to address the demand for knowledge, and not just the supply of research, SSHRC’s core values must expand to include two others:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive engagement</td>
<td>SSHRC systematically supports larger, ongoing linkages and interactions through a mix of partnerships that span a diverse range of researchers, students, fields of activity, institutions, communities, regions, countries, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum knowledge impact</td>
<td>SSHRC works with a range of interested parties to build greater capacity for understanding research and its applicability—and thus for maximizing the impact of knowledge—in government, business and elsewhere, in both the short and long term. As a corollary, the Council invites and takes up challenges for social sciences and humanities research that come from outside academe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OUTLINE OF SSHRC’S ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

It was recognized early on that SSHRC’s activities must be shaped by input and advice from all sectors of society. This is simply because social science and humanities research touches all aspects of human life. SSHRC needed to consult widely, in close collaboration with its university and community partners, to identify the main drivers of, and appropriate responses to, recent changes that have literally transformed both Canadian society and social sciences and humanities research. The consultation sought to provoke discussion among researchers and users of research in all sectors about those changes and about the best ways to transform SSHRC so that it continues to fulfill Canada’s needs. Public, political and community support are all crucial to the success of SSHRC’s transformation.

The consultations were broad and inclusive, involving an extensive “campus dialogue,” bilateral and multilateral meetings, workshops, conferences, and Web-based discussions. SSHRC and its partners consulted first with its core constituents—staff, researchers in all sectors, graduate students, scholarly associations and universities—and then with key users of research—federal government departments and agencies, non-governmental organizations, think tanks, charities and foundations, professional associations, community and social service organizations, and the private sector.

This intensive consultation process has built new bridges within the research community and with users of social sciences and humanities research. The consultations have raised public awareness of social science and humanities research, and this in turn has enabled informed and engaged citizens and policy makers to more readily factor the contributions of such research into their decision making.

At the same time, the consultations also raised awareness, within SSHRC, of the contributions that other organizations make as producers and promoters of research. The role of the Government of Canada in the future development of the social sciences and humanities was as much part of the consultation process as was the search for the best ways to strengthen and reshape the work of the Council.

Short-Term Objectives

The consultation process sought to:

1. engage SSHRC’s constituencies, as described above, to discuss the need, directions and priorities for changes in the Council’s mandate, orientation and programming;

2. inform the development of a new organizational structure for SSHRC;

3. develop broad support for that structure from researchers, universities, scholarly associations as well as voluntary sector organizations, think tanks, government, politicians and the public;

4. change traditional ways of thinking about the nature and value of research in the social sciences and humanities.
Medium and Long-term Objectives

The consultation provided SSHRC with an important opportunity to:

1. catalyze cultural change within the research community;
2. reinforce current partnerships and build new allies who can speak for SSHRC;
3. communicate to government the nature and importance of such issues as faculty renewal, graduate training, funding, international linkages, and knowledge mobilization;
4. raise SSHRC’s profile, and Canada’s place, in the international science policy community;
5. position SSHRC as a key player in the discussion of Canada’s major social and economic issues;
6. situate SSHRC at the centre of the federal government’s plans for research, innovation and learning.

A Systematic Approach

The process was predicated on three basic principles.

1. That the consultation be multi-layered—to ensure a range of voices are heard.

   The consultations reflected the goals for transformation itself. They were organized to (i) foster inter-disciplinarity, (ii) facilitate research collaborations beyond academe, and (iii) engage participants in all stages of the research cycle (i.e., users as well as producers of research).

2. That the consultation be systematic—to ensure that initial findings and support are built on the expertise of the core constituencies. Preliminary conclusions from each phase of the consultation were circulated among participants in order to solicit responses to each stage of SSHRC’s analysis.

   **Stage 1: Campus Dialogue.** The first public round of consultations started with the appointment of representatives on campuses across the country who led local consultations with university administrators, researchers and students. At the same time, a key partnering organization, the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, undertook consultations with scholarly associations. Internal consultations with SSHRC Council members and staff were also conducted.

   **Stage 2: Dialogue beyond Academe.** A second round of consultations addressed non-academic research partners and scholars in other disciplines, then turned to key research users such as government departments, think tanks, and voluntary sector organizations.

   **Stage 3: Commissioned Studies.** Consultations with experts continued throughout the consultation process. Opinion papers were contracted on specific issues.

   **Stage 4: Strategic Planning and Design.** SSHRC staff, in consultation with standing committees of Council and individual Council members, led this final, closed stage of the process, which focused on preparing recommendations for structural redesign for submission to SSHRC’s Council.
3. That the consultation be **balanced**—to ensure transparency and equality, to provide direction, to establish the integrity and usefulness of the data collected, yet also to allow for “blue sky” discussions around proposed models for change. This dimension of the consultations helped us establish clearly that some things—such as public accountability and supporting research excellence as established by a competitive peer-review process—were not open for consultation.

**Multi-Purpose Tools**

SSHRC employed a range of tools to ensure the quality of the consultations. Perhaps the most important were two framework documents, *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council*, volumes 1 and 2, which set out the reasons for change, core values and new objectives as well as possible models for a transformed SSHRC and the implications for current programs. These documents also posed specific questions about the need, direction, goals and approaches to transformation.

An online discussion forum was set up and ran from August to October 2004. Its purpose was to stimulate discussion about new researchers among those who attended the National Meeting of Tier II Canada Research Chairs that SSHRC sponsored in September of that year.

The SSHRC Web site published information on the consultation activities and served as a platform for presenting background papers and consultation documents. It also enabled individuals to submit their responses to the various questions that appeared online, or to e-mail their comments directly to the president.

To support the campus consultations, the president and vice-presidents of SSHRC made presentations about transformation on university campuses across the country and, of course, responded to hundreds, if not thousands, of questions and concerns.

A presentation and workshops were organized at the Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences in Winnipeg in May 2004. These were an occasion to outline the preliminary analysis of the “campus dialogue” reports and to receive feedback from university representatives.
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CONSULTATION PARTNERS, COLLABORATORS AND CONTRIBUTING ORGANIZATIONS

A. Partners
Association francophone pour le savoir
Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
Canadian Association of Graduate Studies
Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences

B. Collaborators
Association of Community Colleges of Canada
Canada Research Chairs Program
Community of Inquiry
Fonds québécois de la recherche sur la société et la culture

C. Canadian Universities and University Colleges
Acadia University
Algoma University College
Athabasca University
Bishop’s University
Brandon University
Brock University
Carleton University
Collège de Saint-Boniface
College Dominicain
Concordia University
Dalhousie University
École nationale d’administration publique
École Polytechnique de Montréal
HEC Montréal
Huron University College
Institut national de la recherche scientifique
King’s University College
Kwantlen University College
Lakehead University
Laurentian University
Malaspina University College
McGill University
McMaster University
Memorial University of Newfoundland
Mount Allison University
Mount Saint Vincent University
Nipissing University
Nova Scotia Agricultural College
Nova Scotia College of Art and Design
Okanagan University College
Queen’s University at Kingston
Redeemer University College
Royal Military College
Royal Roads University
Ryerson University
Saint Mary’s University
Simon Fraser University
St. Francis Xavier University
St. Thomas University
Télé-université
Trent University
Université de Moncton
Université de Montréal
Université de Sherbrooke
Université du Québec
Université du Québec à Montréal
Université du Québec à Chicoutimi
Université du Québec à Rimouski
Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières
Université du Québec en Outaouais
Université du Québec, Abitibi Témiscamingue
Université Laval
Université Sainte-Anne
University College of Cape Breton
University College of the Cariboo
University College of the Fraser Valley
University of Alberta
University of British Columbia
University of Calgary
University of Guelph
University of King’s College
University of Lethbridge
University of Manitoba
University of New Brunswick
University of Northern British Columbia
University of Ottawa
University of Prince Edward Island
University of Regina
University of Saskatchewan
University of St. Michael’s College
University of Toronto
University of Victoria
University of Waterloo
University of Western Ontario
University of Windsor
University of Winnipeg
Vancouver School of Theology
Wilfrid Laurier University
York University

D. Scholarly Associations, Institutes and Organizations
Administrative Sciences Association of Canada
Association for Canadian Studies
Association for Canadian and Quebec Literatures
Association for Canadian Theatre Research
Association for the Advancement of Scandinavian Studies in Canada
Association of Canadian Archivists
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Association of Canadian College and University Teachers of English
Bibliographical Society of Canada
Canadian Anthropological Association
Canadian Archaeological Association
Canadian Asian Studies Association
Canadian Association for Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies
Canadian Association for University Continuing Education
Canadian Association for Cultural Studies
Canadian Association for Information Science
Canadian Association for Irish Studies
Canadian Association for Leisure Studies
Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education
Canadian Association for the Study of International Development
Canadian Association for Translation Studies
Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics
Canadian Association of Deans of Education
Canadian Association of Geographers
Canadian Association of Hispanicists
Canadian Association of Latin American and Caribbean Studies
Canadian Association of Law Teachers
Canadian Association of Learned Journals
Canadian Association of Research Libraries
Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work
Canadian Association of Slavists
Canadian Association of Teachers of Technical Writing
Canadian Association of University and College Teachers of French
Canadian Association of University Research Administrators
Canadian Association of University Teachers
Canadian Association of University Teachers of German
Canadian Association on Gerontology
Canadian Communication Association
Canadian Comparative Literature Association
Canadian Counselling Association
Canadian Economics Association
Canadian Evaluation Society
Canadian Federation of Business School Deans
Canadian Federation of Students
Canadian Historical Association
Canadian Law and Society Association
Canadian Lesbian and Gay Studies Association
Canadian Linguistic Association
Canadian Philosophical Association
Canadian Political Science Association
Canadian Population Association
Canadian Psychological Association
Canadian Regional Science Association
Canadian Science and Technology Historical Association
Canadian Semiotic Association
Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies
Canadian Society for Italian Studies
Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies
Canadian Society for the History and Philosophy of Mathematics

Canadian Society for the History and Philosophy of Science
Canadian Society for the History of Medicine
Canadian Society for the Study of Education
Canadian Society for the Study of Names
Canadian Society for the Study of Practical Ethics
Canadian Society for the Study of Religion
Canadian Society of Biblical Studies
Canadian Society of Church History
Canadian Society of Medievalists
Canadian Society of Patristic Studies
Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association
Canadian Theological Society
Canadian University Music Society
Canadian Women's Studies Association
Classical Association of Canada
Conférence des recteurs et des principaux des universités du Québec
Consortium for Computers in the Humanities
Council of Ontario Universities
Environmental Studies Association of Canada
Film Studies Association of Canada
Folklore Studies Association of Canada
Institut d'histoire de l'Amérique française
National Graduate Caucus
NATVAC – National Association of Vice-Principals and Vice-Presidents (Academic) & Provosts
Society for Socialist Studies
University Government Relations Officers
Western Deans of Arts and Social Sciences

E. Colleges and Institutes
Algonquin College
Cambrian College
Capilano College
Cégep de Sainte-Foy
Cégep du Vieux Montréal
College of the North Atlantic
Douglas College
Fanshawe College
Grant MacEwan College
Holland College
Humber College Institute of Applied Technology and Learning
Kwantlen University College
Lethbridge Community College
Mohawk College
Niagara College
Red River College
Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology
Selkirk College
Sheridan College Institute of Applied Technology and Learning
St. Lawrence College
F. Voluntary Sector Organizations

Canadian Association of Family Resource Programs
Canadian Child Care Federation
Canadian Council on International Cooperation
Canadian Ethniccultural Council
Canadian Labour & Business Center
Canadian Language and Literacy Research Network
Canadian National Institute for the Blind
Centraide du Grand Montréal
Centre for Education and Work (Winnipeg)
Centre for the Study of Civic Renewal
Centre for Voluntary Sector Research and Development
Community Based Research Network of Ottawa
Community Foundations of Canada
Community Services Council of Newfoundland and Labrador
Council of Canadians with Disabilities
CounterPoint (Toronto)
CrossRoads Children’s Centre
Fédération des centres d’action bénévole du Québec
First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada
Girl Guides of Canada - Guides du Canada
Guysborough County Inshore Fishermen’s Association
Heritage Community Foundation Edmonton
Institute for Nonprofit Studies (Calgary)
John Howard Society of Canada
Lac La Biche and Regional Family and Community Support Services
Laura Bisc Research Services
Manitoba Voluntary Sector Initiative
National Organization of Immigrant & Visible Minority Women
Ontario Trillium Foundation
Peter Elson Consulting
PolicyLink NB
Reach Canada
The Salvation Army
Trent Centre for Community Based Education
United Way of Halifax Region
Voluntary Sector Forum
Volunteer Hamilton
YMCA Canada

Canadian Policy Research Networks
Centre for the Study of Living Standards
Community Foundations of Canada
Fondation Lucie et André Chagnon
Institute for Research on Public Policy
Institute on Governance
International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development
International Development Research Centre
J.W. McConnell Foundation
Laidlaw Foundation
Max Bell Foundation
Philanthropic Foundations Canada
Public Policy Forum
Social Research & Demonstration Corporation
The Centre for International Governance Innovation
The Dominion Institute
The North-South Institute
Trudeau Foundation
Walter and Duncan Gordon Foundation

H. Government Departments and Agencies

Agriculture and Agri-food Canada
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation
Canadian Health Services Research Foundation
Canadian Heritage
Canadian Institutes of Health Research
Centre francophone d'informations des organisations
citoyenneté et immigration Canada
Correctional Services Canada
Department of National Defence
Finance Canada
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Foreign Affairs Canada
Health Canada
Human Resources and Skills Development Canada
Industry Canada
Institut Robert-Sauvé en santé et en sécurité du travail
Justice Canada
Library of Parliament
Natural Resources Canada
Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada
Parliamentary Centre for Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade
Policy Research Initiative Secretariat
Privy Council Office
Saskatchewan Labour Force Development Board
Social Development Canada
Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia
Statistics Canada
Status of Women Canada
Valorisation-Recherche Québec
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COMMISSIONED STUDIES

Bibliometric Indicators

European Collaboration

International Collaboration

New Researchers

Public Communication of Research

Research Collaboration

Research Grants

Research Training

Think tanks

## Appendix 5

STRATEGIC RESEARCH CLUSTERS PROGRAM (2004): A THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF AWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INNOVATION AND BUSINESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Canadian corporate competitiveness through sustainable development (Bansal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business ethics (Cragg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work &amp; society in historical perspective (Sangster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Canadian labour market (Riddell)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONS, CITIES, COMMUNITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Social dynamics or economic performance: innovation &amp; creativity in city regions (Wolfe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality of life reporting systems and cultural indicators for smaller Canadian communities (Garrett Petts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beyond the postindustrial metropolis: urban transformation in Canada (Hutton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Premières nations et peuples Inuit du Canada : espaces politiques et dynamiques sociales (Lévesque)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information &amp; communication technologies for Aboriginal communities (O’Donnell)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNANCE AND PUBLIC POLICY INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Media governance (Raboy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Population change in public policy (Beaujot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bringing all the threads together: the contribution of longitudinal &amp; lifecourse approach to knowledge, informed public debate and decision making (Bernard)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MULTICULTURALISM &amp; CITIZENSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Settlement &amp; integration experiences of refugees and immigrants in Canada (McGrath)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social citizenship (Isin)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENT &amp; RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sustainability &amp; natural resources (Rayner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Canadian history &amp; environment (MacEachern)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION AND LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Simulation &amp; advanced gaming environments for learning (Kaufman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changements sociaux, réformes scolaires et pratiques éducatives des agents de l’enseignement au Canada (Lessard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Great unsolved mysteries in Canadian history (Sandwell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Language acquisition (Crago)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Language performance: doing language in real time (Libben)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND WELL-BEING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Early child development (Boivin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence-based model for risk assessment in child welfare (Regehr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disability-related policy (Stienstra)Justice system’s response to family violence; regional specificity and national common ground (Gilli)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Frontiers of Scholarship

- Interactive matters (Rockwell)
- Science and technology studies/history & philosophy of science (McQuat)
- Informal logic, reasoning, argumentation theory (Johnson)
- The study of time (Savitt)

### Canada and the World

- Canada & the new Europe: relations and models (DeBardeleben)
- Comparative dispute resolution in bilateral regional, and multilateral trade & investment agreements (Gal-Or)
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Knowledge Council: SSHRC, 2006-2011
PREFACE: FUTURE KNOWLEDGE
WE KNOW HOW TO SHAPE OUR FUTURE, SO WHAT'S STOPPING US?

Some of Canada’s most insightful and internationally celebrated scholars have issued a warning, a heads-up. Their scrupulously researched and carefully argued warnings concern the future of humanity in the 21st century. The questions they pose and the potential environmental, social and political futures to which they point are sobering. The work of each scholar vividly demonstrates the crucial and growing importance of the social sciences and humanities in assuring our future.

Political scientist Thomas Homer-Dixon discusses the consequences of the widening “ingenuity gap” between our technical and humanistic understanding. Archaeologist Ronald Wright describes the “progress trap”: how the modern, Western-created, global civilization demonstrates the same willful ignorance that doomed so many past civilizations. Veteran social theorist Jane Jacobs presents evidence that the disintegrating foundations of our society point to a “dark age ahead.”

Yet all these thinkers claim it is not too late, that we already possess, or can develop, the knowledge required to build a just, prosperous, sustainable and culturally vibrant world. But, it is not scientific knowledge or technological know-how that will enable us to preserve civilization for our grandchildren and theirs. Most of what we need in these domains we already have. Our problem, as a civilization, is one of values, of economic and political priorities and of social organization.

To adapt a statement by Homer-Dixon, we are in dire need of advanced humanistic and social scientific knowledge to manage our affairs in an increasingly complex and unpredictable world, and SSHRC plays a vital role in fulfilling this need in Canada.

Governments are beginning to recognize this, and Canada’s more than most. The October 2004 Speech from the Throne is striking in this regard. With few exceptions, achieving its policy objectives will depend, in whole or in part, on the wise application of existing and future humanities and social sciences research. This is the case whether the goal is better integrating immigrants, Canada’s sole source of population growth, or addressing, multilaterally, the religious, economic and political factors that breed terrorism. It applies as much to the urgent need to evaluate, without fear or favour, the dangers and benefits of globalization as it does to developing an internationally competitive, but environmentally sustainable economy. It is as necessary in order to design a national system of early learning and child care as it is to strengthen Canada’s social foundations and nurture the country’s cultural and intellectual life.

To take up Northrop Frye’s challenge and create out of the world we have to live in, the world we want to live in, Canada needs humanities and social sciences research; and Canadian researchers and research institutions. SSHRC among them, must do a better job of getting hard-won knowledge out into the world, to families, community groups, policy-makers, legislators, and the media.

Canadians must be able to benefit from and apply the best social sciences and humanities research the world has to offer. That is what a knowledge council is all about. That is the transformed role for SSHRC to which our consultations and the proposals in this strategic plan point.
These proposals honour more than twenty-five years of experience in supporting humanities and social sciences research; they build on the ideas and consensus that emerged during exhaustive national consultations with academics, community organizations, business leaders and other Canadians who care deeply about the future of research in this country.

SSHRC wishes to thank every one of those people who gave so generously of their time and energy to help us understand the present and chart an exciting path into the future.
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TO ENGAGE CANADIANS IN BUILDING KNOWLEDGE THROUGH RESEARCH AND IN USING THAT KNOWLEDGE TO CREATE A JUST, FREE, PROSPEROUS AND CULTURALLY VIBRANT WORLD.

In 1977, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) was created to support and promote research. To that end the Council has, for more than a quarter of a century, focused on “inputs”—on a careful and effective investment of money in the research and research training effort in Canada.

And this has paid off for Canadians who can boast of a well-managed funding organization that over the years has nurtured a growing research community, supported important research projects across the country and pioneered exciting programs that responded to the changing needs of researchers, students and Canadians.

The Council’s new vision—based on ideas coming from consultations with researchers and key stakeholders across the country—introduces a deeper concern for the impact of research—the important and often undervalued social, economic and cultural "outputs."

In a world increasingly driven by technology and global economics, research in education and democracy, Aboriginal rights, business ethics, immigration and cities can provide the understanding to build a truly successful, resilient, modern society—one that can adapt to and prosper from technological innovation, deliver health-care services to all its members, protect human rights, inspire creativity and honour diversity.

This plan proposes broad new directions for SSHRC that emphasize building connections to maximize the impact and quality of humanities and social sciences research.

But, no matter how transformed, SSHRC remains committed to the integrity of the peer-review system—to research excellence and independence. SSHRC will continue to support all the humanities and social sciences disciplines; it will support individual scholars strengthening and building knowledge in their particular discipline, as well as multi-disciplinary teams of scholars working with local and international partners on issues of importance to Canadians and to the world.

The new vision will build on SSHRC’s traditions of inclusiveness and excellence to deliver what Canada needs in the 21st century:

→ a vibrant and internationally-renowned research environment;

→ highly skilled and adaptable people;

→ new understanding and innovative ideas;

→ broad and systematic transformation of knowledge into action.
SSHRC'S VALUES REPRESENT A UNIQUE CONSENSUS—THEY HONOUR OUR PAST AND THEY CARRY US INTO THE FUTURE.

EXCELLENCE
SSHRC's commitment to excellence begins with peer review—the international gold standard for judging the quality of research proposals. All SSHRC funding decisions are made by expert committees, balanced for region, gender, language and university size.

INDEPENDENCE
To do and to support reliable research that creates a deeper, clearer understanding of the world, SSHRC and the researchers it supports must be free from political, bureaucratic and commercial interference.

INCLUSIVENESS
All humanities and social sciences disciplines are essential to building a true understanding of the world. SSHRC is committed to supporting the entire range of perspectives and methodologies involved in all humanities and social sciences research.

IMPACT
Research knowledge must be made public. It must inspire and inform real world debate, enrich intellectual and cultural life, and invigorate the economy.

CONNECTION
Excellent research that can change the way we think and act depends on strong connections—true partnerships that cut across borders and disciplines and that bring researchers together with people working outside academia.

LEARNING
Research fuels learning; the university classroom is the birthplace and training ground of the next generation of researchers and highly-qualified people who will build Canada's future.

BUILDING CAPACITY
A diverse knowledge base is the essential foundation of a vibrant, resilient society. SSHRC is committed to the constant renewal of Canada's research capacity through support for students, faculty and institutions.

ACCOUNTABILITY
Good stewardship of public funds and open, transparent reporting is the foundation of SSHRC's commitment to Canadians.
CONTEXT
SSHRC’S DECISION TO TRANSFORM ITSELF INTO A KNOWLEDGE COUNCIL COMES AT A TIME OF GREAT CHANGE IN THE ACADEMIC WORLD, AND OF GROWING INTEREST IN SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH FROM ALL SECTORS OF CANADIAN SOCIETY.

For the last ten years, the Canadian government has shown its commitment to making Canada a knowledge leader with the creation of exciting new programs that have re-invigorated the Canadian research scene. The complexity of global economic, political and social change has convinced leaders in key sectors that social sciences and humanities research is vital to building a just, prosperous and culturally vibrant world. This understanding is driving an explosion of research outside the academy—in government departments, museums, and in not-for-profit and voluntary organizations.

Change is also happening within our universities. Today, after months of campus consultations across the country, the research community is united as never before.

Massive faculty renewal as the “baby boomers” begin to retire is bringing a new generation of professors into the academy who are increasingly expected—and expect—to be active in research and in research training. At the same time, university researchers are changing the way they conduct research. They are working in multidisciplinary teams and in collaborative arrangements with community organizations, government departments and other groups outside the academy, and they are giving greater prominence and importance to ethical and privacy issues.
BUT THERE ARE ISSUES THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED IF SSHRC AND THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY IT SUPPORTS ARE GOING TO BE ABLE TO BUILD THE DEEP, DIVERSE KNOWLEDGE BASE THIS COUNTRY REQUIRES TO PROSPER.

DEMAND

While the new enthusiasm for research complements the Council’s plans for more multi-disciplinary and collaborative studies, it also runs the risk of overloading the current funding system. Considering the fact that the success rate in SSHRC’s core program (Standard Research Grants) is only 49 per cent and that SSHRC is seeing yearly increases in the number of applications to the program, the growing demand for research support constitutes a serious challenge.

If Canada wants to emerge as one of the 21st century’s leaders in research, higher education, and innovation, SSHRC must find ways to meet this growing demand.

MODERN TOOLS

Changes in the way social sciences and humanities scholars conduct research has led to a demand for modern, innovative research tools. However, the prevailing myth that social sciences and humanities research doesn’t require specialized, high-tech tools has resulted in a lack of support for the development of those tools.

TRAINING

In the last ten years, the government has invested more money into research training through the Canada Graduate Scholarships, but despite this there is still a lack of funding for graduate students in humanities and social sciences disciplines and few opportunities for those students to be actively integrated in research projects as part of their graduate training.

MAKING AN IMPACT

Humanities and social sciences ideas can have enormous impact on society. There are the paradigm-shifting ideas of great philosophers, historians, economists and psychologists and there is the practical knowledge coming from research that helps us understand and address immediate issues such as third-world poverty, security and human rights, education, and health-care delivery.

Today research knowledge is taught in university classrooms, published in academic journals and books, and shared at academic conferences. On an ad hoc basis, research ideas, discoveries and knowledge trickle into the public forum through the media and through the work of research consultants to government or private-sector organizations.

But these activities don’t go far enough in getting research knowledge to Canadians—they do not give us systematic interaction between the research community and the rest of society that will guarantee excellent research knowledge reaches the people who need it.

BOTTOM LINES

After years of sustained public investment in research, governments expect to demonstrate the benefit of research through increased commercialization and by putting research knowledge into practice, policy and public discourse. The challenge for the social sciences and humanities is to expand the idea of “return on investment” to include benefits other than mere commercial ones.

But even with a strong argument for the broader benefits of research there is never a guarantee that the government’s support for research will continue to grow. Faltering of the current federal commitment to research would be a threat to the Council’s new vision, which requires SSHRC’s funding for research and training to double.
SSHRC MUST TAKE STOCK OF THE SHORT AND LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS OF THE CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES BEFORE IT. IF IT TRULY MEANS TO RE-MAKE ITSELF AS A KNOWLEDGE COUNCIL.

For more than twenty-five years, SSHRC has responded quickly and creatively to the changing needs of the research community and Canadian society. The Council has begun to play a larger role in the national research effort by contributing to the development of Canada’s research and science policy. But to make Canada a leader in the knowledge economy, more is needed.

The following plan leverages the opportunities, addresses the challenges head-on and charts a truly exciting future for the Council and for Canada’s research community.
SSHRC will take very specific actions to transform itself over the next five years into a knowledge council. These actions fall into three categories:

- Retool and fine-tune programs
- Create new programs, new approaches
- Renew Council structures and organization

FIGURE 1: The Knowledge Council will build on SSHRC’s core support programs, taking the knowledge created through those programs into the world. The Council’s four new strategic directions—clustering research, building modern tools, mobilizing knowledge and connecting people—create a systematic and effective interaction between researchers and society, and provide researchers with the modern tools they need to do large-scale projects.
1. RETOOL AND FINE-TUNE PROGRAMS

The heart and soul of SSHRC is, and will remain, a suite of core programs that together build a broad and deep knowledge base, create excellent student training opportunities and expand the research capacity at universities and colleges across the country.

These foundational programs will be fine-tuned or retooled to make them more effective in achieving their goals.

EXPAND DIVERSE KNOWLEDGE BASE

Since its inception, SSHRC has funded investigator-driven research of the highest scholarly and ethical standards through rigorous and open competitions adjudicated by peer review. It has stimulated and supported research through a suite of programs that promote creativity and innovation, rooted in freedom of inquiry and a respect for diverse approaches. It has done so by supporting individual researchers and small research teams through the Standard Research Grants program, large multi-disciplinary research teams through the Major Collaborative Research Initiatives program, the Networks of Centres of Excellence and the Initiative on the New Economy, and it has supported institutions through the SSHRC Institutional Grants and Aid to Small Universities programs.

Taken together, these programs represent Canada’s single most important investment in the creation of an original intellectual perspective on the world.

Over the next five years, SSHRC will maintain its commitment to investigator-framed research, while moving to:

- offer a continuum of funding that spans small, medium-sized and larger grants tenable for varying periods of time, with competitions for the different types of grants to be held at separate times of the year;
- improve the success rate in the small grant competitions, as budgets permit, to deal with the longstanding problem of grants recommended but not funded due to lack of funds;
- increase funding for, and introduce more innovative mechanisms to support, the publication of scholarly books and journals;
- re-examine the idea of supporting best-performing scholarly associations and the relevance of the Research Time Stipend.

FOCUS ON ADVANCED LEARNING

SSHRC fellowships and Canada Graduate Scholarships train a new generation of experts and encourage creativity and innovation. These programs prepare students for academic careers, as well as careers in all sectors of Canadian society.

To ensure that Canada has well-educated, highly-skilled experts who can develop new knowledge, teach the next generation and lead the country into a better future, SSHRC will:

- ensure that students have access to excellent training environments in order to improve completion rates and reduce time to degrees (possibly by increasing the funds available for training in all collaborative research undertakings);
- ensure that students have opportunities to study and attend conferences abroad (e.g., by recommending that the Canada Graduate Scholarships program extend its support to include students studying abroad);
- create fellowships that include training in applied settings outside universities (50 per cent of Canadian PhD graduates end up working outside academia).

BUILD COMMUNITY CAPACITY

In hundreds of communities across the country, Canada’s network of universities and colleges provide strong institutional support for social, economic and cultural development through social sciences and humanities research and research training. Because the social sciences and humanities play vital roles in postsecondary institutions of all types, SSHRC itself is uniquely positioned to foster the
development of a robust research culture and research capacity in all regions of the country. Its highly successful program of Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) shows how fruitful research connections can be established to that end. Launched in 2005, a new Social Economy initiative, based on the CURA model, will continue this effort.

SSHRC will integrate the CURA program as a key element of its core program architecture and:

- revitalize the Aid to Small Universities program to help universities and colleges develop more robust research cultures and broaden their graduates’ skill sets;
- encourage undergraduate students and workers in all sectors to rise to the challenge of the knowledge society by diversifying their skill sets through direct research experience (e.g., by creating undergraduate research participation awards and summer research training institutes);
- expand and improve university-community research partnerships to better equip communities to develop local solutions to local issues.
2. NEW PROGRAMS, NEW APPROACHES

Building on past collaborative, multi-disciplinary experiments such as Community-University Research Alliances, SSHRC will engage its research community in implementing four key new strategies: clustering research, mobilizing knowledge, connecting people and building tools.

CLUSTERING RESEARCH

Over the last several years, SSHRC has explored collaborations and partnerships that address complex, research questions on important social issues. Networks of Centres of Excellence, Major Collaborative Research Initiatives, the Initiative on the New Economy and SSHRC’s recently launched Aboriginal Research program have all taught SSHRC valuable lessons in how to manage large, interdisciplinary research groups, how to engage collective action, and how to expand into new intellectual arenas.

SSHRC must now apply these lessons to develop support structures that will promote even more systematic interaction and ongoing linkages across fields of activity, institutions, communities, regions, languages and countries.

To do that SSHRC will:

→ develop mechanisms to expanding networks across the country that will support and promote Canada’s current and emerging research strengths;
→ develop mechanisms, in partnership with external stakeholders, to identify and address critical gaps in research knowledge;
→ continue the research activities started under the Initiative on the New Economy (current funding scheduled to end in 2007).

SSHRC is already addressing the need for expanded research networks. The Strategic Research Clusters Design Grants program was launched in 2004 to help identify areas in which Canada has attained a certain level of research strength and to help SSHRC design a program to support research clusters.

Researchers from across Canada, from both official language groups, and from different disciplines organized themselves into preliminary clusters. Depending on the nation’s and the participating researchers’ specific needs, clusters will vary considerably in size, areas and combinations of expertise and life-span.

A major focus for the investment of new resources, strategic research clusters will:

→ build on and add value to research support in the foundational programs;
→ encourage intellectual and geographic mobility of students and researchers;
→ increase the visibility of social sciences and humanities research both nationally and internationally;
→ catalyze the cross-fertilization of ideas between academia, foundations, voluntary sector organizations, and other stakeholders in the government, community and private sectors;
→ facilitate, for critical intellectual and societal issues, the integration of new knowledge and practice;
→ promote a vibrant environment for research training.

Important knowledge gaps appear as world issues evolve at a rapid pace. To take a few examples, the rise of countries in South and Southeast Asia as major economic powers, the spread of “freelance” political violence, the relentless march of technology, and the aging of Western populations are all major issues worldwide. Understanding and addressing these issues effectively demands new, focused social sciences and humanities research. Special initiatives
may be needed to address particular knowledge gaps, as in the case of the Initiative on the New Economy, launched in 2001, that has mobilized hundreds of researchers across Canada and around the world to understand and address the challenges of the emerging knowledge economy.

MOBILIZE KNOWLEDGE FOR GREATER IMPACT

In recent years, SSHRC has:

- promoted interactive relationships between scholars and government departments through numerous Joint Initiative programs and collaboration with the Policy Research Initiative;
- promoted mutually beneficial, sustained relationships between academic researchers and local community organizations through, among others, its Community-University Research Alliances program;
- provided fundamental support for knowledge sharing, primarily among scholars, through, for example, its Aid to Research Workshops and Conferences program;
- piloted the development of new tools and methods (e.g., Initiative on the New Economy programs) to encourage new alliances among researchers and to nurture actual and potential synergies across large interdisciplinary research teams working on related issues;
- experimented with new forums and events to bring research into public awareness. (The Knowledge Project, held in Ottawa in February 2005, featured 84 research exhibits and brought together more than 150 social sciences and humanities researchers and 600 stakeholders to participate in panel discussions on issues that cut across disciplinary and methodological boundaries.)

Thus far, however, such efforts have been largely ad hoc; much more intensive development is required. Canada needs systemic vehicles that, on a timely basis, enable stakeholders to connect with experts on key issues and problems, access relevant research results and syntheses on specific topics, and understand the applicability and implications of this knowledge for their own spheres of interest.

Accordingly, over the next five years, SSHRC will:

- provide incentives for postsecondary institutions so that they can extend social sciences and humanities research knowledge beyond academic circles;
- establish mechanisms to place researchers and students in new settings—for example, visiting fellowships and applied scholarships would facilitate cross-fertilization of ideas and experiences, break open intellectual silos, bridge cultures and create trust relationships that can serve as foundations for collaborative activity;
- create new mechanisms to increase the impact of social sciences and humanities research on policy—and decision-making—for example, the Council could experiment, along the lines of a successful program pioneered in the United Kingdom, with funding agreements that convene a range of stakeholders around specific issues;
- develop and deliver a suite of regular knowledge events that bring researchers and stakeholders together to learn from each other.

In short, using its unique ability to convene a range of stakeholders and a breadth and depth of research expertise, SSHRC will introduce new mechanisms to create bridging platforms and arenas among academics, government and communities that will greatly improve the ability of social sciences and humanities researchers to impact policy and decision-making. Such activities represent another major focus for the investment of new resources.

CONNECT TO THE WORLD

The forces of globalization are accelerating the scope and international pace of research. To be a competitive economy and a successful society, a medium-sized country such as Canada must have continuous access to the rich diversity of knowledge around the world and must take advantage of opportunities for international collaboration.

Furthermore, the interconnected nature of global issues requires leveraging knowledge, resources and expertise on an international scale. The
Canadian research community is already active internationally, publishing with foreign researchers more often than most nations in the world. Several SSHRC programs, notably the Initiative on the New Economy and Major Collaborative Research Initiatives explicitly support international linkages.

SSHRC will build on these successes by:

→ establishing an International Opportunities Fund that will allow Canadian researchers to take advantage of opportunities to lead and participate in collaborative international research activities that are important for Canada;

→ introducing measures to foster student mobility over and above what is already permitted through SSHRC regular fellowships;

→ providing international leadership with regard to the present state and future development of the humanities and social sciences (e.g., organizing international workshops on key issues such as data archiving standards, longitudinal surveys, large editorial projects and computing in the humanities);

→ internationalizing its peer-review system by, for instance, encouraging more Canadian researchers to sit on the peer-review committees of other national research councils and arranging for foreign researchers to sit on SSHRC peer-review committees.

CREATE RESEARCH TOOLS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

For many years, SSHRC has supported the development of collective research tools, notably dictionaries, bibliographic aids and document collections. Recently, with the assistance of the Canada Foundation for Innovation, SSHRC has helped create a new generation of such tools. Examples include the network of Research Data Centres that provide decentralized access to Statistics Canada’s longitudinal survey data, as well as investments in servers and databases, software packages, digital recording equipment, communications technologies, mobile laboratories and cyber-cartographic systems.

The changing nature of social sciences and humanities research—greater emphasis on large and complex intellectual and social issues, application of new information and communication technologies, and the increasing internationalization of research—highlights the importance for SSHRC and its research community of using new research infrastructure and dealing with “big science” issues in the social sciences and humanities.

Accordingly, SSHRC will contribute to developing not only the human infrastructure that underpins research but also the design and creation of research tools needed for such cutting-edge research. Over the next five years SSHRC will:

→ work with the Canada Foundation for Innovation to ensure investments in research infrastructure meet the needs of the entire Canadian research community;

→ support the development of leading-edge tools for large-scale research on complex, issues that will position Canada as a world research leader (for example, editorial and other text-based initiatives, longitudinal surveys, research output management systems and more effective research data centres).

While support for this strategic thrust will not require vast sums, it will grow substantially over the next five years, pending availability of new resources.
3. BUILD THE KNOWLEDGE COUNCIL

SSHRC constitutes an integral part of the humanities and social sciences research community and plays a critical role in maintaining public support for excellence in research and scholarship adjudicated at arm’s-length from political influence.

It also plays a role in representing the “collective face” of Canadian-based social sciences and humanities research—a role that has grown as scholars expand their activities outside the academic community and beyond Canada’s borders.

The Council is called on to work with researchers and practitioners in all sectors of society and to liaise with scholars and granting agencies in other disciplines and in other countries. It seeks international opportunities for Canadian participation, develops policies and practices that complement or bridge those of other national research agencies and raises the international profile of Canadian research.

FIGURE 2: The complex net of relationships within which SSHRC functions as a granting council. The new Knowledge Council will intensify and expand these relationships.
In order to realize fully the Knowledge Council vision, SSHRC will develop the organizational capacity to:

- act as a national “clearinghouse” providing easy access to SSHRC-funded research findings—possibly by setting up a national database of research outcomes that complements institutional repositories and provides a single point of access, available in Canada and abroad, to Canadian research;
- create more effective, ongoing relationships with media, non-governmental organizations, private sector firms and governments at all levels;
- provide stronger policy leadership on strategically important issues such as research impact indicators, future research directions, the academic incentives and rewards system, and the status of “grey” literature;
- establish a network of SSHRC representatives on all Canadian university campuses.

The next few years will be challenging for SSHRC as it broadens its role to become a more inclusive and effective knowledge council. To make this transition, it must involve and inspire its employees through forward-looking and careful management of change and the recruitment of such new skills as may be needed to fulfill its expanded mission.
4. IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN

SSHRC’s progress towards becoming a knowledge council will depend partly on federal budget appropriations.

Therefore, each year for the next five years, Council will identify and implement specific, affordable, priority goals from this strategic plan. The yearly implementation plan will be a supplement to SSHRC’s Report on Plans and Priorities.

SSHRC is already involved in knowledge council activities (comprising, bridging, promoting); but in order to deliver fully on the vision outlined in this strategic plan, SSHRC’s budget will have to double, bringing it to between 29 and 25 per cent of the total federal investment in the three granting agencies.

**FIGURE 3:** Knowledge Council budget, 2010–11 (in current millions of dollars) The budget of a fully transformed and appropriately financed Council. The largest relative increases will focus on clustering research, building research capacity and intensifying knowledge mobilization.

**NOTES:** 2010–2011 Budget forecasts. Does not include the Indirect Costs program.
CONCLUSION
TODAY, MORE THAN EVER, CANADA AND THE WORLD NEEDS ADVANCED KNOWLEDGE TO DEAL WITH OUR MOST PRESSING SOCIAL, POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS.

Real, lasting solutions to terrorism, AIDS, poverty, global warming will not come entirely from new technology or new science. We have medicines that we can't deliver to the most needy. We have high-tech weapons and information systems that can't stop subway bombs. Our scientists know the causes and consequences of global warming, but we ignore them. Our social scientists know that the most powerful determinants of health are social, not surgical or pharmaceutical, yet popular, policy and political discussions alike focus almost exclusively on the medicare system.

To solve these problems, we need to do a much better job of getting humanities and social sciences knowledge out into the world where it can make a difference, where it can inspire ideas and debate, where it can galvanize individuals, communities, businesses and governments into action.

To do this, SSHRC must operate as a knowledge council.

This means bringing the knowledge gained from both basic and applied research to families, community groups, policy-makers, legislators, business leaders and the media. This means improving by several orders of magnitude the present scope and effectiveness of sharing that knowledge—by fostering more sophisticated regional, national and international research networks, by promoting more vigorous and sustained media attention to and engagement in research issues, by promoting research as a vital and honoured part of every education.

What pay-off can we legitimately expect from the transforming of SSHRC into a value-added knowledge council? Even at this early stage, we can look ahead to:

- more scholars with strong and effective linkages with other researchers across Canada and the world, as well as with a broader range of stakeholders and partners outside academia;
- more stakeholders who are aware of, and actively benefit from, social sciences and humanities research expertise;
- greater participation of Canadian researchers in international research projects;
- more students gaining broader perspectives, adoptive capacity and intellectual dynamism from studying in a variety of university environments;
- the foundations of a knowledge mobilization system that will provide more routine access to new data and research findings, and enable more evidence-based decision-making by governments and other sectors on key social, economic, cultural and other issues;
greater presence in the mass media of articles, broadcasts and interviews on, and directly related to, the contributions made by social sciences and humanities research.

All this will make Canada a more connected nation that reaps unprecedented benefits from both the scale of its geography and the rich diversity of its population. The greater availability and systematic sharing of ideas and research insights will also support, both directly and indirectly, the fullest expression of Canada’s particular approach to participatory democracy.

Canada stands to benefit greatly from the renewal of the social sciences and humanities—with greatly enhanced capacity for economic and social innovation, for wealth creation and for sustaining its citizens’ overall quality of life in the 21st century.
APPENDICES
SSHRC’S BUDGET

SSHRC’s budget for 2005-06 is $292 million, of which $157.4 million is allocated for core grants and scholarships, $50.4 million to the Canada Graduate Scholarships (CGS) program, $53.2 million to the Canada Research Chairs program, $19.4 million to the Initiative on the New Economy (INE), and $11.8 million to the Networks of Centres of Excellence (NCE) program. SSHRC also manages the federal government’s Indirect Costs program, established on a permanent basis in 2003.

SSHRC GRANTS & SCHOLARSHIPS BUDGET 2005–2006

TOTAL BUDGET $292M

- Research $132.4M – 45%
- People $139.3M – 48%
- Knowledge Mobilization $20.6M – 7%

NOTES: 2005-2006 Budget subject to final approval. Excludes the Indirect Costs program.
PROFILE OF SSHRC’S COMMUNITY

SSHRC’s principal clients are the 19,000 full-time faculty and 40,000 graduate students in more than 90 universities across Canada who teach, study and conduct research in the social sciences and humanities. They work in such fields as economics, history, political science, business, education, philosophy and modern languages. Collectively, they represent 54 per cent of full-time professors and 58 per cent of full-time graduate students in Canadian universities. Compared with sister agencies nationally and internationally, SSHRC funds a very broad range of disciplines and fields, including not only the social sciences and humanities but also fine arts, law, commerce, and education. All told, SSHRC funds research and training in over thirty disciplines.

The following two tables compare the numbers and percentages of all full-time faculty and graduate students in Canadian universities in the three main research sectors—health sciences (Health), natural sciences and engineering (NSE), and social sciences and humanities (SSH)—to those of full-time faculty and graduate students in the six broad fields into which SSHRC divides its client community.

### PROFILE OF SSHRC’S CORE COMMUNITY OF FULL-TIME UNIVERSITY FACULTY AND GRADUATE STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>NSE</th>
<th>SSH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Health
- 3.8% law
- 7.1% fine arts
- 12.6% commerce
- 14.5% education
- 28.3% humanities
- 33.7% social sciences (includes law & commerce)

#### NSE
- 1.9% law
- 4.0% fine arts
- 15.8% commerce
- 20.2% education
- 22.9% humanities
- 35.2% social sciences (includes law & commerce)

*Source: Statistics Canada – Faculty (2002–2003) and graduate students data (1999–2000).*
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