



ASIAN & PACIFIC ISLANDER
AMERICAN HEALTH FORUM

www.apiahf.org

**Health Brain Trust on Data & Research
May 1-2, 2008
Houston**

**COMMUNITY BASED PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH
-- Benefits and Challenges --**

Benefits of CBPR for Community and Researcher (Kagawa-Singer 2000)

Issue	Community	Research
Voice	Gives voice to the heretofore silent members of the community	Understanding the greater good that can be accomplished with science
Relevance/validity	Data produced will actually be reflective of the lived world of the community	Ability to have more representative samples of particular populations.
Access to hard to reach communities	Communities that have been overlooked and understudied will be visible	Test strategies in new populations for generalizability
Expands the research paradigm for more valid science	Expertise as members of their own community will be recognized as valuable.	Improve the science by increasing validity & generalizability.

Benefits of CBPR for Policymaker and Funder

There are benefits for policymakers and funders too. Although this is rarely discussed Usually when people say “collaboration” they refer to the collaboration between community and academics. There is also a need for constant and continuous collaboration with policymakers and funders; especially as it promotes result/action oriented philanthropy. And it is the most viable form of research that contributes to reducing disparities. CBPR has been identified as a “*potent approach to collaboratively studying and acting to address health disparities*” (Minkler et al. 2003) and it has been identified as “*compatible with cultural values*” in other minorities of color (Strickland 2006)

Challenges and Facilitating Factors in CBPR

Challenges/Barriers	Facilitating Factors
<i>PARTNERSHIP RELATED ISSUES</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of trust and respect • Inequitable distribution of power and control • Conflicts associated with differences in perspective, priorities, assumptions, values, beliefs and language • Conflicts over funding (e.g. budget control overhead) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Needed by community for sustainability of programs & build capacity; ▪ Needed by academia for promotion & survival of young investigators; • Time consuming process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ for community 1-2 years ▪ for research 3-5 years or longer • Conflicts associated with different emphases on task and process • Purpose <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community (advocacy, application) ▪ Research (research) • Who represents “community” and how is community defined • Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community (benefit now, quality improvement, evaluation) ▪ Research (no immediate benefit, randomized control study = nonintervention community); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jointly developed operating norms • Identification of common goals and objectives • Democratic leadership • Presence of community organizer • Involvement of support staff/team • Researcher role, skills and competencies • Prior history of positive working relationships • Identification of key community members
<i>METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions of scientific quality of the research • Proving intervention success • Inability to fully specify all aspects of research up-front • Seeking balance between research and action • Time demands • Interpreting and integrating data from multiple sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodological flexibility and different criteria for judging quality • Involvement of community members in research activities • Conduct community assessment/diagnosis • Development of jointly agreed upon research principles • Conduct educational forums and training opportunities • Involve partners in the publishing process • Create interdisciplinary research teams

Challenges/Barriers	Facilitating Factors
<i>BROADER SOCIAL, POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, INSTITUTIONAL AND CULTURAL ISSUES</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competing institutional demands • Risks associated with achieving tenure and promotion within academia • Expectations/demands of funding institutions • Political and social dynamics within the community • Deterrents to institutional, community and social change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad-based support: top down and bottom up • Provision of financial and other incentives • Actions promoting policy changes
<i>GEOGRAPHIC ISSUES ???</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional • Researcher availability and expertise in certain areas, specifically related to certain populations 	

References

Israel B, Schulz AJ, Parker EA, Becker AB. Community-Based Participatory Research: Engaging Communities as Partners in Health Research. Prepared for discussion at Community-Campus Partnerships for Health's 4th Annual Conference April 29th ~ May 2, 2000 Washington, DC.

<http://www.googlesyndicatedsearch.com/u/washington?q=challenges%2Fbarriers&hq=inurl%3Adepts.washington.edu%2Fccph&site=search&hl=en&lr=&safe=off>

Kagawa-Singer M. Cultural Tailoring in Cancer Control is Missing the Concept of Culture. 2000. (unpublished).

Minkler M, Blackwell AG, Thompson M, Tamir H. Community-Based Participatory Research: Implications for Public Health Funding. American Journal of Public Health. 2003 August; 93(8): 1210-1213.

Strickland CJ. Challenges in Community-Based Participatory Research Implementation: Experiences in Cancer Prevention with Pacific Northwest American Indian Tribes. Cancer Culture and Literacy. July 2006. Vol 13, No. 3: 230-236