

*June 2024*



# INTERSECTIONAL PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH



# AS

# EPISTEMIC JUSTICE WORK

*Reflecting on five years of  
FPAR in Cambodia.*

---

Prepared by  
*Klahaan*

Prepared for  
*RFSU*



- 
- 01 Introduction
  - 02 Epistemic Justice
  - 03 Intersectionality
  - 04 FPAR so far: Advantages
  - 05 FPAR so far: Challenges
  - 06 A new journey: case study on an unfolding project



# Table of Contents

# Introduction

01



*Klahaan is **an independent feminist organisation that builds evidence, organises and campaigns on issues that affect women in Cambodia.***

*Klahaan works towards a fair, just and equal society in which Cambodian women of all backgrounds can equally enjoy fundamental rights and opportunities, especially sexual autonomy and control over their bodies.*

Since its founding in 2018, Klahaan has been committed to building reliable evidence and research to advocate for women's rights in Cambodia through an intersectional feminist lens.

In 2020, Klahaan was inspired by the Feminist Participatory Action Research (FPAR) method developed by the Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD). This method emphasizes feminist principles and meaningful participation, empowering community members to engage actively in shaping research on issues they directly experience. Adapting APWLD's FPAR framework to the Cambodian context, Klahaan developed its own methodology and launched its first project exploring the relationship between Buddhism and feminism.

Now approaching five years of FPAR research, Klahaan has published five comprehensive reports on topics ranging from virginity culture to sexual consent. Recognizing Klahaan's expertise in FPAR and ethical research principles, other civil society organizations and youth groups have sought guidance to strengthen inclusivity, participation, and intersectionality in their own initiatives.

Through its FPAR projects and training sessions, Klahaan has continuously refined its methods, gaining deeper insights into applying intersectionality within research practices. This case study reflects on our five-year journey with FPAR, sharing our learnings on epistemic justice, intersectionality as well as the strengths and challenges of this approach. Our recent research on sexual consent serves as a practical example, illustrating each stage of the FPAR process.

For further guidance on implementing FPAR, consult our FPAR toolkit available on our website.

# Epistemic Justice

Epistemic injustice comprises unfair treatment in knowledge-related and communicative practices “in which the voices, experiences and problems of marginalised individuals, communities and societies are not being taken seriously.”<sup>1</sup> Epistemic injustice is connected to broader socio-economic inequalities that arise from discrimination based on intersecting aspects of identity. Indeed, **restricting the role of ‘knower’** to members of dominantly situated groups may even reinforce these inequalities – for example, those based on gender, race, class or ethnic group.<sup>2</sup>

Conversely, epistemic justice is defined as “forms of just treatment that relate to issues of knowledge, understanding, and participation in communicative practices.”<sup>3</sup> It requires not only reflexivity but ‘testimonial sensibility’ which can involve correcting for identity prejudice, and ‘deep listening.’<sup>4</sup> Epistemic justice also **acts to reverse historical processes of silencing**. It gives credibility to all, and pays attention to all, as knowledge holders: “particularly those who are not currently receiving attention.”<sup>5</sup>

In Cambodia, there is a **well-documented lack of domestic research capacity**. As in many countries in the Majority World, Cambodians often find themselves *‘written about’* by external researchers for foreign audiences, rather than developing the capacity and gaining the resources to **write their own stories**.

Feminist Participatory Action Research, or FPAR, is a decolonising and intersectional methodology that directly seeks to challenge the status quo of research production. In FPAR, those rights-holders who have lived experience of a specific issue are invited to design, analyse and produce high-quality research alongside professional researchers.

FPAR is explicitly **a process of co-creation**, where the community Action Researchers:

- ✦ Play a pivotal role in each step of the research process from its inception to completion.
- ✦ Avoid being used in traditional extractive data collection processes, i.e. as ‘enumerators’ who collect and submit surveys with little further capacity development or ongoing involvement.
- ✦ Are provided the space to determine their level of involvement, and treated as experts in the field of their own lived experiences (of marginalisation and adversity, but also of resilience).
- ✦ Design not only the research methods, but the overarching methodology: from research objectives and specific lines of enquiry, through to the structure and contents of the report.

*“There is considerable interest in epistemic injustice among scholars, because **investigation can help combat injustice in the real world.**”*

*- Hänel, 2020*

- 1 Cummings, S., Dhewa, C., Kemboi, G., & Young, S. (2023). Doing epistemic justice in sustainable development: Applying the philosophical concept of epistemic injustice to the real world. *Sustainable Development*, 31(3), 1965-1977.
- 2 Coady, D. (2017). Epistemic injustice as distributive injustice. In I. J. Kidd, J. Medina, & G. Pohlhaus (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of epistemic injustice* (pp. 61-68). Routledge.
- 3 Cummings et al., above n. 1.
- 4 Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic justice: Power and the politics of knowledge*. Oxford University Press.
- 5 Boogaard, B. K. (2021). Epistemic injustice in agricultural development: Critical reflections on a livestock development project in rural mozambique. *Knowledge Management for Development Journal*, 16(2021), 1. Cummings et al., above n. 1.



In our FPAR projects over the past 5 years, a range of Action Researchers (ARs) have joined with us to **co-create research** on particular issues. The ARs have had a variety of identities, backgrounds, and lived experiences: we have worked with SOGIESC-diverse individuals (including LBQ women, and trans and non-binary folks); young men; young women survivors of GBV; divorced women; indigenous people and even young Buddhist monks, who over the span of a year generously shared their insights into the intersections of Buddhism and feminism in our groundbreaking 2019 study.

In line with principles of epistemic justice, FPAR is also a process of **learning exchange**: While the ARs gain practical training in research design, coding, and other technical skills, the staff researchers learn invaluable lessons from the ARs. Indeed, we have on many occasions had our own assumptions challenged in unexpected ways that have benefited the research produced.

As Wise & Stanley explain, feminist research sees all marginalised people as **active knowing agents**. While specific methods may differ, an epistemically just and feminist research approach avoids using only traditional positivist notions and favour strategies that help ensure that **“at long last, knowledge has a human face and a feeling heart”**.<sup>6</sup>

Indeed, young Khmer or Minority Ethnic researchers, especially those with additional vulnerabilities to discrimination, do not need fully external researchers to ‘objectively’ analyse their lives in order to maintain research integrity or robustness of findings, or to reduce ‘bias’. Like Wise & Stanley, we prefer a methodological approach that **“strenuously resists seeing women or men as immersed in the local and unable to discern the wider relations and structures of ruling.”**<sup>7</sup> This also means rejecting the notion that we as professional researchers at Klahaan are **“able to see further or better,”** than the ARs with lived experiences or identity characteristics that we do not share.

**By giving primacy to locally situated knowledge and women’s lived experiences,** we have sought in our FPAR approach to develop a foundation of epistemic justice in knowledge production, while recognising that there is much work still to be done – including and indeed especially by our team. We see FPAR as an evolving practice, but look forward to sharing what we have learned with you over the next pages.

First though, it is worth reflecting on the second guiding principle of FPAR: Intersectionality...



<sup>6</sup> Stanley, L. & Wise, S. (1993) *Breaking Out Again: Feminist Ontology and Epistemology*. London: Routledge.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

Core principle:

# Intersectionality

03



“Intersectionality is an analytical sensibility, a way of thinking about identity and its relationship to power (...) It has given many advocates a way to frame their circumstances and to fight for their visibility and inclusion”<sup>8</sup>

-Kimberlé Crenshaw

## Intersectionality

FPAR at Klahaan is a research method rooted in the principle of intersectionality, that is applied both as an “**analytical tool to understand the complexity of real-life inequalities, power and privilege**”<sup>9</sup>, and as “**a way to direct action for social justice**”<sup>10</sup>. FPAR actively engages researchers who have lived experience with a social issue, making their unique insights, perspectives, and ideas central to the research process. In fact, FPAR can embody intersectionality in several key ways, it:

- ✦ highlights the need to consider multiple dimensions of identity, such as race, gender, class, and sexuality. FPAR puts this into practice by actively involving individuals from diverse backgrounds in the research process. This inclusive approach ensures that the voices of those who are often marginalized or overlooked are heard and valued.
- ✦ seeks to address power imbalances that exist within society. FPAR empowers participants by involving them as co-researchers rather than subjects of the study. This collaborative approach helps to redistribute power, allowing co-researchers to contribute their knowledge and expertise and be visible on their own terms.
- ✦ examines how various forms of oppression intersect and interact. FPAR enables researchers to explore these intersections by involving participants who can share firsthand individual experiences of how different forms of discrimination, such as racism, sexism, and classism, intersect in their lives.
- ✦ fosters iterative and reflective research process. FPAR involves continuous cycles of action and reflection, where action researchers and the Klahaan team collaboratively analyze findings and adjust their actions based on what they learn. This dynamic process aligns with the intersectional approach of continuously questioning and challenging power structures and assumptions.



*In FPAR, there is no single correct formula. We only offer foundational elements and reflections derived from Klahaan's research experience in Cambodia. Yet, while the steps and methods are flexible and context-specific, **intersectionality is an essential core principle**. Our priority is to discuss and actively experiment with this principle throughout the research process.*

<sup>8</sup> Crenshaw, K. (2015) Why intersectionality can't wait, Washington Post

<sup>9</sup> Goessling, K.P. (2024) Learning from participatory action research: a framework for responsive and generative research practice with young people, *Sage Publications*, 1.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.



Core principle:

# Intersectionality

03

Applying intersectionality is particularly important in rights-based issues as it ensures that the diverse and intersecting identities of individuals are acknowledged and addressed. In the context of **rights-based research**, intersectionality fosters inclusivity and representation. It encourages the involvement of marginalized and diverse groups in the research process, ensuring their voices and experiences are integral to the research design, the findings and solutions proposed. This participatory approach not only enhances the validity and relevance of the research but also **empowers communities** by valuing their experiences and insights.<sup>11</sup>

## Intersectional Feminism

**Intersectional feminism** acknowledges that barriers to gender equality are shaped by various aspects of an individual's identity, such as race, age, class, sexual orientation, religion etc. (see image below). By addressing this complex interplay of factors and ensuring that the voices of women from diverse backgrounds are included, intersectionality provides a more comprehensive, just and fair understanding of women's issues.<sup>12</sup>



Image adapted from: FYS 101: Intersectional Self, Syracuse University Libraries, available (online) [here](#)

<sup>11</sup> Dag Hammarskjöld Foundations. (2023) Intersectionality: Experiences, views and visions for change, *development dialogue*, 65.

<sup>12</sup> Phoneix, A. (2024) What is intersectionality and why does it make feminism more effective?, *The Conversation*

---

# FPAR so far:

## Advantages

- **Ownership:** Ownership of the research project by Action Researchers (ARs) turns them into active contributors instead of passive subjects. One of the most rewarding aspects of FPAR is when ARs present the findings themselves to civil society leaders and key stakeholders, showcasing their full integration and ownership of the process.
- **Amplification:** The voices of the marginalised should be central to knowledge production on issues where their lived experiences make them experts. In Cambodia, where divorced women are highly stigmatised, derided, and face significant ongoing financial and social penalties, conducting research alongside these women ensured that their voices and experiences were integral to the research design and findings in our 2023 rights-based study on divorce, "*Separate Ways*".
- **Groundbreaking engagement:** In FPAR, it is recognised that the process of knowledge production is as important as any subsequent research output. Our 2019 study, "*Water & Oil?*", gained ground-breaking insights by engaging unlikely allies in the form of young ordained monks. The research explored the intersections of feminism and Buddhism in Cambodia, and the monks' perspectives, along with the young women ARs in their joint cohort, challenged our own perspectives and assumptions. The monks approached the project with enthusiasm, sincerity, and openness, providing valuable insights into the alignment of Buddhism and feminism on topics like contraception, SOGIE, and GBV. The outcome was a richer knowledge base and a lasting impact, as the monks later took it upon themselves to present the research to their pagodas, and independently run community education activities on eradicating GBV in alignment with Buddhist precepts and women's rights principles.





- **Lived insights that cannot be taught:** Another example of marginalised people’s lived experiences being integral to the research process and findings, were those of young LGBTIQ+ ARs in each cohort. In our 2022 project entitled “*Housework: Whose Work?*”, which examined the gendered distribution of unpaid care work and the mental load, the insights from young queer ARs played a crucial role. This extended beyond (important) help with terminology, to shaping the research design and fieldwork as it related to SOGIE-diverse couples and families. This ultimately challenged orthodox perceptions of unpaid care work and the associated mental load in Cambodian society.
- **Reflexivity and positionality:** Feminist research emphasises that who we as researchers are – including our intersecting identity characteristics – in relation to our “subjects,” matters. In the Cambodian context, there is incredible value in, for instance, queer individuals interviewing fellow community members; divorced women interviewing others who’ve been through the same challenges; or having young Indigenous women interview their peers in their own communities and languages—especially on sensitive or taboo topics.
- **Technical skill-building:** Training in designing a research process from inception to completion, along with skills in qualitative data coding and basic quantitative analysis, builds confidence in young researchers. Several ARs went on to apply these analytical techniques in their own undergraduate or postgraduate dissertations, keeping in touch with Klahan for advice on how to adapt the methods for these purposes. This shows how the benefits of FPAR can extend beyond the project cycle and have the potential to enhance the capacity of Cambodia’s up-and-coming researchers to tell their own stories.

---

# FPAR so far:

## Challenges

- **Too many cooks?:** Differing perspectives between Action Researchers (ARs) and navigating intra-group power dynamics can complicate decision-making. For example, during our study on divorce, some ARs disagreed on whether it was essential to interview equal numbers of men and women to avoid ‘bias’. Overcoming these types of challenges firstly involves ensuring that everyone feels heard. It can also mean going back to revisit and re-explore fundamental aspects of qualitative research design so that ARs can move forward together with confidence in the chosen methods and sampling strategies.
- **Letting go:** One challenge is that of finding a balance between true ownership of a project (including its associated instruments and datasets), and maintaining quality control. We experienced this firsthand during the design phase of one project in which ARs developed a Google Form online survey, and the Klahaan team supported with grammar and formatting edits. At some point prior to launch, a user accidentally deleted a demographics question in the back-end, which went unnoticed until the form had been live for some time. Ultimately, FPAR can involve learning to live with some level of unpredictability or imperfection for the sake of everyone truly feeling part of and in control of the process.
- **Balancing representation with tokenism:** It can be challenging to recruit participants with all the lived experiences and/or identity characteristics that would be beneficial to include in an FPAR project. While in some cases it can be appropriate to ‘headhunt,’ for example, where we have an existing collaborative relationship with a young queer activist who we think might be excited to join a cohort and would actively benefit from the training provided, it is not advisable to single people out in order to ‘tick boxes,’ and strategies to avoid this type of tokenism should be explored on a case by case basis.





- Extractivism: Unpaid labour:** Another challenge lies in finding the right balance between ensuring ARs' active engagement in the research process and acknowledging the value of their labor. Tasks like transcribing interview recordings, for instance, don't necessarily enhance research skills but are time-consuming and can interfere with other responsibilities. To address this, we outsource transcription services to avoid overburdening ARs. Similarly, participation in the report writing process is made optional. ARs who wish to develop their writing skills are invited to join the drafting committee, and those who contribute to writing sections of the report are compensated with vouchers for massages or meals as recognition for their time and effort.
- Different skill bases:** It can be difficult from a pedagogical perspective to train cohorts of ARs with wide variations in existing skill levels. For instance, in our first FPAR project, we were surprised to learn that some monks lacked confidence in using Google docs. Surprises like this are part of FPAR, and show the importance of flexibility! In this scenario, we were helped by the other members of the AR cohort with more experience, primarily young women, who graciously provided technical support to the monks so the coding process could continue at a slower but still relaxed and enjoyable pace.
- Time management:** Whatever timeline one has in mind for an FPAR project, bear in mind it will likely change. And it might change significantly. Doing deep engagement and collaboration with 'non-professional' researchers requires respecting their own pace of learning, which as explored above is different for each cohort. Managing the expectations of donors can also therefore present a challenge, but it is worthwhile explaining with confidence that it is the *process*, not necessarily the report, that is the key output in FPAR, and that truly feminist processes cannot always be rushed.

# A new journey: Case study on an unfolding project

06

Attitudes towards sexual consent, 2024



## Step 1: Formulate Topic

We began by meeting together to discuss 'hot topics' related to women's rights in Cambodia that had emerged or gained momentum in some way over the previous year. An academic and grey literature review of several options helped us to think about which had been already well-researched, versus which might be timely for a rights-based and participatory investigation. In 2024, the topic chosen was that of **sexual consent in relationships**. In line with the FPAR Toolkit, we kept the initial topic broad enough to enable it to be shaped and reshaped by Action Researchers once onboarded, but narrow enough that they could be ethically recruited by providing informed consent (a potential AR may be interested in a topic on women in politics but uncomfortable working on GBV, for example).

## Step 2: Sketch a Timeline

After selecting the topic, we began outlining a rough research timeline. This included planning all necessary trainings, workshops, and activities to ensure ARs understood the time commitment involved in co-creating the research project they had applied to join. It's important to design a timeline that remains flexible, allowing for adjustments as the project evolves. For instance, we initially allocated 4 weeks for data collection, but anticipated the possibility of needing an additional week before moving on to the next phase. As expected, some ARs encountered challenges in recruiting participants and requested an extra week to complete their data collection. This experience underscores the importance of incorporating buffer time into our project schedule. This approach helps to manage unforeseen challenges, allowing everyone to participate fully without the added stress of falling behind.



# A new journey: Case study on an unfolding project

06



## Step 3: Recruit Action Researchers

We use our social media channels to promote a sign-up form available in both Khmer and English. This year, we received 82 applications, the majority of which came from women residing in the capital. We shortlisted the top 15 individuals who demonstrated a strong commitment to advancing women's rights, particularly in the area of sexual consent. To ensure a diverse group of participants, we conducted three interview phases, ultimately selecting 12 action researchers from various backgrounds, including young women, LGBTIQ+ individuals, an indigenous woman, and a married woman from Siem Reap.

In an effort to address potential power dynamics within the research team, we made a deliberate decision to include only women and gender-diverse individuals as members of the ARs team, while involving men exclusively as research participants. This approach was chosen to mitigate power imbalances that could emerge as the research progresses, ensuring a safe space for sharing experiences and ideas on this sensitive topic.

## Step 4: Induction Training

We kicked off the research process with a full-day induction training, where the ARs were introduced to each other and the Klahan team. The session focused on the following key objectives:

- **Introduction to FPAR:** We explained the importance of the research topic and the participatory nature of the process, emphasizing that ARs are co-researchers, not just data collectors.
- **Feminism 101 & Sexual Consent:** We provided an overview of feminist concepts to ensure ARs were comfortable applying a feminist lens to the research. We also explored the topic of sexual consent, addressing any knowledge gaps and discussing its current status in Cambodia.
- **Ethical Research Principles:** We reviewed core ethical principles such as informed consent and 'do no harm,' ensuring ARs understood how to responsibly conduct research on sensitive topics. ARs were encouraged to further explore our MOOC trainings available online.
- **Topic Brainstorming:** ARs shared their motivations and collaboratively defined the research questions and objectives. They were also introduced to the process of conducting the literature review, outlining how they would contribute to this crucial part of the research process.

We concluded by setting a deadline for the literature review and establishing Telegram as our primary communication tool.



# A new journey: Case study on an unfolding project

06

## Step 5: Conduct Literature Review

The Klahaan research team began the literature review process early in the FPAR project, using a structured template to organise data on sexual consent. This helped identify key resources and gaps, guiding both the induction and research design workshops. At the orientation workshop, ARs were trained in conducting literature reviews to deepen their understanding of sexual consent and support the research design. Each AR was asked to contribute at least three relevant sources, summarizing its key findings. These summaries were then merged into a single literature review in an Excel document. The review revealed significant gaps, particularly regarding the legal and policy framework on sexual consent. To address this, the Klahaan team conducted additional research to fill these gaps, ensuring a thorough and well-rounded literature review for the study.

## Step 6: Design the Research Instruments

To co-design the research instruments, we began with a "Research Design 101" session—providing an overview of various research methods and their practical applications. This foundation helped ensure everyone was on the same page before we collectively discussed and voted on the most suitable methods. Together, we finalized our research objectives, questions, participant selection, and locations. We decided on a mixed-method approach comprising 60 Key Informant Interviews (KIs) with civil society, 5 KIs with CSO workers, 1 online survey, and 5 storytelling submissions (artworks).



Once the methods were agreed upon, the ARs were split into three groups to co-design specific questionnaires: one for general participants, another for CSOs, and a third for an online survey. Moreover, this year we offered to introduce a new method: storytelling. This approach was incorporated to allow participants to express themselves creatively and talk about consent through non-verbal forms of expression. Based on AR preferences, Klahaan designed the storytelling tool, including its objectives and submission form.

Due to time constraints, we weren't able to finish the questionnaires during the session. The teams continued collaborating online to complete them. To ensure everyone felt confident with the final research designs and tools, we conducted two additional follow-up Zoom meetings to collectively review and finalize all the research instruments.

# A new journey: Case study on an unfolding project

06

## Step 7: Conduct the Fieldwork

After finalising the research instruments, we held two online follow-up meetings. The first meeting focused on preparing for fieldwork and assigning interview responsibilities: each AR was tasked with conducting 5 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with research participants from different communities, while the Klahaan team took on 5 interviews with CSO workers. The second meeting served as an interview rehearsal, ensuring that everyone felt prepared and confident to conduct their interviews. Given the sensitive nature of the topic—sexual consent—some ARs encountered challenges in recruiting participants. To address this, we extended the data collection period by an additional week, allowing them sufficient time to meet their target sample.

## Step 8: Transcription

Since our Key Informant Interviews (KII) were recorded, transcribing and translating these recordings is critical for accurate analysis. However, transcription is highly time-consuming and labor-intensive. Although ARs can gain insights from this process, it risks overwhelming them, affecting their academic and professional commitments. To avoid this and prevent labor exploitation, we have, as in previous years, hired external consultants with expertise in women's rights and gender equality to manage the transcription and translation tasks efficiently.

## Step 9: Coding

We began by having the ARs engage with the data—reading and re-reading their longest transcripts to fully immerse themselves. Afterward, we explained the concepts of coding and thematic development, using concrete examples from other studies as well as past FPAR projects to illustrate the process.

The team spent 30 minutes generating initial codes, and after a group discussion, we refined and agreed on 25 final codes. We practiced coding the transcripts with the 25 codes together before moving on to theme identification, dedicating 45 minutes to finding patterns and overlaps, ultimately identifying six overarching themes to structure the final report. Each AR was then assigned five transcripts for further coding, and sign-up forms were distributed for those interested in report writing and data analysis.

Unfortunately, we received only one submission for storytelling, so we have decided not to include it in this research. Moving forward, we will reflect on how to better integrate this method into future projects.



# A new journey: Case study on an unfolding project

06

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1 INTRODUCTION
- 2 METHODOLOGY
- 3 LITERATURE REVIEW
- 4 PERCEPTIONS & ATTITUDES TOWARDS SEXUAL CONSENT
  - 4.1 Understanding of consent
  - 4.2 Consent within marriage vs outside marriage
  - 4.3 Roots of perception & attitudes towards consent
- 5 COMMUNICATING SEXUAL CONSENT
  - 5.1 Perceived barriers
  - 5.2 Perceived facilitators
- 6 NAVIGATING THE IMPACTS OF SEXUAL CONSENT
  - 6.1 Negative impacts of non-consensual sex
  - 6.2 Positive impacts of consensual sex
- 7 DIVERSE EXPERIENCES OF SEXUAL CONSENT
  - 7.1 Voices of minorities on consent
  - 7.2 Demographic & age-based variations
- 8 TIME CHANGING & WAY FORWARD
- 9 CONCLUSION

## Step 10: Skeleton Outline

Once the coding process was complete, the Klahaan team developed a detailed skeleton outline for the final report based on the outputs and discussions at the coding workshop. This outline captured the structure of the analysis, including key themes, subthemes, codes and narrative flow. We then circulated the draft outline to the ARs for their review and input at the write-up workshop and on our Telegram group chat, encouraging them to provide feedback on the overall structure and suggest any additional points for consideration. During our dedicated write-up workshop, we collaboratively refined and finalised the outline, ensuring that it aligns with the collective vision for the report.

## Step 11: Write-up

After finalizing the structure, we held a workshop with the ARs interested in joining the Writing & Quantitative Analysis Committee, which included six participants this year. During the workshop, the ARs selected the sub-sections they wished to write based on their preferred codes, areas of interests and expertise. Once everyone was assigned one or two sections, we provided guidance on writing strong analyses, offering examples of key findings supported by quotes. We discussed some of the most striking quotes and encouraged them to practice by drafting a short paragraph. This allowed them to receive feedback and recommendations for improvement from the group.



Next, we demonstrated how to conduct quantitative analysis and generate graphs using Excel. Each AR and Klahaan team member was assigned five survey questions to analyze. We set a deadline for submitting both the written analysis and the quantitative data. Once we received the submissions, we provided feedback and further opportunities to refine their work. A consultant was responsible for writing the remaining sections and made further edits to the ARs' contributions to avoid repetition and ensure the report was coherent and cohesive.



# A new journey: Case study on an unfolding project

06

## Step 12: Validation, Revision & Launch

With the first draft report complete, the next step is to schedule a validation workshop with the Action Researchers (ARs). We typically distribute the draft to all researchers at least one week before the workshop for their review. The workshop can be held either in person or online, depending on the availability and preferences of both project staff and the ARs.

During the workshop, we present the key findings using slides, ensuring that the data accurately reflects the ARs' insights on the topic. This collaborative discussion allows for any suggested changes from the ARs to be identified and incorporated into the final report.

The validation workshop is usually the last gathering with the ARs for the project. As part of this process, we allocate an additional hour for a final reflection session. During this session, ARs complete a survey about their overall experience with the FPAR process, which takes approximately 15-20 minutes. In addition to gathering quantitative feedback, we conduct a 45-60 minute focus group discussion, depending on the group size, to further reflect on the experiences of both the ARs and project staff. This feedback helps us improve future FPAR processes.

By creating a space where the ARs' feedback and insights are valued and actively incorporated into the research, we reinforce a sense of ownership, co-creation, and mutual respect.

## Step 13: Launch

After the validation workshop, the next step is organizing the research report launch. Based on our experience, a report launch is an effective way to share our key findings with participants, the wider community, and key stakeholders. All ARs are invited to the event and given the opportunity to speak about their contributions and experiences.



Report Launch, Phnom Penh, 2023 FPAR



In preparation for the launch, we provide the ARs with the slide presentation of the key findings in advance. We also hold a rehearsal session for those volunteering to present, ensuring they feel confident and well-prepared. This practice enhances the overall quality and flow of the event, allowing ARs to effectively communicate both the research findings and their insights.

At the end of the event, we present framed certificates and gifts, such as Kindle e-readers, to the ARs in recognition of their meaningful contributions throughout the research process — from the initial stages to the final report.

We typically hold our report launches between November 25 and December 10, aligning with the 16 Days of Activism Against Gender-Based Violence campaign. This timing not only amplifies the visibility of our research findings but also connects our work to broader movements advocating for positive change.

---

# Bibliography

Asia-Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) (2019). Feminist Participatory Action Research, APWLD website.

Coady, D. (2017). Epistemic injustice as distributive injustice. In I. J. Kidd, J. Medina, & G. Pohlhaus (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of epistemic injustice* (pp. 61–68). Routledge.

Cummings, S., Dhewa, C., Kemboi, G., & Young, S. (2023). Doing epistemic justice in sustainable development: Applying the philosophical concept of epistemic injustice to the real world. *Sustainable Development*, 31(3), 1965-1977.

Crenshaw, K. (2015) Why intersectionality can't wait, *Washington Post*

Dag Hammarskjöld Foundations. (2023) Intersectionality: Experiences, views and visions for change, development dialogue, 65.

Fricke, M. (2007). *Epistemic justice: Power and the politics of knowledge*. Oxford University Press.

Boogaard, B. K. (2021). Epistemic injustice in agricultural development: Critical reflections on a livestock development project in rural mozambique. *Knowledge Management for Development Journal*, 16(2021), 1.

Goessling, K.P. (2024) Learning from participatory action research: a framework for responsive and generative research practice with young people, Sage Publications, 1.

Phoneix, A. (2024) What is intersectionality and why does it make feminism more effective?, *The Conversation*

Stanley, L. & Wise, S. (1993) *Breaking Out Again: Feminist Ontology and Epistemology*. London: Routledge.

# Klahaan Organization



## Contact us

+855 096 292 5015

Phone



info@klahaan.org

Email



klahaan.org

Website



SK. Olympic Kh, 5CE1, St  
157, Phnom Penh

Address

