



Scholar/practitioner research in international development volunteering: benefits, challenges and future opportunities

Rebecca Tiessen , Jessica Cadesky , Benjamin J. Lough & Jim Delaney

To cite this article: Rebecca Tiessen , Jessica Cadesky , Benjamin J. Lough & Jim Delaney (2020): Scholar/practitioner research in international development volunteering: benefits, challenges and future opportunities, Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement, DOI: [10.1080/02255189.2020.1841606](https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2020.1841606)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2020.1841606>



© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 09 Nov 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 33



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Scholar/practitioner research in international development volunteering: benefits, challenges and future opportunities

Rebecca Tiessen ^a, Jessica Cadesky ^a, Benjamin J. Lough ^b and Jim Delaney^c

^aSchool of International Development and Global Studies, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON, Canada;

^bSchool of Social Work, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL, USA; ^cWorld University Service of Canada, Ottawa, Canada

ABSTRACT

International development volunteering (IDV) is the practice of sending skilled international volunteers to exchange knowledge and skills with community-based organisations and individuals in a partner country. IDV is a popular form of development assistance in many countries. As the popularity of these programmes grows, so too does the need for – and interest in – better understanding of their impacts and dynamics. Scholar/practitioner research collaborations provide opportunities for improved knowledge development in this field of study. To better understand the dynamics of these collaborations, researchers collected survey data from 22 scholars and practitioners involved in IDV research, as well as notes from a workshop with 40 stakeholders from the IDV community. Thematic analysis of these data considers the distinctive features of collaboration models used in IDV research. Taken together, these data identify several benefits to collaboration and/or research partnerships as well as significant challenges that limit the scope and impact of their work. The findings from this study provide insights into opportunities for enhancing effective practices and designing new collaborative efforts for engaging in scholar/practitioner collaboration in IDV.

RÉSUMÉ

La coopération volontaire est la pratique consistant à envoyer des coopérant-e-s internationaux qualifiés pour partager des connaissances et des compétences avec des organismes communautaires et des individus dans un pays partenaire. La coopération volontaire est une forme populaire d'aide au développement dans de nombreux pays. Alors que la popularité de ces programmes augmente, il en va de même de la nécessité – et de l'intérêt – de mieux comprendre leurs effets et leurs dynamiques. Les recherches collaboratives entre universitaires et praticien-ne-s offrent des possibilités d'améliorer le développement des connaissances dans ce domaine d'étude. Pour mieux comprendre la dynamique de ces collaborations, des chercheuses et chercheurs ont recueilli des données d'enquête

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 14 May 2019

Accepted 20 March 2020

KEYWORDS

Collaboration; research; volunteering; international; development

CONTACT Rebecca Tiessen  rebecca.tiessen@uottawa.ca

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

après de 22 universitaires et praticien-ne-s impliqués dans des recherches sur la coopération volontaire, ainsi que les notes d'un atelier impliquant 40 intervenant-e-s de la communauté de la coopération volontaire. L'analyse thématique de ces données tient compte des caractéristiques distinctives des modèles de collaboration utilisés dans les recherches sur la coopération volontaire. Ensemble, ces données révèlent plusieurs avantages de la collaboration ou des partenariats de recherche, ainsi que des défis importants qui limitent la portée et l'impact de leur travail. Les résultats de cette étude offrent un aperçu des possibilités qui existent pour améliorer l'efficacité des pratiques et concevoir de nouveaux efforts de collaboration pour s'engager dans des collaborations universitaires/praticien-ne-s sur la coopération volontaire.

Scholar/practitioner collaboration in international development volunteering (IDV)

Scholar/practitioner collaborations offer rich opportunities to expand our knowledge and understanding of the nature and impact of international development volunteering (IDV). This paper considers the benefits, challenges and future opportunities of scholar/practitioner collaboration¹ to advance this field of study. The primary focus of analysis in this paper is on the scholar/practitioner collaborations that take place in the Global North as a starting point for examining IDV. The research presented here is thus a jumping off point for future analyses and critical examinations that require the concerted efforts of scholars/practitioners to advance our knowledge and impact of IDV. The rationale for this paper is to provide a common foundation and understanding among scholars/practitioners of the benefits and challenges of these arrangements, and how these relate to future opportunities for research collaboration beyond North-North partnerships.

IDV occurs when international volunteers serve in another country. Models of IDV include Global North-Global South, Global South-Global North and Global South-Global South transnational relationships. One of the most common models of IDV involves transnational flows of volunteers from the Global North to the Global South – the model that is the primary focus of analysis in this paper.

Effective IDV is characterised by six key criteria whereby volunteers: (1) are motivated by humanitarian/philanthropic ideals; (2) live and work in local conditions; (3) aim for reciprocal benefit with communities; (4) are committed to long-term engagement with communities; (5) prioritise local accountability; and (6) work to tackle causes rather than symptoms (Devereux 2008, 359). The ideals that underpin IDV are “capacity building, mutual learning, and cross-cultural understanding” (Binns and McLachlan 2018, 67), and its operative strategy is “to reduce poverty, to prevent and rebuild after disasters, and to facilitate social integration and social inclusion” (Lough 2015, 3).

Opportunities to participate in IDV have grown in scale and scope and include various programme models including short-², medium-, and long-term options (Lough and Tiessen 2018). Research on IDV has also expanded to cover diverse themes, including

wide-ranging examples of volunteer abroad options, and the impacts of these programmes on the participants and receiving organisations and communities (Lough and Tiessen 2018). As this body of scholarship grows, significant gaps remain in our understanding of who is involved in the collection, analysis and dissemination of this research; the challenges and opportunities for improved research collaborations to facilitate improved knowledge development of IDV; and how to achieve strategic impacts in partner countries in the Global South.

These broad lines of inquiry demand many research approaches. For example, research focussing on the relationship between Global North and Global South scholar/practitioner collaborations will contribute to our knowledge of entrenched power dynamics and relations of inequality. While the value of Global North – Global South collaborative research holds much value, we begin our analysis of IDV research by considering opportunities and challenges of Global North-Global North collaborative research arrangements. Although a starting point, this focus in IDV research is a valuable contribution to the scholarship where resource realities can facilitate and necessitate research collaborations. In short, the Global North-Global North scholar/practitioner research collaboration model has its own unique contributions but is not meant to distract from – or overshadow – other research avenues that might include different directional and transnational flows of IDV.

Stakeholders engaged in Global North-Global North scholar/practitioner research collaboration on IDV include professors, development practitioners, consultants, international volunteer cooperation organisations (IVCOs) and international volunteer service networks (IVSNs) (see Sherraden et al. 2006). Their experiences with research range from designing and conducting highly rigorous experimental research studies, to pursuing less-stringent, practice-oriented evaluations. While the literature on scholar/practitioner collaboration often reinforces a binary that separates “scholars” and “practitioners” to treat these groups as discrete categories and divided communities (Kuhn 2002), we know that these divisions are often unclear as individuals may occupy both spaces and/or adopt hybrid identities. We intentionally use the term “scholar/practitioner” throughout this paper to denote the blurry nature of these two categories, the frequent overlap of roles and the blending of cultural practices. We also use this term to recognise the ongoing tensions that exist between and amongst these research communities in terms of perceptions of goals and benefits, rewards and incentives, expectations around workloads, and power relations.

Similarly, the term “pracademic” is also used by some IDV researchers who move between – and build bridges across – practitioner and scholarly spaces. These pracademics or “bridging experts” (see Chernikova 2011) possess research, academic and/or practitioner experience that can be especially valuable in teams where the divisions between scholar and practitioner roles are significant (Aniekwe et al. 2012; Kuhn 2002; Moseley 2007). Incentives for collaborative research are increasing across the Canadian global development sector. However, only a small number of Canadian development organisations host research divisions and there are few opportunities for research practitioners to do collaborative research in the academic community (Martel, Reilly-King, and Baruah forthcoming). Other considerations of the artificial division of “scholars” versus “practitioners” include the different roles that individuals may hold at different times in their lives. For example, many IDV scholars have previously served as volunteers

engaged with practice work overseas, and/or currently work closely with international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) or as consultants for development agencies. Similarly, IDV practitioners may have research roles in and outside of university settings, perhaps previously as students, or at other times as visiting researchers. Fransman et al. (forthcoming) use complexity theory to demonstrate how roles and identities of those involved in research partnerships can change and evolve through interaction with the collaboration, showing how blurry these divisions are.

Students participating in IDV scholar/practitioner collaboration provide another important dimension to the bridging potential of research communities (Tiessen and Smillie 2016). Students can benefit from collaborative research experiences in preparation for potential careers as practitioners in the development sector after graduation (Chernikova 2011). Research experiences can also provide exposure to diverse approaches to development, different styles of work, and the skills needed to succeed in a practice marketplace and can give students a leg up when looking for employment in the development sector post-graduation (Lough et al. 2019). Students often play important roles as interlocutors between scholars and IDV practitioners, facilitating a collaborative model of research whereby the student serves as a research intern in hosting communities to advance the practitioners' research requirements, while also making practical contributions to a given development project that incorporates an IDV approach.

Additionally, international volunteers who have graduated from post-secondary university programmes play an important role in scholar/practitioner collaborations and in bridging the IDV research communities. Depending on the training and academic backgrounds, volunteers can bring theoretical insights and critical thinking skills honed during university studies to their IDV programmes. In addition, they can help build local capacity by interpreting donor language and requirements that may be conceptually inaccessible to partners or laden with development jargon. All told, these typically young but well-educated international volunteers are another prominent bridging community that is unique to IDV collaboration models.

While the people and organisations involved in IDV research may straddle scholar/practitioner roles, they face persistent challenges when working together to marry their efforts. As a result, they often carry out their work along two parallel tracks. Furthermore, many of the people engaged in research construct their identities through years of academic preparation, professional practice, and performance within institutional environments that carry specific normative structures that can exclude people unaccustomed to working within the confines of these structures (Kram, Wasserman, and Yip 2012).

The institutionalised norms operating within a field of research, along with differing needs along the scholar/practitioner divide, drives how data is collected (Farashahi, Hafsi, and Molz 2005; Toukan 2020) and by whom. Evaluation-based research is generally carried out by volunteer sending organisations (VSOs) for the purpose of reporting to funding agencies, improving performance, and increasing accountability to broader development programmes and receiving communities. This evaluation-focused research is typically practitioner-led and provides important (though limited) analysis of development outcomes in partner communities in the Global South. The research approach usually reflects the interests and priorities of funders, as well as the available capacity

and time resources of practitioners. In contrast, scholarly research, particularly research carried out by Northern-based scholars, is usually conducted through university-supported initiatives involving academics, students and emerging scholars. As a result, many IDV researchers often conduct their studies in isolation, limiting the opportunities for sharing the results of their findings across sectors and reducing the potential for enhanced knowledge development in the field of IDV (Seelig and Lough 2015).

In addition to the differences created by institutionalised norms, two key barriers restrict the accessibility of research across these two groups (loosely defined and artificially divided). First, practitioner communities rarely make their evaluation findings publicly available. Second, scholarly communities often publish their work in subscription-based journals that are not accessible to practitioners. These barriers ultimately result in poor communication of findings and limited opportunities for sharing knowledge (Lough and Tiessen 2018).

Poorly shared research dissemination is particularly problematic given how much added value each of these research communities could potentially offer each other. VSOs have the strength of access to study populations and opportunities for more comprehensive data collection (including outcomes and impacts in partner countries). However, VSO evaluation reports are typically less scientific and rigorous in their data collection processes, and are generally not shared widely through knowledge dissemination channels. On the other hand, scholarly research communities have the advantage of more rigorous research processes, more comprehensive research analysis procedures, as well as broad knowledge mobilisation in scientific circles (though often limited by emphasis on journal publications). Taken together, these dynamics often lead to an entrenching of privilege for those (often Northern-based) researchers who have access to resources to fund private research. This often translates into barriers to access by actors in the Global South. Competitive funding arrangements may also mean there is a lack of incentive for actors to share their research, even though donors are in a position to demand that these be made public but often do not do so.

Working together, scholars/practitioners engaged in research on IDV can bridge knowledge gaps through collaborative networks and potentially change the nature of the research communities in terms of how information is collected, analysed and disseminated. An example of a global network of International Volunteer Cooperation Organizations (IVCO) that brings scholars and practitioners together is the International Forum for Volunteering in Development (Forum). Although nearly all members of Forum are international volunteer cooperation organisations, they work closely with academic researchers to provide value to their members, including commissioning research papers (often co-produced by practitioners and academics), sending representatives to attend academic conferences, and bringing academics and research practitioners together in their Research, Practice, Policy and Learning (RPPL) working group.

Building on the synergies created through the RPPL working group, scholars and practitioners have further united these two communities around a shared research agenda. As one prominent example, the *Global Research Agenda on Volunteering for Peace and Development* (GRA) is an international collaboration of scholars and practitioners dedicated to studying and researching IDV (for more information about the GRA see Lough et al. 2019). As this collaboration grows, it has become evident that the complementary, and sometimes overlapping, roles of scholars/practitioners are not always clear. Regardless

of these initial uncertainties, this emerging community of practice in IDV research is a specific example of ways that scholars/practitioners engaged in IDV research are working to build collaboration, while facilitating new avenues for bridging gaps between these two communities. Examples of such strategies include sourcing funding to bring scholars and practitioners together for knowledge sharing at conferences and workshops, co-creating research projects through partnership research grants, and co-authorship of publications. Deconstructing the benefits and challenges of building and sustaining collaborations like the GRA is a key objective of this paper.

Given the significant gaps in the knowledge about IDV that still need to be filled, clarity around the shared and divergent attributes of scholars/practitioners and the benefits and challenges of research collaboration are needed. Understanding how these diverse stakeholders employ different tools and strategies to document impacts can create opportunities for synergistic collaborations. While the stakeholders engaged in these collaborations may share a common passion, they do not necessarily share common goals or competencies (Wenger-Trayner and Wenger-Trayner 2015). Vague assumptions about the goals of scholar/practitioner-shared research activities and unclear expectations can weaken the research potential of such arrangements, reinforcing the need for: careful attention to the roles and distinctive attributes of different actors, a better understanding of their diverse incentives and values, and clearer expectations of collaborative arrangements at different phases of the research process.

The lessons learned through the IDV scholar/practitioner research practices presented in this paper are informed by previous scholarship and analyses of collaboration models, including those specific to “NGO (non-governmental organisation)/academic” (Roper 2002) and “university/civil society” (Chernikova 2011) relationships. The key findings from these studies, summarised in the sections that follow, inform our analysis of research conducted with IDV scholars, practitioners and pracademics primarily from the Global North.

Benefits and challenges of scholar/practitioner collaboration: an overview of the literature

Analyses of scholar/practitioner collaboration bring to light several common challenges and opportunities. The main themes that guide the current scholarship on scholar/practitioner collaboration include considerations about the roles and responsibilities of diverse actors (elaborated in the previous section) as well as the benefits and challenges of collaboration along the following core themes: shared goals and objectives, reward structures, funding mechanisms, mutual gains and shared ownership, mutuality, complementary expertise, instrumentalisation, (mis)communication, and unequal power dynamics. In the section below, we map out these core themes across the scholar/practitioner scholarship. We return to these broad themes when addressing our research findings and consider the implications of these findings in relation to IDV research in the analysis section.

Shared goals and objectives

While previous literature does not provide a thorough discussion on what a “successful” collaboration entails, prior studies often describe partners working together to establish a

common purpose or goal at the outset of a call for collaboration. Previous discussion on the nature of successful collaboration also cover why collaboration (sometimes referred to as co-production) is necessary, how it can be undertaken, and what the shared goals and objectives should be (Buick et al. 2016; CCIC and CASID 2017; Chernikova 2011; Cottrell and Parpart 2006; ELRHA 2012; Law 2017). The extent to which these goals align may help determine what character a collaborative relationship will take on, and to anticipate potential challenges.

Reward structures

This body of knowledge also recognises how certain drivers and quirks of culture influence collaboration efforts. It recognises how cultural specificities can impede collaboration through competing institutional philosophies, and outcome expectations (Buick et al. 2016), ethical codes (Aniekwe et al. 2012; ELRHA 2012) and research drivers and orientations (Buick et al. 2016). Diverse requirements to produce results and communicate findings within set time frames have also been recognised as a challenge for collaborative work. For example, practitioner-oriented actors may require information to be relayed quickly, especially when reporting to donors, while more scholar-oriented actors often need more time to study and publish research findings (Aniekwe et al. 2012). In IDV research/practitioner arrangements, volunteer placements often adhere to specific timeframes that may or may not align with project and research timelines, thus asserting different pressures on partners to achieve various outputs at different points in a given project.

Funding mechanisms

Another benefit of scholar/practitioner collaboration is the new opportunities they create for accessing research funding. Recognising the potential benefits of scholar/practitioner collaborations, notable donors and funders have opened up new funding channels to support collaborative arrangements³ (CCIC and CASID 2017; Cottrell and Parpart 2006). These funding calls have spurred a proliferation of collaborations in Canada and elsewhere (Stevens, Hayman, and Mdee 2013). In this scenario, both academics and NGOs have sought to establish a collaboration in order to satisfy the demands of their respective funding bodies. While some collaborations may be the result of a mutual interest in accessing funding, some warn that collaborations forged at the behest of externally-imposed requirements may fall short of being equal in benefit and risk if they are borne solely out of a transactional spirit that does not contribute to both partners' priorities beyond the mere exchange of funding for services (Mendel 2013). This idea is expanded upon in the "Instrumentalisation" section.

Shared ownership

These funding mechanisms, among other grants, present new opportunities for the co-design of research projects. However, challenges remain in the nature of collaborative research design. For example, research funding may be finalised during the project design phase, before the practitioners become actively involved. As a result, practitioners

can be constrained by an agenda that has already been set (Aniekwe et al. 2012). These challenges highlight the ideas of common interests, shared goals, as well as even workload and division of labour. The degree of support that each partner receives from their home institutions can also impact resources available for a project (Amabile and Odomirok 2001).

Mutuality

Closely linked to shared ownership, the concept of mutuality entails both a commitment of all parties to the common goals of the collaborative arrangement, as well as the attendant rights and responsibilities that each actor has in working to maximise the benefits for each (Brinkerhoff 2002). Collaboration between scholars and practitioners can help to mutually enhance the learning process of both groups, including helping to expose and frame research questions, supporting data collection and analysis, sharing practical and theoretical knowledge, and developing expertise in the Global South (Chernikova 2011). Effective collaborations require ongoing dialogue, and trust and clarity around the agreed-upon roles of the diverse partners. Different expectations of workloads must be communicated regularly. Some collaborative models will thrive on inequality in the division of labour while others may be built around strong models of equity, and a mutually agreed upon agenda based on fairness and adjusted for various factors such as capacity or merit (Mannix, Neale, and Northcraft 1995).

Complementary expertise

Research collaborations also provide opportunities to enhance the process and application of combined research methodologies through more epistemological and theoretically-driven pursuits of testing theories and conducting applied research (Aniekwe et al. 2012; Bartunek and Rynes 2014; ELRHA 2012; Stevens, Hayman, and Mdee 2013). Individuals more closely aligned with scholarly communities can contribute to empirical data collection while also playing a more substantive role in applying theoretical and analytical knowledge (Chernikova 2011; Roper 2002). With the application of theoretical knowledge, changes to programming can go beyond small tweaks to existing practice and lead to more impactful and/or transformative changes. More practitioner-oriented actors offer practical knowledge gained from hands-on experience wrestling with a problem or question as well as from focussed and sustained interactions with partner communities. These practical applications are built upon theoretical knowledge gained at other points in time (such as in their academic studies). Scholarly input into research can further advance the knowledge and evidence base of effective practice and can tap into diverse funding opportunities that may not be available without rigorous evidence of programme impact (Chernikova 2011; ELRHA 2012).

Instrumentalisation

In contrast to shared ownership, practitioner-oriented research communities may be instrumentalised in research design processes when requirements to obtain research funds or other benefits motivate the collaboration. Often, practitioners are sought

under these conditions to implement pre-determined research goals set by scholars. Under such conditions, the potential for opportunistic relationships are high – particularly because NGOs are often well-situated to provide access to local communities, who are often seen either as direct “beneficiaries” or as research participants (Amabile and Odomirok 2001; Aniekwe et al. 2012; Buick et al. 2016; ELRHA 2012). Examples of co-opting NGO partners in scholar/practitioner collaboration research are not representative of all models. However, this instrumentalisation can emerge during research design as a result of requirements for accessing research funds. In contrast, when collaborative research design is done well for the purpose of accessing new research funds, there are many opportunities for mutual benefit and shared ownership of the research process.

(Mis)communication

One of the most transversal themes that appears in discussions on collaboration and partnerships is communication and miscommunications. Mutual respect and trust that underpins and fuels open communications, if established from the outset, may resolve many unproductive conflicts or misunderstandings in scholar/practitioner collaborations (Buick et al. 2016; CCIC and CASID 2017; Law 2017; Roper 2002). While open and trustful communications are highlighted as key factors in scholar/practitioner collaborations, communication challenges are common. For example, an NGO’s headquarters may agree to a broad research agenda with an academic partner, only to have the field-level representatives redirect the research to suit more immediate needs (Roper 2002), or vice versa. These communication challenges can arise in all models of collaboration but are particularly acute in collaborations that have high levels of power imbalances between involved parties. In addition to the importance of open lines of communication and clarity in setting the research agenda, there are other ways that miscommunication happens in scholar/practitioner collaborations. Jargon and sector-specific language or acronyms may pose challenges for communication between scholars and practitioners. In other words, it is not just about the messages passed on but also how those messages are framed, which words are used to describe the work, and how ideas are interpreted within different sectors. Different norms around language and terminology, as well as the framing of ideas, may result in messages getting lost or misunderstood. Collaboration, therefore, requires an acknowledgement of different terminologies and concerted efforts to ensure understanding across sectors by all parties involved.

Unequal power dynamics

One of the most important challenges in scholar/practitioner collaborations in international development, and in IDV in particular, concerns the power dimensions of collaborative arrangements. Elements of power relations have been identified throughout this section including to references to the co-optation of partner organisations to gain access to communities for data collection. Additional power dynamics can be observed in the nature of the Global North/Global South model of research collaboration that characterises this field of study, highlighting concerns such as the way that “local” people are compensated for their contributions to – and engagements with – research projects (Aniekwe et al. 2012). The problematic (over)use of locally-based partner

organisations in the Global South as the “logical” proximate actors to collect information on the daily lives of people may be used exclusively by scholarly researchers in Northern institutions to advance theoretical frameworks (Roper 2002). This power inequity must be addressed head-on. If the workload and the benefits of the research are not equally distributed, this may inspire feelings of strong resentment among “local” communities (Cottrell and Parpart 2006) and may diminish opportunities for improved collaborations that are mutually beneficial.

The challenges and benefits of scholar/practitioner collaboration in international development research and IDV summarised in this section offer insights into some of the guiding frameworks for considering the main actors involved in this research. It deconstructs some of the diverse and overlapping roles they may hold, the diverse ways that data is collected, and several key considerations for reflecting on effective strategies and problematic practices including: shared values and motivations, diverse rewards and incentives, and new funding opportunities – and the relationship of these strategies to the challenges of inequitable power dynamics, inequality of opportunity, miscommunication, unclear expectations, and the co-optation of certain groups. To further explore how these opportunities and challenges of scholar/practitioner collaboration are reflected in IDV collaborations, we collected data with (primarily Global North) members of the IDV scholar/practitioner research community to gain deeper insights into the pervasive nature of some of these challenges, along with strategies employed to address or circumvent some of the problems that members of this community have identified.

Methodology

The research findings that inform this analysis began with the collaborative design of a research grant application to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). The project, which was funded between 2014 and 2018, integrated several research components including a survey administered to scholars and practitioners as well as workshop discussions.

Data collection

The first set of data were collected from a five-question qualitative survey sent to 44 scholars/practitioners who work in the field of IDV research. For the sake of transparency, responses from some of the authors were also included in the analysis. The questions provided an opportunity for individuals to reflect on the benefits and challenges of scholar/practitioner research collaboration in IDV. In order to capture rich detail and reflection on each topic, all questions were open-ended. In total, 22 responses were received. This survey provided a chance for respondents to reflect on and describe past experiences with scholar/practitioner research collaborations in IDV, opportunities and challenges presented through collaboration, and thematic priorities for future collaborative research projects.

The initial analysis of these responses was summarised in a workshop paper that served as the basis for continued conversations and discussions on this topic at a workshop organised in Ottawa in October 2018. The workshop brought together 40

participants, all of whom were asked to complete the original survey in advance. Workshop participants represented diverse sectors and self-identified across a broad range of (sometimes overlapping) sectors. They can be roughly divided as: 14 practitioners, 9 academics, 9 students, 6 researchers, and 6 “pracademics”. They included specialists on IDV from Malawi, United Kingdom, Australia, United States, South Africa, Kenya, Guatemala, Canada, Korea, Japan, and Germany. Participants from across Canada included area experts in IDV from Alberta to Nova Scotia.

The workshop allowed participants to reflect further on their combined survey submissions on the benefits and challenges of scholar/practitioner IDV research. The format of the workshop consisted of roundtable panel presentations and break-out discussion sessions. Participants prepared summary points from their break-out discussions and shared a list of recommendations during the last session of the workshop. Note-takers were assigned to each discussion group seated at separate tables to capture the main points and provide a summary report. The workshop was an opportunity for more in-depth reflections that would otherwise be difficult to capture through a survey. It also provided opportunities to generate new, deeper and more dynamic considerations of the opportunities and challenges of scholar/practitioner collaboration in the IDV sector. We use the notes resulting from these discussions as a second set of data for the analysis.

The research team consisted of scholars and practitioners, as well as those who straddle – or work within – both of these sectors. As a team representing different sector-specific norms, languages and practices, the authors were able to co-design the research and write up the findings with insights from our respective scholarly and practitioner perspectives in mind. The diversity of approaches and communication styles informed all stages of the research, analysis and writing process.

Analysis

The research team completed a thematic analysis of the survey responses and notes from the workshop following a process outlined by Bengtsson (2016), which moves from decontextualisation, recontextualisation, categorisation and finally to compilation. The analysis aimed to identify themes emerging from each of the core areas of investigation (i.e. previous experiences, challenges, opportunities, effective practices, and future opportunities). Responses were first *decontextualised* to scan for examples of references related to these thematic priorities within and across surveys. Specific quotes and examples were extracted across the survey responses and workshop notes to *recontextualize* the data within a new thematic schema. Within each of the five thematic areas, findings were further *categorised* and organised into subthemes. The team of researchers then compared the specific quotes and examples with the emergent subthemes to *compile* the results.

Each stage of data analysis, from decontextualisation to compilation, involved collaborative feedback from the team of researchers who verified or challenged conclusions from other members of the team. The research team consisted of two full-time academics with some practice backgrounds, one full-time practitioner/researcher working with an international NGO involved in international volunteering and one emerging scholar currently engaged as a practitioner on an intermittent basis. The fluidity of each of the team

members' roles and backgrounds allowed them to approach the data from various points of views, in many ways reflective of the participants themselves. This diversity was an asset to the analytical process, since the team benefitted together from a plurality of perspectives and could make connections between the findings, their own experiences as scholars/practitioners, and the wider literature and theories around IDV.

Findings verified through this process of collaborative reflection were prepared for presentation in a table summary format for easy comparison and assessment. The research team met on three occasions to review this table of findings, to compare and verify categorisation and to discuss the strategy for compilation of findings. Through this process, survey responses were subject to an iterative manifest analysis. The research team aimed to keep tight fidelity with the written texts by using the words and language used by the survey participants.

Notes taken by the research team were analysed in parallel to the survey data except for the initial decontextualisation of thematic areas. The research team summarised and organised major points and findings into seven thematic areas: critiques raised about inequality in the partnership or collaborative arrangement; implications of these critiques for development work; opportunities or strategies used to ensure mutually beneficial results; benefits of working together; how co-research might work better; the limitations of joint research; and suggestions for moving towards a more collaborative model. The findings generated through the survey responses and workshop discussion notes are summarised below. These findings highlight the previous kinds of scholar/practitioner collaboration experienced by the respondents; benefits and challenges of scholar/practitioner collaboration; and future opportunities and considerations for collaborative research on IDV. While these findings reinforce many of the key findings raised in previous literature investigating the benefits and challenges of collaboration, they also raise important considerations for future collaborative research in the IDV field.

Findings

Previous experience with scholar practitioner collaborations

Survey participants were asked to self-identify as scholar (including students, scholarly researchers, and professors), practitioner (including past international volunteers, international NGO staff located in the Global North or Global South, representatives of the donor community, and staff from international organisations) or pracademic (those who identify as engaged in both scholarly and practitioner work in comparable ways) to reflect the research communities with which they feel most closely aligned. As noted earlier in this paper, the division of roles between scholars and practitioners is blurry, sometimes overlapping, and often does not well reflect the diverse skills, experiences and competencies gained by individuals over their lifetimes.

As a framing question, survey participants were asked: "If you have engaged in scholar/practitioner collaboration (past or present), provide some details about the nature of the collaboration, types of partners involved (e.g. civil society organisations, communities, university researchers, students, etc.) and over what period of time". The most obvious theme connecting most answers to this question was research. This indicates a prevailing common interest amongst the participants to collaborate around

potentially shared research goals. Participants also reported using research for academic publications and to inform policies and/or programming, and did so through collaborating with international NGOs, civil society organisations (CSOs), and/or academics to conduct research, as well as engaging students and partners in international research and collaboration opportunities. Key research themes that were cited by participants focused on conflicts, refugees, economic development, gender and LGBTQ+ issues.

The amount of time spent in collaborations also emerged as an important theme. The most commonly noted period for scholar/practitioner collaboration was seven years. The longest collaboration provided in the summary was 11 years. Two-year collaborations comprised the second most common time period.

Participants reported that they employed a range of models of collaborative research methodologies, which included focus groups, surveys, interviews, direct observations, and literature review. One respondent wrote that methodologies differed among scholars/practitioners in terms of designing research. Three respondents stated that scholars and practitioners had different research interests, with collaborators each seeking knowledge that seemed primarily suitable to them. Some scholars were more focused on critical analysis to make sense of data, while practitioners were preoccupied with exploratory research designed to improve the quality of their work and to gain resources. Scholars were seen to take more interest in processes of engaging with stakeholders, while practitioners were seen as being more focussed on the outcomes of actions and programming.

Experiences of how information was disseminated also differed between scholars and practitioners. Scholars indicated the need to produce conference papers and peer-reviewed publications, while practice organisations played a larger role in the dissemination of information through social media and reports. Overall, practitioners were considered less likely than academics to spend time on knowledge dissemination. They also perceived much of the scholarly research to be poorly suited for the broad and diverse audiences that practitioners wish to reach. Furthermore, respondents asserted that practitioners are rarely able to access journal articles and often lack the time to read scholarly literature. Participants also recognised that the method of dissemination will attract different kinds of audiences, depending on who disseminated this information. As one survey participant explained:

In most cases, the researchers will organize conferences/panels etc., and publish journal articles but the audience for these papers and presentations are largely other academics. Practice organizations distribute to policymakers, other CSOs, their funders, others internal to their network. They publish reports on their websites and send out in their newsletters. Occasionally, they will blog a summary of the research.

Websites are a common form of digital outreach and public engagement used by practitioners and some academics to disseminate information. For example, one survey participant mentioned: “IVCO [The International Forum for Volunteering in Development] has a website and has developed a model of publishing discussion papers and framework papers for conferences. Some of this work has been extended into academic articles or equivalent.” There was also mention of dissemination constraints experienced by practitioners and scholars in the Global South due to lack of resources: “We from the [G]lobal [S]outh ... are only able to disseminate through physical public meetings

while our collaborators in the [G]lobal [N]orth with strong web presence were even able to organize live global dissemination webcasts online.”

Several of the themes noted in previous scholarship on scholar/practitioner collaboration were repeated in the survey findings and reinforce the significance of the different demands that scholars and practitioners experience, along with the cultural norms of knowledge generation and dissemination activities between those working in (and across) academic and practice sectors.

Benefits and challenges of IDV scholar/practitioner research collaborations

As evident from the literature review covered above, the benefits and challenges of scholar/practitioner collaboration have been the major focus of the literature to date. Here we summarise findings from the survey that build on categories of our classification that have been informed by the literature review.

Benefits of collaboration in IDV

All participants saw the overall potential of scholar/practitioner research collaboration as mutually beneficial, thus reinforcing the themes of complementary expertise, mutuality and mutual gains discussed in the literature review. The main theme for this question revolved around access to resources and knowledge that comes from collaboration. The words “access” and “knowledge” were the most commonly used words (mentioned 10 times each). Participants stated that scholar/practitioner research collaboration is particularly important as it provides them with access to up-to-date information, resources, knowledge and information. A few examples of benefits include “easier access to research populations and organizations”; “for scholars, the benefits include having access to new data” and “access to various perspectives on international volunteering, access to concrete examples of working with international volunteers in an organization and in the field.”

One participant noted that through access to local practice knowledge they are able to gain “understanding and knowledge that the practitioner has about the development and context players which would not be available to a foreign scholar”. Respondents also stated that local knowledge “minimizes need for costly logistical arrangements such as international travels and it is also time saving due to use of locally available knowledge and capacities”.

Similar to local practice knowledge, respondents believed that scholar/practitioner collaborations provided them with “diverse perspectives” that represent “real world” and “relevant” issues on the ground. The words “reality” and “relevant” came up seven and five times respectively. Moreover, being able to embrace “diverse perspectives” was seen as crucial for “credibility” (which came up five times). For instance, one respondent reported gaining credibility in Africa through their work, as they did not impose an “outsider perspective but instead worked closely with/listened to/taken direction from insiders”. Participants noted that collaboration is crucial because it can “mean areas of research become more relevant to policy and implementation”. Also, “it re-teaches humility while providing insights from ‘real world’ situations that would be difficult to achieve without such collaboration”.

The importance of reality checks for both scholars/practitioners was also emphasised as this “helps correct isolated thinking and bias on both sides”. In doing so, it allows for increased engagement of local knowledge and creates a supportive environment for both sides. Hence allowing for “greater ownership and public/scholar awareness that allows for more strategic thinking in peer reviewed publications rather than just evaluations”. Furthermore, when diverse perspectives are offered, they result in more substantial, comparable data that can be more rigorously collected using stronger methodology. This recognition echoes the theme of complementary expertise discussed earlier in the literature review section. In addition, through working with diverse people, information can capture key current policy and academic debates relevant to a wider audience. Having access to “real world” and “relevant” issues and situations bridges the gap “between ideal/normative, and the on-the-ground reality”. This brings up the important issue of policy relevance, as it is “crucial for evidence-based policy making, a concept which holds that properly developed public policy draws on the best available evidence and is not politically or ideologically driven”.

Challenges of collaboration in IDV

The most common challenges of scholar/practitioner research collaborations were time, communication barriers, and managing the expectations of the partners. Each of these themes are multidimensional and interrelated. Issues relating to time and communication are overlapping concerns because poor communication is often a direct result of lack of time taken to invest in dialogue.

The challenge of limited time emerged as the most common concern. For example, insufficient time to invest in the collaboration, particularly in relation to the funding structures involving practitioner evaluations, require short turn-around times for data collection and reporting. For academics with research grants, research funding may extend for longer periods than project funding provided to practice organisations. By the time research funding expires, practitioner organisations may have moved on to other initiatives or evaluations. Thus, the dynamics of accessing various funding mechanisms and fulfilling their requirements previously discussed in the literature section is reinforced by our data. Practitioners’ busy schedules were also considered as a key time-related challenge to collaborating on research: “CSO colleagues are very busy ... it is very difficult to find time to discuss work in progress”. These challenges negatively affect the collaborators’ ability to ensure a truly collaborative process, and inhibit the frequency and effectiveness of communication. They also detract from collaborators’ ability to complete work within coordinated time-frames and to ultimately build trusting and meaningful relationships. As one participant noted: “trust is a big factor, and trust isn’t won in 15 minutes”.

The study participants asserted that time investments are required in order to nurture equitable partnerships based on trust, and that time and compensation are needed to free up time required to build meaningful and equal partnerships. The recognition that trustful relationships require conscious allocation of time is important because this recognition bumps up against many of the institutional factors noted in the literature review, such as competing timeframes for both academics and practitioners – but particularly for practitioners for whom research may not be a priority for their organisation.

The discussion groups provided additional reflection on the opportunities and challenges of engaging partners in the Global South to design studies on IDV. One of the main themes they mentioned was taking the time to build meaningful partnerships – with both researchers and practitioners working as equals. Again, the development of true partnerships was partially constrained by limited time. Participants suggested that partnerships demand for all partners to start off as equals. To achieve such equality, however, time and resources are needed for relationship-building in order for all to feel comfortable acting as equal partners.

The second most common response to the challenges of scholar/practitioner research collaboration included communication barriers. As discussed in the literature review, the prevalent theme of (mis)communication can manifest in various forms, and can have a significant impact on the nature and success of scholar/practitioner collaboration, as reinforced by this study's data. Communication-related challenges included language barriers and different understandings of terms and concepts. The implications of communication challenges limited collaborators' ability to coordinate and share ideas at various stages of the process, and inhibited the efficient dissemination of research findings – including the “research-to-policy-translation”. For example, participants highlighted differences in communication styles related to knowledge dissemination, noting that academics communicate their research for academic audiences (via journal articles) and practitioners communicate their findings to donors and broader public audiences (via popular forms of communication such as op-eds, newsletters, etc.). Even with access to information communication technologies, social media platforms and other communication tools, opportunities for exchanging ideas and sharing learning were limited.

The third most common challenge was managing the expectations and relations between partners. These included managing different interests, priorities, needs, and approaches, as well as disagreements, shared workloads, etc. As one respondent noted: “practitioners may see researchers as an answer to problems that may not /cannot be answered by researchers”. This challenge highlights the diverse rationales and expectations different partners bring to the collaboration. These differences can be partially resolved through ongoing communication. As one respondent noted: “expectations of roles and responsibilities within a researcher/practitioner collaboration often need to be discussed and revisited throughout the project”.

Another important theme that emerged was the inaccessibility of information by Global South partners. Poor incentives for academics to publish research in accessible formats limits the type of information available to Global South partners. For collaborators living in countries that do not speak English, inaccessibility is particularly acute. Limited sharing of information makes international collaboration difficult and exacerbates power dynamics. To address this, participants offered strategies such as publishing resources and publications as open access papers, and creating other methods of knowledge sharing and dissemination that follow mechanisms to allow a wide outreach of intended audiences.

Future opportunities for scholar/practitioner collaboration

A final question of the survey asked participants to consider future opportunities and interests for scholar/practitioner research collaboration on IDV. Overall, respondents

were enthusiastic about expanding the focus of research beyond Global North-Global North scholar/practitioner collaboration experiences to researching innovative pathways to enhance co-productive knowledge generation. Five participants expressed interest in exploring IDV forms/shapes and outcomes. The issue of women and gender was of particular interest to three participants who expressed a desire to research women's empowerment, feminist approaches to international volunteering, and sexual exploitation by (or of) volunteers. Engaging with Southern volunteers, scholars and researchers was another key interest area, as was analysing volunteers' role in humanitarian emergency interventions. Respondents also expressed interest in analysing the impact of international volunteers on the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), as well as these volunteers' contributions to promoting peace. The experiences of international volunteers, their employability post-placement, the valuation of their contributions, and trends in volunteer programmes were also mentioned as areas of interest for future research collaborations.

Several respondents were also interested in understanding how to bridge the gap between scholars and practitioners studying IDV. One respondent mentioned a desire to examine the hybridity and blurred lines between scholars and practitioners. Many participants noted the importance of "consciously investing time and energy to maintain relationships" between practitioners and those in the academic world – making efforts to "carve out time to have discussions and share with each other".

Discussion and conclusion

The literature on scholar/practitioner collaborations highlight many of the themes also identified by Global North scholar/practitioner researchers in the field of IDV, including expectations around mutual benefits and shared goals, the importance of good communication, improved access to knowledge and resources, and power relationships. Although we recognise the limitations of focusing our analysis in this paper on collaborations that take place in the Global North, we begin here as a starting point for examining and understanding IDV scholar/practitioner collaborations. Findings from research in the IDV communities also demonstrate how "access" is understood by respondents, and in turn plays a role in perceptions of equality within collaborations. "Access" was used by respondents to refer to access to information, access to research participants, and access to "local knowledge". Both scholars and practitioners were concerned with improved access to items they would not necessarily enjoy outside of a collaboration – be it access to people, ideas, or information. However, some participants who raised the importance of access to "local knowledge" discussed this in instrumental terms, that is, to minimise costs, to reduce time needed in the field, to further the research process, etc. This speaks to the critical literature, which identifies certain problematic assumptions related to the division of labour and expectations that are framed in the context of unequal power relationships, further necessitating an expanded research agenda to include Global South scholars/practitioners in collaborative research design.

As the body of literature on IDV scholar/practitioner collaboration continues to grow, it is important to note the additional gaps that require further research. Perhaps the most striking absence is a robust discussion on how the different variations of collaborations may impact local communities, including how individuals are compensated for their

contributions to – and engagements with – research projects (Aniekwe et al. 2012). These dynamics are particularly applicable to North–South collaborations, and certainly merit further attention, as do other aspects of North–South collaborations in general. Other knowledge gaps include how intersectional factors, such as geography and institutional types, influence the experiences and outcomes of research/practitioner collaborations. So far, the literature makes few distinctions between Southern- and Northern-based academics and practitioners, nor are the needs of large or small INGOs or local NGOs specifically considered in discussions of collaborations with Northern- and Southern-based academics. The research on scholar/practitioner collaboration can also learn from the IDV literature that has emphasised reciprocity and exchange (Lough and Tiessen 2018). Ensuring IDV practice, research and scholarship avoid the perpetuation of neocolonial relationships, decentralised decision-making and increased collaborative partnerships with Southern partners is imperative for mutuality of exchange (Lough 2015).

Several advantages of collaboration are also highlighted in these findings. Firstly, IDV scholars/practitioners are able to maximise larger benefits when they worked collaboratively than when working separately. Secondly, the recognition that scholars/practitioners may share the larger goals related to a collaborative pursuit, the specific interests in the process and outcomes may differ, such as the observation that some scholars were more focused on critical analysis to make sense of data, while practitioners were preoccupied with exploratory research designed to improve the quality of their work and to gain resources. The respective added value of scholars/practitioner models is often what drives the desire for collaboration, and speaks to the themes of mutuality while striving towards shared goals.

Lastly, our findings point to an acute awareness of the fluidity of individual – and perhaps institutional – roles and contributions within these collaborations. Recalling earlier discussions, acknowledgement that the lines between scholars and practitioners are “ever blurry” provides space for new types of actors to step into collaboration arrangements. These opportunities seem particularly apt for the work of “pracademics” and other types of non-binary individuals and organisations that do not exist on opposing poles, but rather operate along a scholar/practitioner continuum. Findings suggest that greater attention could be paid to understanding the hybridity of individuals who successfully (or unsuccessfully) move between scholar and practitioner silos and labels. At the same time, development and research institutions, including INGOs, funding agencies and universities, can better open spaces for individuals to cross this artificial divide.

Furthermore, scholar/practitioner collaboration in the IDV sector can provide timely information about contemporary issues and can advance knowledge across and within sectors in ways that can more effectively influence policy, advance knowledge, and demonstrate impact of IDV. The empirical study presented in this paper reinforces some of the overarching themes around challenges, benefits and opportunities of scholar/practitioner collaboration and provides new insights into key challenges pertaining to time commitments, communication barriers, managing expectations and how these themes are linked to power dimensions and inequality of opportunity in IDV research. In the spirit of producing a paper that establishes a common understanding among scholars/practitioners of the advantages and disadvantages of collaboration, we conclude with several recommendations to shape future research initiatives with improved scholar/practitioner collaborative models in mind.

Recommendations

Recommendations that emerge from this study highlight possibilities for changes, modifications and enhancements in collaborative research processes, funding allocations, data collection methods, and knowledge dissemination strategies.

- Recognising that many people regularly cross scholar/practitioner boundaries through formal and informal relationships that extend beyond individual research projects or development interventions, opportunities to enable these collaborations through long term funding mechanisms can build opportunities for dialogue, more internships and externships for early and mid-career researchers, and community-based research. These opportunities should be structured in ways to build relationships over time, rather than to simply produce research outputs.
- Funding provided for scholar/practitioner collaborations must cover not only costs that are specific to the project but should also include a portion allocated to develop and sustain the collaborative process (Cottrell and Parpart 2006). Much of the data and discussion highlighted above have pointed to the importance of time needed to enable meaningful collaborations. Funding opportunities that are both long-term and provide for multiple and iterative points of connection between scholars and practitioners can enable trust and reciprocity in these relationships.
- Provide the next generation of researchers with opportunities for innovation in collaboration, more professional training and more opportunities for placements and experiential learning for both early and mid-career scholars in practitioner spaces are needed (CCIC and CASID 2017; Chernikova 2011). While perhaps insufficient for creating a new generation of “bridging experts”, these opportunities to cohabit different communities can create partnerships early in an emerging scholar’s career.
- Global North universities and academic institutions must play a larger role in facilitating scholar/practitioner collaboration. Mechanisms such as fellowships and funded secondments of IDV NGO staff will allow the space needed for those more engaged in practitioner work to spend more time reflecting, analysing and theorising about the research. Sabbaticals and research leaves for those working in academic institutions might be incentivised with research funds or additional research leaves to dedicate time and resources to scholar/practitioner collaboration. These opportunities are needed for practitioners and researchers in the Global North but especially pertinent for enhancing strong collaborations across the Global North/Global South divide.
- Training in community-based research at the university level, as well as community-driven research design is needed for scholars/practitioners (Hall, Tandon, and Tremblay 2015). Much of the discussion above has noted the conspicuous absence of community members, local NGOs and other marginalised groups in research on IDV. Similarly, positioning INGOs as the sole or primary arbiter of community voice can lead to transactional and, we argue, inequitable relationships of access.
- In order to address significant power dimensions, more research is required to understand how scholar/practitioner collaborations impact “local” people who participate in, contribute to, and are the object of IDV research. In addition, future research should explore how various dynamics of Northern-Southern academics and practitioners move through and negotiate the benefits, challenges, and opportunities of

collaboration. This requires additional research that was beyond the scope of this study but remains central to the recommendations central to advancing scholar/practitioner collaborations in IDV.

- Deliberate strategies and practices are needed on a regular basis to consider the strengths and weaknesses of the collaborative model, the expectations of different parties involved, and to ensure improved communication throughout. Ongoing conversations about expectations and desired outcomes can reduce challenges of collaboration, improve benefits arising from collaborative research and reinforce mutual benefits. Opportunities for maximising information communication technologies, blogs, op-eds, listservs, research forums and other networks exist and need to be more deliberately incorporated into the collaborative strategies.

Notes

1. For the purposes of this paper, we will use the term “collaboration” to mean collaboration among Global North researchers including scholars and practitioners who are involved in data collection in IDV. Other collaborations between scholars and practitioners exist and are highlighted throughout this paper. However, as one contribution to this field of study, the core focus of this analysis is on the North-North scholar/practitioner research collaborations that are carried out in the study of IDV.
2. Voluntourism is distinct from short-term IDV programmes and is not the focus of this paper since voluntourism is primarily focused on a tourism model and the sojourner’s choices (of location, activities, level of involvement). IDV, on the other hand, builds on long-standing international partnerships and requests for development assistance that emerge from the partner communities.
3. For example, Canada’s Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) now includes several research funding streams (Partnership Grants, Partnership Development Grants, Connections and Engage Programs) – all of which require collaboration in the grant application, requiring matched funding and in-kind support from non-academic communities. Similarly, IDRC developed the Canadian Partnership Program in 1994 that supports collaborative research between actors from higher education and civil society organisations, amongst other sectors (Chernikova 2011). Small grants for the *Academics and Civil Society Partnership* began to emerge in 2005 and aimed to motivate these actors to collaborate. As a result, 15 partnerships were fostered with actors such as the Halifax Initiative and Mining Watch Canada (Chernikova 2011).

Acknowledgement

The authors wish to thank the many participants at the Connections grant workshop who shared their knowledge and feedback on scholar/practitioner collaboration, and the large team of research assistants that assisted with the delivery of the workshop, particularly Pascale Saint-Denis for her workshop coordination support. Special thanks to the research assistance team at the University of Ottawa, particularly Pascale Saint-Denis and Adrienne Bolen who assisted with content analysis and summary of data for this publication.

Funding

The authors wish to acknowledge funding provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) Connections grant.

Notes on contributors

Rebecca Tiessen is Deputy Director and Full Professor in the School of International Development and Global Studies and University Chair in Teaching at the University of Ottawa.

Jessica Cadesky is PhD candidate in the School of International Development and Global Studies at the University of Ottawa. Her research is supported in part by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC).

Benjamin J. Lough is Associate Professor in the School of Social Work and Director of Illinois Social Innovation at the Gies College of Business, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Jim Delaney is Senior Technical Advisor at World University Service of Canada.

ORCID

Rebecca Tiessen  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1700-5644>

Jessica Cadesky  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9716-7277>

Benjamin J. Lough  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8106-9207>

References

- Amabile, T. M., and P. W. Odomirok. 2001. "Academic-Practitioner Collaboration in Management Research: A Case of Cross-Profession Collaboration." *Academy of Management Journal* 44: 15.
- Aniekwe, C. C., R. Hayman, A. Mdee, J. Akuni, P. Lall, and D. Stevens. 2012. *Academic-NGO Collaboration in International Development Research: A Reflection on the Issues* (Working Paper). <https://www.ssrn.com/abstract=2995689>.
- Bartunek, J. M., and S. L. Rynes. 2014. "Academics and Practitioners are Alike and Unlike." *Journal of Management* 40 (5): 1181–1201. doi:10.1177/0149206314529160.
- Bengtsson, M. 2016. "How to Plan and Perform a Qualitative Study Using Content Analysis." *NursingPlus Open* 2: 8–14. doi:10.1016/j.npls.2016.01.001.
- Binns, T., and S. McLachlan. 2018. "Exploring Host Perspectives towards Younger International Development Volunteers." *Development in Practice* 29 (1): 65–79. doi:10.1080/09614524.2018.1524850.
- Brinkerhoff, J. M. 2002. "Government-Nonprofit Partnership: A Defining Framework." *Public Administration and Development* 22 (1): 19–30. doi:10.1002/pad.203.
- Buick, F., D. Blackman, J. O'Flynn, M. O'Donnell, and D. West. 2016. "Effective Practitioner-Scholar Relationships: Lessons from a Coproduction Partnership." *Public Administration Review* 76 (1): 35–47. doi:10.1111/puar.12481.
- CCIC, and CASID. 2017. *Improving Our Collaborations for Better Development Outcomes. A Short Summary of a CCIC-CASID Literature Review*. Next Generation for Development: A CCIC-CASID Program. Accessed November 3, 2020. https://ccic.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Collaborations_Short_Report_EN.pdf.
- Chernikova, E. 2011. *Shoulder to Shoulder or Face to Face?* (Occasional Paper). Ottawa: IDRC.
- Cottrell, B., and J. L. Parpart. 2006. "Academic-Community Collaboration, Gender Research, and Development: Pitfalls and Possibilities." *Development in Practice* 16 (1): 15–26. doi:10.1080/0961452050045076.
- Devereux, P. 2008. "International Volunteering for Development and Sustainability: Outdated Paternalism or a Radical Response to Globalisation?." *Development in Practice* 18 (3): 357–370.
- ELRHA. 2012. "Guide to Constructing Effective Partnerships". <https://www.elrha.org/researchdatabase/elrha-guide-to-constructing-effective-partnerships/>
- Farashahi, M., T. Hafsi, and R. Molz. 2005. "Institutionalized Norms of Conducting Research and Social Realities: A Research Synthesis of Empirical Works from 1983 to 2002." *International Journal of Management Reviews* 7 (1): 1–24.

- Fransman, J., B. Hall, R. Tandon, R. Hayman, K. Newman, and P. Narayanan. *Forthcoming*. "Beyond Partnerships: Embracing Complexity to Understand and Improve Research Collaboration for Global Development." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue Canadienne D'études du Développement*.
- Hall, B., R. Tandon, and C. Tremblay, eds. 2015. *Strengthening Community University Research Partnerships: Global Perspectives*. Victoria, BC: University of Victoria and PRIA.
- Kram, K. E., I. C. Wasserman, and J. Yip. 2012. "Metaphors of Identity and Professional Practice." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 48 (3): 304–341.
- Kuhn, T. 2002. "Negotiating Boundaries between Scholars and Practitioners." *Management Communication Quarterly* 16 (1): 106–112. doi:10.1177/0893318902161008.
- Law, B. M. 2017. "Pillars of a Researcher-Practitioner Partnership." *The ASHA Leader*.
- Lough, B. J. 2015. "The Evolution of International Volunteering". United Nations Volunteer (UNV) programme, Bonn, Germany.
- Lough, B. J., C. Allum, P. Devereux, and R. Tiessen. 2019. "The Global Research Agenda on Volunteering for Peace and Development." *Voluntaris* 7 (1): 113–123. doi:10.5771/2196-3886-2019-1-113.
- Lough, B. J., and R. Tiessen. 2018. "How Do International Volunteering Characteristics Influence Outcomes? Perspectives from Partner Organizations." *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 29 (1): 104–118. doi:10.1007/s11266-017-9902-9.
- Mannix, E. A., M. A. Neale, and G. B. Northcraft. 1995. "Equity, Equality, or Need? The Effects of Organizational Culture on the Allocation of Benefits and Burdens." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 63 (3): 276–286.
- Martel, A., F. Reilly-King, and B. Baruah. *Forthcoming*. "Next Generation of Knowledge Partnerships for Global Development. Introduction." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement*.
- Mendel, S. C. 2013. "Achieving Meaningful Partnerships with Nonprofit Organizations: A View from the Field." *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership* 3 (2): 66–81.
- Moseley, W. G. 2007. "Collaborating in the Field, Working for Change: Reflecting on Partnerships Between Academics, Development Organizations and Rural Communities in Africa." *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 28 (3): 334–347. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9493.2007.00305.x.
- Roper, L. 2002. "Achieving Successful Academic-Practitioner Research Collaborations." *Development in Practice* 12 (3–4): 338–345. doi:10.1080/0961450220149717.
- Seelig, V. J., and B. J. Lough. 2015. "Strategic Directions for Global Research on Volunteering for Peace and Sustainable Development". Workshop report. (CSD Workshop Report No. 15–45). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
- Sherraden, M. S., J. Stringham, S. Costanzo, and A. M. McBride. 2006. "The Forms and Structure of International Voluntary Service." *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 17: 156–173.
- Stevens, D., R. Hayman, and A. Mdee. 2013. "'Cracking Collaboration' between NGOs and Academics in Development Research." *Development in Practice* 23 (8): 1071–1077. doi:10.1080/09614524.2013.840266.
- Tiessen, R., and I. Smillie. 2016. "The Disconnect between International Development Studies and Development Practice in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement* 38 (4): 435–450. doi:10.1080/02255189.2016.1204907.
- Toukan, E. 2020. "Why do We Know What We Know about Development? Knowledge Production in Canadian Academic-Civil Society Research Partnerships." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement*. doi:10.1080/02255189.2020.1776689.
- Wenger-Trayner, E., and B. Wenger-Trayner. 2015. "Communities of Practice: A Brief Introduction." <https://wenger-trayner.com/introduction-to-communities-of-practice/>.