Violence Against Women

Gender Violence and Transdisciplinarity

Jill Theresa Messing, Madelaine Adelman and Alesha Durfee

The online version of this article can be found at:

Additional services and information for *Violence Against Women* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://vaw.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://vaw.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

>> Version of Record - Aug 27, 2012

What is This?

Gender Violence and Transdisciplinarity

Jill Theresa Messing[1], Madelaine Adelman[2], and Alesha Durfee[2]

Transdisciplinary (TD) research is a relatively new concept that developed as a response to traditional, discipline-based research methods, which are seen as generalizing (i.e., not specific), decontextualizing (i.e., not locally embedded), and reductionist (i.e., capturing only part of the problem at hand; Horlick-Jones & Sime, 2004). Given the newness of the term, Transdisciplinarity has been described as a "concept in flux" (Pohl, 2010, p. 80), with scholars utilizing the term in a variety of ways. For a core group of scholars, an evolving consensus has emerged around the essential characteristics of TD research (Carew & Wickson, 2010; Hadorn et al., 2008; Pohl, 2010, 2011; Wickson, Carew, & Russell, 2006). First, much of self-identified TD research is "problem" focused, both in terms of the conceptualization of the research questions and outcomes. Second, TD research requires "border-work" (Horlick-Jones & Sime, 2004, p. 442); not only does it cross previously established disciplinary boundaries within the academy, it also crosses epistemological, methodological, and traditional practice–research boundaries.

In recent years, rhetoric affirming transdisciplinarity has emerged, but only a few illustrations of its merits have been published, primarily in the science and policy arenas (e.g., Hadorn et al., 2008, Klein et al., 2001). Far fewer concrete demonstrations of its relevance have emerged within the social and behavioral sciences, and none that we have identified in gender violence research. This is despite the importance of examining social problems—such as gender violence—*between, across, and beyond* disciplines (Horlick-Jones & Sime, 2004; Nicolescu, 2005). It is time to assess the place, pitfalls, and promises of transdisciplinarity for gender violence. Doing so may help recoup some of the motivation for bringing the topic into the academy. At the same time, scholars may benefit from advancements in theory and case study examples. Finally, transdisciplinarity may offer models for researchers, practitioners, and those directly and indirectly affected by gender violence to work together to unravel this social problem.

We sought to coedit this special issue as a result of our experiences at Arizona State University, an institution dedicated to breaking down disciplinary walls and encouraging

[1]Arizona State University, Phoenix AZ, USA
[2]Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA

Corresponding Author:
Jill Theresa Messing, Arizona State University, School of Social Work, 411 N. Central Ave., Suite 800, Phoenix, AZ 85004, USA
Email: Jill.Messing@asu.edu

collaboration. Over the course of several years, the three of us participated in a research cluster on gender violence. The research cluster was inspired by the work of R. Emerson Dobash and Russell Dobash, who are annual visiting scholars in Justice and Social Inquiry (Adelman), a decades-old interdisciplinary academic unit, as well as by the multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary histories of Women and Gender Studies (Durfee) and Social Work (Messing). Other members of the research cluster agreed that gender violence scholars needed to reflect on the challenging concept of transdisciplinarity. Fourteen scholars from eight different disciplines contributed to this special issue on gender violence and transdisciplinarity. We then hosted a conversation for contributors to discuss the contested meaning, value, and potential of transdisciplinarity for gender violence research.

The purpose of this special issue is to discuss how a TD perspective can be employed by researchers to better understand the problem of gender violence. In this introduction, we first define TD research and describe some of its strengths and weaknesses, highlighting its potential for innovative research in the social sciences (where it has been largely absent). We then present a series of seven articles written by gender violence researchers using a TD perspective. These articles focus on a wide range of gender violence—from girls and gang violence to intimate partner homicide to the mobilization of culture in combating gender violence—use a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods, and incorporate different elements of transdisciplinarity in their analyses. Included in each article is a reflection by the authors as to how transdisciplinarity has shaped their research, often in very different ways. We hope that through this special issue we can spark a wider conversation among researchers, policy makers, practitioners, and activists about the future of gender violence research and the "challenges of, and opportunities for, transdisciplinary research" (Hadorn et al., 2008, p. 27).

Transdisciplinary Research

According to scholars who have reflected on the meaning and value of transdisciplinarity, TD research has a specific focus on socially relevant, "real world," complex, multidimensional, and/or contemporary problems (Klein, 2004). These problems have been described as those in which "facts are uncertain, values in dispute, stakes are high and decisions urgent" (Horlick-Jones & Sime, 2004, p. 445). While it is possible for researchers to define a phenomenon as a "social problem," TD research focuses on social problems identified by researchers in conjunction with the wider community, including nonacademic actors such as community members, practitioners, policy makers, and/or activists. TD research is not an exclusively theoretical enterprise but is oriented toward problem solving (Balsiger, 2004).

One key element of TD research is the *problem context*—the broad social (or environmental) structure that created and sustains the problem (Carew & Wickson, 2010). In TD research, the complexity of the problem context is acknowledged by taking into account differential perspectives, with the goal of integrating scientific and practice-based knowledge to create solutions that can be implemented to address the social problem and work toward a "common good" (Pohl, 2011).

The seemingly universal notion of the "common good" within transdisciplinarity stems in part from the disciplinary origins of many TD scholars, mostly natural scientists, who tend to draw on epistemological and methodological assumptions of scientific "objectivity," while recognizing the inherent subjectivity present in "objective" research. One of the key representatives of the TD movement, Basarab Nicolescu, argues that science was founded on the axiom that reality is objective and a person has the ability to observe an objective reality (although their perceptions are inherently subjective). As such, they have advocated for scholars to utilize "scientific" inquiry—typically thought of as "objective"— to engage with social problems toward a specific goal of societal change (Pohl, 2008). By marrying science and social problems, transdisciplinarity encourages the reintegration of the "objective" and subjective through an understanding of multiple subjective realities, or intersubjectivity; in TD research, "realities" are not mutually exclusive and can exist simultaneously (Nicolescu, 2005; see also Despres, Brais, & Avellan, 2004). Within the context of this intersubjectivity, TD researchers develop solutions to social problems, guided by "scientific" principles. Thus, according to TD theorists, it is important for TD researchers to be clear about their own and others' value systems and reflect upon how these influence their research questions and problem solutions (Pohl, 2011).

In a research context where government entities and funding bodies increasingly require that we show the impact that science will have on "real world" problems (Horlick-Jones & Sime, 2004), TD research provides a framework for achieving this goal. According to TD researchers, multidisciplinary (MD) and interdisciplinary (ID) research approaches do not have the same elements as TD research. Balsinger argues that MD research is centered on themes, not problems, and though researchers from multiple disciplines may be included in MD research, "no collaboration is necessary" (p. 412). ID research focuses primarily on "scientific" solutions, not "real world," practical solutions, and there is generally no collaboration between scientists and nonscientific actors (Balsiger, 2004). In contrast, TD research requires a focus on "real world" solutions and collaborations not only across disciplines but also across the traditional research–practice divide (a practice called "border-work," discussed below). TD researchers believe that social problems, by their nature, are too large, diverse, and intractable to be contained by the research of a single discipline or understood from a single perspective (Carew & Wickson, 2010).

Border-work, a term coined by Horlick-Jones and Sime (2004, p. 442), is work that entails crossing the borders between academic disciplines—in terms of epistemology, methodology, and the outcomes of research—and the borders between research and practice. Given the focus of TD research on social problems, which are not bound by academic discipline, the crossing of academic and disciplinary boundaries is a necessary aspect of TD research (e.g., Carew & Wickson, 2010; Lawrence & Despres, 2004; Nicolescu, 2005; Ramadier, 2004; Wickson et al., 2006). Academic science tends to perpetuate discipline-bound knowledge, while contemporary social problems explode the boundaries of disciplinary thought (Horlick-Jones & Sime, 2004; Pohl, 2011). TD research, in the quest to resolve social problems, demonstrates the limitations of disciplinarity (Dolling & Hark, 2000). The terminology used to describe TD research—a "fusion," "transcending," "integrating," "beyond disciplines"—situates it as revolutionizing how we conceptualize the boundaries

and bonds of our disciplines and of academia as a whole (Lawrence & Despres, 2004; Nicolescu, 2005; Pohl, 2010, 2011; Ramadier, 2004). TD scholars argue that, although MD research, for example, provides for cooperation between disciplines or the examination of a topic within several disciplines simultaneously, there is no integration of knowledge, no tearing down of the disciplinary framework (Horlick-Jones & Sime, 2004; Nicolescu, 2005). TD scholars also distance themselves from ID research, arguing that, unlike ID research, TD research, by its nature, would not seek to create a new discipline (Nicolescu, 2005), but to create knowledge that transcends disciplines. As a result, TD advocates do not prescribe any particular research method; rather, TD research utilizes an "evolving methodology," dependent upon the problem at hand (Wickson et al., 2006, p. 1049). Scholars are encouraged to be flexible and open to change throughout the research process.

Interdependency between research questions and research outcomes means that problem-oriented research questions necessarily lead to a focus on social change (Pohl & Hadorn, 2007). Thus, TD researchers are interested in developing practical and feasible solutions (Balsiger, 2004; Pohl & Hadorn, 2007; Wickson et al., 2006). Toward this end, TD research aids in the development of three interrelated forms of knowledge. *Systems knowledge* examines the origin, development, and interpretation of the problem within the social structure; *target knowledge* examines the need for change; and *transformation knowledge*—known elsewhere as translational science—examines the implementation of change (Pohl & Hadorn, 2007). This is demonstrated not only through the generation of problem-oriented research questions but also through the outcomes of TD research. TD scholars contribute to academia not only through peer-reviewed methods but also through dissemination of recommendations for systemic change (Carew & Wickson, 2010). As such, TD research can be assessed not only through traditional academic standards but also with the question, "What change was effected?"

Finally, the intent of TD research is to bridge the gap between practice and academia, what Carew and Wickson (2010, p. 1148) refer to as "democratizing research," by placing the knowledge of policy makers, practitioners, researchers, stakeholders, community members, and other laypersons on equal ground. TD research is not intended as a one-way transfer of community knowledge (i.e., data) to scholars, or of scholarly knowledge from researchers to laypersons; knowledge generation is ideally collaborative, with an iterative process of sharing ideas back and forth among academics and community stakeholders such that all parties experience some transformation in terms of their approach to the problem (Carew & Wickson, 2010; Pohl, 2005; Wickson et al., 2006). This collaboration results in new forms of knowledge that take into account the problem context and have the ability to translate research into social change.

Critical Perspectives on Transdisciplinary Research

The promise of transdisciplinarity is inspiring: to harness the theoretical frameworks, methodological tools, and social and cultural capital of scientific research, along with the needs and insights of community stakeholders, in order to identify and solve urgent and seemingly intractable social problems. Those who advocate for transdisciplinarity urge

researchers to transcend disciplinary boundaries in order to holistically unravel entrenched forms of inequality and resulting disparities. TD supporters envision a world where researchers configure themselves in contingent partnerships with colleagues and community members only to reconfigure themselves when the problem at hand has been solved. Such inspiring promise naturally leads to skepticism about enduring tensions obtained, for example, between intent and outcome, abstract vision and value on the ground, and claims of universality and the needs of the particular. Here we pause to interrogate some of the constituent components of transdisciplinarity, ultimately questioning whether it differs markedly from existing approaches to research and how it might shape the future of gender violence research.

Cross-disciplinary engagements of any sort among academics are time consuming, difficult, and political in nature. The challenges inherent in MD and ID research have been documented for well over half a century, with an emphasis on the inability of some scholars to "see" the boundaries and limitations of their home disciplines, the failure to incorporate the distinct use of similar terminology from another discipline, the lack of institutionalized reward for such collaboration, and the problem of disciplinary dominance on and off campus (Allen & Kitch, 1998; Caudill & Roberts, 1951; Dubois, Kelly, Kennedy, Korsmeyer, & Robinson, 1988; Klein, 1990; Sharland, 2011). Despite endorsing an evolutionary push away from MD and ID research, TD advocates have given little direction as to the specifics of transcending disciplines. Nor have they anticipated either the predictable or unique methodological, epistemological, symbolic, or structural impediments to doing so.

TD advocates would find a long-standing conversation among feminist scholars concerning the privileging of the perspective of those in power within the assumptions of and intellectual tools and concepts used by traditional disciplines (Acker, Barry, & Esseveld, 1996). One example of this privileging is the belief in the "objectivity" of science and the scientific method. Any TD-based fusion of disciplines with the goal of generating emancipatory research requires researchers to first understand the relationship between research, knowledge, "objectivity," and power inherent in their own disciplines and in themselves as researchers (Harding & Norberg, 2005). Although TD researchers acknowledge the existence of multiple sources of knowledge in society, and encourage researchers to interrogate their own perspective and how it influences their research, Harding and Norberg argue that "researchers, like the societies in which they live, cannot detect—much less correct—the assumptions and practices that shape the interests, conceptual frameworks, and research norms of social sciences" (p. 2010). The practicalities of how such an interrogation could be done, or the possible strategic desire for deploying scientific discourse, are not yet specified in the literature on transdisciplinarity.

TD research is distinct from much MD and ID research in its expressed commitment to community engagement. For most TD advocates, community engagement means that stakeholders outside of the university setting are integrated into problem-identification and problem-solution research-based processes. Thus, TD researchers seek to build on cross-disciplinary engagements by integrating the viewpoints and needs of stakeholders in the pursuit of the common good. Because feminist researchers and others have incorporated community-based research methodologies within the social sciences and humanities

(sometimes referred to as "feminist research," "community research," "participatory action research," or "action research") it remains unclear how TD researchers intend to move beyond these still contested norms of community collaboration.

More troubling is that few TD advocates have reflected on the embedded and potential pitfalls of this promise, related but not limited to the power dynamics inherent in the identification of "the community," its "needs," and what constitutes the "common good." The TD literature lacks a discussion of what constitutes "the community," who is entitled to define its boundaries, and how they are to be determined. What does it mean to work with the community? Can one community identify urgent social problems affecting another community? How might divisions within a community or across communities or conflicts between scholars and community members be resolved or such creative tensions be mobilized? Should scholars from the collaborating communities be embedded within the research project? Who decides the research priorities? How will the endpoint of a research initiative or the utility of an accidently discovered research question be agreed upon? These and other methodological challenges can be found in any kind of research; the politics of knowledge knows no disciplinary boundaries.

Guidance may be found from feminist scholars who have long argued that the definition of what can be considered a research or social "problem" and what is believed to be the "common good" reflect broader structures of power and control in society (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2007; Reinharz, 1992). Furthermore, after a "problem" is identified, establishing what constitutes the "facts" that need to be taken into consideration when assessing and analyzing the problem is also linked to power and the ability to define information as "knowledge" or "facts" (DeVault, 1999). What is often described as "impartial" or "objective" research replicates "conceptual practices of power" (Smith, 1990). TD researchers' call for equalization of knowledge across researchers, community members, practitioners, stakeholders, and policy makers is a powerful notion, yet how such equalization would come about is unclear as are the implications of this equalization. We would like to learn more about TD approaches to the real-life social hierarchies of who can know, what can be known, and how it is known.

Finally, in a time period when so-called lone academics, basic research, and liberal arts education are derided, and large-scale TD grant-funded research teams are lauded, we are concerned with the totalizing way TD advocates have called for the abandonment of disciplinary (or even MD and ID) knowledge. TD scholars have not persuasively articulated what is gained and lost by transcending the boundaries associated with disciplinary knowledge, or how TD research might complement the strengths of MD or ID research. The idealistic and relatively untested nature of TD research—particularly in the social sciences—prompts concerns about its potential superficiality. When drawn together to address an urgent social problem, are scholars supposed to "knock off the edges" of specialized knowledge in order to properly collaborate? In order to engage quickly with others, are we to practice or share "lite" versions of our disciplines? What do we decommission in terms of explanatory and epistemological frameworks as we transcend the boundaries of our respective disciplines? TD advocates also have not indicated the steps a scholar might take to becoming a TD researcher. Should an individual be immersed in their home

discipline first; that is, "go deep," and then "go broad" by conducting TD research with others? Or should TD scholars be created anew? Despite the expressed lack of desire to create new TD disciplines, the telltale signs of such are emerging, including books, international conferences, journals, academic units, and associated educational degrees and credentials. Such transformations of the academy will shape what is known and knowable about gender violence. The promise of TD research on gender violence will be borne out as the pragmatics of TD research are further developed.

Transdisciplinarity and Gender Violence Research

Over the past three decades, scholars have produced an impressive collection of research on gender violence; the monthly publication of *Violence Against Women* is but one indicator of the growth of this area of inquiry. Despite its groundbreaking nature and key contributions, much of the research on gender violence is shaped unreflexively by the epistemological assumptions, methodological perspectives, theoretical frameworks, and research questions built into any one particular discipline. Thus, what is known about gender violence is also disciplined. That is, while disciplinary scholars of gender violence (typically from within the social sciences) ask important questions, analyze understudied communities, and develop new theories, knowledge about gender violence tends to remain discrete and fragmented.

In addition to such disciplinary compartmentalization, significant divisions in the production (and consumption) of gender violence knowledge exist between qualitative and quantitative research. Epistemological, methodological, and theoretical divisions also are reflected in the hierarchy of knowledge attributed to academic researchers, community-based practitioners, and those directly and indirectly affected by gender violence. As a result, we also observe a lack of coordination among various gender violence "constituents." This fragmentation of knowledge stems in part from the acceptance of gender violence as a legitimate area of research within the academy, and from the institutionalization of movements against gender violence within criminal justice and social services agencies. These research and practice fissures have produced knowledge that may not be the most relevant or useful for solving the tenacious and complex problem of gender violence.

Like many contemporary problems, the study of gender violence necessarily transcends the academic and disciplinary boundaries traditionally utilized to understand and resolve research problems (Carew & Wickson, 2010). Gender violence entered the academy, and the social sciences in particular, as a viable research topic because feminist social movements successfully garnered public recognition of various forms of violence against women as social problems (Messing, 2011). Activists and scholars initiated socially relevant research on gender violence based on this recognition (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). Indeed, much research on gender violence is problem focused but, in part due to the legitimacy conferred by departments and disciplinary-based journals, remains discipline bound. Thus, gender violence knowledge remains largely segmented and, as scholars, we retain disciplinary perspectives, distinct methodologies, and rely upon a version of knowledge that corresponds with our own disciplinary viewpoint.

The articles included in this special issue can be considered an initial foray into the use of transdisciplinarity to analyze gender violence. As noted previously, both qualitative and quantitative methods are represented, and the articles focus on a myriad of forms of gender violence. No one article contains all of the previously described elements of TD research, but all incorporate several elements of transdisciplinarity that are worthy of further reflection. Of particular note are three core elements of the articles included in this issue: TD research and the framing of gender violence, TD research and the context in which gender violence occurs, and TD research and "border-work"—the bridging of the gap between academia and the "real world" (Horlick-Jones & Sime, 2004, p. 442). It should be noted that most of these articles incorporate more than one of these core elements; however, they have been sorted into these three categories to facilitate a dialogue about the utility of a TD approach.

Overview of the Special Issue

Transdisciplinary Research and Framing Gender Violence

The first article in this special issue, written by Juanjo Medina, Robert Ralphs, and Judith Aldridge, is a theoretical reflection on the TD perspective and their 3-year ethnographic study of young women and "gang culture" in England. They argue that previous research using a traditional criminological approach to the study of gangs in England has framed gang violence as an exclusively "criminal problem," and thus the "problem" necessitates a criminological approach and a "criminal" solution. Medina and colleagues believe that drawing from other disciplines such as public health, social work, and other social sciences would likely lead to a "more holistic and socially inclusive" approach to understanding gang violence. In addition, the gang "problem" has been seen as a predominantly "male" problem; research and social services have focused on young men—not young women—despite young women's extensive involvement in gangs. Medina and colleagues argue that the use of a TD framework will likely lead to research and social services that recognize the gendered nature of gang violence and address the unmet needs of both gang-involved young women and men.

This reframing of gendered violence in response to collaborative, TD research is also present in the article by Russell P. Dobash and R. Emerson Dobash. Their analysis of "collateral" homicides based on data from the Murder in Britain Study suggests that the narrow framing of intimate partner homicides—abusers killing current or former partners—ignores a troubling form of domestic violence homicide where the abuser does not kill their partner but instead kills their partner's children, allies, and/or new partner. As a result of "working within and across the inevitable boundaries of differing groups and disciplines in a spirit of greater openness and cooperation," and through attention to the context in which intimate partner violence occurs (also a hallmark of TD research), Dobash and Dobash are better able to identify and analyze cases of "collateral" domestic homicide.

Transdisciplinary Research and the Context in Which Gender Violence Occurs

Melinda Tasca, Marjorie Zatz, and Nancy Rodriguez, like other TD researchers, also focus on the importance of understanding problem context when analyzing gender violence. Their research critically analyzes violence in the lives of girls who are victims of violence, girls who are perpetrators of violence, and girls who are both victims and perpetrators (although, as noted by the authors, the boundary between victimization and offending is often "blurred"). They examine the official delinquency records and social service files of girls referred to juvenile court, noting the complexities of these girls' lives, including family, school, and institutional contexts that shape these girls' experiences and behaviors. It is only through the attention to social context, argue Tasca and colleagues, that we can truly understand the nearly "omnipresent" role of violence in these girls' lives.

Understanding problem context, especially the ways in which gender, culture, age, and ethnicity shape young Hispanic girls' behaviors in intimate relationships, is central to the piece by Vera Lopez, Meda Chesney-Lind, and Julia Foley. Their analysis examines strategies that boyfriends use to control young Hispanic girls, and the resistance strategies employed by these young girls. The controlling strategies often rely on stereotypes about women and men, including "marianismo" and "machismo." Most of the girls' resistance strategies reflected their "anger and frustration" with these stereotypes and ultimately challenged the boys' power and control in the relationship. Thus, the emphasis of TD research on linking behavior to the social and cultural context in which gender violence occurs is a critical component of Lopez and colleagues' analysis.

Transdisciplinary Research and "Border Work"

Another key element of TD research is the bridging of the gap between academia and the wider community in the hopes of creating a more holistic understanding of a social problem. Knowledge is not transmitted from researchers to community stakeholders and policy makers but is instead generated through a collaborative, iterative process. Madelaine Adelman, Hillary J. Haldane, and Jennifer Wies provide us with a salient example of how such a process might occur. In response to the sexual assault of a student, Xavier University (a Jesuit institution) hosted a national conference on gender violence where community stakeholders, activists, practitioners, and scholars from multiple disciplines were invited to discuss how to best address the problem of sexual assault on campus. Ultimately, the conference led to a broader discussion of how the Jesuit concept of *cura personalis* ("care for the person") could be mobilized to both prevent and intervene in cases of sexual violence. While the problem of sexual assault at Xavier University has not been "solved," the process by which the problem was addressed is an important example of how TD research can be used to combat gender violence.

The importance of including activists, practitioners, and scholars when formulating research questions, collecting and analyzing data—a central tenet of TD research—is highlighted in Alesha Durfee and Jill Theresa Messing's analysis of domestic violence civil

protection orders (POs) in the United States. They focus on a problem-oriented question identified by domestic violence activists and practitioners: Of those women entering domestic violence shelters, who obtains POs? Durfee and Messing then analyze data collected by a domestic violence shelter using quantitative academic research methods, identifying those demographic groups that are most likely not to file for POs and may be "underserved" by social service providers. Durfee and Messing, through their TD project, thus produce two types of "useable knowledge" identified by Carew and Wickson (2010): "target knowledge" (by identifying the need for change) and "transformational knowledge" (examining the implementation of change). These two forms of knowledge can then be used to develop practical and feasible solutions to the problem of access to POs.

Like Durfee and Messing, Fiona Morrison and Fran Wasoff address a "problem" identified by those outside of academia—that of child welfare and child contact centers in Scotland. Although continued contact with a nonresidential parent is often beneficial for children, contact between a child and an abusive nonresidential parent can have negative consequences for the health and safety of the child. Morrison and Wasoff review the literature on child contact centers with a focus on family law and feminism. Morrison and Wasoff also generate "target knowledge" through the identification of major risks that contact centers pose for children and make suggestions as to how such centers could be improved so that risks to children and residential parents are minimized. Thus, their analysis, consistent with other TD research, addresses "real world" problems and proposes "real world" solutions.

The Future of Transdisciplinarity and Gender Violence Research

Transdisciplinarity may offer gender violence scholars an opportunity to reach a praxis between research and practice knowledge, to transcend disciplinary boundaries, and it may challenge us to provide long-term and sustainable solutions to the problem of gender violence. However, might transdisciplinarity also be a repackaging of many of the tenets that have been central to gender violence scholarship for decades? For example, researcher–practitioner partnerships and relationships with stakeholders have been a mainstay of gender violence scholarship. Gender violence researchers have much to contribute to a critical discussion of the politics of collaboration. Furthermore, we could take a leadership role within the academy by sharing experiences of navigating power, violence, and inequality within the community. Transdisciplinarity may provide the space for such self-reflection, allowing us to question the assumptions we often make during the research process. Perhaps this is a reminder to be reflexive about the opportunities and boundaries of our disciplines and collaborations, to consider the orientation of our work, the full inclusion of nonacademic actors, the methods that we utilize, the social change that we are shaping, and our ability to move beyond disciplinary boundaries and knowledge. If TD research is to be part of the future of gender violence scholarship, it remains necessary to develop a sharper focus on the goals, methods, language, and utility of transdisciplinarity as well as evaluation criteria for success within gender violence research.

Acknowledgments

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

Funding

References

Acker, J., Barry, K., & Esseveld, J. (1996). Objectivity and truth: Problems in doing feminist research. In H. Gottfried (Ed.), *Feminism and social change: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 60-87). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Balsiger, P. W. (2004). Supradisciplinary research and practices: History, objectives and rationale. *Futures, 36*, 407-421.

Carew, A. L., & Wickson, F. (2010). The TD wheel: A heuristic to shape, support and evaluate transdisciplinary research. *Futures, 42*, 1146-1155.

Caudill, W., & Roberts, B. (1951). Pitfalls in the organization of interdisciplinary research *Human Organization, 10*(4), 12-15.

Despres, C., Brais, N., & Avellan, S. (2004). Collaborative planning for retrofitting suburbs: Transdisciplinarity and intersubjectivity in action. *Futures, 36*, 471-486.

DeVault, M. L. (1999). *Liberating method: Feminism and social research*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1992). *Women, violence and social change.* New York: Routledge.

Dolling, I., & Hark, S. (2000). She who speaks shadow speaks truth: Transdisciplinarity in women's and gender studies. *Signs, 25*, 1195-1198.

Dubois, E., Kelly, G., Kennedy, E. L., Korsmeyer, C., & Robinson, L. (1988). *Feminist scholarship: Kindling in the grove of academe*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Hadorn, G. H., Hoffman-Reim, H., Biber-Klemm, G., Grossenbacher-Mansuy, W., Joye, D., Pohl, C., et al. (2008). *Handbook of transdisciplinary research*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Harding, S., & Norberg, K. (2005). New feminist approaches to social science methodologies: An introduction. *Signs, 30*, 2009-2015.

Hesse-Biber, S., & Leavy, P. (2007). *Feminist research practice: A primer*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Horlick-Jones, T., & Sime, J. (2004). Living on the border: Knowledge, risk and transdisciplinarity. *Futures, 36*, 441-456.

Klein, J. (1990). *Interdisciplinarity: History, theory and practice*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Klein, J. T. (2004). Prospects for transdisciplinarity. *Futures, 36*, 515-526.

Klein, J. T., Grossenbacher-Mansuy, W., Haberli, R., Bill, A., Scholz, R. W., & Welti, M. (2001). *Transdisciplinarity: Joint problem solving among science, technology and society.* Basel, Switzerland: Birkhauser.

Lawrence, R. J., & Despres, C. (2004). Futures of transdisciplinarity. *Futures, 36*, 397-405.

Messing, J. T. (2011). The social control of family violence. *Affilia, 26*, 154-168.

Nicolescu, B. (2005). *Transdisciplinarity: Past, present and future.* Vitoria, Brazil: Centro de Educacao Transdisciplinar.

Pohl, C. (2005). Transdisciplinary collaboration in environmental research. *Futures, 37*, 1159-1178.

Pohl, C. (2008). From science to policy through transdisciplinary research. *Environmental Science & Policy, 11*, 46-53.

Pohl, C. (2010). From transdisciplinarity to transdisciplinary research. *Transdisciplinary Journal of Engineering & Science, 1*, 74-83.

Pohl, C. (2011). What is progress in transdisciplinary research? *Futures, 43*, 618-626.

Pohl, C., & Hadorn, G. H. (2007). *Principles for designing transdisciplinary research.* Berne, Switzerland: Swiss Academies of Arts and Sciences.

Ramadier, T. (2004). Transdisciplinarity and its challenges: The case of urban studies. *Futures, 36*, 423-439.

Reinharz, S. (1992.) *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sharland, E. (2011). All together now? Building disciplinary and inter-disciplinary research capacity in social work and social care. *British Journal of Social Work, 42*(2), 208-226.

Smith, D. E. (1990). *The conceptual practices of power: A feminist sociology of knowledge.* Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Wickson, F., Carew, A. L., & Russell, A. W. (2006). Transdisciplinary research: Characteristics, quandaries and quality. *Futures, 38*, 1046-1059.