

Origins and Principles of Community-based research

COMMUNITY-BASED
RESEARCH AND
HIGHER EDUCATION

Principles and Practices

Kerry Strand, Sam Marullo, Nick Cutforth,
Randy Stoecker, Patrick Donohue

2003

 **JOSSEY-BASS**
A Wiley Imprint

ORIGINS AND PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH

Lastly, I would address one general admonition to all: that they consider what are the true ends of knowledge, and that they seek it not either for pleasure of the mind, or for contention, or for superiority to others, or for profit, or fame, or power, or any of these inferior things; but for the benefit and use of Life.

—Francis Bacon

OVER THE PAST TWO DECADES, many higher education institutions, from small, private, liberal arts colleges to massive state-supported research universities, have begun to rethink their institutional missions and implement a variety of community outreach efforts. Several forces have helped to create this state of affairs. Two of them—widespread criticism of higher education's disconnection from communities and growing concern about the professorate's exceedingly narrow definition of research—originated outside the institutions but quickly led to wide-ranging and often heated debate across campuses. The third force, recognition of the need to develop students' civic capacity and prepare them for active democratic citizenship, came largely from within the institutions themselves.

The Development of Campus-Community Partnerships

The contemporary criticism of higher education's inequitable and unresponsive relationship with the community echoes a historical chorus of voices weighing in about the nature and purpose of knowledge, from

Bacon's concern about the "true ends of knowledge" to John Dewey's warnings (1938) about the importance of linking knowledge with social inquiry rather than leaving it disconnected from action and isolated and mined in academic culture (Benson, Harkavy, and Puckert, 2000; Maurrasse, 2001). These ideas seem particularly relevant today, as the neighborhoods adjacent to many college and university campuses struggle with greater and greater challenges that university resources could help to address: urban decay, environmental threats, growing economic inequality, and the unmet needs of vulnerable children, families, and communities in areas such as education, health care, housing, criminal and juvenile justice, and employment. Some have even called for a widespread return of colleges and universities to the historical mission of land grant universities—regional institutions shaped by and responsive to local conditions, local problems, and local needs (Bledstein, 1976; Campbell, 1995; Kellogg Commission, 1999). What is the purpose of higher education, they ask, if not to reach out so as to provide something useful to society, starting with the communities that surround them?

At the same time, we have heard public demands for the work of professors to be more responsive to the public good. Ernest Boyer, in his widely cited book *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), criticized the narrow definition of scholarship as research in pursuit of new knowledge and took issue with how the "science of discovery" serves as the key, if not the only, kind of acceptable scholarship for faculty, especially those at research universities (Edwards and Marullo, 1999). He was concerned that other forms of scholarship—the scholarship of integration, of application, and of pedagogy—were undervalued and neglected with regard to both faculty roles and institutional credibility. In particular, he argued that the scholarship of application is best suited to address society's problems, and he challenged institutions to rethink their faculty reward systems and redirect their efforts by developing the resources needed to address the ills that confront society.

The third force for change was the growing realization on campuses that despite our best intentions, higher education is largely failing in its efforts to prepare students for lives of social responsibility and civic and political engagement. Slowly we learned that college and university graduates are no less likely than the rest of the population to be disengaged from political issues, disenfranchised with the potential of government to effect positive change, and disinclined and ill equipped to participate actively in civic life. Invoking Dewey's treatise (1916) that education is where democratic participation is best learned, educators began to challenge col-

prepare students for democratic citizenship (Boyer and Kari, 1996; Ehrlich, 2000). Increasingly, the most widely promoted strategy for citizenship education has been some form of student involvement in communities, most typically in the form of volunteering and service-learning.

As a result of these three forces, the latter years of the twentieth century saw a dramatic increase in the involvement of higher education institutions in their surrounding communities. Today, a growing number of institutions are returning to the land grant ideal of American universities by forging connections with the communities that often lie just beyond their campuses. Many colleges and universities are partnering with schools, social service agencies, businesses, neighborhood organizations, and health care providers, often with government, corporate, or foundation support. These partnerships have resulted in a plethora of outreach initiatives in which thousands of students and faculty are participating in tutoring and sports programs; internships in areas such as education, social work, and psychology; research projects; and the provision of other services to their local communities (Maurrasse, 2001). The effectiveness of these partnerships has been enhanced by the establishment of the Campus Compact, an organization that focuses on increasing service opportunities for students and faculty, as well as a wide range of service-learning programs that have become more and more commonplace in community colleges, four-year colleges, and research universities (Eyer and Giles, 1999; Zlotkowski, 1999).

A particularly promising activity to come out of these academy-community partnerships is what has come to be called community-based research (CBR). CBR is a partnership of students, faculty, and community members who collaboratively engage in research with the purpose of solving a pressing community problem or effecting social change. *Community* in this context includes educational institutions (schools and day care centers), community-based organizations of various kinds (neighborhood associations, for example), agencies that provide services or otherwise work on behalf of area residents (such as a local health department or battered women's shelter), or groups of people who may not share a geographical association but do share an interest around cultural, social, political, health, or economic issues (for example, unions, Latinos, ex-offenders, breast cancer survivors, and identity groups such as the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Alliance). Sometimes the focus is on a local problem facing a neighborhood or an organization. The focus can also be regional, national, or global. In every case, the community consists of people who are oppressed, powerless, economically deprived, or disenfranchised—that is, who are disadvantaged by existing social, political, or economic arrangements.

In a broad but critical sense, then, CBR is about working for social and economic justice. By placing larger questions of social, political, and moral purpose at the center of higher education's historical missions of teaching, scholarship, and service, CBR addresses in a direct way higher education's public mandate to serve some larger public purpose as a citizen within a civil society.

Historical Influences on Community-Based Research

Community-based research has a long and diverse history. This diversity is reflected in the different terms used to describe this kind of research—*action research*, *participatory research*, *popular education*, and *participatory action research*—which illustrate historical distinctions concerning the political nature of the research enterprise and the degree of active participation of the community in the research (Sclove, Scammell, and Holland, 1998; Stoecker, 1999a). Moreover, practitioners of participatory research in different fields and different parts of the globe trace their history differently. Indeed, traces of CBR's historical roots can be found in several social science disciplines and professional fields both inside and outside academia. These multidisciplinary origins make it difficult to construct a precise history of CBR. However, these distinctions are less apparent today, and regardless of disciplinary origins or the terminology employed, many community-based researchers draw from several common historical and modern strands.

In the twentieth century, we have seen three basic influences that have converged into community-based research:

- A popular education model that emphasized the involvement of people in educating themselves for social change
- An action research model used by academics in conjunction with major social institutions
- A participatory research model that emphasized the involvement of people in doing their own research for social change

The Popular Education Model

The popular education influence on CBR has a number of important sources. In the early decades of the twentieth century, the settlement house movement swept the United States as young women from wealthy backgrounds moved into poor urban neighborhoods to provide services and, in some cases, to work for social change. Among the most famous of these was Hull-House, founded by Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr in 1889

(Pollock, 1999). The important work of the Hull-House staff included a research project mapping the land use patterns in their Chicago neighborhood, involving neighborhood residents in a fascinating research and popular education process that became part of Hull-House's social service and social action agenda. The research itself provided a model that would later appear in depoliticized form and be credited to University of Chicago researchers Robert Park and Ernest W. Burgess (Deegan, 1988; Harkavy and Puckett, 1994). The model that Hull-House pioneered has become an important influence in the field of empowerment planning.

Another crucial popular education influence on CBR was the Highlander Folk School, now the Highlander Research and Education Center, founded by Myles Horton. Highlander was important for developing a model of popular education that emphasized people's ability to generate their own knowledge, independent of outside experts. Located in Tennessee, Highlander historically focused its efforts on the people of Appalachia and the rest of the South, among those groups in the United States most excluded from formal education and power.

Highlander's early development of a popular education and participatory research model included a project in support of a timber workers' strike in 1933. Highlander brought timber workers and their families together to research the logging industry in the area and develop a model of sustainable logging that would protect both the forests and workers' jobs in the long term (Adams, 1975; Bledsoe, 1969; Glen, 1988; Horton, 1989). In the 1950s, Highlander was involved in racially integrating labor organizations, as well as laying the groundwork for the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* school integration decision. After the major flood that devastated the Appalachian region in 1977, Highlander helped local residents, community organizers, and academic researchers investigate the conditions that produced the endemic poverty in the region, with the intent of bringing about changes through community action. In the process, citizens learned research skills and actively participated in civic politics to bring about changes in local tax codes that had been impoverishing the regional economy in favor of absentee landowners, mostly coal mining companies (Horton, 1993).

Highlander built a model of adult education focused on community-generated needs that set a standard for CBR as many researchers began to adopt some of its approaches. For example, Tax's Iowa Fox Indian Project (1958) involved anthropologists' combining research and action in their work with the tribe.

Paulo Freire was another central popular education influence on CBR, particularly through his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), which evolved from the author's experience in adult literacy work in Brazil. Freire

believed in the power of education as a political tool for raising the consciousness of oppressed people at both the local and global levels. He tied education to an agenda of social change in which learning was to be coupled with the investigation of social conditions and then their transformation. Freire's writing served as a basis for a theoretical and practical model for participatory research and inspired scholars and activists to get together with community residents to research, educate, and plan for sustainable, community-controlled social change projects in which learning through investigation occupied the central role.

The Action Research Model

A second influence on community-based research, the action model, has its roots in the work of Kurt Lewin (1948). He coined the term *action research* to describe an approach that gained popularity in the 1950s as a tool to increase worker productivity and satisfaction through democratic relationships. Lewin's work is regarded as a conservative influence on CBR because it placed less emphasis on active community participation and did not challenge existing power relationships (Brown and Tandon, 1983). Nevertheless, it was useful for those who wanted to understand organizational change, innovation, and improvement by combining theory and practice. Decades later, a similar model emerged, in the work of William Foote Whyte (1991). Whyte's model, which he referred to as *participatory action research*, followed Lewin's in focusing on workplace management. Similarly, it was seen as ignoring class conflict, reigniting an earlier debate between action researchers and those who emphasized the importance of doing research in the service of lower classes struggling against oppression (Brown and Tandon, 1983).

The Participatory Research Model

The third influence on CBR comes from the more conflict-oriented participatory research model. Here, the widespread social and political critiques characteristic of the 1960s and 1970s also looked to the dominant approaches of social research, particularly its assumptions regarding the purposes of research, the possibility of objectivity, relationships between the researchers and the researched, the ethics of data collection, the ownership of research results, reporting findings, and epistemology (Sclove, Scammell, and Holland, 1998).

Forces emerging from community development efforts being under-

taken in Third World countries increased the momentum of this critique. For example, during the early 1970s, young social scientists of the First World working as aid specialists in Tanzania became frustrated with the rigidity of the Western social science methods in the African setting (Park, 1992). These methods were based on rigid empiricism and positivism, with its obsession with instrument construction and rigor, defined by statistical precision and replicability. The scientists found that teams of students and village workers who were studying problems such as unemployment among youth and the socioeconomic causes of malnutrition were far more effective in eliciting needed information from the people than they, the scientists, had been. They attributed this success to the data collection methods that relied on the more communal sharing of knowledge specific to the local culture (Hall, 1992). The social scientists also came to realize that their own conventional research methods, which privilege the experts who control the production and distribution of knowledge, served only to reproduce a model that was tied to the Western domination of the newly emerging African nations. Based on these insights, development workers began to rely more and more on local knowledge for the technical solution of problems facing the people, who were encouraged to contribute their own experience, wisdom, and skills to the research.

Similar practices were adopted to address social change in parts of Latin America and Asia, which were also experiencing pains of struggle for liberation from foreign or dictatorial domination. Examples include Orlando Fals-Borda's work with peasants struggling for land in Colombia, people's struggles for protection against deforestation in India, and efforts to secure rights for farmer settlers in the southern Philippines (Park, 1992).

Critiques of positivistic research continued to surface and by the late 1970s, participatory research projects were being conducted in northern regions of the world, including Switzerland, Canada, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Italy, and the United States (Hall, 1992). By the early 1980s, several international groups were established and began writing on participatory research. These included the International Council for Adult Education's Participatory Research Group in Toronto and the Society for Participatory Research in Asia (Sclove, Scammell, and Holland, 1998). Participatory research projects were also undertaken in urban and rural North America in various disciplines, including public health, sociology, anthropology, community psychology, and community development.

In North America, participatory research has since been adopted in work with traditionally disadvantaged groups such as Latin American immigrants and First Nations councils (Hall, 1992), people with disabilities (Brydon-Miller, 1993), and Canadian aborigines (Jackson, 1993), as well

as on women's issues (Cancian, 1993; Maguire, 1987), and community mental health issues (Schensul and Schensul, 1992).

Although books on participatory research appeared (see Maguire, 1987; Park, Brydon-Miller, Hall, and Jackson, 1993; Whyte, 1991), until recently much of the impetus for this work came from people in nonprofit research organizations rather than from academics in higher education settings. As we will see later in this chapter, the reasons for the limited faculty involvement in participatory research have to do in part with tensions between the traditional research emphases of colleges and universities and the needs of the communities beyond their campuses.

Principles of Community-Based Research

Our model of community-based research draws on these diverse historical influences and is guided by three central principles that represent the core tenets of CBR as it engages the resources of colleges and universities to help communities address pressing problems:

- CBR is a collaborative enterprise between academic researchers (professors and students) and community members.
- CBR validates multiple sources of knowledge and promotes the use of multiple methods of discovery and dissemination of the knowledge produced.
- CBR has as its goal social action and social change for the purpose of achieving social justice.

These principles are also perhaps best understood as features that differentiate CBR from business as usual in American higher education: that is, from conventional academic research including research *on* communities (see Exhibit 1.1) and from conventional approaches to teaching and learning at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.

Collaboration

From the perspective of the college or university, community-based research is the systematic creation of knowledge that is done with and for the community for the purpose of addressing a community-identified need. Ideally, CBR is fully collaborative, with those in the community working with academics—professors and students—at every stage of the research process: identifying the issue or problem, constructing research questions, developing research instruments, collecting and analyzing data, interpreting

Exhibit 1.1. A Comparison of Traditional Academic Research and Community-Based Research.

	Traditional Academic Research	Community-Based Research
Primary goal of the research	Advance knowledge within a discipline	Contribute to betterment of a particular community; social change, social justice
Source of the research question	Extant theoretical or empirical work in a discipline	Community-identified problem or need for information
Who designs and conducts the research?	Trained researcher, perhaps with the help of paid assistants	Trained researchers, students, community members in collaboration
Role of researcher	Outside expert	Collaborator, partner, and learner
Role of community	Object to be studied ("community as laboratory") or no role at all	Collaborator, partner, and learner
Role of students	None, or as research assistants	Collaborators, partners, learners
Relationship of the researcher(s) and the participants-respondents	Short-term, task-oriented, detached	Long-term, multifaceted, connected
Measure of value of the research	Acceptance by academic peers (publication, for example)	Usefulness for community partners and contribution to social change
Criteria for selecting data collection methods	Conformity to standards of rigor, objectivity, researcher-control; preference for quantitative and positivistic approaches	The potential for drawing out useful information, sensitivity to experiential knowledge, conformity to standards of rigor, and accessibility; open to a variety and combination of approaches
Beneficiaries of the research	Academic researcher	Academic researcher, students, community
Ownership of the data	Academic researcher	Community
Mode of presentation	Written report	Varies widely and may take multiple and creative forms (for example, video, theater, written narrative)
Means of dissemination	Presentation at academic conference, submission to journal	Any and all forums where results might have impact: media, public meetings, informal community settings, legislative bodies, and others

results, writing the final report, issuing recommendations, and implementing initiatives. To be effective, this collaboration requires mutually respectful relationships between university and community people and a fundamental sharing of authority. Everyone in the group is regarded as both a researcher and a learner. In this way, the research process itself becomes a means of change and growth for everyone involved in it.

This sort of collaboration clearly distinguishes the roles and relationships in CBR from those that characterize conventional academic research. Much research, of course, does not involve communities at all. But even with conventional approaches, where the community serves as the research "laboratory," there is a definite distinction between the researcher and the researched, or at least between the researcher and the clients for whom the research is being conducted. The traditional community researcher as outside expert typically has a limited and task-oriented relationship with the community rather than the more multifaceted and long-term relationship that characterizes CBR. This does not mean, however, that academic expertise is irrelevant in CBR. Indeed, professors and students can bring to the table a level of objectivity and broader knowledge and experience (including experience with other initiatives) that may be lacking within the community and are valuable precisely because they may encourage community members to consider new directions and new approaches.

The collaborative nature of CBR also makes it a distinctive and highly effective mode of teaching, learning, and empowerment for everyone involved. Students—who may undertake CBR for an independent study project, a graduate-level thesis, a term project with a class, or to fill a research requirement in a course, such as research methods or a capstone—are engaged in active learning and problem-centered pedagogy and benefit in several important ways from the sort of collaboration that characterizes this research approach. CBR offers the chance to learn through the best combination of experiential and intellectual learning strategies. As equal members of CBR teams, students learn how to listen to one another, engage in critical discussions about problems and issues, arrive at solutions mutually, and work together to implement them (Couto, 2001)—all skills that are important in the increasingly team-oriented work world.

The community's involvement in the research process also can have powerful outcomes for them. The capacity of community organizations, schools, and social agencies can be strengthened so that they are able to collect, analyze, and use data independently. Indeed, an important goal of CBR is to transfer information expertise into these organizations through training and resources provided initially by the college or university. If this goal is realized, the organizations become self-sufficient and no longer need to rely on

outside experts, but can continue to draw on them when necessary (Stoecker, 1999a). The learning that results from involvement in information gathering and analysis can be an empowerment, or capacity-building, tool for the community (Sclove, Scammell, and Holland, 1998).

In practice, however, the full and equal participation of community members in every phase of the research may be somewhat problematic. Sometimes university researchers are unable or unwilling to relinquish their traditional roles as authoritative experts. Students may be insensitive to the importance or meaning of collaboration, or community members may have insufficient interest, time, or expertise to participate in every phase of the research. However difficult full and equal collaboration may be to achieve, though, it is a tenet and a goal of CBR. At the very least, the community must be fully involved in the first phase of the project—identifying the research need and questions—and in the final phase, where the results are disseminated and implemented. The degree and form of both community and student participation in other phases of the project also may depend on factors such as the nature of the project, characteristics of the community, the level of the students, and the availability of different kinds of expertise from both the university and community.

New Approaches to Knowledge

The second principle—that CBR validates multiple sources of knowledge and promotes the use of multiple methods of discovery and dissemination—refers to the distinctive ways that CBR defines knowledge and approaches the production of knowledge.

First, in the same way that CBR requires the equal participation of academic and community people in the research process, it also values equally the knowledge that each party brings to that process—both the experiential (or local) knowledge of community people and the specialized knowledge and skills of university faculty and students. CBR answers the question, "Whose knowledge counts?" in distinctive ways. It places the less powerful members of society at the center of the knowledge creation process. This means that people's daily lives, achievements, and struggles are no longer at the margins of research but are placed firmly at the center. CBR requires acknowledging the validity of the local knowledge generated in and through practice in community settings and weighing this alongside institutionalized, scientific, and scholarly professional knowledge familiar to faculty and students. Put simply, community-based researchers are interested in the epistemology of practice and, in particular, how each form of knowledge informs and guides the other.

A second distinctive feature of CBR's approach to knowledge is that it recognizes and may incorporate multiple research methods. It also encourages practitioners to develop and apply unconventional criteria for determining the appropriateness of those methods. CBR requires that we eschew rigid methodological rules or protocols. Rather, methods are chosen or developed because they have the potential for drawing out useful, relevant knowledge and because they invite the involvement of all parties, or stakeholders, in identifying, defining, and struggling to solve the problem. For example, because CBR places high value on local or experiential knowledge of community members, research approaches that are particularly sensitive to discerning the voice and perspective of participants, such as informal interviews or open-ended questions, might be chosen over more structured, researcher-controlled data collection methods. Generally, CBR also requires a willingness on the part of researchers to be flexible and adaptable: to be willing to rely on a variety and multiplicity of data collection methods and instruments, work to develop unconventional ones, ignore discipline-bound methodologies, and even change methodological direction in the middle of the study if it will enhance community participation and empowerment or enhance the usefulness of data collected.

A third feature is that CBR often requires innovative, user-friendly approaches to the dissemination of knowledge as well. Neighborhood residents and community organizations want tangible results that they can use. Indeed, the value of the entire research project rests on its potential to produce results that can be used by the community. This may mean that professors and students who are used to thinking in terms of research reports and scholarly standards of proof must think instead of the need for concrete results presented in a form that is comprehensible to neighborhoods, organizations, politicians, agency personnel, and others who might make use of the research findings. It requires that researchers demystify the language used in research reports, and it might also call for the use of innovative, creative methods of describing and reporting results that may not involve writing at all: video, art, community theater, or quilting, for example.

The distinctive approach to defining, discovering, and disseminating knowledge that is essential to CBR poses yet another challenge to conventional research paradigms in the sciences and social sciences. The collaborative nature of CBR calls into question conventional assumptions about who should be allowed to participate in the production of knowledge. That is, it challenges the exclusive authority of the trained researcher and argues for the value of nonspecialist participation in decisions relating to research processes and priorities. CBR's approach to knowledge—its insistence on

democratizing and demystifying knowledge—goes further. CBR also challenges conventional assumptions about knowledge itself: what constitutes valid knowledge, how it is best produced or acquired, and who gets to control it. In this sense, CBR engages some of the provocative epistemological debates that have emerged in the sciences and social sciences in the form of feminist theory, critical science studies, and other important challenges to traditional thinking and dominant canons, including rigid disciplinary boundaries that can stand in the way of addressing research questions that are seldom confined to the content or methods of one discipline. To engage students with some of these epistemological questions, by modeling CBR as an alternative to conventional approaches, is yet another way that CBR differs from traditional teaching.

Social Action and Social Change

The third principle of CBR is its commitment to social action and social change in the interest of advancing social justice. Community organizations often need information as part of their efforts to make needed changes: improve their programs, promote their interests, attract new resources, understand their target populations, or in other ways contribute to a social action agenda aimed at improving the lives of people in the community, particularly those who are most limited in their access to resources and opportunities. The kind of information that CBR produces can explicate issues and challenges facing communities, create awareness of the need for action, focus attention on areas of particular concern, identify resources that can help address those concerns, design strategies for change, and assess the impact of those strategies. In other words, CBR offers a chance for community organizations and agencies to have a strong information base from which to plan and act. Hence, the central purpose for engaging in CBR is to produce information that might be useful in bringing about needed change.

The social change that is the goal of CBR may be of a substantial and long-lasting nature, but typically the social action it implies, or the improvement that it brings, is fairly modest. This may be by design—for example, an assessment of an after-school program has as its ultimate goal producing information that will improve that program, a useful but limited kind of change. It also may be a result of other factors, such as the failure of the project to produce truly useful results or, as is often the case, the inability to get decision makers to pay attention and act on the results that the project produces. Because the research project is often one relatively small item on a larger community social action agenda, its impact

may be minimal or may not be discernible for some time. For example, a project whose purpose is to identify areas of community concern might be little more than a first stage in a long series of efforts to get those concerns analyzed and addressed.

Finally, the research process itself, quite apart from any results that it produces, may contribute to social change by empowering and helping to build capacity among community members. Some of this has to do with skills and knowledge that academics share with the community members. Another is simply the fact of community members coming together to identify collective needs and talk about potential solutions, which may help revitalize democracy in the community and otherwise set into motion structures and processes for social change quite beyond any particular research project. This aim of CBR has its roots in Freire's popular education model, where the process of coming together to educate, learn, and talk about social change serves as a means of consciousness raising and organization among community members, who are then empowered to work for change themselves.

The social action—social change goal of CBR distinguishes it in yet another clear way from both conventional academic research and, when it is used as a pedagogical strategy, conventional approaches to teaching as well. The dominant research paradigm dictates that the central purpose for doing research is to advance knowledge within disciplines. The careers of college and university faculty members—decisions about hiring, promotion, and tenure—rest primarily (or at least partially, at more teaching-oriented institutions) on their being successful researchers. Such success is measured mainly by the researchers' ability to attract grant money and the favorable judgment of their research by academic peers, as evidenced by presentation at disciplinary conferences and publication in peer-reviewed professional journals. The measure of the value of community-based research, in contrast, is its potential to bring about social change. And the research questions that drive CBR come not from the mandate to build theory in a discipline, but rather from a need for information that might help advance the social justice and social action agenda of a community organization or agency. CBR's social change objective, like its unorthodox approach to issues of knowledge and expertise, renders it at least somewhat suspect within traditional academic reward structures.

All of the basic principles of CBR distinguish it from conventional modes of teaching that is classroom based and lecture oriented. However, its social action orientation also makes CBR different from other forms of service-learning, much of which involves students in charity-oriented, direct-service-providing roles in the community. CBR's goal of social change

means, among other things, that students must engage in some amount of critical analysis of causes of social problems and also must consider solutions and strategies for change. Its advocates argue that this makes CBR a particularly effective pedagogy for helping students acquire knowledge and skill for active citizenship and democratic participation.

Summary

Community-based research has emerged in response to the criticism that colleges and universities are insufficiently responsive to the needs of communities. CBR has a long and diverse history, and this history provides a basis for the three major principles that guide our model of CBR for higher education institutions: collaboration, validation of multiple sources of knowledge and methods of discovery and dissemination, and the goals of social change and social action to achieve social justice.