

Engagement Literature Review

Ahmed, S.M., Beck, B., Maurana, C.A., & Newton, G. (2004). Overcoming barriers to effective community-based participatory research in US medical schools. *Education for Health, 17(2), 141-151.*

This article addresses the lack of medical research conducted with communities. Citing Green et al. (1995), researchers Ahmed, Beck, Maurana, and Newton offer a common reason for the gap, namely that communities are often reluctant to participate in medical research as they view conventional research projects as “paternalistic (and) irrelevant to their needs” (p. 142). Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR), they propose, offers one strategy for overcoming the community distrust of researchers and better verifying and applying research findings.

But community members are not the only ones reluctant to engage in CBPR. Ahmed et al. believe that a “lack of understanding of CBPR by key decision-makers in academic institutions” is another “major barrier affecting the institutionalization of CBPR as a valued and desirable mode of conducting research” (p. 144); additionally, the belief that CBPR cannot be conducted in conjunction with more traditional methods, prevents academic leaders from accepting its use. In contrast, Ahmed et al. cite Kreiger et al. (2002) to argue that CBPR, and especially Participatory Action Research (PAR), are methods that enhance and give context to “traditional qualitative research methods.

The section entitled “Proposed Changes in Academic Culture” provides a particularly useful description of how CBPR could facilitate a mindset shift in higher education; it offers insights for faculty and staff interested in increasing the use of CBPR at their institution, and in the ways their CBPR projects work could reform society. The accompanying diagram shows that for a philosophical shift to occur, it must also include work in synergy with practical processes and national trends. Among the practical steps that Ahmed et al. propose, and which influence philosophical shifts, are the following: educate key decision makers; institute change in committee membership; enhance the critical mass of CBPR researchers; and mentor new faculty.

The final section that is of particular relevance discusses the “Individual Barriers” to CBPR. Lack of training in CBPR and its unfamiliar, flexible nature, makes many researchers hesitant to implement it. Because of this common barrier, Ahmed et al. reiterate the importance of building CBPR mentors who can help reluctant researchers get involved at the community level first. They also offer six, tangible steps to becoming a CBPR researcher. Two of the most important are to shift the focus from academic needs to community needs, and to get involved in non-research community activities as well as the CBPR project.

Bringle, R.G., Clayton, P., & Price, M. (2009). Partnerships in service learning and civic engagement. *Partnerships: A journal in service learning and civic engagement*, 1(1), 1-20.

Civic engagement, which Bringle, Clayton, & Price define as including both “service learning and participatory action research,” centers on a collaboration of “knowledge, skills, and experience” between participants; university students, faculty, and community members all contribute to choose, pursue, and review a research project (p. 1). Implied in this collaborative model, and in the term partnership, are the three qualities of “closeness, equity, and integrity” (p. 3). These qualities highlight the evolutionary nature of the community-engaged research relationship and its movement towards partnership, along the continuum of communication, coordination, common goals, and integrated objectives (p. 4).

Bringle et al. cite researchers Enos and Morton (2003) and their distinction between transactional and transformational relationships to clarify this point. Transactional relationships refer to the bond that exists between participants in the initial stages of a project (p. 7). Depending on the project’s length and intent, these bonds could remain in the transactional stage or evolve into a transformational relationship with high levels of “equity, closeness, and integrity” shared between members (p. 8). The term transformational implies that through the context of the project, all partners

evolve in their perception of themselves and their roles, through a deeper understanding of their colleagues.

This article is particularly useful in its discussion of time and the impact of time on research relationships. For instance, the longer the project, the greater the chance for partners to form the trust-based relationships that unveil the “cultural acts and expressions” of communities: . . . gift-giving, forms of address, food sharing . . .” (p. 12). In other situations, length does not imply deeper levels of trust; a relationship that creates a dependency can establish itself early in the research plan and worsen with time, as one partner deteriorates the self-sufficiency of other contributors (p. 9); consequently, short-term projects might actually suffer from an extended time frame that overshoots the original intentions of its community partners (p. 10).

The Venn Level of Closeness that Bringle et al. cite from Mashek, Cannady, & Tangey (2007) on page thirteen presents a helpful visual of the continuum from transactional to transformational. Introducing this diagram, he also discusses the shift in language that accompanies this progression, namely the replacement of I to We in inter-partner dialogue (p. 12). These two references reiterate the fundamental “person-to-person interaction” that civic engagement requires, especially when it bridges campus and community in a common project (p. 14). For Bringle et al., the ever changing role of the individual gives insight into these interactions and stresses the foundation of partnership in community-engaged projects.

Calderon, J. (2004). Lessons from an activist intellectual: Participatory research, teaching, and learning for social change. *Latin American Perspectives*, 31(1), 81-94.

This article focuses on Jose Calderon’s personal experiences implementing participatory action research (PAR) in his courses. He compares PAR with the traditional “banking” concept of learning where “the teacher ‘educates’ while the students ‘memorize’ and feed back to the teacher what they absorb” (p. 81).

Calleson, D.C., Jordan, C., & Seifer, S.D. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? *Academic Medicine*, 80(4), 317-321.

Written for the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship (CES) in the Health Profession and thus framed through the lens of health-related disciplines, this article encourages a dialogue on ways to increase CES. Researchers Calleson, Jordan, and Seifer begin by identifying external and internal hurdles to implement this form of scholarship. The most important external hurdle that they note is the requirement of “clinical and research revenues,” which burden faculty with the need to constantly apply for and depend on grants and outside funding (p. 317). A noted internal hurdle includes the pressure for publications. Specifically, because the track to tenure in institutions of higher learning depends so heavily on publications, faculty members often deem CBR “too professionally risky” (p. 317).

Calleson et al. defend that all research aims need to be “framed within the context of the institution’s missions,” to overcome these hurdles and generate larger, campus-wide support (p. 318). Portland State University is mentioned as an exemplar of this practice, “taking a campus-wide approach to promoting community-engaged scholarship” and rewriting the tenure guidelines accordingly (p. 318). Calleson et al. particularly suggest that institutional tenure guidelines should consider the “collaborative inquiry and the relationships that form between faculty and communities” as significant reflections of faculty work (p. 319). However, there is also a growing need to distinguish which of these community projects fall under the category of scholarship; Calleson et al. propose that an expanding definition of scholarship should be implemented to increase CES’s viability and credibility at the institutional level (p. 318). To address the latter, the Commission for CES created an online tool kit for faculty in the health related fields to implement and review CES, funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. The references at the end of this article

are another good resource for faculty interested in implementing CES/CER in higher education and in health related fields.

In this form of scholarship, community members should not only be a part of the dialogue, but also key actors in the task of defining their needs. Calleson et al. emphasize the need for balance between “community priorities and university requirements” and how this balance impacts the outcome of CES (p. 319). In addition to the traditional, peer-reviewed articles, Calleson et al. suggest the role of applied research products, such as “innovative intervention programs; policies at the community, state, and federal levels; training materials and resource guides; and technical assistance” (p. 320). They also suggest community dissemination products, such as “community forums, newspaper articles, websites, and presentations” (p. 320). A combination of articles, applied products, and community dissemination products, may lead to a shared commitment between campus and community.

Campus Community Partners for Health. (2009). *Promoting healthy public policy through community-based participatory research: Ten case studies* [PDF document]. Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/CBPR_final.pdf

This publication presents ten case studies rooted in CBPR. Topics range from food insecurity issues, youth empowerment, environmental policy, and reintegration of communities with formerly incarcerated members. Despite the public health focus of these studies, the manner in which each case is summarized, compared in table form, and discussed in light of its strengths and challenges, proves significant for community-partnerships from many different disciplines. Useful publication and web resources are also included in the appendices.

Carter, M., Rivero, E., Cadge, W., & Curran, S. (2002). *Designing your community-based learning project: Five questions to ask about your pedagogical and participatory goals. Teaching Sociology, 30(2), 158-173.*

Carter et al. define CBL in terms of its variety, such as “field trips, observational projects, service-learning projects, community-based internships, research, courses and programs” (p. 158). The authors also warn of the common dangers of CBL and propose five questions that could serve as tools to build mutually beneficial projects for students, faculty, and community organizations. Among the dangers, Carter et al. first introduce the savior complex. This situation occurs when students believe their role is to remove the burden of a problem from a passive, defenseless community (p. 159). The second potential danger is that the engagement with the community actually reconfirms stereotypes (p. 159). Thirdly, students’ personal experiences could take precedence and sacrifice academic objectives, or fourthly, programs could be ineffective because of budget constraints (p. 159). A final possibility is that the academic calendar, with its term divisions and student vacations, frustrates the creation of a long-term partnership with the community organization (p. 160).

This article poses five questions with which to analyze the effectiveness of a CBL project. Questions one through five are as follows: 1) Among the goals of the project, are there primary and secondary goals, or are the goals given equal weight?, 2) Is participation in the project mandatory or voluntary?, 3) Should the CBL component of a course be concentrated in one site or dispersed across many sites?, 4) How similar or different should each student’s individual participation in the project be?, and 5) How central should direct client/community interaction be to students’ activities?” (p. 159). The last four questions are supplemented with very valuable spreadsheets that weigh the pros and cons of each choice in light of the decision’s impact on instructors, students, and partnership organizations. For example, the question of mandatory or voluntary participation impacts students in that mandatory participation facilitates classroom bonding and students’ understanding of diverse perspectives; voluntary participation creates flexibility and accommodates the busy student’s schedule (p. 165). The third question compares the benefit of a deeper relationship and greater

commitment of resources to one site, with the danger of overextending one site's probably minimal staff and free time (p. 167).

After a brief introduction of these questions, Carter et al. offer examples of academic courses with CBL components. These examples are particularly useful in that they highlight the factors a professor considers when implementing a CBL project. For example, professors often consider “the institutional capacity of a college or university, the human and financial resources available...the number and kind of students in a course, and the geographic location of the school” when deciding how to best engage students and community members (p. 163). The combination of these components allows CBL to present students with valuable, real world learning experience for students, such as skills in “assessment survey, grant-writing, office work, or web design” (p. 164). Learning thus comes in a variety of forms and often in ways not directly associated with the research goal (p. 164). Even frustrations experienced as part of the community-partnership can serve as educational tools (p. 171).

Carter et al. emphasize the need to offer a range of roles and subgroups for students to choose so that they contribute to a project in a way that speaks to their interest (p. 168). Students should also approach a project with sufficient background knowledge and experience in qualitative and quantitative research, so that they do not overtax the community organization with the need to train, answer questions, and mentor students (p. 171). This article concludes with authors Carter et al. calling for an evaluation of students' performance that is both fair and respectful of the nonlinear nature of CBL work (p. 171). The summary of CBL projects that the authors provide in addendum, also reveals details about project funding, university courses, project assignments, and class components and makeup (p. 171-172).

Checkoway, B. (2001). Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 125-147.

“For democracy to function successfully in the future, students must be prepared to understand their own identities, communicate with people who are different from themselves, and build bridges across cultural differences in the transition to a more diverse society” (p. 127).

Checkoway explains that “American universities are strategically situated for civic engagement” in that they have a wealth of social and technological resources to form networks between peoples (p. 128). He argues that the history of these university institutions has shown a trend from social networks to research institutions; this shift, as well as the rise in departmentalization between disciplines, has sacrificed the university’s ability to connect with each other and engage the surrounding community (p. 128). In light of this trend, Checkoway asks the question: “How can research universities prepare students for active participation in a diverse democratic society?” (p. 129). One particular challenge to this question is the fact that “the youngest voting-age Americans have unprecedented levels of political nonparticipation” (p. 129); university curricula and courses do not challenge students’ democratic imaginations, campus curricular activities do not offer opportunities for students to engage in political campaigns, and the campus itself is a wasteland of public dialogue” (p. 129). Checkoway then asks “If the students are disengaged, does it mean that the universities are not doing their job?” (p. 130).

The answer that Checkoway offers to his questions and disheartening news about college student activism is the idea that “academically based knowledge is not sufficient to motivate or prepare people to think about the issues” (p. 130). This lack of activism directly impacts society by shortchanging it of the knowledge and skills young adults could contribute (p. 130). Universities, however, hold the potential to better prepare students to be active citizens; they could enlist students’ participation in research projects that tackle real, applicable social problems (pp. 130-131). Through this engagement, students’ develop survey, presentation, and communication skills while directly working with their communities (p. 131). Post-service reflections also allow students to form

connections and learn in a deeper way, while service-learning, as a whole, integrates academic and practical knowledge (p. 131).

Checkoway also proposes that “cocurricular activities with a strong civic purpose” can increase the students’ engagement (p. 131). These activities include direct service projects that occur outside of class, and could also be used in conjunction with academic objectives (p. 131). But research should not only engage the students, it must also involve the faculty in a participatory way. And through community-based research projects, faculty can initiate a “co-learning and empowering process that attends to social inequalities” and facilitates dialogue (p. 134). The mere presence of a research team dedicated to addressing social problems, can provide low-cost resources to the community and exchange valuable knowledge (p. 134). Not only does this format contrast with the objective, postpostivist model, it also builds networks within the local community and “empowers members for immediate action” (p. 134).

Checkoway takes care to note that he is not advocating for a removal of the postpostivist research model; rather, citing Bringle, he advocates for multiple research models from which researchers can choose the most appropriate option for their aim (p. 134). But in order for faculty to truly engage themselves in the process, Checkoway explains that the current conception of higher education, one that separates students from their respective communities, is a major obstacle to civic engagement (p. 135). He further argues that the system of tenure and insistence on solitary research thwarts the development of multi-discipline, service-learning classes; in the current system, faculty focus their energies on grants and rank, and are not rewarded for building relationships with community-partners (p. 135). Active research’s emphasis on letting the community needs decide the research question directly counters the tradition of academic disciplines and departments’ defining a research objective for the faculty member (p. 135). Another challenge that the current system of higher education presents is the idea that taking time for community engagement will cause the

faculty member to jeopardize his commitment to research and teaching (p. 135). Checkoway encourages faculty to push for a reworking of institutional rewards, and to work within the current system to implement community-university partnerships, even without financial rewards (p. 135).

Delving deeper into the question of how to restore civic engagement to its rightful place of higher education, Checkoway calls for “some sort of institutional restructuring” such as a central office, academic program, or collaboration between disciplines (p. 136). He also emphasizes the need to build support and awareness within the community, and build links between university and community (p. 136). Clarification is often needed within the term community-university partnership as all partnership do not integrate students with the community or open lines of community-university dialogue; without this element of participation, a partnership cannot increase civic engagement levels (p. 136). The full renewal of the university in Checkoway’s opinion would “make knowledge more accessible to the public, reward faculty for their efforts to draw upon their expertise for the benefit of society, and build collaborative partnerships with communities...It would connect the diversity and democracy objectives of the research university in a society that is becoming more multicultural” (pp. 143-144).

Community-Based Collaboratives Research Consortium. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.cbcr.org>

This website connects researchers, mediators and facilitators, government agencies, community groups, and environmental groups interested in sharing research and case studies. The projects it supports focus on strengthening local communities, especially through environmental issues; its website includes links to government agencies, universities, non-profit, and mediation groups that are leading the exchange of research ideas on stewardship and conflict resolution. For instance, the Loka Institute is a non-profit research and advocacy organization that studies the social, political, and environmental repercussions of research, science, and technology; the Institute for

Environment and Natural Resources educates about environmental and economic issues so as to create collaborative, community-based decisions.

Membership in Community-Based Collaboratives Research Consortium (CBCRC) is free and funded by a grant from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. Its website also provides free, detailed databases for books, journal articles, case studies, and other media resources for collaborative projects. CBCRC's Protocol and Guidelines for Ethical and Effective Research of Community Based Collaborative Processes (2003) details the four main steps of a community-based research project. The first section underlines the importance of forming a protocol or guidelines with the community partner. This agreement states the project's objectives, the process of gathering information and keeping it confidential, and lays the foundation of dialogue between researchers and community-partner. As part of this stage, the researcher and community-partner should list their respective interests, needs, roles, and responsibilities.

The second step is one of preparation before research. The foundation of this step, as explained by CBCRC, is to establish clear community-researcher contacts and set project expectations. The community should have the freedom to collaborate with the research team and offer its own project objectives or research questions. A community-partner that is actively engaged in a research process that also addresses its needs, is more likely to become a long-term and collaborative partner. As a result, the research team needs to be aware that the community's organization and diverse interests may frustrate immediate decision making; the researchers must "be open to 'letting go'" of a rigid research plan, and adapt to an evolving research question. This evolution is particularly important when dealing with cultural differences. For instance, research that focuses solely on accuracy may blind itself to the inputs of the community; a crucial role of the community-partner is to offer feedback on the research process and their perceptions of the research team, thus aiding the team hear some of its own biased questions or methods. Hearing community

feedback and overcoming prejudices require the researchers to immerse themselves in the community. Learning about the community through direct interaction will help the researchers form relationships and move beyond the limitations of an outside observer. This direct interaction will also help the researchers determine an appropriate hypothesis; they will be able to avoid problems that the community wishes to remain private or others that might clash with cultural beliefs, and thus alienate community members. Knowledge of the community means that the researchers are better able to frame a question from the society's perspective so that it is applicable and rallies support.

The third step establishes the research approach in a way that solicits cooperation and avoids harm. To do this, CBCRC counsels the research team to "be aware of the internal dynamics, conflicts and history of the group and make an effort to include all sub-groups as equals." The role of the research team is to form a relationship with the community group and not enter into its power structure. However, there is a danger that in the process of engaging the community, its members feel that they give more (time, energy, and resources) than they receive. Instead of overtaxing an organization or community, the researchers should share its resources and use its personnel to support the community members. Voluntary and informed consent of the community participants should also be a priority for the research team, and can be obtained through verbal explanations or translated forms. Because of the evolutionary nature of the research, the team should anticipate redrafting their project guidelines as its partnership with the community strengthens and re-evaluates community needs. A key component of this step, CBCRC argues, is articulating the foreseeable problems with the community; false presentations of the community, if not caught in an early stage of the project, may lead to distorted research findings and distrust between the partners. The research team should begin with the open question of "What can I do for you (the community)?" This question coincides with the researchers' tricky balance of remaining independent of the community and working with them; a degree of independence allows the researcher to critically reflect on the

information community members offer, knowing and respecting its authority figures; collaboration with the community manifests itself in a trust-filled relationship that allows the researcher to understand individual comments in the context of the group.

The fourth section, *Involving the Community in the Validation and Publication of Research Findings*, suggests the establishment of a review committee to involve community members in frequent evaluations of the findings. These findings must be both accurate representations of the community, and they should also be presented in a culturally acceptable and approachable manner to the community. CBCRC recommends “executive summaries, brochures, web sites and workshops” as ways to dispense information between members. Frequent reviews also address community impatience and curiosity in regards to the outside research team’s work. After the work has been reviewed and finalized, CBCRC warns that the way the research team concludes its study is of the utmost importance: “Just as researchers shouldn’t parachute unannounced into a community, they should not depart without saying a proper ‘goodbye.’” The research findings should be presented to the community in an open and engaging forum, such as a celebratory dinner, as a way of extending appreciation for the trust of allowing the research team into the community. This event should also allow for group editing, questions, and discussions of the research results. Other forums might include group databases, conferences or consortiums, as a way to obtain additional feedback beyond the community in question.

Community-campus partnerships for health: Transforming communities & higher education. (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.ccpb.info>

This website provides a range of resources: peer reviewed and annotated journal articles, examples of funded proposals, community-based research (CBR) syllabi, and course materials. While it contains some general information within these sections, it focuses mainly on ways to conduct CBR on health related issues. More detailed resources include a directory of funding sources

for CBR (2004 edition), categorized by areas of service and complete with deadlines and further links.

Corrigan, D. (2000). The changing role of schools and higher education institutions with respect to community-based interagency collaboration and interprofessional partnerships. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 75(3), 176-195.

“Collaboration, like everything else that is important, is a question of values” (p. 187).

This article discusses the development of school-community partnerships and the challenges to forming such collaborative relationships, as experienced by institutions of higher learning. This partnership is further defined as collaboration, in that it requires more effort than cooperation or coordination. As Corrigan explains, the school-community “collaboration is more like a marriage in which a partner can speak for you even though you are not at the meeting;” it requires time in which to lay a foundation of trust and confidence (p. 177).

Largely influenced by Boyer (1991), Corrigan argues that the crucial power of the school-community partnership is its ability to address the rising rates of poverty among youth. Partnership, in other words, is crucial because students “bring more than educational needs to the classroom” and their needs are a social responsibility that requires the effort of multiple institutions (p. 179). The steps that Corrigan proposes to build such collaborative partnerships, could also apply to other community-based research or service-learning models. The first of these steps state that families should be included as partners alongside other institutions. Similarly, programs should be tailored to the cultural setting of the community and involve local members in the planning stages. The strongest and most universally applicable step on Corrigan’s list is the need to create shared vision that unites the partners’ aims and directs future action (p. 180).

This article presents another helpful list of steps that could function as a checklist for school-community partnerships. This list, from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement Conference, represents the lessons of seventeen universities on the topic of collaborative learning.

The most relevant items on this list include the following: 2) real experience is the best teaching method; simulation is okay; the didactic is worst...; 5) the learning process determines what will be learned; 12) attitude and orientation are as important as skills and knowledge in promoting relationships rather than individual orientation; 15) interprofessional education must be grounded in history, culture, and local relationships; 16) leadership requires letting go and giving over; it involves creating conditions so that others can succeed; 24) interpersonal collaborators need to be watchful of their language both among themselves and outside the professions; and 25) interpersonal collaborators need to avoid project mentality.

Corrigan emphasizes the need for flexibility within systems, such as the cross-listing of courses, and creation of interdisciplinary courses and resource centers. The challenge to collaboration at the school-community level, he argues, is the implementation of shared decision making at every stage. With this statement, Corrigan suggests that school-community collaboration only exists when community members are allowed to participate in the decision making, fundraising, and needs assessment processes. As expressed in the list above, particular care should be made to overcome the potential barrier of language and use “not only the language of various ethnic groups, but also the language of different professions” in these steps (p. 187).

Participatory Action Research (PAR) represents one means in which to build effective partnerships between schools and their communities. According to Corrigan, PAR is a strong example of a holistic research paradigm and, as such, can aide university efforts to build social reform. He defines holistic research paradigms as methods that use interdisciplinary approaches in direct response to community-identified needs. These methods allow for community members to assert themselves as leaders and work as collaborators to define research aims, interpret findings, and publish results. Speaking from this PAR methodology, Corrigan argues that universities must

“connect professional preparation programs to the solution of society’s problems” as a way to make its institutional role remain valid (p. 193).

Cushman, E. (1999). The public intellectual, service learning, and activist research. *College English*, 61(3), 328-336.

Cushman calls for a redefinition, a reexamination of the word public if individuals hope to impact this sector and implement change (p. 329). Her article addresses the challenges of translating academic work into a form that makes it relevant to the public and informs decision making; the challenge of what Cushman terms the ‘public intellectual’ is to overcome this challenge (329). For Cushman, it is a self-created “ivory tower isolation” disconnecting the university from the surrounding community (p. 329). She asserts that this barrier can be overcome by academics pursuing service-learning and activist research (p. 329).

Service-learning calls for “students (to) enter communities as participant observers” with a “sincere effort to both engage and observe” the needs and interests of the members” (p. 329). One key element of this learning process is the exchange of information and experiences between students and community partnerships, a “mutually beneficial give-and-take” (p. 329). Another key is the reflection that should follow each field experience and allow students to discuss class readings and compare reactions (pp. 329-330). Reflections from direct service-learning experiences give context to course material and show the progression in students’ thoughts as a result of the community engagement. This format differs from the traditional form of academic learning that focuses on the individual amassing information, and replaces the previously mentioned “isolation” with “interaction” (p. 330).

Similar to other researchers, Cushman cites the savior danger associated with service-learning: that students may feel that they have the “greater knowledge and skills” with which to liberate their poorer community members (p. 331). And just as the service-learning classroom

requires a non-traditional approach to learning, the research that stems from its experience requires a more community-centered form of collecting and reporting data. Activist research invokes the theory of “praxis” as a way to combat objective research methods, which can lead to a power structure between the researcher and his ‘subjects’ (p. 331). Praxis, on the other hand, calls for “ethical action to facilitate social change,” through direct participation with the community (p. 332). This form of research operates as an “emancipator pedagogy” in which the researcher teaches by engaging with his community, learning with and from them (p. 331); the relationship that is built between researchers and community is one of “solidarity and dialogue” that extends the classroom beyond the institution’s walls (p. 331).

Service-learning and activist research, thus, satisfy the type of transformation Cushman hopes to see in the public intellectual. These two learning strategies rework academia’s traditional teaching establishment- namely, individual classrooms- and relocate learning to the community so that all community members become active participants in the knowledge exchange; “community and university values, language, and knowledge” interact so as to impact social change and engage university students and community members (p. 334)

Edwards, K.E., & Gibson, N.L. (2008). Knowledge profiling as emergent theory in community-based participatory research. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action* 2(1), pp. 73-79.

Edwards and Gibson propose the use of a knowledge profile (KP) as a “road map” in which to structure and integrate community skills into an evolving, efficient research plan (p. 73). This article especially challenges the “apparent dichotomy between academic and community-knowledge” that Community-based Participatory Research (CBPR) sources describe, and through KP, calls for a multidisciplinary approach to community needs that takes into account all forms of knowledge (p. 73). Therefore, what weakens traditional research strategies when applied to community needs and

community partnerships is not their type of knowledge, but the resistance to incorporate rather than compete with other viewpoints, and welcome other collaborators.

Broken into four organizational steps, a KP creates a research environment which gradually incorporates more voices to specify the research question (p. 74). The first step creates a “neutral” environment for the research team and emphasizes in-person introductions (p. 74). It often includes changes in finances, leadership, and group politics; consequently, members will assume different responsibilities with time or even pursue their own research questions separate from the group (p. 74). To endure all of these fluctuations, KP relies on the presence of a strong facilitator. This individual leads the fluid process by corralling the various individual interests that might otherwise overshadow shared, community needs (p. 74). He or she “helps to bring out the skills, experience, and complimentary knowledge of the partners” in the context of the research objective (p. 74). A successful first stage is therefore indicated by a research team that incorporates more members and a broader skill base, while it also specifies and reassesses its research aims.

The second step is one of articulating and negotiating these goals. Divergent ideas are discussed in the neutral environment that step one created, and individual team members are allowed to express their ideas openly and collaboratively (p. 75). Edwards and Gibson warn researchers to pay particular attention to silent teammates at this stage, and not to assume that silence implies agreement. For instance, Edwards and Gibson explain that members of marginalized groups may have stronger tendencies to be quiet while the research partnership and questions are developing (p. 75). Humor and encouraging words are recommended as techniques to engage these quiet members and create a comfortable, friendly dialogue (p. 75). The learning partnership that defines a successful second stage is, therefore, a “dynamic and living process” guided by members’ input and forever striving to engage all members’ participation (p. 75).

When the research project begins, the research team of university and community members is “usually incomplete;” it only represents the individuals who expressed an initial interest in the proposed topic (p. 75). As dialogue about the community need reveals knowledge gaps and spreads awareness about the project, the research question will refine itself and the research team will expand (p. 75). This third step, therefore, focuses on identifying and reevaluating the research question. The fourth step analyzes the resources needed to pursue this aim. It calls for the creation of a resource inventory, which organizes the needed knowledge into categories such as expertise, contacts and community connections, funding and materials, and availability. The narrowing of research aims will also identify “resource gaps” that may be filled by the expanding research team; community members with particular skills can lend their knowledge in a participatory, relevant project, and the process of conducting the research will create an experiential knowledge base useful for the project’s completion (p. 76).

This article concludes with a case study that applies the four steps of the KP process. The project described centers on the implementation of a birthing center, in a community distant from a hospital and culturally reliant on midwives. In this example traditional midwives were not only respected and given a voice but, in order to build a community center that would collaborate with this local health authority, midwives were encouraged to assume leadership roles.

Fitch, B., & Kirby, A. (2000). Students’ assumptions and professors’ presumptions: Creating a learning community for the whole student. *College Teaching*, 48(2), 47-54.

“Interactive learning, then, is an essential ingredient to ‘the scholarship of teaching’ and, by necessity, puts the student at the center...By definition, that sort of learning environment seeks out connections, including those across disciplinary boundaries” (p. 48).

This article looks at the need to validate the individual experiences each person brings into a learning environment, and reevaluate personal assumptions with the lens of multiple, interconnected

perspectives (p. 49). It questions the current system of higher education, which fills classrooms with passionate young adults and turns them into tired and passive students, whose classroom lessons are rarely connected to life experiences (p. 49). As a result, Fitch and Kirby call for a “learning process (that) is at once social and developmental” so as to relate classroom learning and life (p. 50). They call for an environment that facilitates interaction between students, between students and teacher so that all members feel comfortable enough to voice their assumptions and ask questions (p. 50).

Out of such open discussion stems a type of knowledge that is applied rather than memorized (p. 51). Reflection papers support this distinction in that they value applied knowledge and allow students to evaluate and reevaluate their own beliefs. Fitch and Kirby especially recommend using reflection papers as a component of a class’s final assignment, and suggest that students be allowed to rewrite them after an initial grading, while also giving them a choice for the final project topic (p. 51).

Giles, D.E., Jr., & Eyler, J. (1998). A service learning research agenda for the next five years. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 73, 65-72.

This article by Giles and Eyler opens with the top ten questions Service-Learning research has yet to answer. Their questions are categorized in five groups as they are directed to students, faculty, institutions, community, and society; and were drafted from a research agenda led by the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education (NSIEE) in 1991. Not only did this agenda have a significant impact on the amount of subsequent S-L research, but its ten guiding questions remain relevant reflections for individuals and research teams interested in S-L (and other community-based learning models) and its subsequent impact on students, faculty, institutions, etc.

The research on students shows that S-L increases levels of social responsibility. More research is needed, however, on how S-L impacts subject matter learning, a challenging factor to measure in experiential based learning models. The research on faculty reveals most of the faculty

members who implement S-L, do so in order to increase teaching efficacy; the faculty who do not implement S-L are reluctant because of a lack of institutional support. While Giles and Eyler explain that the implementation of S-L strengthens the teacher-learner relationship, they also ascertain from the NSIEE agenda that more research is needed to study the barriers that faculty face: S-L's interdisciplinary nature, tenure requirements, and other career objectives.

The research on institutions discusses the benefits of offering S-L as part of a core curriculum, and the rise of service centers and full time positions. More research is needed on S-L's impact on campus culture and higher education reform. More research is also needed on the means used to engage community members "in the planning process or in the process of students' reflection about the experience." More studies need focus on the long-term impacts of S-L on students, and how these students, reflect and use their S-L experiences to impact the larger society. Researchers Myers-Lipton (1996) particularly recommend two-years as the minimum time frame of study. Prior studies show that S-L impacts society by creating a "social ethic of caring," but Giles and Eyler call for more research into how S-L is currently being measured and discussed.

For future research into the field of S-L, they propose longitudinal studies that track students ten years after graduation, experimental studies that analyze S-L's impact on a wider range of students (beyond the similar demographic that voluntarily chooses S-L programs), and observational studies of current programs. Giles and Eyler also call for studies that use Participatory Action Research as a means to research S-L's impacts in the NSIEE questions' categories.

Gibson, C.M. (2009). *Research universities and engaged scholarship: A leadership agenda for renewing the civic mission of higher education*. Retrieved from <http://www.compact.org/resources>

Gibson pinpoints a divide in civic engagement among institutions of higher education: research universities fall behind liberal arts colleges in their implementation of engagement programs

and service-learning classes. Ironically, these research institutions also hold the potential to serve as leaders within the field because of their high levels of financial and human capital; their size and reputation uniquely prepares them to initiate wide-scale and rapid change. Gibson, therefore, calls for the creation of a university network to address this lack of scholarship and improve the distribution of civic engagement resources between institutions of higher learning.

Written from the results of a 2005 partnership study between Campus Compact and Tufts University, this article captures the insights from campuses currently involved in civic engagement programs. Its findings particularly emphasize “distributed knowledge” and “partnerships” as means to actively pursue new information and solutions. It also calls for a diversity of perspectives through which to connect the institution’s financial and human resources to community needs.

Barriers that this study’s participating universities identified include research’s traditional focus on objective, discipline-specific conclusions. The university’s preference for “abstract” and theoretical knowledge, rather than “participatory (and) action-oriented” knowledge, similarly frustrates the pursuit of engaged scholarship. Yet, the goal of interdisciplinary research can also lead to skepticism among professors who are traditionally trained or pursuing tenure through the institutionalized track of individual publications. Research that views its end goal as improving one academic field, therefore, is challenged by engaged scholarship’s quest to improve the community and build interpersonal, interdisciplinary understanding.

While the university and community resources and objectives might differ, this diversity reiterates the need to open lines of communication between campus and community partners. For instance, Gibson’s article suggests that universities could direct senior faculty and administrators into the field of engaged scholarship through tenure, grant, and recognition processes that support its mission. A method of reviewing engaged scholarship in a way that honors and critically examines it as an equal of traditional research methods would also strengthen the field. In these ways, research

universities, whose very establishment centered on a civic cause, would fulfill their unique responsibility to educate future leaders and teachers to build stronger communities and engage students in applied, interdisciplinary learning.

Hall, B.L. (1992). From margins to center? The development and purpose of participatory research. *The American Sociologist*. 23, 15–28.

In this article, Hall's sheds light on Participatory Research (PR) in Tanzania as well as PR's evolution as a methodology. He defines PR as a "process that combines three activities: research, education and action (1981)" in which the objective is to build and strengthen social interactions for a more equitable balance of power. He further defines PR as a "social action process that is biased in favor of dominated, exploited, poor, or otherwise ignored women and men and groups" in that it brings attention to social factors, such as "gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, physical and mental abilities," that are otherwise ignored or divisive (p. 16).

While not called 'participatory research' until the social movements of the 1960s, this methodology as a theory dates back to Engels and Marx. Throughout these decades, the consistent mission of PR has been to address "class, power, and ideology" as a means of "understanding change" within a society (p. 20). In Hall's words, PR roots itself in the assumption that "knowledge is constructed socially and, therefore, research approaches which allow for social, group or collective analysis of life experiences of power and knowledge are most appropriate" (p. 20). PR and Feminist Research (FR) fit the above description as these pedagogies share the aim of community empowerment and criticism of the status quo (p. 21). A particularly strong section delves into this overlap with FR and examines gender as it relates to culture, race, and class to impact the research team, question, and evaluation (p. 22). In this section Hall questions the role of voice and highlights PR's mission of restoring voice to the subordinated members of a community, especially the members who are marginalized because of "gender, race, (or) ethnicity" (p. 23).

PR roots itself in what Hall terms ‘popular knowledge,’ knowledge that seeks to transform its community and shifts power so that the power-wielders of society must cede their ability to control the “wants of others” (p. 24). Unlike academic norms, this knowledge does not rely on the “tenure, promotion, peer recognition, (or) research grants” of the author; instead, popular knowledge supports PR’s aim of building partnership and challenging the internal workings of communities (p. 25).

Israel, B.A., Schulz, A.J., Parker, E.A., & Becker, A.B. (1998) Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. Retrieved from <http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146%2Fannurev.publhealth.19.1.173>

This article emphasizes the need for an integrative approach to medicine through CBR. It includes a general review of CBR as a viable alternative to traditional research methods, especially when working with marginalized communities. It also reveals that CBR is particularly valuable when it achieves the following goals: “integration of research and practice;” “greater community involvement and control” through organizations, agencies, and universities; “increased sensitivity to and competence in working within diverse cultures;” use of quantitative and qualitative research; and a greater “focus on health and quality of life” (p. 174)

Israel et al.’s discussion of some methods for conducting CBR, specifically recommends critical theory and constructivism. Both methods are distinct from traditional methods in that the researchers are no longer completely objective, but have a mission of involvement with the community. Neutrality of opinion or bias is similarly rejected as the researchers must understand the perspective, values, and beliefs of the community with which they interact. Critical theory particularly approaches problems from the interconnections between “social, political, economic, cultural, ethnic, and gender factors,” relying on dialogue with the community as a basis for delving into these meanings (p. 176). Constructivism focuses on the “social, historical, and historical contexts” of the problem, and how the identified problem is community-specific, the result of

socially constructed views (p. 176). In both methods, the researchers strive to work directly with the community to glean and assess information.

This article also defines CBR in three ways: “community-wide research,” “community-involved research,” or “community-centered research” (p. 177). Regardless of the term used, successful CBR taps the knowledge and skills of the immediate community and applies the tools and insights of the community members into the research process (p. 177).

Israel et al. identify eight key principles for maximizing community engagement. The first principle is viewing community as a “unit of identity” composed of unique individuals but rooted in the social interactions of the group (p. 178). Identity in this understanding revolves around shared values, interests, needs, future investments, etc; however, when communities are primarily defined by geographical boundaries, this sense of shared identity may be weaker (p. 178).

The second principle “builds on the strengths and resources within the community;” it calls the research team to create an atmosphere where all community members can share their input (p. 178). The third principle emphasizes “collaborative partnerships in all phases of research” (p. 178). Unlike traditional methods that establish the researcher as an objective observer, CBR calls for shared ownership and control of the findings, with the community. The community-partner should be included in all stages: “problem definition, data collection, interpretation of results, and application for the results” (p. 179). In short, when addressing a community problem, the community must be involved.

Principle four “integrates knowledge and action for the mutual benefit of all partners” (p. 179). Principle five “promotes a co-learning and empowering process that attends to social inequalities” (p. 179). This principle emphasizes a reciprocal exchange of knowledge, skills, capacity, and power, between researchers and community members. It states that particular care

should be given to validate the voice of the marginalized members of society through this community engagement, and esteem the value of lived experience.

The sixth step refers to the “cyclical process” of assessing, defining, pursuing a research plan, interpreting the findings in context of the community problem, and then reassessing the objective (180). In this process, the researchers strive for awareness and sustainable initiatives rather than an immediate solution (p. 180). The seventh principle is to study the medical, social, political, ecological, and economic impacts on community health (p. 180). The final principle considers the fact that feedback in CBR is never completed; knowledge and data must be shared at all stages of the study, and community-partners must be treated as co-authors in the findings (p. 181).

Because of its interdisciplinary nature, CBR allows for more critical thought and reexamination of social priorities than more objective research methods. As a result, CBR faces certain challenges that are specifically related to its organic, community-dependent research plan. This article highlights the common problem of a lack of trust and respect between researchers and community-partner. Another problem is the inequitable distribution of power and control. Working with diverse groups of people often creates conflicts over different values and assumptions, and it can create logistical concerns because qualitative heavy research requires a significant time commitment (p. 184). Conflicts over funding and community representation are also common, especially if the project participants do not define the “community” in the same way (p. 184).

In response to these common challenges, the article offers several suggestions for improved CBR facilitation. The first recommendation discusses ways to involve the community in joint research projects, and emphasizes the need for “operating norms,” common goals, and confidentiality (p. 185). Democratic leadership within the research partnership is also important. For instance, a community organizer and support staff could facilitate the research objectives, improving their timeliness and accuracy (p. 186). The skills required of the researchers also include the following:

negotiation, listening, team development, conflict resolution, cultural understanding, self-reflection, humility, ability to admit mistakes, and flexibility (p. 187).

CBR's non-traditional research methods and community dependence, often causes its efficacy to be questioned; for instance, because of the limitations of accurate sampling, statistical significance is difficult to achieve (p. 188). But rather than a complete alternative to the scientific based research, CBR presents a balance between research and community-driven action. The importance of its study lies in the feedback, analysis of data from multiple sources, and relationship commitment (p. 188). Judgment of the data, largely qualitative, therefore requires particular discussion between the researchers and the community-partner (p. 188). Training in how to effectively implement CBR is also needed for more traditionally trained academics (p. 188).

Israel, B.A., Schulz, A.J., Parker, E.A., & Becker, A.B. (2001). Community-based participatory research: Policy recommendations for promoting a partnership approach in health research. *Education for health, 14(2), 182-197.*

Written from a health education focus, this article provides solid definitions of Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) and policy recommendations for its expansion at the institutional level. Israel, Schulz, Parker, and Becker begin by distinguishing between CBPR and Community-Based Research. The latter, they explain, “emphasizes conducting research *in* a community as a place or setting, with only limited, if any, involvement of community members;” in short, CBR is a “researcher-driven enterprise” (p. 184). CBPR, however includes one fundamental difference: participation. CBPR implies that the community is a “social and cultural entity” that is actively involved in the research process (Hatch et al., 1993; Schulz et al., 1998).

Israel et al. continue to define the nine key principles of CBPR. The first couple principles emphasize the integrity and unique identity of the community members; the community brings its own source of knowledge to the collaborative relationship, its own “strengths and resources” which should help direct the research planning and project. Later principles define the process of CBPR as

both “cyclical and iterative,” one that promotes “co-learning” and empowerment, as well as a “long-term commitment” from academic and community researchers (p. 184).

The policy recommendations that Israel et al. offer for increasing CBPR focus on the long-term nature of partnership. They also emphasize the role of sustainable funding, and the need to build funding partnerships as well as community partnerships. One challenge that Israel et al. cite is the short-term nature of grants and how the deadlines of grant applications may frustrate the process of building trust with a community, over time. Israel et al. iterate the need to plan for these sources of outside funding, and in this process, clearly identify common goals, set project objectives, and devise means for evaluating the project, with community members. Resources should be shared and utilized within the partnership, and the way in which this exchange will occur must be articulated so that all parties understand and agree to their role.

The ideal situation for CBPR would include five-year funding minimums. This funding would be directed to community-based organizations (CBO) as well as universities, and while the universities may need to assist with the distribution of these funds, they must not assume that the CBO cannot raise or manage the money without an intercessor. Instead, in the case of money and other decisions, community members should be empowered as leaders and valued as participators in the planning process.

Training plays a large role in the cyclical planning process, with a growing need for more researchers to be familiar with CBPR methods. This article suggests training for doctoral students to develop relationships at the community level and learn how to practice CBPR for their future projects. Israel et al. also argue for training programs that would help community members, and especially marginalized communities, increase their independence over financial and other resources. By training CBO staff, the university enables more community partner involvement and allows members of the community to sustain the project rather than depend on an outside academic to fill

the occupation or research gap. Finally, Israel et al. argue that in this partnership, the community should also be compensated for its time and effort. For example, the university could use its traditional methods of publication as an outlet to compensate the community partner for their time and participation; namely, spreading awareness of their need, project, and ongoing efforts or success.

Krieger, J., Allen, C., Cheadle, A., Ciske, S., Schier, J.K., Senturia, K., & Sullivan, M. (2002). Using community-based participatory research to address social determinants of health: Lessons learned from Seattle partners for health communities. *Health Education & Behavior*, 29(3), 361-382.

This article presents four case studies that partnered with the Seattle Partners for Healthy Communities (SPHC), “a multidisciplinary collection of community agencies, community activists, public health professionals, academics, and health providers who conduct research aimed at improving the health of urban, socioeconomically marginalized Seattle communities.” These case studies are particularly useful for the manner in which they address their main themes. Specifically, each study is described in terms of its program description, challenges and lessons learned, and post-project reflection. A helpful chart that synthesizes this information is included; the chart further breaks down ways that each project engaged the community: ways in which the community values were upheld, how the research process and outcomes will serve the community, and how the implemented project will be sustained by local staff and leadership.

Martin M. (1996). Issues of power in the participatory research process. In K. deKoning & M. Martin (Eds.), *Participatory research in health: Issues and experiences* (82-93). London: ZedBooks.

This article details Participatory Research (PR) and Feminist Research (FR), two methods that apply research aims to community (rather than strictly academic) needs. The strength of Martin’s analysis, however, lies in its discussion of power and how power creates challenges within the research process, team, and partnership.

In the context of power dynamics, PR and FR's definitions hold particular meaning. Citing Mulenga (1993), the article defines PR as a constant effort to reduce "the power often held by researchers who come from outside the community to do research, and by elite groups within the community...; the bias (of these methods) is towards marginalized groups in the community" (p.83). More important than quantitative or qualitative methods is, therefore, the fundamental question of who directs the research; the indication of a successful PR process is the cultivation of critical awareness and active consciousness among the community-university team (p. 83).

FR emphasizes sharing community perspectives, especially the stories of its female members. Critics claim that by challenging the male bias of traditional research and PR, FR "assumes a position of commonality across women's experiences of oppression, (and runs the risk of) ignoring differences of...national identity, class, race, sexuality, and disability" (p. 84). Citing Reinharz (1983), a prominent feminist researcher who combined the models of PR and FR, this article then offers her two stipulations for cooperative research partnerships as a model: the research aims appeal to the "researched and researcher" with findings that are "relevant to the needs of all those involved in the research" (p. 85).

As this article highlights, efforts to involve the community as power-holders can provoke challenges to the research process. For instance, community members might readily give the academic researchers the authority to choose a research method, because of the assumption that only the academics possess the qualifications and expertise (p. 86). Another common reaction is for community members to perceive that the role of co-researcher would take too much time away from their other responsibilities of work and family, or incur a burdensome financial cost (p. 87).

After discussing such scenarios and posing follow-up questions such as when/how/by whom is power wielded, this article discusses ways in which these challenges might improve through PR and FR's collaborative process. Trust, for example, might emerge from the "recognition by

community representatives that they could control many aspects of the study and would directly benefit from it” (p. 88). Post-decision reflection also would allow community members to learn from the failures and successes of the process, so as to share the costs and benefits of the research process with the academic community (p. 89).

The ways in which academic researchers and the partnering community interact are particularly viewed through the lens of power in this article. The following citation by Foucault best expresses the impact power as a social factor: it is “a dynamic, moving force” between researcher and research community (p. 89). And because of power’s fluctuating nature, it can challenge research aims and provoke intense emotions that divert researchers’ attention and thwart collaboration (p. 91). This article constantly reiterates that power is a “fluid, multi-faceted force that permeates all research activity” and that must be understood in the context of a specific community (p. 92); therefore, however much PR and FR strive for participation and collaboration, until the power structures of a society- particularly ethnicity, gender, and class (Mezirow 1995, p. 12)- are acknowledged, collaborative research will not occur.

Mcintyre, A. (2006). Activist research and student agency in universities and urban communities. *Urban Education*, 41(6), 628-647. doi: 10.1177/0042085906292510

Mcintyre writes about the trials facing urban schools and how the growing disparities between “oppression and privilege” weaken certain students’ “sense of agency” (p. 628). Her literature review expands upon this study of social class and how it impacts student participation and self-identification. The key to increasing student participation, or agency, she argues, is to make their academic lessons relevant and applicable to daily life.

While McIntyre’s article focuses on inner-city schools and the problems faced by these environments, it also discusses student engagement and, through project examples, Participatory Action Research (PAR) as a form of scholarship. These projects reveal that increased student agency

is not a panacea for the wide-ranging problems of the urban school community, but rather a tangible opportunity to improve students' ability to connect to and change these environments. For evidence, McIntyre offers the case study of a faculty member at Northeastern University who engaged her class of middle/upper middle class, white graduate students with an ethnically diverse elementary school in a lower socio-economic neighborhood.

This case study provides helpful insight into the challenges of PAR and the wide range of projects that this form of scholarship allows. The section "Challenging Beliefs and Assumptions in a PAR project" is particularly useful. It discusses PAR's abilities to overcome preconceptions of community groups, to rethink stereotypes of community members through direct interactions, to develop skills of listening and collaboration, and to gain a better sense of the local environment.

As the Northeastern faculty member noted in her reflection, the driving motivation for the participating students ended up being their desire and strengthened ability to spread awareness about community problems. McIntyre reemphasizes this sentiment in her conclusion. PAR as a research strategy, holds an ability to bridge individuals, construct knowledge through collaboration, and work within institutions- as evidenced in the university-public school partnership- that are wary of or unused to its experiential learning methods.

Mettetal, G., & Bryant, D. (1996). Service learning research projects: Empowerment in students, faculty, and communities. *College Training*, 44(1), 24-28.

Mettetal and Bryant identify service-learning as a model that "can service simultaneously as a vehicle for teaching, full-scale research, and community service" (p. 24). Their article further defines three components of a good service-learning project: it must 1) relate to students' learning goals, 2) serve a community need in some way, and 3) research acts as a way to apply knowledge and theory (p. 25). When these components are fulfilled, students benefit from a learning environment

where they gain research experience and train with local organizations, while providing a free service to the community (p. 25).

A particular strength of this article is the Venn diagram that offers a visual analysis of PAR and the ways in which service, learning, and research all complement each other in academic and community-based learning. Mettetal and Bryant further identify keen observation and social interaction as untraditional but vital skills of the action-oriented researcher. PAR requires the researcher to deal with a range of emotions, both his own and those of the other community members, and develop a sense of team commitment within these varying perspectives (p. 26); it also supports teaching that prepares students to act as contributors in the larger society (p. 26). PAR projects specifically strive to influence students beyond their class term and build networks between all students ever involved in the project (p. 26). Mettetal and Bryant view this transfer of knowledge as a vital component of students' future educational success (p. 27). And while faculty should facilitate a balance between the class's academic objectives and commitment to community needs, sharing knowledge and resources supports social reform, combats negative impressions of the university, and enables future research projects between university and community partners (pp. 27-28).

Morton, K., & Troppe, M. (1996). From the margin to the mainstream: Campus compact's project on integrating service with academic study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(1), 21-32.

Morton and Troppe propose that one unifying characteristic between the multiple definitions of service-learning, is the fact that it is a "pedagogy that works from a common assumption about how people learn," namely by experience (p. 21). Citing John Dewey and Jane Addams as pioneers in the field of service-learning, this article briefly discusses the role of teamwork that Dewey's work emphasized. In his words, "people often learn best in teams, when they build upon what they already

know, when they understand the purpose of what they are learning, when what they are learning clarifies their values, and through experimentation” (p. 22).

Morton and Troppe reiterate the role of teamwork, and define service-learning as a means of teaching academic content and values by committing students to the community; the students define their personal values and gain context for the classroom material in the process (p. 22). Three comparative studies on service-learning are cited, which further define this educational approach by comparing it to the traditional classroom model. Among the conclusions that are drawn from these studies, the first is that the traditional classroom obscures learning “through abstraction rather than direct experience” (p. 22). Second, the classroom favors an “information-assimilation” approach to learning, or a regurgitation of information rather than service-learning’s “bottom-up approach” (p. 22). The role of reflection and post-service discussion are also identified as a key step in the learning process (p. 22).

This article argues that service-learning is not a common educational technique in universities partly because it requires a significant commitment of time and effort to nurture the community-university partnership (p. 23). Specifically, more time is required of the faculty than in a lecture-based course, thereby taking more time away from research or publications (p. 23). Morton and Troppe call for more support to teachers who are trying to implement service-learning (p. 23). They then present a brief history of Campus Compact, a network that supports a wide range of service-learning programs on college campuses.

An important distinction is made between volunteerism and service-learning on page 25. The authors designate that the former does not necessarily integrate into the curriculum to teach “citizenship” (p. 25). And even if these volunteer opportunities “enliven or reinforce the content of a particular course (they) do not necessarily lead to an improved quality of life in a community”- the

goal of service-learning (p. 25). Service-learning, in other words, must respond to the needs of a community and strive to impact change.

Morton and Troppe explain that for these goals to be achieved in higher education, programs must tap into existing “reward systems” and institutional structure (p. 26). For a university to value service-learning, it should commit department funds to the program, send faculty to service-learning workshops as a means of increasing their course options and implementation, and hire staff to oversee the community-university partnerships that emerge from these classes (p. 26). The authors suggest that a program’s success is determined by the faculty’s ability to understand and work within the institutional channels, relaying their service-learning proposal in a clear way that speaks directly to the university’s mission (p. 26). Similarly, a successful integration of service and academic learning requires a supportive community. Morton and Troppe emphasize the importance of a “continuity of staff, faculty, and/or administrative support” (p. 27). They encourage faculty to enlist the available resources within the institution, regardless of the stage of program development. As these authors view the process, there are three options for successful service-learning implementation: 1) make service-learning a component of a class, 2) make service-learning a distinct discipline, or 3) create a central hub on campus for service-learning resources and opportunities (p. 27).

Nyden, P., & Wiewel, W. (1992). Collaborative research: harnessing the tensions between researcher and practitioner. *The American Sociologist*, 24, 43–55.

Nyden and Wiewel discuss the fluctuations in national support and resources for community-based research (CBR) and distinguish it from other research methods. Specifically this article explains the roles of advocacy and action in the CBR process and how these components might result from the process but do not define it; the end goal of CBR is the “transfer of knowledge” (p. 44). This transfer includes the knowledge of how to conduct research because in CBR the ‘researcher’

and 'client' are "mutual partners" who share in defining the problem statement and project objectives (p. 44). CBR, in this relationship, calls for a balance of power between academic interests and community representation (p. 47).

Within this balance lie the contrasting aims of academic objectivity and community costs of time and money. For instance, the academic researchers' goals often frustrate a community's "need of quick, clear answers to very pressing problems" or simply miss this urgency in the desire to look at problems from a larger, more theoretical scope (pp. 47-48). Nyden and Wiewel call for more interdisciplinary research and research teams as a means of addressing this clash; in their words, "collaborative research that seeks solutions to social problems and negotiates the difficult line between what the discipline needs and what a community needs, should be put on equal footing with exclusively discipline-oriented research" (p. 50). Thus, by rethinking the very "perceptions of the research process," academic researchers will be better prepared to understand their community partners and communicate their message- ideally in the local language (p. 51). In turn, "community leaders need to recognize the importance of carefully designed research and the critical eye of the researcher" as a resource to build and strengthen programs; consequently, the academic researcher becomes more than a mere "outsider" and grows closer to the role of collaborator (p. 52).

CBR adds a personal, human element to social problems and, in this way, makes them more than theoretical, objective research questions. To underscore this relationship between theory and action, Nyden and Wiewel conclude with a call for "community-orientated internship programs for students and for current community activists," as a way to create a "generation of researchers interested in careers of community-sensitive collaborative research" (p. 52). They detail these internship programs as a means to build empowering, knowledge exchanges rather than relationships based on "selling and buying of research services" (p. 53).

Paul, E. L. (2009). Community-based undergraduate research. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education* (pp.196-212). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Elizabeth Paul defines community-based research (CBR) as “scientific inquiry conducted collaboratively by a team of community citizens and leaders, students, and faculty in service of community-identified needs and aims; “research, civic engagement, and liberal learning” intersect to engage both students and teachers in an interdisciplinary learning experience (p. 196). In this way, CBR presents a process of learning that invites each individual into the redefined, research process (p. 197).

The fluidity of student-teacher roles that CBR particularly creates, increases the levels of responsibility and the understanding of the participants; students “move toward self-authorship” as the teacher becomes “facilitator- rather than supplier or director- of learning” (p. 198). Similarly, effective partnerships between the campus and community are rooted in cooperation: both parties must have the ability to share their experience and knowledge (p. 198). These mutual, rather than charitable, contributions facilitate a “co-learning process” and require a significant level of trust between campus and community members (p. 200).

The uniqueness of this trust-based, reciprocal relationship subjects it to higher standards than other research models. Specifically, CBR must prove itself not only as a research tool, but also as a strategy to address community needs and an impetus for community action (p. 200). Paul particularly highlights the university’s need to uphold its commitment to community-based projects. She advises a review process which includes community members and discusses how to implement research findings or seek additional funding. The post-research reflection, which follows this discussion, should be similarly inclusive because reflection between partners not only brings awareness to the lessons learned but it also allows the participants to revisit the original, community problem from a new perspective (p. 201).

At present, Paul asserts, there is a visible discrepancy between universities' civic intentions and their application of community-engaged programs. She particularly notes the many barriers that CBR faces in the traditional, academic environment, and cites some of these obstacles as reasons for the lower levels of institutional support. For instance, the lack of faculty training in community-engaged work lessens the university's willingness to pursue or preparation for CBR (p. 202). The issue of access is also a problem for students, as many universities bar undergraduates from CBR opportunities and only allow them to participate in community partnerships through service-learning, non-research courses (pp. 202-203). Issues of funding similarly frustrate research projects or display disparities between the campus and community members, thereby creating an unequal relationship rather than a partnership (p. 203).

Joined by their quest for reciprocal partnerships, CBR models should and do vary depending on the project type- team based or individual work- length of project, or learning outcomes (p. 204). The origins of a campus-community relationship might be a shared and timely crisis, a pre-existing volunteer program, or a service-learning class (p. 205). CBR also requires an understanding of each partner's motivations and functions as an evolutionary model (p. 207). For instance, partners who set realistic goals that they are willing to modify for a flexible, research environment, have the most CBR success (p. 208). And only participants whose decision making process allows all voices to be heard, will establish the equitable relationship necessary for partnership (p. 208).

These characteristics of CBR create an opportunity for multigenerational relationships, student empowerment through the "realness of the work," and social improvements through the direct application of new skills and findings (p. 209). Because of this range of benefits and the potential they hold for learning at the university level, Paul concludes with the argument for stronger mentors among the faculty, to initiate and support CBR experiences (p. 210).

Peters, S.J., Jordan, N.P., Adamek, M., & Alter, T.R. (2006). *Engaging campus and community: The practice of public scholarship in the state and land-grant university system*. Dayton: Kettering Foundation Press.

This text describes case studies that seek to transform college and university students into engaged citizens, active in the economic, social, cultural, and political issues of their local communities.

Puma, J., Bennett, L., Cutforth, N., Tombari, C., & Stein, P. (2009). A case study of a community-based participatory evaluation research (CBPER) project: Reflections on promising practices and shortcomings. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15(2), 34-47. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0015.203>

Puma et al. describe their project with particular care to define the method of CBPER and evaluate the program's effectiveness within the context of their community-partner. The Shortcomings and Lessons Learned sections expand upon this in-depth evaluation and offer a valuable chart and list of steps for improvement.

Reardon, K.M. (1998). *Participatory action research as service learning*. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 73, 57-64.

This article traces the history of university-based Participatory Action Research (PAR) from the labor reform efforts of the Seventies to present day models. Portland State University is noted for its leadership in the area of community engagement, and its move to make community engagement a bachelor's degree requirement. Reardon further defines PAR and its modern applications as a truer form of engagement than seen in the "professional-expert research model" (p. 57). The latter involves the community to the degree that their involvement serves the researcher's academic agenda; the research does not necessarily respond to a community need or allow for community voices to be heard.

In contrast to this traditional method, PAR "actively involves local residents as co-investigators on an equal basis with university-trained scholars in each step of the research process" (p. 59). Research is constantly being "reframed" as new knowledge is generated from interactions

with the community (p. 59). Reardon argues that the ideal research method combines both quantitative and qualitative methods, and follows this process of constant review. He also argues for local problem-solving teams who would actively work with communities to address their needs, and use academic and publication resources to spread awareness of these needs.

When the needs are identified in such a manner, there is less chance that the community problems are misrepresented or interpreted out of their localized context. PAR facilitates a knowledge exchange within the community that can bridge the community-academia gap and build more sustainable relationships than researcher-subject projects. The heightened levels of awareness that PAR creates may also lead to higher degrees of citizenship and better informed action from the whole community. Members of the campus-community team gain experience working as part of a collaborative and working with individuals from various disciplines.

Reardon offers the East St. Louis Farmers' Market as an example of a personal, successful PAR experience. This mini case study provides a model for his previous discussion of PAR's ability to incorporate community needs and student voices, and build a research team of contributing members. To accomplish this collaboration, universities should be sensitive to the challenges of PAR: 1) the projects or solutions to community needs that are not taken up and implemented by community officials, may subject universities to community disappointment or protest; 2) universities may face criticism if their findings lead to a redistribution of resources, especially if more resources are given to formerly marginalized communities; 3) strategies that are proposed and implemented too fast may overwhelm local officials. To ease these three challenges, local leaders should take the initiative in proposing needs and implementing changes.

Reardon, K.M. (2006). Promoting reciprocity within community/university development partnerships: Lessons from the field. *Planning Practice and Research*, 21(1), 95-107. doi.org/10.1080/02697450600901566

Reardon's article refers to his involvement with ten Campus Compact directed community-university partnerships at schools throughout the nation. From this list, he details three case studies and compares the level and type of leadership, particular challenges, economic constraints, and organizational/scheduling conflicts that occurred at each site. His introduction provides a particularly useful definition of the degrees and varying forms of partnership, while his final reflection offers a succinct comparison of the previously mentioned issues.

Seifer, S.D. (2005). *Tips and strategies for developing strong community-based research proposals*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccpb.info>

This link presents a helpful, two pages of questions and concerns to keep in mind when conducting CBR. Examples include what to do when there is no overlap between community priorities and research objectives, or when a community is only defined by its needs and not its social capital or strengths. This guide also provides links to the CCPH list-serve and funding links for health-related CBR projects.

Seifer, S.D., Shore, N., & Drew, E. *Ethics of Community Engaged Research*. (2009). Article posted to <http://primr.blogspot.com/2009/02/ethics-of-community-engaged-research.html>

This blog by Community-Campus Partnerships for Health's senior consultants, argues that CBR requires a multi-perspective review process because it includes ethical concerns (community relevance, community participation, mutual capacity building, and community building) that are distinct from more traditional research programs. CBR also requires an alternative review method because the research's objective and success are defined in relation to a community need. Two proposed alternatives are reporting to a community organization's board of directors for input, or creating a coalition of community organizations in place of a traditional Institutional Review Board (IRB). CBR evokes specific research questions as well, such as the following: 1) "How can we ensure that human subjects' research protections extend to both the individuals and communities

involved in research?” or 2) “What should be the roles of institution-based and community-based processes for research ethics review?”

Seifer, S.D., Shore, N., Holmes, S.L. (2003). *Developing and sustaining community-university partnerships for health research: Infrastructure requirements*. Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/p-nih012903.pdf

This article provides general knowledge on common challenges and strengths of CBR and strategies for how to prepare the research to accommodate for them. It particularly identifies nine common issues that challenge research goals, such as the fact that CBR might be viewed by the academic community as an inferior mode of research and receive less funding as a result. The nine issues are deconstructed and paired with solutions to overcome their challenge to community engagement. These recommendations combine general suggestions with specific information that is appropriate for each level of the university/CBR partnership.

Advice is also given on how to develop and sustain partnerships, specifically what is required in terms of faculty/staff/students, university structures, processes and policies, and experience levels. The need for shared definitions is emphasized as a foundation in which community and research objectives can begin. The five recommendations include the following: building infrastructure with community-university partnerships, policies and procedures, financial resources, human resources, and “hard” infrastructure (access to libraries and archives, meeting and parking space, computers and internet access, etc.). This article identifies the strength of CBR as its power to dispel assumptions and narrowed thinking, through community involvement and community partner representation in research decisions.

Shore, N., Wong, K.A., Seifer, S.D., & Grignon, J. (2008). Introduction to special issue: Advancing the ethics of community-based participatory research [PDF document]. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 1556-2646. Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/JERHRE_intro.pdf

Community-based participatory research (CBPR) is identified by its potential to improve community health: as CBPR increases community participation, the chances of creating a workable solution with maximized benefits and minimized deficits, also increase (p. 1). In other words, by including more voices, common concerns are better addressed (p. 1).

And as CBPR rises in popularity, more researchers are forming committees to review their research and ethics in community-based engagements (p. 1). This article particularly argues for a combined review process of communities and institutions, ethics and academics (p. 3). It also cites a common frustration to this alternative review: as CBR often involves communities experiencing “social injustices and inequities,” an efficient review process that includes all of a community’s voices, might be difficult to achieve (p. 3).

Silka, L. (2004). Partnerships within and beyond universities: Opportunities and challenges. *Public Health Reports, 119*(1), 73-78.

A useful section of this article, Addressing Concerns about Partnerships, looks into the reason that partnerships first became a part of research models (p. 119). Individual, objective studies are increasingly being replaced by community-centered, multi-discipline approaches in order to effectively address problems (p. 119). One main objection to partnership-based research is the significant amount of time it requires when contrasted with more objective, distanced models (p. 120). Silka responds to this criticism and argues that only partnership-based research brings awareness to interrelated projects across academic disciplines, so as to combine resources, effort, and solution strategies (p. 120).

Small, S.A. (1995). Action-oriented research: Models and methods. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 57*(4), 941-955.

Small opens this article by equating “conventional social science research” to the “positivistic scientific paradigm,” or the classically objective research method that strives to predict and then dictate human behavior (p. 941). Small then denotes four research models that lie outside of the

positivistic option: action research, participatory research, empowerment research, and feminist research.

Under the action research model of Kurt Lewin, researchers assume the dual mission of altering and “generating critical knowledge about” a social system (p. 942). This model is thus closest to the postpositivist model, which rejects the “objectivity and separation of researcher from what or whom is researched, the superiority of the researcher as expert, and the ability of the research process to be value neutral” (p. 942). In the action research model, research is instead grounded in a community problem and rooted in a specific population; this unique environment creates a research question that is ever evolving and inseparable from the community it involves (p. 942). In other words, as the relationship with the community develops, so does the researcher’s question and means of understanding it. Both the researcher and the community are valued for their contributions of “expertise and knowledge,” and the researcher must assume the duty of incorporating these multiple perspectives and participants into his study (p. 943).

Participatory research unites the three components of research, education, and action, in the effort to “bring about a more just society through transformative social change” (p. 943). Author Stephen Small explains that this model is particularly appropriate for dealing with “oppressed, exploited, and disenfranchised groups” and other communities where there are large class divisions and power structures (pp. 943-944). Participatory research increases access to information and reveals how learning depends on community inputs not research controls. This model is unique from other research methods as it emphasizes what Small calls the “politicalization of the inquiry” (p. 943); in other words, the research collaboration involves community members as “full partners” not subjects of study (p. 943). The objective of the researcher in this process is to facilitate and open leadership opportunities for community members. The researchers’ expertise thus chooses research methods and engages participants, while the community members help design and contribute to the

process (p. 943). The research process is the means through which the participatory model involves community members, combats social isolation, implements social change, and boosts self-confidence and learning (p. 944).

Empowerment research is based on the understanding that “there are multiple and constructed realities (and) that human behavior is time and context bound” (p. 945). As a result, the researcher cannot be completely objective because each community member acts as a co-researcher to actively direct the project’s analysis. In this model, the researcher does more than facilitate; he must create an environment in which each participant recognizes and taps into his own potential (p. 946). The primary function of empowerment research is to strengthen the community’s relationships to the environment, each other, other communities, and other cultures (p. 946). Small argues that empowerment research is capable of working with a variety of other research methods, but it is more impacted by “ethics and goals” than other methods because of the primacy of relationship building (p. 946). As a result, qualitative research suits this model’s research aims and best captures the variety of “expectations, perceptions, and preferences” the many participants contribute (p. 946).

The feminist research model’s goal is to free women from male dominance in society (p. 946). It stems from the understanding that most research comes from male authors and is biased by this gendered perspective (p. 946). Research questions thus target the assumed “patriarchal nature of society” and call for equality through their language, subject, and community engagement (p. 947). The core of this equality lies in the “egalitarian relationship between researchers and participants,” in which participants’ emotions and needs are validated and valued within the research process (p. 949). Feminist research espouses the belief in multiple truths and allows these truths to guide its findings (p. 949).

Action-oriented research models pursue questions that will likely lead to social change and are easily altered to address changing social needs (p. 948). Stephen Small reiterates the vital role the

community plays in forming these questions (p. 948); proposals for social change must be specific to the local population, its needs and geography. Unlike the traditional positivistic model that views community members as passive “human subjects,” all action-oriented methods rely on community members as collaborators in the research process (p. 949). Questions are guided by morals and ethics, while objective research analyses are rejected as impossible (p. 949).

In other words, the four previously discussed methods (action, participatory, empowerment, and feminist research) all base their actions on knowing the community, the community’s current situation, and the implications research could have on community relationships (p. 949). The immediate impact of involving the local community as participants in the research process is that these members will feel connected to the research and the findings will have a greater significance for them, possibly contributing to a better future (p. 949).

Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). *Community-based research and higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

This book discusses the methods and reasons to implement community-based research (CBR) in higher education. The initial chapters particularly provide a clear comparison of traditional academic research (TAR) and community-based research (CBR), and the ways in which CBR can be an effective, impactful, and inclusive learning tool. A second comparison pits the action research model against the participatory research model; both methods pioneered the integration of learning with social activism, and therefore served as early influences for CBR.

The first chapter identifies the three principles of CBR as the following: it is a 1) “collaborative enterprise between academic researchers and community members,” 2) it “validates multiple sources of knowledge and promotes the use of multiple methods of discovery and dissemination of the knowledge produced” 3) it has “as its goal social action and social change for the purpose of achieving social justice” (p. 8). These components explain that CBR differs from TAR

primarily in its emphasis on collaboration. For example, while the goal of TAR is to “advance knowledge within a discipline,” CBR strives to “contribute to the betterment of a particular community: social change, social justice” (p. 9); while TAR poses a research question that addresses “theoretical or empirical work in a discipline,” CBR focuses on a “community-identified problem or need for information” (p. 9). The researchers and community members also work as a team in the CBR model, establishing a long-term relationship, analyzing the interconnections of problems, and presenting their findings directly to the community through a range of media forms (p. 9).

The chapter Methodological Principles emphasizes the need for community organizing skills among researchers. Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, and Donohue begin by stating that the principal goal of research is not to tire the community but, through a relationship with them as partner, work together to tackle a social justice concern (p. 73). The researchers should tap into the knowledge and resources already existing within the community and find ways to expand upon them through sharing common goals; for example, “identifying shortcomings or injustices in the agency’s work, or other kinds of information that might be the basis for some sort of change that benefits the community” (p. 74). Some options to include the community are through community-partner representatives on research teams, reviewers of research drafts, or focus group members to assess the research findings; researchers can also contribute to a community organization as staff support, an especially helpful resource when organizations are overtaxed and understaffed (p. 74). In these instances when the community-partner is limited in the amount of time they can commit to the research project, careful judgment is required on the part of the academic team so as to ensure an appropriate representation of the community needs (p. 76).

As previously mentioned, the purpose of CBR’s research must stem from a community need, not simply an academic interest (p. 75). Research needs to reflect the “language, worldview, (etc.),” which necessitates an established relationship and understanding (p. 76). Thus the goal of research is

not just accuracy and academic relevance, but it's "usefulness to the community to help bring about social change" (p. 77). For Strand et al. this goal requires "multiple methods of data collecting," and especially relies on qualitative data more than other research methodologies (p. 78). For example, various perspectives could come from "interviews, focus groups, and observation...community meetings, video documentaries, legislative records, shared testimonies, or public art..." (p. 140). Acquiring these multiple perspectives inevitably means working with a wide range of personalities and necessitates flexibility and patience in the successful researcher. It also calls for an interdisciplinary, systems approach to community problems, one that analyzes issues through a political, social, and economic lens rather than strictly the academic discipline of the researchers. Knowledge of the past and present concerns as well as perspectives from inside and outside of the community, all shed light on the problem and prepare a better assessment of the findings (p. 80).

CBR does not value the objectivity of traditional research, but rather views the reciprocal relationship as key to getting accurate knowledge about the community in question. Trust is a key ingredient in this partnership-building goal, as the researchers' desire to 'study' a community could create wariness, especially without a pre-established relationship. In addition, the research must go beyond 'studying' and contribute to a community if it is to be worthwhile; the research objectives should not overwhelm the community but, at every stage, include its members as partners (p. 87). In other words, the key strategy of successful CBR is for the research project to be one of collaboration (p. 85). Thus, the project's success is not defined in terms of accurate data, but rather by the researchers' ability to explain the data's relevance and apply it through collective action within the community (p. 83).

The Methodology chapter concludes with a detailed explanation of SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) as one strategy for developing and reassessing research plans. It reiterates that research is a component of, not a complete means to, social change

(p. 95). It also provides a clear, five step layout for ways to implement social change through CBR that is a good general overview that provides examples from past projects.

The chapter entitled *Research Practices in CBR* delves into the five step guide identified in the previous chapter. It offers advice on ways to reframe ambitious goals into manageable, more term-friendly projects suitable for academic schedules. The chapter also recommends ways to gauge resources, population characteristics, population accessibility, skills of the research group, and the nature of research questions. More details are included on how to sample a community group, enlist participants, and tackle ethical issues that might arise when working with institutional review boards. And as CBR often supports non-traditional forms of data presentation, recommendations on how to interpret and best display unconventional, non-literary formats are also discussed.

Community-Based Research as a Teaching Strategy is a chapter that delves into the student's participatory role in CBR. It distinguishes CBR from volunteering, fieldtrips, or outside of class projects, and provides an honest review of the challenges when incorporating CBR as part of a discipline specific class or university requirements. It discusses the drawbacks of working within a community, and the unpredictability it entails, as well as the potentially lower levels of self-awareness, cultural sensitivity, commitment, and responsibility found among undergraduate students, which could impact research success (p. 136). CBR and service-learning are explained in terms of the collaborative learning it affords students and how this learning influences social change. CBR is further analyzed in terms of its inherent cross-disciplinary nature and its ability to nurture critical perspectives in students. Page 125 notes that as CBR brings value to the "lived experiences" of the students and community partners, it tends to motivate learning and cooperation. Specifically, CBR favors collaborative learning over the traditional, hierarchical separation between student and teacher (p. 129). Among the few drawbacks that are discussed, the main weakness of CBR is when projects

do not significantly benefit the communities they engage and thus, do not adequately address a community need.

The chapter entitled “Teaching Community-Based Research” speaks to CBR’s potential to unite “teaching, research, and service in exciting and promising ways” as it promotes hands-on experience in the discipline rather than just theories (p. 138). Suggestions are offered for ways to incorporate CBR into all disciplines, such as history, biology, and sociology (pp. 139-140). Strand et al. also recommend ways to supplement a current course syllabus with CBR components, or create independent studies that would foster community-partnerships beyond the traditional course requirements (p. 143). Perhaps the most valuable section of this chapter addresses the issue of student readiness in light of CBR opportunities. The first step in improving this level of preparation is to gauge and build knowledge of the community with which the students will work (p. 145). This chapter also specifies texts that could be included as part of a students’ preparation for challenging cultural and social issues found in community work (p. 145). An ongoing discussion of the research and collaboration between student and community-partner is also crucial so that the student does not feel that his or her objective is to do research *on* a population, but *with* them (p. 151). Choices for CBR sites and projects should also be given to the students whenever possible, so as to maximize interest and ownership (p. 155). The chapter concludes with a discussion on how to structure, delegate, and evaluate the CBR experience.

Organizing for Community-based Research provides models for organizing CBR depending on the size of the class, available resources, and institutional support. It argues for the creation of a CBR center on the college campus, as a site in which to organize and build long-term relationship across many facets of the local community (p. 173). A particularly helpful discussion includes ideas on how to manage authority relations and divide responsibilities between the research group, community-partner, and institution. Helpful diagrams of the “multi-plex role relations,” such as the

expectations and influences placed on the academic researchers, and interests of the community researcher, clarify the interconnected web of relationships that frustrates and is supported by CBR initiatives (p. 173).

The chapter entitled *Managing Community-Based Research* returns to the idea of a CBR center as a main hub for resources, recruitment, and networking on a university campus. While this chapter focuses mainly on university initiatives, it also discusses the role of the community-partner, how to locate an appropriate community-partner for one's research interests, and how to tap the university institution for support and resources as the community partnership grows. Internships, research assistantships, and volunteer positions are also applicable components to maintain a CBR relationship and future research opportunities (p. 222). This chapter's discussion of the moral, civic, and social responsibility required in a community partnership is particularly strong. It emphasizes the need to prepare students for the potential risks they will face in their community setting, and the similar need for a public relations team to seek future participants or community partners, and spread awareness to the general public.

A Look to the Future reiterates the role of CBR in challenging the assumptions of students, faculty, and community members about the ability of university research to directly impact change. The final pages particularly discuss ways to incorporate CBR into continuing-education or graduate level students, leadership development, and student scholarship programs. It also provides resources on how to create web site systems that help connect community needs with university resources and research objectives.

Bibliography

- Ahmed, S.M., Beck, B., Maurana, C.A., & Newton, G. (2004). Overcoming barriers to effective community-based participatory research in US medical schools. *Education for Health, 17*(2), 141-151.
- Bringle, R.G., Clayton, P., & Price, M. (2009). Partnerships in service learning and civic engagement. *Partnerships: A journal in service learning and civic engagement, 1*(1), 1-20.
- Calderon, J. (2004). Lessons from an activist intellectual: Participatory research, teaching, and learning for social change. *Latin American Perspectives, 31*(1), 81-94.
- Calleson, D.C., Jordan, C., & Seifer, S.D. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? *Academic Medicine, 80*(4), 317-321.
- Campus Community Partners for Health. (2009). *Promoting healthy public policy through community-based participatory research: Ten case studies* [PDF document]. Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/CBPR_final.pdf
- Carter, M., Rivero, E., Cadge, W., & Curran, S. (2002). Designing your community-based learning project: Five questions to ask about your pedagogical and participatory goals. *Teaching Sociology, 30*(2), 158-173.
- Checkoway, B. (2001). Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *The Journal of Higher Education, 72*(2), 125-147.
- Community-Based Collaboratives Research Consortium. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.cbrc.org>
- Community-campus partnerships for health: Transforming communities & higher education.* (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.ccph.info>
- Corrigan, D. (2000). The changing role of schools and higher education institutions with respect to community-based interagency collaboration and interprofessional partnerships. *Peabody Journal of Education, 75*(3), 176-195.
- Cushman, E. (1999). The public intellectual, service learning, and activist research. *College English, 61*(3), 328-336.
- Edwards, K.E., & Gibson, N.L. (2008). Knowledge profiling as emergent theory in community-based participatory research. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action 2*(1), pp. 73-79.
- Fitch, B., & Kirby, A. (2000). Students' assumptions and professors' presumptions: Creating a learning community for the whole student. *College Teaching, 48*(2), 47-54.
- Gibson, C.M. (2009). *Research universities and engaged scholarship: A leadership agenda for renewing the civic mission of higher education.* Retrieved from <http://www.compact.org/resources>
- Giles, D.E., Jr., & Eyler, J. (1998). A service learning research agenda for the next five years. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 73*, 65-72.
- Hall, B.L. (1992). From margins to center? The development and purpose of participatory research. *The American Sociologist, 23*, 15-28.
- Israel, B.A., Schulz, A.J., Parker, E.A., & Becker, A.B. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/rwjscsp-cbpr-resources.pdf
- Israel, B.A., Schulz, A.J., Parker, E.A., & Becker, A.B. (2001). Community-based participatory research: Policy recommendations for promoting a partnership approach in health research. *Education for health, 14*(2), 182-197.
- Krieger, J., Allen, C., Cheadle, A., Ciske, S., Schier, J.K., Senturia, K., & Sullivan, M. (2002). Using community-based participatory research to address social determinants of health: Lessons

- learned from Seattle partners for health communities. *Health Education & Behavior*, 29(3), 361-382.
- Martin M. (1996). Issues of power in the participatory research process. In K. deKoning & M. Martin (Eds.), *Participatory research in health: Issues and experiences* (82-93). London: ZedBooks.
- Mcintyre, A. (2006). Activist research and student agency in universities and urban communities. *Urban Education*, 41(6), 628-647. doi: 10.1177/0042085906292510
- Mettetal, G., & Bryant, D. (1996). Service learning research projects: Empowerment in students, faculty, and communities. *College Training*, 44(1), 24-28.
- Morton, K., & Troppe, M. (1996). From the margin to the mainstream: Campus compact's project on integrating service with academic study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(1), 21-32.
- Nyden, P., & Wiewel, W. (1992). Collaborative research: Harnessing the tensions between researcher and practitioner. *The American Sociologist*, 24, 43-55.
- Paul, E. L. (2009). Community-based undergraduate research. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education* (pp.196-212). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Peters, S.J., Jordan, N.P., Adamek, M., & Alter, T.R. (2006). *Engaging campus and community: The practice of public scholarship in the state and land-grant university system*. Dayton: Kettering Foundation Press.
- Puma, J., Bennett, L., Cutforth, N., Tombari, C., & Stein, P. (2009). A case study of a community-based participatory evaluation research (CBPER) project: Reflections on promising practices and shortcomings. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15(2), 34-47. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0015.203>
- Reardon, K.M. (1998). Participatory action research as service learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 73, 57-64.
- Reardon, K.M. (2006). Promoting reciprocity within community/university development partnerships: Lessons from the field. *Planning Practice and Research*, 21(1), 95-107. doi.org/10.1080/02697450600901566
- Seifer, S.D. (2005). *Tips and strategies for developing strong community-based research proposals*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccph.info>
- Seifer, S.D., Shore, N., & Drew, E. *Ethics of Community Engaged Research*. (2009). Article posted to <http://primr.blogspot.com/2009/02/ethics-of-community-engaged-research.html>
- Seifer, S.D., Shore, N., Holmes, S.L. (2003). *Developing and sustaining community-university partnerships for health research: Infrastructure requirements*. Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/p-nih012903.pdf
- Shore, N., Wong, K.A., Seifer, S.D., & Grignon, J. (2008). Introduction to special issue: Advancing the ethics of community-based participatory research [PDF document]. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 1556-2646. Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/JERHRE_intro.pdf
- Silka, L. (2004). Partnerships within and beyond universities: Opportunities and challenges. *Public Health Reports*, 119(1), 73-78.
- Small, S.A. (1995). Action-oriented research: Models and methods. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 57(4), 941-955.
- Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). *Community-based research and higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.