Knowledge equity: a framework for critical reflection

By Donna Arrondelle, Stephen Ashe, Danica Darley, Fleur Riley, Paula Harriott, Fauzia Ahmad, Debbie Bargallie, Marc Conway, Dalton Harrison, Hannah Lewis, Kirsty Liddiard, Michael McCusker, Pradeep Narayanan, Esther Outram, Aisling Skeet, Lauren White

For those researchers interested in challenging inequalities and working in ways which attend to redressing the power imbalances involved in traditional academic research and positivist epistemologies, knowledge equity can be used to integrate diverse perspectives and better produce and disseminate knowledge. More specifically, knowledge equity is "a commitment to focus on knowledge and communities that have been left out […] and to break down the social, political, and technical barriers preventing people from accessing and contributing to free knowledge…" (Campbell, 2022). Knowledge equity can also ground researchers in "an understanding that different forms of knowledge and expertise are vital to progress and drive systems change… It asks us first to consider who we believe to be knowledge producers. It then asks us to consider if and how those knowledge producers are given equitable and meaningful agency as systems analysts, activists and change-makers" (Sandhu, 2021: n.p.).

Where to begin when developing a knowledge equity framework?

Knowledge equity is grounded in principles which acknowledge the relationship between knowledge production and social inequality, the limitations of traditional academic practice in addressing its potential harms, and the necessity for knowledge equity in practice. JoAnn Jaffe (2017: 408-409) argues that 'Social inequities are made possible by and compounded by knowledge inequity'. If knowledge justice and meaningful, broader systemic change is to be brought about, Jaffe contends that this will involve building 'ecologies of knowledge' which bring different practices of knowledge production into dialogue and commit to the co-creative forms of knowledge production (2017: 408-409). Researchers must 'work toward an ecology of knowledges in which the need for many types of knowledge are understood [and] recognised' and where different forms of knowledge are 'respected on their own terms' (2017: 391, 408-409;

see also Teo, 2010). Thus, knowledge equity is founded in a commitment to social justice, and to develop knowledge equity it is essential that researchers engage deeply and critically with their epistemological stances and research practices and consider how these align with their ideological and ethical positions as members of society and citizens of the world.

How do I apply a knowledge equity framework to my research practice?

Rather than prescribing a set of linear predetermined steps towards knowledge production, we suggest that *critical reflective questioning* is key to building meaningful inclusion. It involves an ongoing interrogation of assumptions, practices, and perspectives of the self and the systems in which knowledge is produced. This encourages researchers to constantly assess whose voices are being prioritised, whose knowledge is being validated, and who is being excluded from the conversation. Researchers are asked to challenge conventional hierarchies of knowledge, appreciate how existing knowledges impact knowledge creation and recognise exclusionary and/or harmful processes. Through this, researchers can make space for alternative epistemologies and less conventional ways of knowing, allowing for more meaningful and responsive engagement with those whose lived experiences are central to the research.

Critical reflective questioning is required to also extend more broadly to the wider power structures across institutional contexts and beyond. For example, this approach necessitates that academic institutions rework their policies and practices regarding whose knowledge is valued and how it is rewarded. This might include academic institutions and policy makers questioning the metrics by which research success is measured. It might also involve examining the ways that research findings are made accessible and beneficial to the communities involved.

The ongoing task for researchers is to *meaningfully prioritise lived experience expertise*, engaging alternative voices and ways of doing things *to create more equitable and diverse ecologies of knowledge* and systems of knowledge production. This involves broadening knowledge legitimacy - widening the parameters of what is understood as legitimate knowledge, creating conditions of possibility so that individuals and communities traditionally excluded from creating knowledge which is typically deemed credible knowledge in academia and policy-making processes are instead positioned as paramount in decision making on how knowledge is created. A key actionable step here is to undertake research design and implementation

planning with individuals with lived experience expertise on an equal footing with academic researchers. This approach is bespoke and iterative and will look different for every research project. There is no singular way to prioritise lived experience, so the concrete approach undertaken is highly contingent on the context of your research project. Researchers should be actively guided by the experts with lived experience that are involved, while continuously engaging in critical reflective questioning. This actively foregrounds lived experts' contributions and creates space for democratic and reciprocal dialogue, while recognising and valuing the credibility of these knowers. This is central to co-creating equitable knowledge, especially in decision-making that directly impacts people's lives.

Below, we offer four reflective activities exemplifying some questioning along these lines to guide *critical reflective* questioning, mindful that these seventeen questions are merely suggestions and there are a multitude of other questions beyond those offered here:

1: Engaging new and alternative voices and ways of doing things

This first of four reflective exercises encourages you to develop your own working definition of 'knowledge equity', as well as consider what and who constitutes a credible knowledge producer. You are also asked to map the different knowledge producers that you engage with and whom comprise your personal ecology of knowledge.

The excerpts from our conversations with different knowledge producers are presented to spark thinking for the exercise. Here Lauren White, a critical disabilities researcher and Fauzia Ahmad, whose research interests include the experiences of Muslim women in elite academia, consider the power relations in the predominant knowledge system we operate within.

> **Lauren:** I guess in academic research, you know, for a long-time particular voices have sort of dominated it, and with that, you know, there's kind of inequalities embedded within that. So, you get the privilege of particular types of voices that you know are gendered, raced, classed, you know, associated with place, disability, all of those things, and then the intersections of those. So, I think in terms of the knowledge we produce and making that more equitable, we need a kind of diversify voices in those institutions where the knowledge is produced, but we also need them involved in all aspects of the research process … and that includes from the research design right through to the dissemination

and the kind of, yeah, and the diversity of what dissemination looks like, and in a diversity of spaces. So, it's not just about publishing an academic journal in a you know top tier, you know, a journal that, you know, is kind of behind a paywall and all that kind of stuff. It's about thinking how do you get this knowledge that's created equitably also into spaces where knowledge can be shared and accessed by everyone.

Fauzia: I think the very obvious thing first of all is that we recognise that there is no one grand meta-narrative and you can't explain the social world with one grand metanarrative; you certainly can't explain diverse peoples and their perspectives using one grand meta-narrative. And we've known, you know, we know that attempts to frame people with a meta-narrative or one way of knowledge, or one way of gaining knowledge, in itself leads to pathological tropes and misrepresentations and stereotypes. And you know, on one level these are very, I mean these are very persistent stereotypes as well. It's very difficult once a stereotype has been established to counter that, and at its worst, we know that these kinds of stereotypes, they are epistemological forms of violence. And they actually also have lead, are leading to, and currently are in operation in terms of physical violence in order to maintain a certain form of order by those who yield the most power over these narratives. So, I think it's really important that we do recognise knowledge from different perspectives, that we do recognise that there are many varied forms of knowledge and ways of being, you know, and we have to kind of recognise that violence in terms of knowledge production and the kind of well, the knowledge that the European or the Western frames of knowledge have been posited on, has been born in violence, and is born in violence. We see that also in the ways that international structures have been imposed on the world. You know, it's one way of being…

... Well, we're looking at again the impact the long term impact of colonialist mindsets and colonialist forms of knowledge gathering, and then that form of knowledge gathering being used to impose control over subjugated peoples, and again because I just mentioned it, you know, there is the violence that is inherent within those forms of knowledge gathering and then in the ways that that form of knowledge has been used to subjugate people, and one of the kind of, I suppose, if I'm gonna maybe give a particular example, is the very clear distinction between secular forms of knowledge and non-secular forms of knowledge, and the fact that the Western rationalist thought is rooted

within this secularist forms of knowledge. And they inherently position any other form of knowledge that is not westernised and secular as inferior in some shape or form. You know, if we look at the kind of multiple traditions of spiritualism, of religion, of connections that people have with the land, which are in, you know, very kind of spiritual. These are all things and ways of being that are, umm, routinely denigrated and presented as less than, uh, as somehow inferior and we need to question why. The Western world is not in the majority as a number, and I think Edward Said said something to that effect, but there seems to be an assumption that the Western world or the Western mind has a right to know and control knowledge about the Other. And I think that's deeply problematic.

Reflective questions:

1.   How do you define knowledge equity?

2.   Why do we need to understand knowledge from different perspectives?

3.   Whose knowledge is considered most important in contemporary society and why?

4.   Who do you identify as 'credible' or 'legitimate' knowledge producers?

5.   How does your own status impact the knowledge you produce, and how could knowledge equity work impact your status?

6.   What role does experiential knowledge play in your own personal ecology of knowledge?

7.   Given what Lauren says above, how could you make your personal ecology of knowledge more diverse and equitable?

2: Engaging new and alternative voices and ways of doing things

Knowledge equity principles encourage critical reflection and rethinking to redress the power imbalances which stem from the hegemony of traditional academic ways of knowing. The task at hand then is to engage diverse voices and ways of doing things to create diverse ecologies of knowledge and more equitable forms of collaborative knowledge production and dissemination by widening the parameters of what is understood as legitimate knowledge. To create conditions of possibility, individuals and communities traditionally excluded from creating knowledge (or what is typically deemed credible knowledge in academia and policymaking circles) are instead centrally positioned in decisions on how to produce knowledge. Thus, striving for knowledge justice by actively recognising, valuing and foregrounding the potentially vital contribution of these knowers.

Having developed your own working definition of knowledge equity and mapped the ecology of knowledge which has informed your past, current or future planned lived experience research, campaigning and activism, this second exercise asks you to reflect on the different things that must be kept in mind when trying to engage with experiential knowledge in a democratic and non-hierarchical way, while trying to ensure that such work is of benefit to the people and communities with direct experience of a particular issue, or combination of issues, that have had an impact on their lives. Below, Marc Conway, a lived experience criminal justice reform activist offers his perspective on the importance of centring lesser-heard voices, while Esther Outram, a lived-experience researcher of neurodiversity in education, gives her insight into advancing a different way of working that encourages knowledge equity.

> **Marc:** When people write policies about how people are gonna be governed, it is fundamental that the people that are going to be governed by that policy, that their voice is running through that. Now, that's not to say that they get to dictate what that policy says but they get, but it enables the people who are writing them policies to understand how it feels to be on the other end of them policies. And it goes back to that power struggle…
>
> They've not had a chance to say, 'well, actually this is how it feels to be on the other end of that'. And there's so many times that people in power have made them policies without even knowing, and the people that they consult are higher level civil servants. Probably,

not been on the other end of it, that, right, you know, Oxford, Cambridge, all these kind of places. Like, that's the same likeminded people, right, because that's what we do to feel safe. We don't want people to argue against our ideas, if possible. Some of us encourage it, like an open challenge, but nine times out of ten you want your ideas to stay, I do, you know everyone does, so, I think that's the of real importance of it. And also, I think it's about giving agency to people that feel like they have none. And I think in this world, if you can make someone feel like they belong to something, or they are worthy, or they're just being treated like a human being, I think that outweighs anything else. I think that, allow people to feel like that because when you are dehumanised or you feel like you're voiceless, or you don't feel like a human being, I know what that feels like and it's not a nice feeling but I also know what it's like to be given that kind of stuff as well…

… It's like there's always like just a level, you can get to that point but actually you can't come into government and advise us what it's like to live on a council estate or what it's like to be [released] on licence [from prison] when you get out with nowhere to live. You know, there's that glass kind of ceiling kind of effect where you can see what the issue is, if you can get through to it you can help with that issue but actually this this country is very good at keeping people in their place and I think what knowledge equity does, it helps to break that down, so that's why I believe it's really important.

Esther: … Just not having to follow the same rigid conventions of, 'this is the best place for an interview to take place', you know, thinking more about, I think ad well for people who may have limited attention spans having a space that is not just devoid of distractions, if that makes sense, I think having a space where if they wanted to fidget, if they wanted their attention to wonder, they can do, and that's fine and we're not sitting in a room that's just like white walls, very clinical. You know, like the traditional kind of corporate spaces. I think having somewhere where they can feel more relaxed, if that makes sense and it doesn't have to be these clinical spaces, which I think sometimes research encourages us to do. I think if we have more authentic spaces that are similar to real life, the more comfortable people are going to feel to be open…

So, working with the young people, I think they had a perception of me as a teacher to start with, or an educational professional, or a research professional. And so the start of

the interview was really breaking down that conception and showing that I wasn't here to evaluate them. I wasn't here to test them, I was here to hear what their experiences were. And even though straight from the beginning I shared a little bit about me, I shared a little bit about my personal experience, my family, the fact that all of my siblings are also dyslexic as well, and sharing that where my passion came from… I shared with them, I was like, I think the best way for us to make change in policy or understand what's going on is to directly speak to people who are experiencing it at the moment and I think you guys have the best insight into what it's like today at school being neurodiverse, dyslexic. So I said that at the beginning, but then I don't think that was enough to just blurt that out right at the beginning, so I continually throughout our conversation dropped in anecdotes from me, especially if they said something that spoke to an experience I had when I was at school. So, I would affirm that during the interview. Or, if they were struggling to think of an example, then I was more than happy to share examples from my life or from my siblings' lives or other friends that I knew that were dyslexic and I think that did really help and I had a student at the end that said to me, because at the end I was like, 'thank you so much for talking to me. I appreciate it's really weird talking to someone you've only just met about these personal things, you know, confidence, maybe negative experiences of school' and once, a couple of students said, 'oh, it really helped that you shared too' so it was a two way conversation, so I wasn't there to just extract their really vulnerable moments of life.

Reflective questions:

1. What mechanism, tools and ways of working do you currently use, or are you considering using, to co-produce experiential knowledge in an inclusive and non-hierarchical way? Relatedly, what are the strengths and limitations of these approaches?

2. In his contribution, Marc discusses the way in which there can be 'levels' to the way in which policymakers engage with people with experiential knowledge. Are there any 'levels' which limit how you engage, or plan engaging, with experts by experience?

3. Above Esther discusses ways in which we might develop spaces and settings for dialogue and co-production that are sensitive to the needs of people with lived

experience of disability. In terms of your work, what are the adaptations that you might undertake in order to make your spaces for dialogue and co-production more accessible and inclusive?

4.   Reflecting on the examples above, what other mechanisms, tools and ways of working might you and those whom you are working with add to your repertoire to produce knowledge in inclusive, equitable and just ways?

3: Critical reflections on the role of organisational and institutional frameworks on knowledge equity and lived experience work

In this exercise, you are invited to critically reflect on whether your work has been/ might be helped or hindered by the organisational and institutional frameworks where you were/ are doing this work and how these frameworks might be adapted, contested and/or developed further; thus, potentially disrupting hegemonic and orthodox ways of doing things. Moreover, we invite you to reflect on different approaches, methods and techniques which you might call upon to make your work more ethical and accessible to people and communities with direct experience of a particular issue, or combination of issues, that have impacted their lives.

Below, Debbie Bargaille, an Indigenous Australian inter-disciplinary critical race scholar from the Kamilaroi and Wonnarua peoples of the north-west and Upper Hunter regions of New South Wales, considers the importance of researchers reflecting on their own agendas and positionalities. Lauren White, a disabilities researcher then discusses turning lived experience work into action, before Hannah Lewis, a refugee community researcher, reflects on how we might make space for alternative knowledges.

> **Debbie:** … I think that all non-Indigenous peoples you know in the Australian context who are trying to do work and research in Indigenous communities or about Indigenous peoples need to understand first, why are they doing that research is that of benefit to Indigenous peoples for their betterment or is it for the betterment or whoever aggression of the actual researcher? … So, my point would be first, is that is there actually a need and a benefit to the Indigenous peoples and the Indigenous communities? … Next, I would say to make sure that research does no harm … research is a dirty word for Indigenous peoples because of the abuse that's come and the negative outcomes that

have been there for Indigenous peoples … So, in doing for non-Indigenous people's working and wanting to do Indigenous researchers, I think that they need to first of all know that they are doing research with indigenous peoples, not for or about Indigenous people … My second take would be, I don't think in Australia there should be any need for any non-Indigenous researcher to be doing indigenous research without a - coresearcher who is indigenous in this day and time … There's plenty of Indigenous researchers … who have expertise in all fields now where they should be included at all levels of a research project … So that's a really solid thing for me in terms of an expectation … I would also say that non-Indigenous researchers need to know their own positionality in this research … And that's more than just saying yes … I recognise I'm a non-Indigenous person and I have privilege … It's about knowing how their position is what their positioning is in terms of, you know, power and where they are in their actual, you know role and position within this research project

Lauren: Um, you know, there's kind of establishing knowledge equity and kind of bringing those voices to the table if you like. But then, it's also about how you exercise that and then what you do with it. There's no point just being like we spoke to these people and hear their voices if you can't then like, utilise that into effective social action and like social justice and activism, and stuff. And I guess people feel differently about the extent to which that is a thing. But I guess if you're doing participatory research or co-production, and especially if you're in a kind of critical social science space, there is always that kind of like, like you'd like to think that you are sort of committed to that sort of social justice and equity of knowledge, and um, and power and the redistribution of power that comes with it.

Hannah: An idea of equity has to be underpinned by an idea of knowledge inequality that it's very easy when you get into, that there's different types of knowledges as well like theocratic/bureaucratic, institutional, and that kind of thing that operate, part of how they operate as a cultural system is to exclude other forms of knowledge. So I think in research and academia it's very easy, we're trained to write about ideas and abstracted ideas, and it's easy to write about these kinds of things, and I've always had these kinds of ideas but to be totally honest with you, I, you know, with the best will in the world and the best intentions in the world, I struggle, you know, in an interpersonal interaction to

really, adequately, give space to other forms of knowledge because the structure that I work in, and the way that I work, and the way that I'm trained and stuff can make it difficult sometimes…

… That specific example of what I've been doing the last 2-3 years I think is an interesting one because… So, something I've been thinking a lot about in recent years is how again, based a bit linked to what I was just saying, that If people are interested in knowledge equity then they may be recruit peer researchers or community researchers to do data collection because they have language skills or access that you can't get as a researcher and you get paid if you're lucky, not all peer researchers get paid. If you're lucky, you to get paid to extract data from other people for the benefit of a research project based on your networks. And you know as well as I know, but it's very seldom the case even now, even with everything, even with the popularity of participatory approaches and everything for people to actually consider that community researchers might wish to be involved in analysis and writing, and presenting. I'm just about to pull out, withdraw from an academic conference in April because we don't think it's legitimate for two or three of us to go and present our project and it's not feasible to and it's not a good use of our resources to invest in taking more people. And there's no support for that. Not anymore.

Reflective questions:

1. Given what Lauren says regarding organisational structures shaping our approaches to experiential knowledge production, what organisational rules, regulations and procedures do you need to follow in your work and why?

2. Relatedly, if you could, what current ethical protocols and ways of things would you change to do lived experience work in a more ethical and equitable manner? What might be the techniques that you need to add to your repertoire to address the ethical challenges that you have/ might encounter?

3. Reflecting on the issues raised by Debbie, what might you do to ensure that lived experiential knowledge is accessible to, and works to the benefit of, the people and

communities with direct experience of a particular issue, or combination of issues, that have had an impact on their lives?

4.   Relatedly, Hannah also raises the important issue of co-designing and enacting social change. What is your approach to co-design and enacting social change? And how might they be made more democratic and non-hierarchical?

4: Re-imagining your knowledge equity praxis

In this final exercise, you are invited to further reflect on your working definition of knowledge equity, re-map the ecology of knowledge that you are part of, and how the principles and practices that shape your work might be re-imagined. Below, Pradeep Nayaran, a practitioner of participatory methods and approaches in research and evaluation based at the Praxis Institute in Delhi, and Hannah Lewis offer examples of how they have re-thought their own ways of thinking and doing things.

Pradeep: How we… look at look at this knowledge transaction process or facilitation process was to, to say that our knowledge on expertise on a particular aspect which you engage with is going to be, is zero, whereas you want to learn more from the rest of the people so, you know, as a, as a facilitation. Research itself is about facilitation, where we try to bring it. Some of the interesting thing which I feel is with the intergenerational sex work, you know, communities with which when I was engaging with and the idea was to find out about how they look at sex work, right? Is it a sex work, is it a work or is it a something which is not work? And within the sex work is it a matter of choice or is it a matter of being forced into it? Or is it about you are being forced into sex work but after that you start exercising a choice to be in sex work? So you have these different ways to look at it, but one thing which, which I felt was, where I started reimagining some of the knowledge, some of these debates and forced me to go beyond it is probably one of the scenarios where I found that some of the girls with whom we, I was engaging with, for them, it was like, as a researcher many of us come with a binary. Either you are in sex work or you are not in sex work, right? So, if you have been taken away from sex work that means you are not in sex work, so. But here is a situation where we met somebody, that particular girl has moved away from sex work and she's largely into the, got into some kind of a profession and she's engaging in that work but then when I was asking,

talking to her, and then she said, 'but when I go for a vacation, a summer vacation, when I go back home, I do sex work'. So then all your indicators that whether you are no longer in sex work because they're sex work is a moral binary, right? It's like either you are in sex work or not in sex work, but these kind of people who get into sex work and then leave, for them sex work is immaterial. It is not so important for them to even look at sex work as, as something which is defining them as a thing. So, while this kind of analysis has happened for other things, but for something which is morally right or wrong issue, it's very difficult for us to, to put it in that kind of a thing. So, I thought those were some of the areas where certain findings make you think that, you know, some of the knowledge which you had has to be, has to be completely reversed. So your indicators have to change, so all the research frame questions might have to change, all the questions were devised in such a way that it is about one part of it, but then this knowledge actually makes your entire thing irrelevant...

… I was looking at myself from the location of what are the privileges that I don't have or what are the things where I feel discriminated? What are the things where I have a lived experience of deprivation or discrimination? But then it, it also had the other aspect of what are the privileges you have, so you location is about the privileges that you enjoy, privileges not only you enjoy but privileges that that, that the social identity of yours enjoy. So you may not be enjoying directly, but anybody who is similar to you, do enjoy. So in a way, it's about, while in, in such an individualistic world where we, we are constantly looked at everything from an individual cell, whether it is about deprivation or privilege, there is an element of, of privilege which comes from your social identity, national identity, and many other identities, right. So, that that that is something which, some of them have been captured through feminism, some of, some isms, but some of them are not because they are largely intersectional and more than intersectional. Also, is often looked at it as a linear addition of it, like if you are a female plus a black, it is a female plus black, but often it is, it is not as linear addition of deprivations…

… So in my location I feel this constantly, a lot of things is about my engagement with an underprivileged, who is whom I am studying, so that power thing matters, and for me the best example of, of a researcher who I keep in mind is, is, is, is, is, is, Buddha. I would call him the first researcher because if you, if you look at the history of his life history, he

gave up his position of privilege and he went and studied and he became part of the, the place which he is studying and he just subsumed himself into that thing. And then he came out with a recommendation or findings, or what thing and all. So in a way, his life is a history. And it's a, it's a kind of a thing for many of us, like privileged, who want to study under privilege. I think that's the example which I always keep in mind, that you have to become part of the problem. You have to become part of the cause which you are studying for you to understand that lived experience.

Hannah: How did I become able to do this stuff? I mean part of how I became able to do this stuff was to get out of doing other peoples' research and to design my own research, is a key thing. But you know what, having that experience actually of having to have been required to conduct these kind of parachuting researches and little bit-parts and I've done analysis on other people's projects, I've done interviews and other people's projects, so you know, I did have all of that in my background… But I mean, I guess I try and do this with a lot of things that I do now is that there's a platform built into it so that there's a sharing, so there's maybe four points, depends on what it is. But if you're engaging with organisations and gatekeepers, they usually want the knowledge straight away, and you're also interviewing them, and their part of creating change or delivering a service, or maybe they're developing out their own policies or something like that so increasingly I tried to design research that funds, and incorporates, and is realistic about time, saying to practitioners, for example, 'you're going to come for half a day every three months and we're gonna build together the research tools, we're going to build together the knowledge, we going to share the knowledge'. And so that even if you get to the end of that research project and you're sat around twiddling your thumbs, well many people just get on with their lives, completely forget about it, and then twelve months later you come on and go, 'oh well I've published this article, or I've written this research report', then you've already, hopefully, benefited from some kind of knowledge sharing activity throughout…

… I think a lot of these things just get recycled every few years, right, and called something different. I do think that we are starting to really take seriously changing the outputs and I think that's something that has changed because I think critical ethnography, I think, no matter, positionality, all of those debates, the subaltern, the other

postcolonial approaches that haven't been taken on board as much as they should have been, in my view in a lot of areas of research have all questioned a lot about the author, like, and a subject, like author or researcher, researched, inside or outside, and all these kinds of things. But very, much less critique and advice, and change has been done in the area of what we do with all of this stuff. And it is still the case, obviously we are universities; our main job is to write arcane articles that no one else can really understand. No matter how much money gets spent on knowledge exchange and impact that's still what we have to do to be able to get our job and keep our job, and progressing our job, right. But I do think, I feel that in this project, for example, that I'm doing now that, I mean, yeah, of course I'm under pressure to write an article about it and you know what, I probably should, but I do feel like things have shifted a bit in that it's valid. More valid than it used to be. And OK, that the output of a research project is some videos and a guide and stuff that people might actually use and read…

… We still have this idea that you do research - that you start research, you plan research, you do research, you finish research, you come up with the 'genius plan' and then you share it with the world. But I think the, I think knowledge equity, there needs to be more involvement with people throughout the course. And I think having sharing and things like that within a project built in, and these, these are sorts of projects that I, I mean I've put a lot of energy and effort, and time into trying to design projects like that in recent years and not being funded. But like for me, the work that I, the area that I work in now, it's a requirement and this is the sort of thing that I'm working on, is like what I would call a platform, like a knowledge platform that is built as part of a research project. So that it's not, that it's just so distant and far off in time, even if it's a one-year project, never mind a three-year project, that you come to the end and you do like a sharing of research findings and research findings isn't even necessarily, like the way that we do it as academics, isn't even necessarily the most useful thing.

Reflective questions:

1.   Can you think of a time when you have re-thought or re-imagined your own knowledge?

2. When, or if, rethinking your own knowledge, whose voices and which alternative lived experiences, theories and perspectives did/ might you engage with in order to produce and engage with experiential knowledge in more equitable ways?

This EPrint has offered an introduction to a knowledge equity method for anyone curious about how they might work towards a more equitable and just knowledge system, i.e. knowledge justice. The content here is co-produced by sixteen individuals, many/most with lived experience expertise plus academics, with a some of us embodying both identities. As a collective we hope that dipping your toes in here will spark interest and encourage people to explore the selected additional resources below (shout out to the amazing work that these authors do), as well as encouraging you to directly reach out to us to continue this conversation and build momentum for change.

Resource list (listening, reading and watching)

Booth, M., and Harriott, P. (2021) Service Users Being Used: Thoughts to the Research Community in I. Masson, L. Baldwin, L., and N. Booth (2021*) Critical Reflections on Women, Family, Crime and Justice* (eds.). Bristol: Policy Press. Available at: Service users being used: thoughts to the research community (Chapter 10) - Critical Reflections on Women, Family, Crime and Justice (cambridge.org)

Centre for Social Justice and Community Action, Durham University National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement Community-based participatory research. A guide to ethical principles and practice (2nd edition)

Cooperativa de Diseño (2021) What knowledge may you grow? Knowledge Equity Lab. Available at: https://youtu.be/exgmBcZv-Is?si=NsQuZKDpQoidl7AY

Experience for Justice (2024) Available at: https://www.experienceforjustice.com/about

Unsettling Knowledge Inequities. Podcast. We highly recommended episode 'Indigenous epistemologies & open science: learning from the land' but also dip in to any you like the sound of. Available at: Podcast – Knowledge Equity Lab

Singh, B (2022) What is knowledge equity and why does it matter? https://youtu.be/kjCkv0U4UO4?si=m0IA9jMdsHJYBXRK. If you liked this, you may also like Sandhu, B. (2017) *The Value of Lived Experience in Social Change: The Need for Leadership and Organisational Development in the Social Sector. Centre for Knowledge Equity*. Available at: https://knowledgeequity.org/publications/. Accessed 3rd June 2024.

References

Bell, D. (2018), 'A Pedagogical Response to Decoloniality: Decolonial Atmospheres and Rising Subjectivity', *Am J Community Psychol*, 62: 250-260. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12292. Accessed 4th June 2024.

Campbell, L. (2020), 'A Common Purpose: Wikimedia, Open Education and Knowledge Equity for all' Keynote speech at the *Disruptive Media Learning Lab at Coventry University, 26th February, 2020*. Available at: A Common Purpose: Wikimedia, Open Education and Knowledge Equity for all | Open World (lornamcampbell.org). Accessed 1tst March 2023.

Jaffe, J. (2017) Knowledge Equity is Social Justice: Engaging a Practice Theory Perspective of Knowledge for Rural Transformation. Rural Sociology, 82: 391-410.

Sandhu, B, (2021) 'Systems Week 2021: Knowledge Equity for Systems Change', *Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship*, Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?app=desktop&v=IG65KvoqNWM. Accessed 3rd June 2024.

Bios of contributors

Fauzia Ahmad is a Muslim sociologist working at Goldsmiths, University of London, recently made redundant.

Donna Arrondelle is a critical interdisciplinary scholar in the public health team at the University of Southampton working with justice involved adults and children. Donna also brings expertise by experience of maternal imprisonment.

Stephen Ashe is an Assistant Professor at Durham University. Drawing on historical and political sociological perspectives, his research primarily focuses on racism and anti-racism, and is underpinned by a commitment to public sociology.

Debbie Bargallie is an Indigenous Australian interdisciplinary critical race scholar from the Kamilaroi and Wonnarua peoples of the north-west and Upper Hunter regions of NSW. Debbie is currently a Principal Research Fellow based at Griffith University.

Marc Conway is the Chief Executive Officer of Fair Justice, an organisation striving for a fairer criminal justice system.

Danica Darley is a PhD student at the University of Sheffield and a lecturer in applied custodial leadership at Leeds Trinity University who has lived experience of the prison system.

Paula Harriott is the Chief Executive Officer of Unlock and thought leader on expertise by experience.

Hannah Lewis is a researcher in Sociological Studies at the University of Sheffield, working with young migrants.

Kirsty Liddiard is a disability studies scholar at the University of Sheffield.

Michael McCusker is an expert by experience, podcast host and author working in CJS and leadership spaces.

Pradeep Narayanan is a practitioner of participatory methods and approaches in research and evaluation. He works around areas of decolonisation, ethics, Participatory Research, Business

and Human Rights, and Sustainable Development. He is currently Advisor, Praxis Institute for Participatory Practices, India.

Esther Outram is a lived-experience PhD researcher at Durham University, investigating disabling barriers experienced by dyslexic pupils in grammar schools.

Fleur Riley is a PhD researcher at Durham University, whose work focuses on the lived experiences of criminalised women.

Lauren White is a lecturer in social research methods at the University of Sheffield.

Dalton Harrison is a trans writer, poet and activist with lived experience of incarceration.

Aisling Skeet is a psychology student with lived experience of gender transition, acute mental health services and neurodivergence.