Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions

Johanne Provençal
Simon Fraser University

Scholarly and Research Communication
VOLUME 2 / ISSUE 2 / 2011

Abstract

In May 2010, with the support of funds from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada, a one-day workshop titled "Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities" brought together Canadian stakeholders involved in extending the reach of research (for the public good). This article presents a summary of the workshop presentations and a synthesis of the workshop discussions as well as a discussion of the emergent issues arising from the workshop (such as the sustainability of open access journal publishing, the challenges of knowledge mobilization, and the limited media uptake of social sciences and humanities research). Also discussed are areas of inquiry that these issues open up (engaged scholarship and the engaged university, faculty reward structures, and public knowledge/knowledge mobilization as areas of scholarly inquiry), and collaborative next steps for stakeholders to take, to address concerns raised, and to seize opportunities to advance shared interests.

Johanne Provençal completed her doctoral research in 2009, examining the historical and international contexts for the changing role(s) of post-secondary institutions vis-à-vis governments, community organizations, industry professionals, evolving student populations, and diverse publics as stakeholders in higher education. She has since been investigating research, policy and practice in community and civic engagement by universities and colleges in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia.

Keywords

Knowledge mobilization; Public knowledge; Engaged scholarship; Social sciences and humanities research; Canada

CCSP Press
Scholarly and Research Communication
Volume 2, Issue 2, Article ID 020107, 30 pages
Journal URL: www.src-online.ca
Received February 2, 2011, Accepted March 30, 2011, Published December 30, 2011

Provençal, Johanne. (2011). Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions. *Scholarly and Research Communication, 2*(2): 020107, 30 pp.

Introduction

In April 2009, John Willinsky (Director of the Public Knowledge Project), in collaboration with Rowland Lorimer (Director of the Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing) and Johanne Provençal (who was completing doctoral work on issues related to knowledge mobilization of social sciences and humanities research in Canada), submitted a proposal to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada for a workshop that would bring together some of Canada's key figures involved in extending the reach of research as a public good.[1] The initial rationale for the workshop was that although those involved in both knowledge mobilization and public knowledge appeared to have shared interests and a shared goal of extending the reach of research to diverse publics, they did not appear to be working together or even to be sufficiently aware of each other's activities. The main concerns of those at the public knowledge end of the spectrum involved questions of how publics can access research (in particular, published research); the main concerns of those at the knowledge mobilization end of the spectrum involved questions about how research can reach different publics.

As the workshop proposal was being drafted, it became evident that although public knowledge and knowledge mobilization appeared to be situated at opposite ends of a spectrum (of sorts), the same spectrum was also populated by others involved in extending the reach of research, and invitations to participate were sent, for example, to individuals associated with research groups involved in extending the reach of research; organizations linked to the research community; non-academic organizations with a clear mandate to include research in their activities; and other organizations with a mandate to extend the reach of research, such as library groups, science journalists, and educational organizations. The full-day workshop was held at Concordia University in Montréal on May 27, 2010 (see the workshop program, attached, as a supplementary file).

The presenters were grouped according to three topic areas: (i) knowledge mobilization, (ii) research as public knowledge, and (iii) extending the "reach" of research. Each presenter was asked to give the group a brief (15-minute) overview of how their own work and/or how their organization's activities were involved in extending the reach of research as a public good.[2] A discussion followed each series of presentations. The first discussion was on "research as a public good" and concerned questions about what was involved in knowledge mobilization and its challenges. The second discussion identified partnership opportunities within the group (as well as beyond the group). Participants were asked to identify where, within the scope of the activities of their organization or their research, they could see areas for collaboration following from the workshop. The third discussion identified possible collaborative next steps more specifically, whether for events, research projects, or other activities.

Immediately following the workshop, the organizers (Willinsky, Provençal, and Lorimer) met to confer about the workshop presentations and how the workshop discussions had unfolded over the course of the day. In regard to the key concern of the day — research and the public good — there were four emergent dimensions evident from the workshop. First was the issue of *opening up scholarly journals*, which included concerns about journal business models, existing resources provided to journals,

Provençal, Johanne. (2011). Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions. *Scholarly and Research Communication, 2*(2): 020107, 30 pp.

and the benefits and sustainability of open access journals. Second was the issue of *knowledge mobilization*, which included concerns about the different understandings of what is meant by "knowledge mobilization" and different facets of engaging in it, as well as the challenges of knowledge mobilization efforts across discourse communities. Third was the issue of the *engaged university*, which included concerns about the perspective of changing university mandates, the faculty reward systems, engaged scholarship, and the "scholarship of service." Fourth was the issue of *media reception* of social sciences and humanities research and scholarship, including questions of whether the media benefit from increased access to journals and where the media are situated in knowledge mobilization efforts.

Workshop Welcome

The Principal Investigator for the workshop proposal, John Willinsky, opened the day's events with a welcome address, inviting attendees to take the opportunity presented by the workshop to get to know one another in terms of research as a public good and to listen for possibilities for collaboration and for ideas for collaborative research proposals that could follow the workshop. Willinsky noted that advancing research on the question(s) of research as a public good could improve the perception that the public and researchers themselves have of the public value of research, which could inform an understanding of the need for public investment in research. The issue of research for the public good involves not only the question of impact, but also knowledge translation, mobilization, transfer, and management, and draws attention to issues about the kind of mediation required. These concerns all need to be taken into account when thinking about how to establish, document, and present a convincing case for research and the public good.

Willinsky then provided a few examples of how some of his own work has investigated the question(s) of research as a public good, and from different approaches, beginning with:

> [T]wo pilot projects of the Public Knowledge Project at the University of British Columbia. The first was a collaborative effort with the *Vancouver Sun*, a daily local newspaper, examining how print journalism could be extended by providing links to related research, policies, practices, programs, and organizations available on the Internet (http://pkp.sfu.ca/files/Standards.pdf). A Public Knowledge Policy Forum was then created with the British Columbia Teacher's Federation ... to facilitate public participation in the policy-making process of the BC Ministry of Education supported by access to the relevant educational research and the government policies and plans. (Willinsky, 2001, p. 619)

Willinsky noted, however, that although there was interest and involvement from non-academic partners, the journals would not provide access to their content.

Ten years after these early pilot projects, the Public Knowledge Project (PKP) has since been involved in launching the Open Journal Systems (OJS), Open Conference Systems, and Open Monograph Press (PKP, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, respectively). Each of these provides a content management system (which is open source) and a platform to

provide open access to content. Since launching in 2002, OJS has been made available in more than 15 languages and used to launch more than 8000 journals worldwide. The Public Knowledge Project has also partnered with Synergies Canada, a "not-for-profit platform for the publication and the dissemination of research results in social sciences and humanities published in Canada" (Synergies Project, 2011), which now has more than 250 journals included in its online platform.

Following the launch of OJS, Willinsky (2003) was also involved in studies of the use of online research by civil servants in Ottawa to address "the question of how new technologies can improve the public quality and presence of academic research" and reported on "interviews with a sample of 25 Canadian policymakers … looking at the specific role that online research has begun to play in their work, and what frustrations they face in using this research." Among the findings: civil servants have very little time to gather information or research on an issue (20–30 minutes), most have no budget for electronic journals, and status of sources is an issue (there is a tendency to favour Ivy League publications over others). There was also an interest among interviewees in having more information about articles (PKP has since developed reading tools to help readers find other online content that is similar or relevant to an item being viewed).

Willinsky noted, however, that issues of access to published research have gained increasing attention from funding bodies. For example, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) and the U.S.-based National Institutes of Health (NIH) both have public access policies. One question that arises in the context of mandates that are opening access is, how can social sciences and humanities research begin to track public impact? Willinsky raises this as both an educational question and a democratic question, closing his workshop presentation with a call to create a research environment that the public can benefit from without having to depend on support for knowledge translation.

Workshop Presentation Series 1 — "Knowledge Mobilization"

The first series of presenters at the workshop discussed issues of knowledge mobilization from various perspectives based on their own experience and how they were situated within the academic system. Barbara Crutchley, President of the Canadian Association of University Research Administrators, provided insights from the offices of university research administrators. Robert Greenwood, Director of the Harris Centre of Regional Policy and Development at Memorial University of Newfoundland, discussed collaboration and outreach to address regional needs. Budd Hall, Director of the Office of Community-Based Research at the University of Victoria, discussed the involvement between the university and community throughout the research process, from shaping research questions to circulating results. David Phipps, Director of Research Services and Knowledge Exchange at York University, gave examples of various approaches to knowledge mobilization and knowledge brokering.

Research Administration and the Changing Research Environment

Barbara Crutchley has been involved in the research administration field since 1980 and has witnessed the changing research environment and changing needs of researchers. This change has included growth in the area of knowledge mobilization as researchers try to make research more public. One important concern, however, is the dual issue of assigning value and deciding who assigns it. There is clearly a disconnect

Provençal, Johanne. (2011). Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions. *Scholarly and Research Communication, 2*(2): 020107, 30 pp.

between the research and reward processes: the process is about what *has been* successful rather than what *will be* successful. Tenure assessment does not take into account relationships and students are not provided with training in this area. There is a tension between the old way and the new way of doing things that is clearly visible to research administrators. Also, from the vantage point of research administrators, there are some concerns as researchers apply for funding to develop relationships but they do not know how to build those relationships: the researchers may gain access to funds, but they do not necessarily have the skills to conduct themselves as needed to build relationships in the wider community, beyond academe.

Crutchley discussed the tension arising from the university need for faculty to teach courses and conduct research, while relationship-building activities require time and can result in resentment when researchers request course release for this work. The reward system does not recognize knowledge mobilization activities undertaken by faculty, as peer-reviewed publications remain privileged. In some cases, individual awards may exist for this kind of work, but the university as an institution does not appear ready to support group awards. There is a reluctance to value "translation" for community-based work but there is some value given to produce research outputs that can inform policy. University research offices are not equipped (or at least, not *well* equipped) to support knowledge mobilization for researchers, yet researchers need the support to be successful. A further concern is whether there is the expertise to write up research findings in a way that is accessible to a wider public and, if there is, where the public would access these findings.

Another tension arising with community-based work and knowledge mobilization is that success in this kind of work requires researchers to take on the role of collaborator, rather than "expert," because one of the most important elements in this kind of work is that partners in the community need to be heard. In the work that these partners do in their communities, *they* are the experts. This is a serious matter because if a researcher approaches an existing university partner, there is a risk of damaging that relationship if the researcher does not have the skills required to work with community partners. The situation may in part be due to the tendency for researchers to work independently and therefore be reluctant to seek out within the administrative units of the university the expertise that may be available in terms of working with community partners. The university could set up mentor programs to provide this support. For example, in every large project, before submitting a proposal, someone in the university research administration unit could sit down with the research team and ask them how they plan to deliver on the impacts they have set out for the project and what metrics they will use. Help can also be given to find the right people for the team and to ensure that the research team members have the community expertise needed for the project.

In addition, research funding adjudicators do not appear equipped to assess partnership. Despite increasing pressure to fund research that involves partnerships, there does not seem to be sufficient understanding about how long it takes to develop a relationship. Similarly, expectations for impact results in one or two years are not realistic. The movement by SSHRC toward partnerships is an important step but there is also a need for the research community to know how to adjudicate the proposals, to develop the skills to succeed in research partnerships, to evaluate and properly

assign value to that work, and to support and encourage graduate students to engage in such work. Projects with the best success involve people originally from other sectors who are now academics, because they understand whom to talk to in the sector (and how), and they can take on leadership roles in moving forward individual universities, funding bodies, and the research community as a whole.

Knowledge Mobilization Helps Turn Research into a Public Good

David Phipps discussed how knowledge mobilization is developed at York University, for researchers and for others, including graduate students and non-academic partners. He describes knowledge mobilization *not* as one thing that happens at a particular time, but rather, as a suite of activities that supports two-way connections (user push, user pull, and knowledge exchange).[3] Ultimately, the knowledge mobilization unit at York University encourages researchers to work with others in the co-production of knowledge (Research Impact, 2011). This is evident in the "Mobilizing Minds" initiative in co-producing the research, so what is produced makes sense for those who want to use it.

York Region has a very diverse "Inclusivity Action Plan" evaluation that recognizes the need to absorb new Canadians into the fabric of the region. In 2007 York Region called on the York University knowledge mobilization unit to evaluate the plan. York Region Council received a number of recommendations and the plan now includes five welcome centres rather than only one, and greater interchange between the university and the community. Relationships take a long time to develop, however, and it is important to know that these initiatives are not about York University: this work is about issues in the community. It is also important to keep in mind that there are different phases of knowledge mobilization and phases of forming a community of practice.

One of the key activities of the York University knowledge mobilization unit is the "KM in the AM" breakfast series, which is based on the model of venture capital breakfasts, bringing people with money and need together with people with good ideas. The breakfast topic is always identified by the community, and then the York University knowledge mobilization unit goes back to the university community to invite people who may have an interest in the topic to participate. At the breakfasts, the community and university present on equal terms (the event always happens in the community and not on campus), and there is a shared understanding that not all knowledge is at the university. There is a need to ensure a balanced relationship. After the breakfasts, a follow-up phone call is made to all participants to see who is still talking to whom. One successful example of "KM in the AM" was the session on mental health: two people in the group met and submitted a CIHR proposal, pulling in other researchers, and they now have a five-year funded project on knowledge translation for young adult mental health, involving researchers, community partners, and young adults themselves (Mobilizing Minds, 2011).

The York University knowledge mobilization unit also works with a language-writing practitioner to train graduate students to write in clear language. One example is the "Research Snapshots" that contain a headline and four key questions, with links to the researcher and full article or full study. At the time of writing, there was a searchable

Provençal, Johanne. (2011). Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions. *Scholarly and Research Communication, 2*(2): 020107, 30 pp.

database of more than 100 research snapshots (Research Impact, 2011), which provide a one-sentence headline, a box containing two or three sentences on "what you need to know," and a two-page summary.

On the question of the unit's beginnings at York University, Phipps and others interested in knowledge mobilization submitted several successful grant proposals then presented a value proposition to the university's vice-president. The vice-president and the university have supported the unit with soft funds and the unit continues to get grants in for projects. The goal, in Phipps's view, is for universities to invest in institutional knowledge mobilization support services the way they support commercialization and university-industry liaison.

Research, Knowledge, Public Outreach, and Measures of Engagement

Robert Greenwood gave an overview of the Leslie Harris Centre of Regional Policy and Development, established in 2004, building on a long tradition of engagement at Memorial University of Newfoundland. In the university's mission statement there is recognition of the special obligation of the university to the province of Newfoundland and Labrador and to the region. This commitment is evident in the VP Academic's most recent strategic plan: the university did not want to lose its extension in the region, so there was a need for a broker, facilitator, or catalyst to identify and address the needs of the region.

The Harris Centre is mandated to identify priority themes and projects related to research, teaching, and outreach. The organizational structure for the Harris Centre activities is as follows: the Director of the Centre reports to the university's VP Academic, VP Research, and an advisory board; reporting to the centre's Director are a secretary, centre associates, an associate director of Public Policy, a manager of Knowledge Mobilization, and an operations manager (reporting to them are interns and project staff).

The Harris Centre's key programs and services are public forums, conferences, invitation-only sessions, targeted research funding, graduate student knowledge exchange, packaging research to meet needs, regional workshops, and Yaffle (a database of the university's research activities).[4] Greenwood provided several examples of how the Harris Centre responds to the community, including circulating "one-pagers" on collaborative research opportunities, holding regional workshops, liaising with regional councils, preparing individual submissions for funding/projects, and preparing lay summaries.

Although the Harris Centre has been successful, it has also confronted several challenges, one of which was how to build the centre's brand both within and outside of the university. The faculty reward system (and tenure and promotion criteria) also presents challenges. Other challenges were how to maintain independence while brokering projects that require funding, accepting that patience is required when dealing with university politics and posturing, recognizing that the capacity of community organizations should not be overestimated, and being sure to manage workflow when responding to demand from the community.[5]

Greenwood identifies the three key components in the knowledge brokering at the Harris Centre as (1) demand (research, teaching, outreach, and knowledge "pull"); (2) supply (the capacity of the university to deliver, or knowledge "push"); and (3)

champions (those who see the value in knowledge mobilization and are in a position to move initiatives forward). Greenwood also notes the importance of clarifying roles (whether for the leaders, partners, or those providing support) and for clarification of commitments being made (whether for project management, monitoring, or evaluation). Lastly, it is important to communicate about knowledge mobilization opportunities, initiatives, and success stories.

Toward a New Architecture of Knowledge

Budd Hall has been involved in participatory and community-based research since the 1970s, extending this to involvement in the International Participatory Research Network in the 1980s and 1990s. Hall reminds us that knowledge and the public good have a long history in Canada, citing Henry Marshall Tory, the founder of UBC, the University of Alberta, and Carleton University, describing university as "a people's institution." Other examples across Canada include Frontier College (1899), the Faculty of Extension at the University of Alberta (1912), the Antigonish movement at St. Francis Xavier University (1930s and 1940s), participatory research at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto (since the 1970s), and the establishment of indigenous-centred research methods (since the 1970s).

More recently, there are numerous examples of movement toward a new architecture of knowledge. Among the examples is the Community-University Exposition held in recent years (in Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Victoria, and Kitchener). Hall notes that SSHRC's Community-University Research Alliance program is coveted around the world. Research Impact, led by York University, is an active hub for knowledge mobilization at other universities including Memorial University of Newfoundland, l'Université de Québec à Montréal, the University of Guelph, the University of Saskatchewan, and the University of Victoria. Community-Based Research Canada (CBRC) is a network that brings together "people and organizations engaged in Community-Based Research to meet the needs of people and communities" (Community-Based Research Canada, 2011) and is linked to the Global Alliance on Community Engaged Research (Global Alliance on Community Engaged Research, 2011). The Canadian Alliance for Community Service Learning supports students, educators, and communities in "building partnerships to learn from each other while working together in innovative ways to strengthen individuals, communities and society" (Canadian Alliance for Community Service Learning, 2011). The Canadian Community Economic Development Network is a "member-led organization committed to strengthening communities by creating economic opportunities that improve environmental and social conditions" and has regional networks across the country (Canadian Community Economic Development Network, 2011).

Hall invited workshop participants to become involved in these activities, and also in the Canadian Knowledge Commons Initiative, which uses a social networking site to allow people to "share ideas, find out more information and participate in the on-going conversation about the role of knowledge in Canadian society" (Knowledge Commons Initiative, 2011). Hall notes that several questions arise from involvement in these kinds of initiatives, from issues of power relations and use of resources, to the role of "knowledge" in society (where it resides and who owns it) and the extent to which people are prepared to co-create and share knowledge in new ways.

Provençal, Johanne. (2011). Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions. *Scholarly and Research Communication, 2*(2): 020107, 30 pp.

Hall closed his presentation by remarking that not only are we building on a Canadian tradition, we are also having this conversation at an excellent time, given the growing sense — from funders, from universities, from communities — that there is a new opportunity availing itself in that the way we interact around knowledge is changing and being challenged.

Group Discussion 1: Research As a Public Good

After the first series of presentations, workshop participants engaged in a group discussion aimed at arriving at a shared understanding of "research as a public good." To describe research as "a public good" is problematic in the sense that it can become trapped in an economic model of goods. That said, the notion of research as public rather than private is key. Another approach is to think of "research for the public good" and the place of community in research. Also important is an understanding that the public has a right to the knowledge produced by the academic research community. With this general framing of research as/for the public good, the discussion turned to issues of advancing research as/for the public good, and several main points were raised.

First is the question of the position and the role of the university in advancing research as/for a public good. Beyond the presence of the public in the research and teaching activities of faculty, as well as in the rather marginalized activities regarded as service, to what extent do universities undertake activities *with* the community? The need for community involvement is being given increased attention but it is unclear whether the university as a whole or individual members of faculty, or indeed both, are responsible for better addressing the issue. There is clearly a need for infrastructure to support community-based research and community engagement activities. Some faculty have an interest in their work contributing to public knowledge, but if that work is not part of a project that includes knowledge mobilization, they may be uncertain of how best to achieve that goal on their own. That said, not all research activities undertaken by the university need to directly involve the community; or in other words, not all knowledge produced by the university needs to be mobilized. There is a shift toward engaged scholarship, but there are also tensions arising from that shift. Some of the challenges of knowledge mobilization emerge from the tension between an interest in and resistance to knowledge mobilization.

One challenge for knowledge mobilization is the need to recognize that knowledge is created not only within the university, but also within communities outside of the academy. The research democracy movement, for example, aims to support research capacity in the community itself and to better understand how to recognize knowledge forms that are derived from community processes and practices. This also raises questions of how academic organizations are interacting with other kinds of organizations that are already engaged in their own knowledge mobilization.

Another challenge for knowledge mobilization is to recognize *different publics* (as plural) and, related to this, to challenge the notion of "plain language" because language can (and does) include people in and exclude people from a particular public. Academics are trained to communicate in their field of research and their scholarly discipline but are not trained or encouraged to communicate outside of it. Specialized, scholarly discourse is valued in the academy, but not outside of it, and vice versa. We cannot avoid the use of specialized language to produce specialized knowledge. Texts

that are derived from scholarly publications but aimed at readers/audiences outside the academy are not meant to replace scholarly publications, but to complement them. What is needed is a better way to link these forms to each other. Another question that arises, then, is, what is the place of peer review in this shift? Peer review is the gold standard for scholarly journal articles, but what gold standards are there (or could there be) for knowledge mobilization texts (or knowledge mobilization through other media), and how can these forms be complementary links to scholarly texts?

One response to such questions about scholarly journals is to look at the possibilities that open access presents. Open access to scholarly journal content permits public access to peer-reviewed research and scholarship. Although there are barriers in the form of the language/discourse of scholarship, open access does provide the public with access to a body of research (which they might not otherwise know exists) that they can draw on — even if not by reading the articles themselves — to seek out other work of journal authors, or activities at the authors' home institutions (in research centres or as part of research projects), for example. Online content is not limited to textual content, and some journals have begun to experiment with short video clips to complement the published journal articles (Teachers College Record, 2011). We can perhaps expect some resistance to the evolving form of the journal in this way just as we experienced resistance to journals moving online over the course of the past decade. The question of how the strength of peer review can be used when encountering objections to evolving journal content is an important one. If, as noted by some of us in the group who are experienced in knowledge mobilization, open access is only part of the equation — because "knowledge mobilization is a contact sport" — then how can evolving journal content and peer review together make knowledge mobilization work? To complement journal articles, what other journal content (or other content that is linked to journals) can we explore? There is also the question of what is most useful to different publics (for example, practitioners, policymakers, etc.).[6]

The first discussion ended with an agreement that further exploration was needed for new forms of journal content, for research on knowledge mobilization itself, for infrastructure and support for engaged scholarship, and for collective efforts to advance research for/as a public good.

Workshop Presentation Series 2 — "Research As Public Knowledge"

The second series of presenters at the workshop discussed issues of "research as public knowledge" from various perspectives. Robyn Stockand, President of the Canadian Association of Special Libraries and Information Services, presented some economic considerations and ideas on how the issue at hand could be understood and approached as an "information problem." Rowland Lorimer, Director of the Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing, presented on the scholarly and non-scholarly roles that are necessary in research communication and the dynamics of the existing model. Christian Vandendorpe, Vice-President of Research Dissemination at the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, presented on the necessity of open access.

The Information Marketplace: Public Goods, Private Enterprise

Robyn Stockand opened her presentation by noting that, drawing on the relationship between "knowledge" and "information," she would be suggesting ways that research

Provençal, Johanne. (2011). Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions. *Scholarly and Research Communication, 2*(2): 020107, 30 pp.

as a public good or public knowledge can be understood and approached as an *information* problem, which is a problem of content, rather than systems. In other words, there is a need for dialogue in advance of asking questions to ensure that answers are meaningful. Archives are about storage and libraries are about using information/knowledge, again, and again, and again.

It is also important not to lose sight of the economics of information. Details of contracts to get access to research make this clear. It seems that the public undervalues information, compared to other goods and react strongly to the idea of paying for content. In terms of academic research/knowledge/information, the input costs are tremendous. Stockand also provided some 2009 figures related to access that special libraries and information services require: $100,000 to access content, $45 billion for financial and credit market information, and $350 billion for "business actionable information." This differs from research in the social sciences and humanities, but illustrates how information for different purposes comes at different costs.

This raises some questions about the idea that information wants to be free. Is there some risk, for example, in devaluing social sciences and humanities research by calling it a public good? If it is "free" then how can we defend the cost to produce it, its usefulness, its currency, and its quality? Valuable information can change lives and save lives. Is there not some concern about public goods being too subject to the tragedy of the commons? Also, if the information is not seen as being owned by anyone, will anyone care about it? One other concern is that if this information is free, but not accessed or used, as "rejected" information is it then a rejected public good?

Scholarly and Non-Scholarly Roles in the Reinvention of Scholarly Communication

Rowland Lorimer's presentation provided an overview of the scholarly and non-scholarly roles in research communication and stressed the need to understand that these roles require different knowledge and skills. It is also important to understand how content and rights management are evolving and Lorimer presented a framework with which to see some of the players involved. Lorimer also called for a suitable infrastructure to support scholarly communication in Canada.

On the issue of roles and skills required in scholarly communication, Lorimer noted that although journals are centres of intellectual energy and organize and consolidate fields of inquiry, legitimize access, and invigorate a field, of the many tasks involved in journal publishing, very few are purely scholarly tasks. For example, while scholarly professionals have an important role in activities involving the founding of a journal, selection of the journal editor, editorial vision, peer review, submission choices, editorial board membership, and in some cases grant writing, consider the many other activities involved in journal publishing. Journal management, brand development and management, professional editing, design, proofing, marketing and packaging, printing and mailing, subscriptions fulfillment and management, financial management, hosting, archiving, rights management, aggregation management, harvesting, and indexing, for example, all require the knowledge and skills of publishing professionals or other professionals, rather than the academic or research knowledge and skills of most scholars.

The need for involvement by both scholars and other professionals becomes clear when considering content, rights, and funding flows for journals. In the case of content, files flow to the host, then to libraries, then to users (with access gained through the user to the library, through the library to the host, and through the host to the content). In the case of rights, through licensing, the rights flow from the owner to a consortium seller, then to a consortium buyer, then to the libraries, then to the user. Funds flow from the libraries to the consortium buyer, to the consortium seller, and, finally, to the journal. Looking at the flow of content, rights, and funds, it becomes clear that libraries cannot be charities, but neither can journals because it is too risky for journals to look for beneficent donors and then give away the journal content to the library community. In this context, it is not advisable for all funding for journals to be on the production side because when there are dollars on the demand side, there are market sensitivities and a system that is more responsible to the environment that it is supposed to be serving.

Several observations can be made about the existing model. First is that self-archiving is not consistent with the role that publications play in increasing the value of research. Second, we need social sciences and humanities funding in Canada to encompass a great deal more than the scholarly activities of conducting research: proper infrastructure of scholarly communication is needed at the level of the journal so that journal publishing is not a volunteer effort that falls short of what international publishers are doing. Third, we need to look closely at funding the journals in an open access framework as part of our responsibility as public institutions and public employees to make it publicly accessible. SSHRC funds about one third of what it costs a journal to publish and although this can support a journal for a while, it is not a sustaining amount of money. The Canadian Association of Learned Journals has been involved in discussions exploring the kind of structure that could fund journals so that they can become open access while also bringing the larger community of subscription-based Canadian journals into a consortium sale.

The Double Necessity of Open Access

Christian Vandendorpe opened his presentation by noting that knowledge is essential in order to understand and address the many problems with which our planet is confronted. The question of access is therefore fundamental. His concern is the privatization of knowledge that came with the shift from print to digital and his interest is in the open access movement born as a reaction to that situation. The Directory of Open Access Journals had exceeded 5000, for example. Vandendorpe then provided an overview of the current situation for the open access movement.

In 2007, the U.S.-based National Institutes of Health (NIH) required all published research funded by NIH to be made publicly available 12 months after publication. In 2009, the European Union introduced a similar requirement for funded research. In 2010, efforts were made to extend the NIH mandate to all U.S. funding agencies. Even with these changes, and although many universities have institutional repositories, most researchers do not archive their articles. There are also only very few open access mandates by universities (Eprints.org, 2011)[7]. Vandendorpe noted that according to Guédon (2009), the situation may be due to a lack of a coherent policy at the institutional

level. SSHRC supports open access journals but does not make it mandatory. The Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences also adopted a position in favour of open access in 2006 but most journals are still subscription based.

Vandendorpe described open access as necessary from an *ethical point of view*: journal rights can end up with foreign aggregators and then sold back to Canadian libraries. He suggested that in Canada we need a coalition that works to ensure that publicly funded research is openly accessible to the public. From an *economic point of view*, there is no library that can afford to subscribe to the 25,000 journals that are published around the world. Vandendorpe, citing the U.K.'s Research Information Network, noted how frequently researchers are unable to access material from their own library (Research Information Network, 2009).

It is important to note also that open access provides increased visibility and citations (see Harnad, 2009). There is also an explosion of knowledge available through data mining. Similarly, Google Analytics, for example, can provide a journal with information about the country of origin of those accessing journal content. This is important when considering the limited access to journals in some parts of the world. In the case of one journal with which Vandendorpe is involved — @nalyses — at the time of the presentation, 1741 visitors from the continent of Africa had accessed the journal content. Increased access through open access also facilitates collaborative research in what is a new (and evolving) ecosystem of knowledge. Vandendorpe closed his presentation with a reference to Jeremy Rifkin's *The Empathetic Civilization: The Race to Global Consciousness in a World of Crisis*.

Group Discussion 2: Possibilities for Collaboration

After the second series of presentations, the aim of the group discussion was to identify possibilities for partnership among the workshop participants (as well as useful partnerships involving others) that would address the need for further exploration in the areas identified in the previous group discussion. These areas were:

1. further exploration in new forms of journal content,
2. research on knowledge mobilization itself,
3. infrastructure and support for engaged scholarship, and
4. collective efforts to advance research for/as a public good.

In recalling that the workshop was originally planned to bring together key players on the spectrum of public knowledge/knowledge mobilization, the group also identified the following two priorities for possible partnerships:

1. to pursue collaboration among stakeholders — journal publishers, research libraries, universities, funders, and scholars — to arrive at a sustainable model for the greatest possible public access to published research.
2. to make knowledge mobilization a higher priority on provincial and federal agendas (noting that the issue cannot be sufficiently addressed on an individual basis and that it is important to value the knowledge that is also generated by the community).

Each of the workshop participants was then asked to provide a list of current activities or future interests where they would welcome collaboration to pursue the priorities listed above. The results are presented in the table below.

Participant organization	Areas of possible collaboration
Canadian Association of University Research Administrators	a) Investigating broad application (including but also extending beyond social sciences and humanities) for improving knowledge mobilization. b) Addressing the cultural "clash" between the research community and potential community partners.
Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing/Synergies/CALJ	a) Creating sustainability models for journal publishing. b) Defining needed infrastructure. c) Research on and experimentation with journal content categories. d) Research on the journal industry (in Canada and internationally).
Canadian dissertation-writing research/graduate education	a) Invite the Canadian Federation of Students to become part of the movement. b) If we want to encourage collaboration, we should allow and support PhD and MA students to undertake collaborative theses. c) Investigate the "Scholarship of Service" in Canada.
Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences	a) Looking more closely at faculty evaluation (vis-à-vis public knowledge and knowledge mobilization). b) Identifying/investigating "scholarship of engagement" in Canada.
Canadian Science Writers' Association	a) Participating in an annual conference forum to discuss research and the media/communications (target audience for updates on subjects like OA). b) Investigating the ethical dimension of these issues (for example, through a workshop on OA and research integrity).
The Harris Centre	a) Collaborating with others interested in the Yaffle database at Memorial University. b) Collaborating with others in the Research Impact Community of Practice. c) Holding an annual conference on knowledge mobilization. d) Launching a knowledge mobilization publication and/or developing the area as a field of research. e) Addressing promotion and tenure/peer review as impediments to knowledge mobilization. f) Developing best practices for knowledge mobilization.

Provençal, Johanne. (2011). Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions. *Scholarly and Research Communication, 2*(2): 020107, 30 pp.

Library Associations	a) Partnering with provincial associations at the public library support level to advocate for provincial funds and change. b) Partnering with CLA for federal government initiatives — already established relationships with lobby groups, politicians, and other organizations (such as CARL).
Public Knowledge Project	a) Expanding Synergies as a platform for access to Canadian journals and conferences. b) Diversifying templates for journal table of contents categories in OJS.
The media & journalists	a) Exploring possibilities with the Science Media Centre of Canada. b) Investigating issues of access to community in journalism scholarship. c) Increasing collaboration with communication/ethics/dissemination grants.
University Affairs	a) Partnering with CALJ to give UA a précis of interesting research in their journals that might become stories in UA.
University of Victoria Office of Community-Based Research	a) Collaborating on the Canadian Knowledge Commons Initiative. b) Building regional, multi-institutional partnerships. c) Extending the Vancouver Island University Research Alliance to include initiatives in the Lower Mainland and elsewhere in BC.
York University Knowledge Mobilization Unit	a) Collaborating with others in social networking activities (such as https://researchimpact.othree.ca). b) Developing Research Snapshots (www.researchimpact.ca/researchsearch). c) Participating in ResearchImpact (www.researchimpact.ca) d) Contributing to the Community-University Expo 2011 (http://www.cuexpo2011.ca/)

After the workshop, the above list of possible collaborative next steps was circulated to all workshop participants. The workshop organizers also provided each participant with a customized list of more specific partnering options and these are discussed in the concluding section of this article.

Workshop Presentation Series 3 — "Extending the Reach of Research"

The third and final series of presenters at the workshop discussed issues of "extending the reach of research" from various perspectives. Peggy Berkowitz, Editor of *University Affairs*, presented on how the well-established magazine can be used to extend the reach of research. Tim Lougheed, Past-President of the Canadian Science Writers' Association, presented perspectives as a freelance journalist and noted the importance of narrative in media stories. Kathryn O'Hara, CTV Chair in Science Broadcast Journalism at Carleton University, presented on some of the challenges involved in public engagement. Anthony Paré and Doreen Starke-Meyerring, Professors of Education at McGill University, presented key questions that a rhetorical perspective brings to issues of knowledge mobilization and access to knowledge. Johanne Provençal, Research Associate, Canadian

Centre for Studies in Publishing, gave the final presentation of the workshop, describing how knowledge mobilization presents scholars with a zero-sum paradox, and she suggests possibilities for movement forward.

Research as a Public Good: How *University Affairs* Can Take Part

In her presentation, Peggy Berkowitz discussed how *University Affairs* can be used to get researchers' messages to a wider audience. *University Affairs* is a publication of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and began publishing in 1959. *University Affairs* publishes 10 times per year with a print run of more than 17,000 copies and has a website with an average of 200,000 monthly page views. The readership of *University Affairs* overlaps with that of the *Globe & Mail* and the *Walrus* magazine — readers are knowledgeable and interested in research beyond their own field, but are not familiar with it.

There are several options for extending the reach of research on the pages and website of *University Affairs*. First is to pitch a story idea for *University Affairs* writers. If the idea is suitable for *University Affairs*, it can be used for a feature article or a series of articles. A recent example — and one that reflects the issues being taken up in the workshop — was a story titled "Putting Knowledge into Practice" that discussed some changes at SSHRC and examples of knowledge mobilization activities (Fitzpatrick, 2008). A second option is to write a letter to *University Affairs*, responding to an item published in an earlier issue, perhaps linking your own research (or the research of colleagues or others in your field) to the item. A third option is to write an opinion piece (of approximately 750 words), again, in response to an item appearing in an earlier issue. In some cases, an opinion piece draws so many comments that *University Affairs* will ask one of its reporters to follow up. A fourth option is to write an essay by proposing an idea to *University Affairs* and working within the parameters of their word count, deadline, and feedback for revisions as needed. Beyond these options, *University Affairs* also has regular columnists, and the magazine is always looking for content for the website, including podcasts.

Telling Tales Out of School

Tim Lougheed has been a freelance writer for 20 years, having written for a wide number of publications for many audiences. According to Lougheed, journalists are "hungry for stories" and are therefore at the "knowledge pull" end of the spectrum, with scholars, by contrast, involved in "knowledge push." The academic research community generates much knowledge but must ask, who is the intended recipient? And, how can you get the media to pay attention to your material?

Lougheed stressed the significance of compelling narrative, noting that some universities are posting short narratives about research activities on their websites to draw the attention and interest of wider audiences. One concern about this kind of work is that such limited dollars support professional work in this area. Although the Internet may have an insatiable appetite for data, and individual blogs and Twitter can be useful, there is a need for professional reporters, journalists, editors, and publishing professionals to fulfill gate-keeping functions (to limit the data smog) and ensure quality of content.

Provençal, Johanne. (2011). Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions. *Scholarly and Research Communication, 2*(2): 020107, 30 pp.

In the mainstream media, science is underserved. The question of how to sell a science story is really a question of selling a *story*. Readers should be compelled by a story rather than being overwhelmed by specialized academic research. The question of whether or not there are barriers keeping science writers from the social sciences and humanities is an interesting one. Although the connection between broader society and social sciences and humanities research may seem more obvious than is the case with the hard sciences, there is a privileging of "science" in North America.

Research and Knowledge as a Public Good: From Evidence to Attitudes

Kathryn O'Hara discussed some of her experience both as a professional journalist and in her position on faculty in the journalism program at Carleton University, identifying some of the main challenges for the research community as those of public access to and reception of media content, and the obstacles of scholars' engagement with wider publics, including questions of training, promotion, and tenure. O'Hara pointed out the significance of relationships with the media and the incredible amount of goodwill that comes from face-to-face meetings, noting that the media do not like to be "fed" material. Consider, for example, suspicions involving pharmaceutical companies and medical research findings, or the ongoing debate about climate change. When thinking about the public right to information and all that is available online, we need to keep in mind that not everyone knows where to look for that information or how to evaluate who is supplying it. Open access is important, whether as a public right or a consumer right.

There are a number of challenges involved in public engagement for researchers. First, academics are neither trained to be nor rewarded for being good science communicators. Although this has been changing somewhat in recent years with some research grant applications requiring communication strategies, the reality of the situation is that if a researcher is trying to get word out through the media, this means time away from research. There is a contradiction between what scientists are trained to do and what they are required to do when they are being asked to reach wider audiences. One example of how this difficulty was overcome is in the case of two Canadian scientists who, in explaining to their families what their research was about, became accustomed to doing so and were able to describe their research in a way that could be understood. The same idea — of caring enough and seeing the need to explain — can also apply to a wider community.

What is needed is a greater profile for the social sciences and humanities.[8] To make this research newsworthy, we need to ask, "What are the social sciences and humanities telling us that we do not already know and that we need to know?" One problem is that reporters have to find the people, but finding the faces to illustrate the story is not always easy. Researchers alone do not make a story a human-interest story. Another problem is that, with the social sciences and humanities, unless the results are counterintuitive, there can be a "so what" response, whereas in science there are stem cells, new planets, and "wow!" stories. As important as social sciences and humanities research is, the stories do not often have that kind of appeal. That said, one recent example to the contrary was the open letter from social sciences and humanities researchers in China about suicide clusters in a computer manufacturing plant.

One further question to be asked is how is it that charlatans (in disreputable media outlets, for example) can spread information that people believe when researchers cannot be heard or believed? It is not only what people know or have access to, but also, what they believe or want to believe. It seems there is almost a wilfulness to not see the world as researchers see do, that critical thinking capacity is in short order. Perhaps society needs to be brought back into science (whether social science or otherwise). It is important, then, to train the students to reach the community. Also, if you want a culture of research integrity, you have to start at the graduate level so that young researchers are trained and understand what quality research is, how social sciences and humanities can contribute to society, and why open access is important. In closing, O'Hara (2003) cited Boris Cyrulnik: "Knowledge that is not shared humiliates those who have no access to it."

Writing (in) the Knowledge Society: A Rhetorical Perspective

Anthony Paré and Doreen Starke-Meyerring opened their presentation by considering knowledge mobilization from a rhetorical perspective, which requires us to ask about the rhetor/speaker/writer, their audience(s), their purpose(s), and the rhetorical situation more broadly. When thinking about knowledge from a rhetorical perspective, it becomes necessary to consider knowledge as contested, distributed, and situated; how knowledge is produced in a response to a particular situation and in a particular genre; and how rhetoric underpins all knowledge-making.

These kinds of questions are taken up in the field of inquiry that is sometimes called rhetoric and composition, and sometimes called writing studies.[9] The field also investigates questions involving the knowledge society and the importance of making knowledge accessible and available. In this context, "clear language" is a relative term, as academics use very clear language given that their audience — those in their field of study — understands the terms they are using. One question that needs to be asked, then, is how do we use language to get it to do what we want it to do? Also, genres are important to the public access movement because they are inherited and involve certain economics, and public access relies on technology to challenge and disrupt established genres of knowledge production.

Knowledge always needs to have a space to be contested. Contestation surrounds technologies as well and a prime example is the "Net neutrality" debate. The Internet has changed the kinds of content that people can access. Disruption to knowledge exchanges is not necessarily in the interest of those who control the Internet: there is debate on Internet traffic shaping and what that shaping could do to the open access movement. If you look at how the Internet is constructed rhetorically, there are two models: (1) as a medium (which is what media companies favour); and (2) as a telecommunications technology. The language that is used to describe these models changes the way we think about the Internet.

Academic Reward and Punishment: The Zero-Sum Language Game of Knowledge Mobilization

Johanne Provençal presented an overview of key points in SSHRC funding policy, an overview of the literature on the significance of "discourse communities" and some fundamentals of game theory, as context to consider the academic reward system and

Provençal, Johanne. (2011). Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions. *Scholarly and Research Communication, 2*(2): 020107, 30 pp.

the zero-sum paradox confronting scholars interested in knowledge mobilization of social sciences and humanities research. Issues of knowledge mobilization have been taken up by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada in recent years. In 2004, for example, SSHRC described the "paradox of ubiquity and invisibility" of social sciences and humanities research, as that of being "present everywhere, but for all intents and purposes, visible almost nowhere" (SSHRC, 2004, p. 12). Yet, SSHRC has also noted that "scholars who use traditional methods are also seeking to communicate their work more effectively and to broader audiences" (SSHRC 2005, p. 4). According to SSHRC, there is a "need to build meaningful connections" and to "enhance the impact of knowledge by … building interfaces with media, community groups, the private sector, and all levels of government, and by moving knowledge beyond academia" (SSHRC 2006, p. 7). The 2009–2010 restructuring of SSHRC's program architecture encourages partnerships and "connection" is one of three key priorities (SSHRC, 2010).

Yet, as the scholarly literature has long made evident (see, for example, Bizzell, 1982, 1992; Bourdieu, 1988,1991; Herzberg, 1986; and Lyotard,1984 [1979]), the rules and conventions of discourse differ across communities and there are therefore considerable challenges in mobilizing knowledge across discourse communities. As a consequence, scholars are situated in the paradox of a "zero-sum language game" because although there is increasing pressure to mobilize research knowledge across discourse communities — to government, media, community organizations, and publics — work beyond academic arenas is not rewarded within academic discourse communities. Evidence of this paradox can be found in the collective agreements for faculty associations. Provençal presented her findings from the faculty collective agreements of 38 (of the 56) institutions classified as English-language or bilingual universities in Canada at the beginning of 2008. In the descriptions of faculty responsibilities and tenure and promotion criteria, fewer than half — only 17 in the 38 sampled — make reference to work beyond academe. Similarly, fewer than half — only 16 of 38 — contain details of "service" beyond academe.

Provençal concluded her presentation by suggesting three ways in which scholars — as authors, peer reviewers, journal editors, tenure and promotion committee members, grant adjudicators, and in other positions — could (in the language of game theory) make "moves" to change the rules of how knowledge mobilization activities are evaluated and supported in the academic community. First is to identify in faculty work what could be understood as "scholarship of service" or "scholarship of engagement" and move toward establishing a body of research in this area. Second is to further investigate faculty collective agreements, faculty evaluation, and SSHRC adjudication in order to reconcile systems of reward with changing and diverse expectations of "the engaged university" and research as a public good. Third is to examine scholarly journal content in order to consider issues of access (to the research, to the language, to understandings) as well as issues of *reach* (reaching discourse communities beyond academe, but also reaching levels of recognized, shared interests and what SSHRC has described as "systematic interaction").

Group Discussion 3 — Next Steps and Possible Projects

The third discussion identified possible collaborative next steps more specifically, whether for events, research projects, or other activities. Following the workshop, the organizers also contacted each of the participants with a customized document on possible collaborative partnership and projects. Presented below is a general summary of the ideas carried forward.

Canadian Association of University Research Administrators

One possible step toward collaboration would be to encourage the CAURA to join CFHSS to bring together university administrators and university faculty in Congress sessions to identify and address mutual interests. Workshop participants or others interested in collaboration with members of CAURA could attend national and/or regional CAURA meetings, or partner with a CAURA member to speak at CAURA events. CAURA also authors white papers (Canadian Association of University Research Administrators, 2011), and these too could present opportunities for collaboration with members of the academic research community.

Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing/CALJ/Synergies/PKP

Collaborative activities could include co-authoring white papers or other reports with the Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL), which is involved in projects on a number of issues related to scholarly communication and knowledge dissemination (Canadian Association of Research Libraries, 2011). CARL members could be invited to be reviewers or to guest edit special issues of *Scholarly and Research Communication*, CALJ, CCSP, Synergies, and PKP could submit funding proposals to the Canada Periodical Fund and to SSHRC for various projects. For example, this could include collaborative approaches to increase access to journal content.[10] Other kinds of collaboration could involve launching an initiative with CALJ member journals to opt in to open up tables of contents for wider readership (for example, adding "research snapshots" or similar sections in tables of contents or as supplementary documents to academic abstracts) and track results.[11]

Canadian Dissertation-Writing Research/Graduate Education

The National Graduate Caucus of the Canadian Federation of Students lists campaigns/issues on their website (Canadian Federation of Students, 2011), and they could be contacted to add issues of engaged scholarship to the concerns they raise and address. Research on "scholarship of engagement" or the "engaged campus" could also be undertaken with teams of graduate students and faculty, perhaps through a collaborative research grant involving various fields such as higher education, journalism/communication, and discourse/writing studies.

Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences

Collaborative initiatives (events or committees) could address issues of faculty evaluation, following up on earlier CFHSS discussion on engaged scholarship (Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, 2011).[12] Future CFHSS Congress sessions could include a session such as "From public knowledge to knowledge mobilization: Bridging the divides." Also, an application could be made to the CFHSS Congress Interdisciplinary session fund, which provides support for scholarly societies interested in hosting a joint session at Congress every year that is open to all Congress delegates. Some possible ideas include the following:

Provençal, Johanne. (2011). Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions. *Scholarly and Research Communication, 2*(2): 020107, 30 pp.

1. Canadian Association for the Study of Discourse and Writing (CASDW) and Canadian Association of Learned Journals (CALJ) session: "Open letter to journal editors: The writing on the wall" (panel session with a speaker on the need to open up journal content, an editor on reaching broader audiences, and CASDW scholar on recognizing and overcoming discursive barriers).
2. Canadian Communication Association (CCA) and the Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education (CSSHE) session: "Continental drift: The ecologies of communication and higher education in a climate of knowledge mobilization."

Similarly, an application could be made to the CFHSS International keynote speaker fund to invite leaders from the U.S. or U.K. to provide international perspective on the issue of research as/for the public good. There are also links to be explored between research integrity/ethics and open access: if access is a human right, then perhaps access needs to be considered as part of what faculty consider in terms of ethical implications of their work.[13]

Canadian Science Writers' Association (and the media/journalists)

The Canadian Science Writers' Association could be invited to collaborate with the scholarly associations for Congress sessions. Similarly, the Canadian Science Writers' Association has an annual conference that could involve sessions partnering with scholars. For example, their 2010 conference included a session on "Science opens up: Opportunities through open access and open data." CALJ, PKP, and Synergies could collectively make a presentation at their conference regarding open access to social sciences and humanities research. Another possibility is to approach the Science Media Centre of Canada[14] to bring the social sciences and humanities into its scope (Science Media Centre of Canada, 2011).

Harris Centre of Regional Policy and Development, Memorial University

All workshop participants were invited to log in to the Yaffle website (Yaffle, 2011) to receive the online newsletter and set preferences for email alerts about new content added to Yaffle. Interested workshop participants could form a scholarly society, which would then join CFHSS and have an annual conference as part of CFHSS Congress. Similarly, collaborative efforts could be made to launch a journal that focuses on issues of community engagement in Canada. Before such an undertaking, however, it may be advisable to begin by approaching journals to edit a special issue on knowledge mobilization, research for the public good, engaged scholarship, etc. (*Scholarly and Research Communication* and the *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* are possibilities for journals in Canada.) On the noted need for best practices for knowledge mobilization, this could be an outcome of a research project, funded through a research proposal submitted to SSHRC.

Library Associations

In the interest of increasing communication with the library community, CALJ could approach the Canadian Association of College and University Libraries (CACUL) — which is affiliated with the Canadian Library Association (CLA) — to become a member or exchange memberships. This would allow CALJ to be involved in

the CACUL interest groups (there is an existing interest group on open access). In addition, CACUL Joint Committees develop and carry out "programs of mutual interest, exchanges information, or discusses matters of mutual concern with an organization or organizations outside CLA" (Canadian Library Association, 2011a, 2011b). Possible joint committees could include CCSP, CALJ, Synergies, and PKP. CACUL also has an occasional papers series, including one on "periodical use" (Canadian Library Association, 2011b). CALJ, Synergies, and PKP may also be interested in being involved with the annual CLA conference.

University Affairs magazine

CALJ and *University Affairs* have already been in discussion about inviting journals to suggest stories in the magazine that are based on journal articles. Workshop participants and their networks of colleagues could also propose ideas for *University Affairs* stories on engaged scholarship, knowledge mobilization, and research as/for the public good. Graduate students could also be invited to propose ideas for the magazine that would involve their submitting short summaries of research projects they are involved in.

University of Victoria Office of Community-Based Research

All workshop participants are invited to sign up as part of the Canadian Knowledge Commons Initiative (Knowledge Commons Initiative, 2011a), to keep informed and contribute to information about events, resources, etc. Participants are also invited to visit the 2010 Knowledge Commons Summit website to view the report and videos (Knowledge Commons Initiative, 2011b). Those with an interest in the annual Community-University Partnerships Expo could submit proposals. The Vancouver Island Community University Research Alliance could also be approached by workshop participants and their colleagues located in BC to collectively hold a workshop or conference in the region.

York University Knowledge Mobilization Unit

All workshop participants are invited to sign up for the Research Impact newsletter[47] and the York University knowledge mobilization unit's "opportunities for collaboration" Web page, to search or post information (Research Impact, 2011a). All workshop participants are invited to explore and/or contribute to research snapshots (Research Impact, 2011b) and to become part of the unit's social networking website (Research Impact, 2011c).

Conclusion: Areas of Inquiry Opening Up Following the Workshop

Over the course of the workshop, it became evident that although there are shared interests among those working in the areas of knowledge mobilization and public knowledge, relatively few established links currently exist in advancing what SSHRC has described as "systematic interaction between the research community and the rest of society." The workshop discussion identified possible collaborative next steps as well as areas of inquiry in need of further research in the areas of research as public knowledge and knowledge mobilization of research.

Research as Public Knowledge

Collaborative next steps to advance research as public knowledge would aim to devise a sustainable model of scholarly journal and book publishing that maximizes public access to research and scholarship. Changes in scholarly publishing bring

Provençal, Johanne. (2011). Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions. *Scholarly and Research Communication, 2*(2): 020107, 30 pp.

both challenges and opportunities in extending research as public knowledge. Communications and digital technologies make it possible to store and access not only unprecedented volumes of published work, but also evolving forms of research and scholarship (from searchable data sets to audio and video content). With these same technological possibilities come challenges, however, as scholarly publishers adapt to the changes these new technologies bring.

Perhaps the greatest of these challenges is adapting the business model(s) for scholarly publishing to the new (and still evolving) digital environment. As noted in a report by Lorimer et al. that was provided to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada in December 2010,[15] it is a challenge for the independent scholarly journals that constitute most of the journal publishing industry in Canada to adapt to the shift by research libraries (the main buyers of scholarly journals and books) to purchasing bundled journal subscriptions from consortia and commercial publishers. Related to this are other challenges — such as content management, copyright, international marketing, and impact factors — for which large commercial journal publishers have the resources not only to address, but also to seize on opportunities that digital technologies present.

Similarly, the open access movement — which has a number of pioneering initiatives in Canada, such as the Public Knowledge Project (PKP) and Synergies — also presents opportunities and challenges. The Open Journal Software + Open Journal Systems (OJS) created by PKP provides more than 8000 journals worldwide with free, open source journal management software, which not only enables open access to journal content, but also contributes significantly to the technological capacity of individual journals and to the ability of journals to remain independently published (rather than being acquired by commercial publishers which for many years have led increasingly ambitious acquisition campaigns). Synergies, which is a project involving a partnership of Canadian research libraries, also supports open access by providing access to Canadian journals through a searchable online database. For both PKP and Synergies, however, a sustainable model is needed for them to remain competitive in terms of what foreign-owned commercial publishers can offer for content management, copyright, international marketing, impact factors, and other journal publishing needs.[16]

This description of the current situation for scholarly publishing in Canada is informed by a policy and professional literature (see Lorimer et al, 2010) as there is limited scholarly research in this area. Scholarly publishing in Canada (and internationally) could benefit from scholarly research that takes up issues of how the communication of research and scholarship is evolving. One aspect of this evolution involves public, government, and community access to and use of research and scholarship, a key concern for the workshop participants involved in knowledge mobilization.

Knowledge Mobilization

Knowledge mobilization of research and scholarship to a great extent begins and ends with questions about what "knowledge mobilization" means, and how it is achieved, by whom, for whom, and to what end. For knowledge brokers, knowledge mobilization involves the "translation" of research and scholarship to meet the needs of a particular audience (government, industry, community, the media). For community-based

researchers, knowledge mobilization involves the exchange of ideas — the exchange of different knowledges — between academic communities and communities outside of academe. Along the spectrum between the knowledge broker and community-based researcher, however, there are numerous activities and roles that involve the production and mobilization of knowledge so that the benefits of knowledge can extend ever further.

Collaborative next steps for knowledge mobilization in Canada would bring together units such as those involved with Research Impact — York University, Memorial University of Newfoundland, the University of Victoria, for example — for events such as conferences, as well as for collaborative digital efforts (such as the Yaffle database or ResearchImpact blog). Beyond increasing and strengthening collaborative efforts for knowledge mobilization practice, social sciences and humanities could benefit from *research on* knowledge mobilization. Although research on knowledge mobilization (or "knowledge transfer") is established in the field of health sciences, in the social sciences and humanities, knowledge mobilization does not tend to be recognized as a central concern of research projects and activities. Further research on the different understandings of what "knowledge mobilization" means and how it is accomplished in different scholarly disciplines and different sectors of society would strengthen the activities, impacts, and measures used to mobilize the knowledge resulting from social sciences and humanities research in Canada.

Drawing Bridges between Public Knowledge and Knowledge Mobilization

The bridging of the above two areas of inquiry also requires attention. The "public knowledge" dimension of the workshop discussion involved issues of access to the results of scholarly research. The "knowledge mobilization" dimension of the workshop discussion involved issues of different forms and avenues for that research to reach wider publics. Common to both, however, is a fundamental change in how scholars and universities are situated in relation to "knowledge" and to the publics that can benefit from it. In the context of social sciences and humanities research in Canada — which was the focus of the workshop — a number of questions require attention.

In what ways is research evolving in light of new possibilities for wider engagement with questions taken up by society and addressed by research questions? What new ways are there for communicating research (and engaging in discussion and debate about research results) within and beyond disciplinary and academic boundaries? To what extent do universities in Canada exemplify the "engaged campus" not only in community engagement activities, but also in program offerings for undergraduate students (do they include service learning, for example?) and in the opportunities and training for graduate students? Are faculty encouraged, supported, and rewarded for scholarship of engagement? What level of commitment and infrastructure does the university have for community-engaged research and for providing access to research findings?

It is evident from the workshop and from the activities undertaken by individuals within academic and other communities that these and related questions are being taken up; however, in the social sciences and humanities research literature, there is a clear need for these questions to be pursued further. Although practitioners of public knowledge and knowledge mobilization activities understand that this work is

Provençal, Johanne. (2011). Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions. *Scholarly and Research Communication, 2*(2): 020107, 30 pp.

central to what SSHRC has referred to as "the research enterprise," for the academic community, public knowledge or knowledge mobilization have yet to establish themselves as areas of research and scholarly inquiry. In some fields of research — higher education, discourse and writing studies, journalism and media studies, and communication studies, for example, as discussed during the workshop — questions of public knowledge and knowledge mobilization can perhaps be understood as areas of scholarly inquiry in ways that advance research and improve practice.

Notes

1. The full list of workshop presenters is as follows: Peggy Berkowitz (Editor, *University Affairs*), Barbara Crutchley (President, Canadian Association of University Research Administrators), Robert Greenwood (Director, Harris Centre of Regional Policy and Development, Memorial University), Budd Hall (Director, Office of Community-Based Research, University of Victoria), Rowland Lorimer (Director, Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing, Simon Fraser University), Tim Lougheed (Past-President, Canadian Science Writers' Association), Kathryn O'Hara (CTV Chair in Science Broadcast Journalism, Carleton University), Anthony Paré (Professor, Integrated Studies in Education, Faculty of Education, McGill University), David Phipps (Director, Research Services & Knowledge Exchange, York University), Johanne Provençal (Research Associate, Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing, Simon Fraser University), Doreen Starke-Meyerring (Professor, Integrated Studies in Education, Faculty of Education, McGill University), Robyn Stockand (President, Canadian Association of Special Libraries and Information Services), Christian Vandendorpe (Vice-President of Research Dissemination, Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences), and John Willinsky (Director, Public Knowledge Project, University of British Columbia, Simon Fraser University, and Stanford University). Other workshop participants/attendees were: Shauna Butterwick (Department of Educational Studies, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia), Andrew Churchill (PhD candidate, Department of Integrated Studies, Faculty of Education, McGill University), Nicole Fiore (graduate student, Department of Integrated Studies, Faculty of Education, McGill University), Ursula Gobel (Director, Communications, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada), Rhonda Moore (Senior Policy Analyst, Research and Policy Analysis, Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada), and Gary Myers (Digital Researcher, Knowledge Mobilization Unit, York University).

2. Please note that in the summaries of the presentations that follow, the title of each participant's presentation is used as the heading for the summary. In some cases, these are the same as the presentation titles found in workshop program (attached as a supplementary document), but where the presenter revised his/her title, the revised title is used here.

3. Phipps cites as an example Lavis, Ross, McLeod, and Gildner (2003).

4. This list of activities is drawn directly from Greenwood's slide presentation "Knowledge mobilization in action: The Leslie Harris Centre of Regional Policy and Development."

5. This list of challenges and items to consider is adapted from Greenwood's slide presentation "Knowledge mobilization in action: The Leslie Harris Centre of Regional Policy and Development."

6. The workshop participant from SSHRC responded to this by noting that they get many calls from government officials and the media, but that it is very labour-intensive to provide brief profiles (and to do so at a moment's notice), and that it would be useful to start moving forward on this collectively.

7. Citing http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/policysignup/, Vandendorpe notes that while there are 229 institutional repositories on record, there are only 18 university open access mandates.

8. O'Hara also gave the example of how the Canadian Cancer Society was troubled by the perception — from the media and consequently the public — that although there is much innovation in cancer research, there is no dissemination. Looking at cancer prevention research, for example, makes up a very small portion of the overall research budget but has tremendous community value. One of the issues discussed was the conflict between how much funding to give primary cancer research science versus other related activities. She noted also that some scientists are not keen on sharing large budgets.

9. Paré and Starke-Meyerring (2010) also made brief reference to their SSHRC-funded project investigating graduate student writing at 11 universities, the support that the students get, etc., noting that statistics in the U.S. show a 35–50% drop-out rate and for many the reason is lack of support for writing.

10. At the time of writing (December 2010), a project proposal had been submitted to the Canada Periodical Fund by CALJ to undertake such an effort through the formation of a Canadian Scholarly Journal Consortium.

11. In November 2010 several workshop participants — Rowland Lorimer and John Willinsky (co-applicants), Johanne Provençal (project coordinator), and Kathryn O'Hara, the Canadian Association of Learned Journals, Magazines Canada, the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, and *University Affairs* magazine (project collaborators) — submitted a proposal in response to SSHRC's Public Outreach program to launch an initiative that would involve journalists, editors, social media professionals, and other media industry professionals to work collaboratively with journals opting in to experiment with creating content (snapshots, video clips, social media postings, etc.) based on and linked to published articles in Canadian scholarly journals.

12. Karen Grant, VP Research Policy, CFHSS, moderated a panel on "engaged scholarship" at the 2010 AGM (see http://www.fedcan.ca/content/en/252/Policy_Work.html).

13. The Expert Panel on Research Integrity at the Council of Canadian Academies, which includes Kathryn O'Hara (2003), could be invited to join workshop

Provençal, Johanne. (2011). Social Sciences and Humanities Research and the Public Good: A Synthesis of Presentations and Discussions. *Scholarly and Research Communication, 2*(2): 020107, 30 pp.

participants on a panel at Congress to consider broader questions of integrity with regard to open access and knowledge mobilization.

14. For information on the Science Media Centre of Canada mandate to improve the links between journalism and science, see: http://www.sciencemediacentre.ca/smc/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=46&Itemid=55&lang=en .

15. The report is titled "Digital Technology Innovation in Scholarly Communication and University Engagement" and is available through the Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing (www.ccsp.sfu.ca).

16. In regard to scholarly book publishing, the opportunities and challenges are similar. Library acquisition practices are changing, reader preferences are changing, and large foreign-owned entities (such as Google Books) have become powerful players in how the scholarly book publishing industry is evolving. As with journals, the involvement of research/university libraries is also changing, which brings not only interesting possibilities, but also uncertainties and tensions.

References

Berkowitz, P. (2010). Research as a Public Good: How *University Affairs* Can Take Part. Workshop presentation from *Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities*. May 28, 2010, Montréal, Québec.

Bizzell, P. (1992). *Academic discourse and critical consciousness*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Bizzell, P. (1982). College composition: Initiation into the academic discourse community. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 12(2), 191-207.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus* (P. Collier Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, UK: Harvard University Press.

Canadian Alliance for Community Service Learning. (2011). Vision, Mission and Values. URL: http://www.communityservicelearning.ca/en/about_vision.htm [January 30, 2011].

Canadian Association of Research Libraries. (2011). Projects. URL: http://www.carl-abrc.ca/projects/projects-e.html [January 30, 2011].

Canadian Association of University Research Administrators. (2011). About Us. URL: http://www.caura-acaru.ca/pages/about_us [January 30, 2011].

Canadian Community Economic Development Network. (2011). What's New in CED. URL: http://www.ccednet-rcdec.ca [January 30, 2011].

Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences. (2011). Policy Work. URL: http://www.fedcan.ca/content/en/252/Policy_Work.html [January 30, 2011].

Canadian Federation of Students. (2011). National Graduate Caucus – Research Funding. URL: http://www.cfs-fcee.ca/ngc/english/campaigns.php [January 30, 2011].

Canadian Library Association. (2011a). Committees. URL: http://www.cla.ca/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Committees&Template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=8623 [January 30, 2011].

Canadian Library Association. (2011b). Occasional Papers. URL: http://www.cla.ca/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Occasional_Paper_Series [January 30, 2011].

Community-Based Research Canada. (2011). Who We Are. URL: http://communityresearchcanada.ca/?action=who_are_we [January 30, 2011].

Crutchley, B. (2010). Congress 2010: Research as a Public Good. Workshop presentation from *Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities*. May 28, 2010, Montréal, Québec.

Eprints.org. (2011). Registry of Open Access Repository Material Archiving Policies (ROARMAP). URL: http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/policysignup [January 30, 2011].

Fitzpatrick, J. (2008). Putting Knowledge into Practice. *University Affairs*. URL: http://www.universityaffairs.ca/putting-knowledge-into-practice.aspx [January 30, 2011].

Global Alliance on Community Engaged Research. (2011). Global Alliance. URL: http://communityresearchcanada.ca/?action=alliance [January 30, 2011].

Greenwood, R. (2010). Knowledge mobilization in action: The Leslie Harris Centre of Regional Policy and Development. Workshop presentation from Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities. May 28, 2010, Montréal, Québec.

Guédon, J.-C. (2009). Open access: An old tradition and a new technology. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *39*(3), i-v.

Hall, B. (2010).Towards a New Architecture of Knowledge. Workshop presentation from *Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities*. May 28, 2010, Montréal, Québec.

Harnad, S. (2009). The university's mandate to mandate open access. *Science, 323*(5917), 1025.

Herzberg, B. (March, 1986). *The politics of discourse communities*. Unpublished manuscript.

Knowledge Commons Initiative. (2011a). Catalyzing the Conversation. Retrieved January 30, 2011, from http://knowledgecommons.ning.com/page/catalyzing-the-conversation.

Knowledge Commons Initiative. (2011b). National Summit Report. Retrieved January 30, 2011, from http://knowledgecommons.ning.com/page/national-summit-report.

Lavis, J., Ross, S., McLeod, C., & Gildner, A. (2003). Measuring the impact of health research: Assessment and accountability in the health sector. *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy, 8*(3), 165-70.

Lorimer, R. (2010). Scholarly and Non-Scholarly Roles in the Reinvention of Scholarly Communication. Workshop presentation from *Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities*. May 28, 2010, Montréal, Québec.

Lorimer, R., Provençal, J., Owen, B., Devakos, R., Phipps, D., & Smith, R. (2010). Digital technology innovation in scholarly communication and university engagement. Report to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, Ottawa, Canada.

Lougheed, T. (2010). Telling Tales Out of School. Workshop presentation from *Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities*. May 28, 2010, Montréal, Québec.

Lyotard, F. (1984 [1979]). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Mobilizing Minds. (2011). Mobilizing minds: Pathways to young adult mental health. Retrieved January 30, 2011, from http://www.mobilizingminds.ca .

O'Hara, K. (2003). Science Journalism 2002: Who'se Buying It? Retrieved January 30, 2011, from http://www.com.ulaval.ca/fileadmin/contenu/chaire_bell/docs_pdf/Actes_du_colloque_2002.pdf .

O'Hara, K. (2010). Research and Knowledge as a Public Good: From Evidence to Attitudes. Workshop presentation from Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities. May 28, 2010, Montréal, Québec.

Paré, A., & Starke-Meyerring, D. (2010). Writing (in) the knowledge society: A rhetorical perspective. Workshop presentation from Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities. May 28, 2010, Montréal, Québec.

Phipps, D. (2010). Knowledge Mobilization Helps Turn Research Into a Public Good. Workshop presentation from *Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities*. May 28, 2010, Montréal, Québec.

Provençal, J. (2010). Academic Reward and Punishment: The Zero-Sum Game of Knowledge Mobilization. Workshop presentation from *Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities*. May 28, 2010, Montréal, Québec.

Public Knowledge Project. (2011a). Open Conference Systems. URL: http://pkp.sfu.ca/?q=ocs [January 5, 2011].

Public Knowledge Project. (2011b). Open Journal Systems. URL: http://pkp.sfu.ca/?q=ocs [January 5, 2011].

Public Knowledge Project. (2011c). Open Monograph Press. URL: http://pkp.sfu.ca/?q=ocs [January 5, 2011].

Research Impact. (2011a). *Mobilize This!* URL: http://researchimpact.wordpress.com/category/opportunities-for-collaboration [January 30, 2011].

Research Impact. (2011b). *Research Summary Search*. URL: www.researchimpact.ca/researchsearch [January 30, 2011].

Research Impact. (2011c). Research Impact@03. URL: https://researchimpact.othree.ca [January 30, 2011].

Research Information Network. (2009). *Overcoming barriers: access to research information*. URL: http://www.rin.ac.uk/our-work/using-and-accessing-information-resources/overcoming-barriers-access-research-information [January 30, 2011].

Science Media Centre of Canada. (2011). About the Science Media Centre of Canada. URL: http://www.sciencemediacentre.ca/smc/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=46&Itemid=55&lang=en [January 30, 2011].

Science Media Centre of Canada. (2011). Expert Panel on Research Integrity. URL: http://www.scienceadvice.ca/en/assessments/completed/research-integrity/expert-panel.aspx [January 30, 2011].

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (2010). Briefing on SSHRC's New Program Architecture. Retreived January 30, 2011, from http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/news_room-salle_de_presse/Program_Architecture_Consultation_e.pdf

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (2006). Moving forward as a knowledge council: Canada's place in a competitive world. Ottawa, ON: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (2005). From granting council to knowledge council: Renewing the social sciences and humanities in Canada, Volume 3: Report on the consultation. Ottawa, ON: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (2004). From granting council to knowledge council: Renewing the social sciences and humanities in Canada, Volume 1: Consultation framework on SSHRC transformation. Ottawa, ON: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Stockand, R. (2010). The Information Marketplace. Workshop presentation from *Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities*. May 28, 2010, Montréal, Québec.

Synergies Project. (2011). Synergies: Canada's SSH Research Infrastructure. URL: http://synergiescanada.org [January 30, 2011].

Teachers College Record. (2011). The Voice. URL: http://www.tcrecord.org/voice.asp [January 30, 2011].

Vandendorpe, C. (2010). The Double Necessity of Open Access. Workshop presentation from *Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities*. May 28, 2010, Montréal, Québec.

Willinsky, J. (2010). Increasing the Public Status of Research and Scholarship. Workshop presentation from *Social Sciences and Humanities Research as a Public Good: Identifying Research Prospects for Advancing Research Among Academic and Non-Academic Discourse Communities*. May 28, 2010, Montréal, Québec.

Willinsky, J. (2003). Policymakers' online use of academic research. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 11*(2). URL: http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/230 [January 30, 2011].

Willinsky, J. (2001). Raising the standards for democratic education: Research and evaluation as public knowledge. Standards and schooling in the United States, ABC-CLIO, Santa Barbara, CA, p. 609-621. Retrieved from http://pkp.sfu.ca/node/461.

Yaffle. (2011). Memorial University of Newfoundland – Yaffle. URL: http://www.yaffle.ca [January 30, 2011].