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Overview

• Key questions:
  – What is CBPR?
  – How is CBPR different from other approaches to research?
  – Why CBPR?
  – What are the guiding principles of CBPR?
  – What are key issues in conducting CBPR?
HISTORICAL ROOTS OF COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY
COMMUNITY-BASED PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH

A collaborative inquiry approach with roots in both the northern and southern traditions
Historical Foundations

• The Northern/Traditional
  – Collaborative, utilization-focused research and evaluation with the practical goal of system improvement
  – Proceeds in a spiral of steps, each of which is composed of a cycle of planning, action and fact-finding about the result of the action (Levin, 1948)

• The Southern/Radical
  – “openly emancipatory research, which challenges the colonizing practices of positivist research and political domination by elites” (Wallerstein & Duran, 2003, p 28)
Community-Based Participatory Research

• “A collaborative approach to research that equitably involves all partners in the research process and recognizes the unique strengths that each brings. CBPR begins with a research topic of importance to the community and has the aim of combining knowledge with action and achieving social change…”

  - WK Kellogg Foundation Community Health Scholars Program
Major Terms

- **Research**: “the systematic process of collecting and analyzing information (data) in order to increase our understanding of the phenomenon with which we are concerned or interested” (Leedy, 1996, p. 3)

- **Evaluation**: “the use of social research methods to systematically investigate the effectiveness of social intervention programs...” [emphasis mine] (Rossi, Freeman & Lipsey, 1999, p. 20)

- **Community-based research & evaluation**: research and evaluation done in communities, with minimal participation of community members

- **Community-based participatory research & evaluation**: research and evaluation done with communities, involving community members in the research process
Community-based Participatory Research

- From researchers acting upon a community to answer a research question to researchers working side by side with community members to define the questions and methods, implement the research, disseminate the findings and apply them

- An approach, not a method!

(The Examining Community-Institutional Partnerships for Prevention Research Group, 2006)
Participatory Evaluation

• “[W]hen doing an evaluation, researchers, facilitators, or professional evaluators collaborate in some way with individuals, groups, or communities who have a decided stake in the program, development project, or other entity being evaluated”

Cousins and Whitmore, 1998, p.5
Rationale for CBPR

• Social, political, and economic systems play a role in the development of complex social problems

• Community members are asking for research to address their locally identified needs
  – “drive-by data collection”

• Community involvement can enhance the quality of research

• Findings can be used by the community to develop its own solutions to its problems

• Collaborative research promotes trust between researchers and communities

Source: The Examining Community-Institutional Partnerships for Prevention Research Group, 2006
CBPR Principles

- **Builds on strengths** and resources within the community
- **Addresses issues** from both positive and ecological perspectives
- **Facilitates collaborative partnerships** in all phases of the research
- **Promotes co-learning and empowerment**
- **Co-creation of knowledge** for mutual benefit of all partners
- **Involves a cyclical and iterative process**
- **Leads to trust** between researchers and community
- **Increasing of the reliability and validity of research** by collaborating with the community regarding interpretation of the research
- **Disseminates findings and knowledge gained to all partners**

Christopher et al., 2008; Cochran et al., 2008; Holkup, 2004, CCPH
CBPR Descriptors

• Promotes co-learning and capacity building among all partners

• Seeks a balance between research and action for the mutual benefit of all partners

• All partners are involved in the dissemination of findings and knowledge gained

• Involves a long-term process and commitment

• Involves systems development through a cyclical and iterative process
KEY ISSUES IN CBPR
Collaborators

- Potential community collaborators
  - Professional staff employed by local agencies/organizations who provide services
  - Managers or supervisors of local agencies/organizations
  - Clients of local agencies/organizations
  - Citizens of the community

- Potential researcher collaborators
  - Faculty
  - Research staff
  - Graduate students
  - Undergraduate students
Key issues in CBPR: Levels of Participation

- Three dimensions of participation in collaborative inquiry:
  - Control of decision making
    - Who controls decision making?
  - Selection for participation
    - Who gets to participate?
  - Depth of participation
    - Who is involved in what aspects of the research process?

Source: Cousin’s and Whitmore’s (1998)
Key issues in CBPR: Approaches to Collaboration

• Approaches to Sharing Power

• **Controlled Decision Making:** Researchers/evaluators and community members work together on a study/intervention that is designed, initiated and managed by researchers.

• **Shared Decision Making:** Researchers/evaluators and community members work together as colleagues, each with skills to offer for mutual learning.
Key Issues in CBPR: Race, Gender, Class

- Dynamics of race, gender, class, power, and privilege in university-community partnerships

- The failure to acknowledge these disparities in power and privilege can itself be a form of oppression
Basic Levels of Participation

• **Contractual:** Research contract for services (e.g., interviewing, data collection) or resources (e.g., time or property) from community members

• **Consultative:** Community members are asked for their opinions and advice before the intervention is designed

• **Collaborative:** Researchers and community members work together on a study that is designed, initiative and managed by researchers

• **Collegiate:** Researchers and community members work together as colleagues, each with skills to offer for mutual learning
## Degree of Engagement in Community Engaged Research & Evaluation

Adapted from Stanton, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage in Engaged R/E</th>
<th>Degree of Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify issue of importance</td>
<td>Community Research/Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide on research question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select research design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop instrument/process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate of findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create academic products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create public products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Stanton, 2008
Common Problems in Partnerships

• Lack of trust and respect
• Inequitable distribution of power and control
• Conflicts over perspective, priorities, assumptions, values, beliefs and language
• Conflicts over funding
• Conflicts associated with different emphases on task and process
• Conflicts regarding who represents the community and how is community defined
• Not understanding small group dynamics
IS IT COMMUNITY-ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP?

• Is there (one or more) community partner involved in planning and implementation?

• Have the university and the partner articulated their separate and collective goals?

• Is there evidence of benefits or outcomes for the university and the partner?

• Is knowledge being exchanged to meet the goals of the activity?

• Does the activity link directly to research or teaching/learning or both?

CONDUCTING CBPR

Distinct Phases Mark the Process of Conducting CBPR
CBPR Phases

• Phase 1: Partnership Development
• Phase 2: Project Development
• Phase 3: Project Implementation
• Phase 4: Data Analysis & Interpretation
• Phase 5: Product Generation
Phase 1: Partnership Development

Step 1: Establish a community advisory group
Step 2: Define roles
Step 3: Develop contract or MOU

PHASE 2: Project Development

Step 4: Get to know the issues
Step 5: Develop the methodology
Step 6: Review the MOU and the Research Plan

PHASE 3: Project Development

Step 7: Implement the project (deliver intervention and collect data)
PHASE 4: Data Analysis and Interpretation

Step 8: Analyze the data
Step 9: Meet with partners to review findings

PHASE 5: Product Generation

Step 10: Prepare written reports
Step 11: Conduct presentations of the findings
Step 12: Prepare scholarly reports
CBPR and Service Learning
CBPR-based service-learning experiences need to be...

• Positive, meaningful, and real

• Cooperative, promoting skills associated with teamwork, community involvement and citizenship

• Engaging opportunities problem-solving with community members

• Promoting deeper learning through blending of tacit and explicit knowledges

• Personally meaningful and to challenging existing values and ideas

• Supporting social, emotional, and cognitive learning and development

Faculty researcher

Community

Service-learning students

SOCIAL CHANGE
CBPR methods will need to:

• Have the potential to answer the search/community questions

• Be acceptable and engaging to the community

• Be practicable by students and/or community members

• Build the research and collaboration capacity of both community members and students
From the perspective of *productivity*, how can CBPR be embedded in faculty service-learning activities?

- An approach to answering research questions in the faculty’s area of interest

- Scholarly work on the service-learning process and outcomes

- Scholarly work on CBPR
What is Photovoice?

HISTORY/BACKGROUND - Developed by Caroline Wang and colleagues in 1995 as a means for women living in a rural village in China to communicate important health messages to policy makers.

THEORY – Freire/critical consciousness; feminist theory; empowerment theory, participatory action research.

DOCUMENTARY PRACTICE – documentary photography; efforts of community photographers and participatory educators to challenge assumptions about representation and documentary authorship; auto-ethnography.
Typical Project Cycle

Photovoice Process: Training

- Basic Photography
- Selecting and Portraying Subject Matter
- Ethics and Safety
- Selection and Reflection Processes

Data Collection Cycle

Data Collection Components

- Photography
- Written reflections
- Personal reflections
- Group dialogue

Data Collection Cycle

- Participant Photography
- Selection and Reflection (individual)
- Selection and Reflection (group)
- Sharing, Showing, & Telling

• 1 roll of film per week for XX weeks
• Photos taken around framing questions assigned for that week.
• Film processed and 1 set of prints delivered to participants

Photovoice Process

- Each week, participants chose photos from their roll for that week that they wanted to share.
- Participants complete written reflection worksheets on these photos to help them prepare for group conversations:
  - “I want to share this photo because. . .”

Photovoice Process

- Weekly, 2-hour small-group meeting with other participants from their school and facilitator
- 1st hour: round-robin style sharing of photos and personal reflections
- Example facilitation questions:
  - What is important for people to understand about this photo?

Photovoice Process

- Group photo selection – sticky dot “voting”
- Group dialogue around 5 photos with the most votes.
- Explore meaning of photos and different interpretations of issues/ideas presented together.
- *Why does this happen?*

When to use Photovoice

- When participants are an important beneficiary of the knowledge generated
- When issues of empowerment and participatory competence are particularly important to the evaluation context
- When what you want to know requires opportunity for exploration, thought and reflection
- When dissemination of findings to a broad audience is important
- When the assumptions embedded within traditional forms of data collection are inappropriate
Videotelling

- Like photovoice, but with video
- Particularly engaging to students in YouTube generation
- Editing, video skills
- United Nations: Youth voices contest
- In readings: *A bridge between communities: Video-making using principles of community-based participatory research* (Chavez et al., 2004)
Observation of Neighborhood Disorder

What is it? Observers walk the streets and rate the signs of physical/social disorder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical disorder</th>
<th>Social disorder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes, cigars</td>
<td>Adults loitering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage, litter</td>
<td>People drinking alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty beer bottles</td>
<td>Peer group, gang indicators present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti, graffiti painted over</td>
<td>People intoxicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned cars</td>
<td>Adults fighting, arguing in hostile way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condoms on sidewalk</td>
<td>Prostitutes on street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needles and syringes</td>
<td>People selling drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observation of Neighborhood Disorder

How could it be used?

Community is concerned about community conditions
Can use existing measure or have community come up with their own indicators of poor community conditions
Community identifies areas of interest
Observe all or a sample of the blocks

HOW IS CBPR DIFFERENT?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>CBPR</th>
<th>CBPR Advantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify Topic concerns</strong></td>
<td>Based on epidemiological data and funding priorities</td>
<td>Community participates in identifying health concerns</td>
<td>Increased motivation of community members to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design study</strong></td>
<td>Based entirely on scientific rigor and feasibility</td>
<td>Community participates in development of study design</td>
<td>Increased acceptability of study approach to community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruit and retain participants</strong></td>
<td>Based entirely on scientific considerations and best guesses about community members</td>
<td>Community provides guidance about recruitment and retention approaches</td>
<td>Enhanced recruitment and retention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Examining Community-Institutional Partnerships for Prevention Research Group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design measurement instruments and collect data</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>CBPR</th>
<th>CBPR Advantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures adopted or adapted from other studies</td>
<td>Measurement instruments are designed with community input and tested in a similar population</td>
<td>Increased reliability and validity of measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Better handling of sensitive issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design and implement intervention</th>
<th>Researchers design intervention based on literature and theory</th>
<th>Community members help guide intervention development</th>
<th>Greater cultural and social relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased likelihood of positive impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyze, interpret, translate, and disseminate findings</th>
<th>Researchers report findings from analyses and publish them in peer-reviewed journals</th>
<th>Community members assist in interpretation, translation, and dissemination</th>
<th>Greater sensitivity to cultural and social norms, potential harms, enhances potential for translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Examining Community-Institutional Partnerships for Prevention Research Group.
The Bottom Line...

• CBPR can improve:

  – The quality of your research
  – Its relevance to the needs of communities
  – Its impact on community-identified concerns
Despite the Strengths of the Approach, There are Always Challenges!

CBPR approach requires:

- A need for flexibility
- An ethical understanding of the issues
- Working within a culture other than one’s own
- Time commitment
- Sustainability of project goals

Holkup, 2004
CBPR: Learning Provides Connectivity between University and Community

• Learning:
  – About each other’s capacity and limitations
  – About each other’s goals, culture, expectations
  – To develop students as active citizens
  – To exchange expertise, ideas, fears, concerns
  – To share control and direction
  – To share results and apply them in different ways
  – To adapt based on evaluation and documentation
  – To experiment; to fail; to try again. To Trust
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