

Social Movement Research with Whom:

Potential Contributions of Community-based Research Methods

(pre-publication draft 5.29.19)

Charlotte Ryan*

charlotte_ryan@uml.edu

www.mrap.info

University of Massachusetts, Lowell

and

Gregory Squires

squires@gwu.edu

George Washington University

Cite as: Charlotte Ryan and Gregory Squires. "Social Movement Research with Whom: The Potential Contribution of Community-based Research Methods." Published in the 2019 volume of *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change*, an annual peer-reviewed interdisciplinary journal, Volume 43: Bringing Down the Divides, pp.185-211.

* Corresponding author: Charlotte Ryan, charlotte_ryan@uml.edu, www.mrap.info
Professor Emeritus, Sociology Dept, UMASS Lowell

Abstract

We argue that by conducting systematic research *with* communities rather than *on* communities, community-based research (CBR) methods can both advance the study of human interaction and strengthen public understanding and appreciation of social sciences. CBR, among other methods, can also address social scientists' ethical and social commitments. We recap the history of calls by leading sociologists for rigorous, empirical, community-engaged research. We introduce community-based research methods (CBR) as empirically-grounded methods for conducting social research with social actors. We define terms and describe the range of methods that we include in the umbrella term, "community-based research." After providing exemplars of community-based research, we review CBR's advantages and challenges. We, next, summarize an intervention that we undertook as members of the Publication Committee of the URBAN Research Network's Sociology section in which the committee developed and disseminated guidelines for peer review of community-based research. We also share initial responses from journal editors. In the conclusion, we revisit the potential of community-based research and note the consequences of neglecting community-based research traditions.

Keywords: community-based research, action research; participatory action research, engaged scholarship, collaborative research

Social Movement Research With Whom:

Potential Contributions of Community-based Research Methods

Introduction

It is precisely in the creation, articulation, and formulation of new thoughts and ideas—new knowledge—that a social movement defines itself in society (Eyerman & Jamison, 1991, p. 55).

In the United States, a well-documented gap exists between social scientists studying social movements and the movements they study. As a result, scholars and movement activists develop thoughts and ideas about social change strategies in isolation from each other without benefit of dialog (Flacks, 2005; Croteau, 2005; Bevington & Dixon, 2005).ⁱ

Bridging the gap can be risky. First, collaboration may lengthen the time needed to complete research. University-based movement researchers and the movements they study may have competing or diverging concerns regarding evidence, rigor, and scholarly objectivity that may complicate publication. Moreover, the fact that few top journals publish community-based research on a regular basis, in and of itself, becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy; in informal conversations between members of the Sociology node of URBAN (Urban Research Based Action Network, www.urbanresearchnetwork.org) and several top sociology journals, editors explained they were open to community-based research but that such submissions were uncommon. Researchers, on the other hand, might not consider submitting work to a journal that rarely publishes such research.

Movement organizers may also hesitate to approach social movement scholars as collaborators. First, pressed by urgent problems and limited resources, organizers may not prioritize research. After all, movement organizers do not regularly read social movement research (Bevington & Dixon, 2005) insofar as firewalls surround journals and academic libraries housing movement research (Peters, 2005). Given activists' limited time and resources, as well as limited access to social movement research, one would not expect U.S. movement organizations to initiate collaborative research.

As a result of these dynamics, social movement scholars talk to each other (Croteau, 2005), an isolation that hurts both movement activists and scholars. Organizers and other activist leaders constantly share experiences, then generalize about their conditions, life chances, and strategies for improving them. In failing to interact, social researchers limit lay theorists' access to potentially relevant lessons, ideas, and frameworks from other times and settings. While social movement actors can form communities that reflect on experiences, name and test social patterns and change strategies, they lack sufficient access to researchers who have honed these very skills.

Again, it is not just movements that lose. Scholars also reduce their capacity to understand how individuals, setting aside disparities of interests and wills, "reach out for goals and enterprises which would never enter [an individual's] mind, let alone the desire of his [their] heart" (Arendt, 1969, p. 52). Isolation from social movements hampers scholars' understanding of how social movements share grievances, reflect collectively about their situations, their options, and strategies for addressing them.

Despite efforts by movement scholars (Croteau, Hoynes, & Ryan, 2005; Abraham & Maney, 2012; Noy, 2009; Squires & O'Connor, 2001) and by research centers, non-

governmental organizations, policy centers, and think tanksⁱⁱ, resistance to collaborative methods continues to weaken scholar and activist understanding of movement practices, dynamics, and reflections. It also narrows opportunities to test new paradigms, produce new knowledge, and share that knowledge across generations and locations, especially across disciplines and beyond the academy. More optimistically, if, as Eyerman & Jamison (1991) suggest, movements incubate and test new ideas, then, scholar-activist collaborations could contribute substantially to research in social movements, conflict and change. To accomplish this, however, scholars and activists would need to develop approaches to theorizing that allow collaboration in research design, data collection, data analysis, etc. One useful approach is community-based research (CBR).ⁱⁱⁱ

Here we argue that the co-production of knowledge should be recognized as a valid approach to studying social movements.^{iv} If the potential added value of knowledge co-production were accepted, researchers could elaborate projects and methods tapping the benefits of collaboration. Within this broad framework, collaborative research including community-based research methods (CBR) may offer useful tools.

To forward this argument, we describe CBR's origins, then, make an argument for CBR's inclusion among methods available to researchers of social movements, conflict, and change. We describe our efforts to open dialogs regarding CBR's potential contributions and how these initial interventions fared. We also include examples of community-based research (CBR) methods to substantiate our claims that research undertaken with social movement actors and with communities challenging social inequalities can deepen understanding of collective agency. We conclude with lesson and work that remains.

A Tradition Nurtured in Opposition

Mainstream U.S. sociology's relationship with engaged research has long been fraught; DuBois proved that scientific rigor and engaged social research were compatible yet met consistent resistance and dismissal at the hands of the Chicago School (Morris, 2015). Treviño traces similar marginalization of the engaged community studies of Jane Addams (2012; 2013). Within academic sociology in the U.S., tensions between academic sociological research and socially engaged research rose and fell throughout the 20th century, often with the rise and decline of social movements. Professional associations reflected these dynamics; the Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP) was founded in 1951 to challenge what it saw as a consolidating "scientific" trend within the American Sociological Society (ASS). In contrast, the new professional association sought engaged work that would combine rigor and attention to social change presenting themselves as "a marginal group gradually gaining strength and being resisted by powerful antagonists within the discipline and such outside forces as McCarthyism" (Skura, 1976, p. 15).

By the mid-70's, the SSSP began to reflect on its progress translating its oppositional stance into a proactive mission. Some members of the renamed American Sociological Association (ASA) also continued to debate engagement vs. detachment particularly vis-à-vis theory's relation to practice. And periodically beginning at the end of the 1970's, ASA presidents used their inaugural podium to call for empirically grounded, engaged research to address relevant social issues. 1980 ASA President Peter Rossi noted that, "The stance of our profession toward applied work of all sorts...has been one of considerable ambivalence. Some colleagues gloss over their applied work as if it were a vice best kept from view" (Rossi, 1981). Eight years later, 1988 ASA president Herbert Gans urged his fellow sociologists to engage with current social problems and the constituencies affected. Calling for a public sociology, he asked,

What happens when working-class and poor students, whose lay sociologies are particularly rich in the fields of class and inequality, take a course in social stratification which sees society solely from a middle-class perspective? Although we assume that professional sociology is always better than the lay version, that assumption also deserves some inquiry (Gans, 1989, p. 5).

Yet ambivalence about engaged work within mainstream academic circles continued. In 2004, ASA President Michael Burawoy reactivated Gans' call for a public sociology, offering CBR researchers a new opportunity to advance collaborative knowledge production. While the call was widely debated (Jeffries, 2009), barriers to public sociology generally and to community-based research in particular remained. An American Sociological Association (ASA) committee produced guidelines for tenure and promotion for public sociologists that acknowledged collaborative research's value. The guidelines, however, were not formally supported by the ASA Council (American Sociological Association Task Force on Institutionalizing Public Sociologies, 2005).

In 2010, ASA president Patricia Hill Collins reiterated the under-appreciated "everyday knowledge of poor people, racial and ethnic groups, new immigrant groups, women, and similar populations" (2011, p.10). And again, in Seattle in 2016, social movement scholars explored possibilities for engaged research within professional meetings and in external dialogs with regional social movement leaders (Ryan, Manski, & Maney, 2016). Thus, decades-long tensions between interest and resistance continue.

Engaged Methods in Interdisciplinary Fields

While academic sociology maintains its hesitant relationship with engaged research, applied social sciences and interdisciplinary fields have embraced collaborative research

methods, arguing that they expand access to lay sociologies and the everyday knowledge of marginalized groups. Applied researcher Kurt Lewin (1946) promoted action research as a change-oriented social investigation in which “experts in theory” collaborate with “experts in practice.” His work spawned applications in management, organization, and development studies (Whyte, 1991).

Other fields adopting engaged methods include public health (Petersen, Minkler, Vásquez, & Baden, 2006; Minkler, Garcia, Williams, LoPresti, & Lilly, 2010), education (Warren, Calderon, Kupscznk, Squires, & Su, 2018; Payne & Kaba, 2007), and urban studies (Stoecker & Beckwith, 1992; Ryan, Jeffreys, Ryczek, & Diaz, 2014; Squires & O’Connor, 2001; Squires, 2018).

Despite divergences, Israel et al. (1998) flag the considerable overlap among action research (Brydon-Miller, Greenwood, & Maguire, 2003; participatory action research (Reason & Bradbury, 2001), community-based participatory research (Kidd, 2003, Wallerstein & Duran, 2010; Minkler & Wallerstein, 2008), collaborative interactive action research (Rapoport, Bailyn, Fletcher, & Pruitt, 2002) and cooperative inquiry (Heron & Reason, 2008). These variants most commonly differ in how collaboration is organized, and results are applied.

Action research, for instance, stresses concrete applications. Participatory research stresses the process of engagement. In contrast, community-based research highlights the right of affected constituencies to partner in designing and conducting research. The term community-based participatory action research intentionally incorporates all these elements.

While engaged research collaborations evolved in the United States, participatory methods sunk even deeper roots among subaltern researchers (Freire, 1968, 1994; Fals Borda & Rahman, 1991; De Vos, Strydom, Fouché, Delport, 2002; Rahman, 2008; Nhamo, 2012; Dias &

Gama, 2014). In the Global South, participatory methods consistently involved constituencies marginalized previously in political and knowledge arenas. These approaches resonated with those of oral historians developing history from below (Perks & Thomson, 1998). Riaño (1994) noted the resonance between subaltern scholarship in South and Central America and the grounded and engaged methods of Black feminist, Chicano/a, Caribbean, and Civil Rights scholars who linked macro forces to micro-inequalities in historically embedded studies (Morris, 1985, 2015; Payne, 2007; Payne & Kaba, 2007; Robnett, 2000).

Also relevant are North American popular educators who conducted lay sociology such as Catalyst Centre, Highlander School, Praxis Project, and Center for Media Justice all of whom often integrated community-based participatory action research into organizing strategies as a way to identify problems, open dialogs about inequalities, and test solutions. The impact of popular education and related collaborative research routines can be life-changing. In the wake of establishing collaborative social investigations, for instance, members of the Rhode Island domestic violence survivors' group *Sisters Opposing Abusive Relationships* (SOAR) described the transformation from passive research subjects to active participants in research and policy design: "I went from being talked about to being part of the talk," explained one SOAR member. (Interview, January 10, 2004).

In addition to actually conducting research, projects emerged such as the Public Science Project (2018) at CUNY that conducts and offers training to advance the co-production of knowledge. A scholarly network, URBAN (2018) linked community-based researchers across locations and fields. And Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (2018) archived vast troves of public health-relevant studies and tools.

Scholars researching social movements have been particularly well-positioned to collaborate with the collective actors they studied. But more broadly, justice-driven scholars—Black feminists and other feminists of color, as well as researchers in environmental and racial justice, housing, health, labor, LGBTQ, and other social movement arenas (Brewer, 2005; Fonow and Cook, 2005; Acker, 2005; Padgug, 1989; Aronowitz, 2005; Bullard, 2007; Krinsky & Barker, 2009; Taylor, 1998; Massey & Denton, 1993; Squires & O'Connor, 2001; Squires, 2018) resonated with Global South sociologists seeking “a reciprocal, non-hierarchical relation between the core and periphery of sociological knowledge, within the Global North and between North and South” (Ghamari-Tabrizi 2005, p. 367. See also, Mohanty, 2004; Baiocchi, 2005; Abraham & Purkayastha, 2012; Arribas Lozano, 2014, 2018). To advance the use of community-based methods in the Global North, we summarize the characteristics of community-based research, its pros and cons, and outstanding challenges, then describe our efforts to open space for its use in peer-reviewed publications.

What is community-based research?

Community-based research (CBR) is best understood as a general approach with many methodological variants as highlighted by the labels community-based participatory research (CBPR), community-based participatory action research (CBPAR), participatory action research (PAR), public sociology, engaged scholarship, engaged research, translational research, emancipatory action research, collaborative inquiry, and participatory inquiry. Most recognize marginalized constituencies as critical social actors collaborating at one or more research stages. Some community groups may choose to prioritize engagement during problem definition. Others prefer to be involved on a continuing basis, collaborating to design research, plan

implementation, gather and analyze data, and to determine how to share results and with whom. Often, the research explicitly aims to empower the community and facilitate social change.

Here we define community-based research in the terms proposed by Green et al. (1995) as “systematic inquiry, with the collaboration of those affected by the issue being studied, for purposes of education and taking action or effecting change” (Green et al. 1995 www.pram.mcgill.ca). CBR involves scholars doing research *with* a community recognizing that the search for social patterns is a universal human activity. Those who conventionally are studied as academic research objects instead cooperate actively as subjects developing research questions, hypotheses, research design, data collection, data analysis, and the presentation of findings.

The research process itself involves the pooling and application of academic and community knowledge and skills along with the revision of this knowledge and skill acquisition through iterative cycles of dialog, action, and reflection. Core principles of community-based research include:

- 1) The unit of analysis is community defined alternatively by geography, identity, interests, values, or by shared social locations and conditions.
- 2) Communities are complex entities with overlapping and diverging interests, assets, concerns, and viewpoints (Freire, 1994, p. 12).
- 3) CBR partners appreciate academic expertise as a strength that scholars bring to multi-perspectival cooperative research (Heron & Reason 1997; Reason 2006).
- 4) CBR partners link knowledge and action for mutual benefit (Israel et al. 1998, 179) although action and knowledge are not necessarily joined in each instance.
- 5) CBR approaches advance a reciprocal transfer of knowledge, skills, capacity that attends

to social inequalities and empowerment. (Israel et al. 1998:179).

- 6) Additionally, community and academic research partners build sustained relationships that share knowledge, skills, and conceptual language (Israel et al., 1998, 178).

Using these approaches, collaborative studies offer opportunities for understanding social inequalities and collective resistance but also present methodological problems. After presenting two illustrative cases we turn to a fuller discussion of advantages and challenges.

Sample Study: Fair Lending

CBR is a general inclusive orientation toward establishing mutually beneficial collaborative work rather than a rigid technique. Collaborations often begin in one context and evolve over time. The community-based research project may involve collaboration at one or more steps depending on the context and the needs of the partners. Squires and O'Connor (2001) offer a case in point. In 1989, the federal government reported racial disparities in mortgage application denial rates for the first time; Milwaukee had the highest racial disparity among the 50 largest metropolitan areas in the nation. While nationwide blacks were rejected twice as often as whites, in Milwaukee the ratio was 4-1. Milwaukee Mayor John Norquist and Wisconsin Governor Tommy Thompson organized a Fair Lending Action Committee consisting of lenders, civil rights groups, regulators, community development advocates and scholars to explore why the disparity was so high and develop policies to reduce it.

As a member of this committee, one of us (Squires) became frustrated with the progress and in 1991 collaborated with two veteran Milwaukee community organizers to form the Fair Lending Project (later changed to Coalition) to increase pressure on local lenders to improve their community reinvestment records. As part of this effort, Squires and his students analyzed Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data, public reports documenting where most lenders make their

loans, to identify and publicize those lenders who were doing a particularly poor job of serving Milwaukee's low-income and minority communities. Building on this study and utilizing leverage provided by the Community Reinvestment Act,^v the staff and board of the Fair Lending Coalition entered into negotiations with several lenders that led to 11 commitments totaling \$160 million in loans along with affirmative action agreements to increase minority employment and contracts with minority-owned businesses, agreement to open new branches in underserved neighborhoods, and other community development initiatives. Fundraising challenges led to the demise of the Coalition a few years later, but community reinvestment remains a more visible, higher priority throughout the community today than was the case prior to the release of the 1989 report on racial disparities in mortgage lending.

These actions reflected a longstanding pattern in Squires' research, continuing today, whereby he has collaborated with community organizations, government agencies, and other non-profit groups. In these collaborations, Squires and community partners have examined challenges facing the communities and developed responses to ameliorate them (Squires & O'Connor, 2001; Squires 2018). The case, albeit brief, highlights some of the major arguments for community-based research; here research was initiated with ongoing conversations involving constituencies directly affected, so that their concerns shaped the research agenda and, their participation in negotiations helped shaped solutions.

Ongoing dialogs develop between activists leading campaigns and researchers who—even if not engaged directly—search for, document, and name social patterns. Once patterns are identified and documented, scholars and activists^{vi} can use results to promote policy changes as described by Squires and O'Connor (2001) as well as to design further research. Below we

describe another research study co-designed by activists and scholars; again, the study emerged from ongoing relations and dialogs.

Sample Study: Defending Public Space

The 2008 recession triggered intensified battles over homelessness in U.S. cities. Many urban developers and U.S. municipalities sought to remove homeless people from areas pegged for business development and tourism (Mayer, Thorn, & Thorn, 2016). Rather than expand affordable housing, more U.S. cities used fines and threats of imprisonment to banish homeless people from downtowns and tourist areas. Local governments increasingly established penalties to coerce the homeless to leave the city limits. For example, in Reno, Nevada, police have embarked on a program where people with a history of misdemeanor charges, including trespassing on public property, public drunkenness, and panhandling, are given the choice of either (a) receiving a suspended sentence in exchange for a promise to stay out of the downtown area, or (b) going to jail (Saelinger, 2006, p. 560).

One study reported that 50% of U.S. cities surveyed had passed laws making it illegal to sleep, sit, beg, or share food (without a permit) in public spaces. And in 30% of cities surveyed, regulations prohibited sleeping or lying down in specified public spaces (NLCHP, 2012).

Fines imposed for violating the new regulations added even more hurdles for homeless people struggling to stabilize themselves economically. If paid, fines reduced savings for rental deposits; if unpaid, fines could lead to jail time triggering more losses in services and employment:

Levying fines on the homeless for camping, panhandling, or storing property in public space poses the obvious dilemma that the offender is likely to be unable to pay the fine.

When fines are not paid, they lead to jail time, which has a significant negative impact on access to employment and social services and stigmatizes the incarcerated individual. Long criminal records and indebtedness to the city lead to the possibility that the offender will be excluded from jobs, housing, credit, and public assistance benefits. For example, anyone who has been incarcerated for 30 days or more suffers an automatic loss of Social Security benefits during their incarceration. The alternative for the homeless person is to pay the fine, but the subsequent loss of capital prevents them from being able to afford housing and other basic necessities in the future (Saelinger, 2006, p. 560)

Challenging this criminalization, the small U.S. state of Rhode Island passed a 2012 [Homeless Bill of Rights](#) (HBOR), ensuring all Rhode Islanders' rights to access public services such as libraries or buses, and to assemble on sidewalks and other public spaces. The right to public space was critical; homeless Rhode Islanders were being pushed from public areas, especially in the state capital Providence where downtown areas were being redeveloped to attract tourists. Despite the Homeless Bill of Rights, however, a Providence panhandling ordinance passed in 2015 upping the number of detentions and arrests.

Over summer 2015, attacks grew; even a community lawyer talking with a homeless client was arrested for loitering. Homeless activists and advocates claimed that the panhandling ordinance and related regulations were being applied selectively; office workers taking a smoking break on a sidewalk were not bothered, while individuals whom police or private security had identified as homeless might be told to move on. With increasing frequency, people experiencing homelessness were being subjected to judicial and extrajudicial arrest, harassment, and discrimination. Additionally, they contended, individuals who were homeless were treated as

criminals for engaging in necessary life activities, foremost among them resting and sleeping (<http://www.rifuture.org/homeless-advocates-confront-pvd-police-over-homeless-harrassment.html>). These ordinances became justification for the city's forced removal of homeless people from downtown Providence in preparation for "Providence Fest," a cultural event designed to attract tourist trade.

After much public pressure, activists and advocates met with the Mayor in Fall 2015 but progress was slim. Calling themselves the Homeless Bill of Rights Defense Committee, the group decided, therefore, to launch a broader anti-criminalization campaign that would include a collaboratively designed community-based research project. Activists began using smartphones to document police abuse. At the same time, Providence College sociologist, Eric Hirsch and students conducted a *Public Spaces Survey* that documented that police disproportionately targeted homeless people in enforcing city ordinances against solicitation and loitering. The Mayor's Office, however, did not follow through on its promise to address the underlying issue of aggressive policing.

When January 2016 came and the Mayor's office still had disassociated itself from the police harassment and fining of homeless people, advocates released the Providence College's *Public Spaces Survey* of random pedestrians in contested areas of downtown Providence. The results were striking: just over half (52%) of those surveyed were homeless or formerly homeless, but 95% of the citations and 94% of the arrests were experienced by homeless and formerly homeless persons.

Answers to other questions on the survey, such as whether law enforcement had asked them to "move on" or to leave a particular area, how often they were asked for identification, and

how often law enforcement searched their belongings without their permission, showed the same pattern of disproportionate harassment of homeless and formerly homeless persons by police. Other potential reasons for such targeting, such as race, ethnicity, or age, were not found to be relevant. Eric Hirsch, Professor of Sociology and principal investigator of the *Public Spaces Survey* explained,

It was stunning to see the degree to which homeless Rhode Islanders are subject to harassment by the Providence Police Department,” “It was the only factor relevant to why someone was ticketed or arrested for everyday activities such as sitting, lying down, etc.” (Eric Hirsch, Interview, June 25, 2016).

Kate Miechkowski, Outreach Worker for House of Hope Community Development Corporation confirmed the study’s findings:

This past summer and fall I interviewed dozens of people experiencing homelessness about their interactions with Providence police officers. I was horrified by their experiences of degradation, humiliation, and blatant profiling. There was almost no one I spoke to who had amiable experiences with police officers. I personally witnessed multiple incidents in which people were told that they had to move for doing nothing except occupying a public sidewalk. (Kate Miechkowski, Interview, June 25, 2016).

Shortly thereafter, the mayor issued a formal notice for police to void the ordinance and stop fining homeless residents for standing on the sidewalk. But the battle was not over. Within weeks, a major downtown developer asked the Providence City Council to reinstate the ordinance and to remove homeless people from tourist areas during cultural events. This gave Hirsch a second opportunity to share study findings via mass media and to advocate for fair

housing solutions proposed by Rhode Island's economic justice organizations.

In this campaign, the research by Hirsch and his students involved ongoing conversations and cooperation with housing rights activists; in public hearings and in mass media coverage, for instance, survey results were illustrated by smartphone videos taken by homeless activists and advocates. The ongoing conversations, moreover, ensured that the multi-layered tactics of the anti-criminalization campaign were documented and preserved as replicable practices for movement building (Ryan & Jeffreys, 2019).

The Promise of Community-based Research

Building on Global South studies as well as Global North studies in applied fields such as public health and urban studies, a number of social movement scholars have called for research that addresses inequality and related social justice issues, informs public policies, and assists civil society actors in achieving positive social changes. Social Science Research Council President Craig Calhoun argued that social engagement coupled with systematic reflection provides fertile ground for critical scholarship:

That knowledge is vital to social action—as to individual ethics—has long been recognized. Thinkers have been doers (contrary to stereotype). And reflection on successes, failures, and unexpected consequences of social action has been a vital source of new understanding. Yet activist scholarship often seems an unusual or surprising idea. It isn't widely taught in textbooks. Tenure committees are unsure how to think about it. Why should this be so? Three reasons seem especially influential: (1) modern science (and modern epistemology more generally) has developed an ideal of knowledge based on detached, objective observation; (2) the university has come to contain a much larger proportion of scholarship than in the past (though perhaps not as big a proportion as

academics believe), and thus scholarship is more contained with “academic” agendas and career structures; and (3) activism is widely understood as directly expressive of individual interests, or emotions, or ethical commitments rather than of a broader, more reflective, and more intellectually informed perspective on social issues (2008, p. xiii).

Sociologists conducting community-based research are among those particularly well positioned to answer Calhoun’s call. And, as a result, one would expect rising numbers of CBR articles in peer-reviewed journals. Yet, only a handful of such articles have appeared since his call.^{vii} The limited visibility of CBR research in leading peer-reviewed journals—in and of itself—influences sociologists’ decisions regarding what to study, how, and with whom. Mentors occasionally advise junior scholars to postpone CBR until after tenure. Their suggestion is often driven by the reality that engaged research can take longer and be less predictable. In a contracting job market, their concerns are not without foundation.

Unintentionally, however, this advice can undermine the intrinsic relationship between systematic social investigation and civic responsibilities by limiting dialogs between the scholars and the movements they study. Moreover, since a “commitment to social action in pursuit of social change [fuels] commitment to social science” (Calhoun, 2008, p. xxi), framing social engagement as a risk to securing stable employment could not only discourage CBR and other forms of engaged scholarship but unintentionally weaken sociology as a discipline, untethering it from its roots. And yet, impulsive decisions to undertake CBR without attending to needed supports could demonstrate the very risks of which some warn. To inform such decisions, we review collaborative research’s potential value and risks below.

Potential Advantages and Challenges of Community-based Methods

As with any research methodology, community-based research's suitability depends upon the researchers' goals and context, on the community partner's goals and context, and on the research question at hand. Resources and time constraints are additional factors. Additionally, each partner's publication priorities must be articulated. Here, we sketch potential advantages and challenges to consider when adopting CBR. We also describe efforts by the Publications Committee of URBAN Research Network's Sociology node to establish and disseminate guidelines for community-based research that would facilitate CBR's acceptance by peer-reviewed journals with particular attention to journals covering social movements.^{viii}

Among the potential advantages is the improvement of data quality due to increased community engagement. Jagosh et al. (2012) explain that increased trust between academics and community members strengthens recruitment and response rates. Murphy, Franz, and Callaghan (2015) similarly argue community-based research methods in public health and epidemiological studies have enhanced data collection and analyses improving rather than weakening evidence.

CBR approaches also can provide feedback on research process from constituencies directly affected by the issue at hand (Jagosh et al., 2012). The inclusion of research partners inhabiting distinct social locations also responds to feminist methodologists' calls for researchers to acknowledge their standpoints and include alternative perspectives (Harding, 2004; Fonow and Cook, 2005). In accomplishing the above, CBR promises to implement the oft-cited principle that the social patterns and dynamics named by social researchers should make sense to the social actors being studied (Becker, 2007).

Jagosh et al. (2012) review 591 CBR studies to identify additional benefits including positive outcomes from conflicts successfully resolved and unanticipated outcomes from research questions developed in dialogue. Brown et al. (2012) document increased impact of

research findings on communities directly affected by the issue at hand. These impacts included expanding the organizational capacity of the community-based partnering groups (including increased funding); providing residents with knowledge of environmental exposures and their significance; catalyzing a court decision mandating assessment of an oil refinery's community impacts; and establishing new policies regulating chemical use in consumer products. The benefits to both research and community partner expand if the research relationship can be sustained over time. Ryan and Jeffreys (2019) document how their ongoing dialogs helped deepen their learning about how social movement organizations resolve internal conflicts and refine strategic interventions. Community partners' assistance in collecting and analyzing data also increases when partnerships are ongoing.

Despite the increasing adoption of community-based research methods over the last fifteen years, especially in applied fields, community-based researchers acknowledge recurring challenges (Ryan, 2004; Reason, 2006). These include difficulties in establishing and maintaining research partnerships; in decision-making (Ryan & Jeffreys, 2019); in addressing partners' diverging interests (Ryan, 2004, 2018; Diaz & Gama, 2014); and in research funding^{ix} (Squires and O'Conner, 2001). Sustaining learning communities between studies represents yet an additional challenge. Additionally, challenges arise to insuring research quality as routinely defined. Minkler and Baden (2008, p. 253) report cases of eliminating or mixing control groups and withholding data from the analysis or dissemination phase because these data were perceived as potentially harmful to the community's reputation... From a pure science perspective, these challenges may be viewed as shortfalls of CBPR. Yet from the vantage point of public health practice, many of these concerns can be recast as ethical issues typically associated with human research.

On occasion, research findings can be viewed as inconvenient, or worse, by community partners. Future funding may depend on outcomes of current research which can create conflicts. As part of research planning, collaborators should discuss how, when, where, and to whom findings will be presented. Ryan (2018) describes a case in which the community partners wanted to delay publication of a media monitoring study until they completed negotiations with the local media being monitored.

We would note that most of these issues can also arise among academic research partners and between academic researchers and large institutional partners. As is true in these instances, these related issues can be more readily addressed if there is a longstanding relationship of trust among the researchers (Warren et al., 2018). New challenges can be expected when directly affected constituencies collaborate on problem definition, research design and execution, data analysis and dissemination.

To anticipate challenges, Sandoval et al. (2011) review 273 CBR articles to map an elaborate matrix of factors affecting community-based research. Far from being an automatic method of choice by social justice researchers, the authors argue that community-based research approaches are effective when they concretely address the problem at hand, the desired changes or outcomes, as well as the context in which specific inequalities have evolved. In terms of context, for instance, effective community-based researchers must consider social-economic, cultural, geographic, political-historical, and environmental factors.

The capacity of the community and the resources available to the researcher matter as does the researcher's history and reputation and existing relationships with the community at hand. The selection of community-based research designs may also depend on the social density and tensions within the marginalized constituencies and communities. The resulting matrix is

intended to help researchers and communities to create rigorous studies that consider concrete conditions while expanding research success metrics to include the deepening of working relationships between scholars and communities being studied (Sandoval et al., 2011. p. 682).

Mixed-method research designs (Noy, 2009; Stewart et al., 2008) incorporate CBR strengths while addressing some of challenges previously described. Noy's two-year study embeds his participatory action research with homeless San Franciscans in studies that analyze the socio-historical context and map homelessness as a policy field of networked social actors. In addition to CBR, methods included frame analysis, network analysis, extensive interviews, media content analysis, examination of campaign contribution data, and observation of public meetings. In another mixed method study, Ryan and students worked with Mexican scholar-activist Gabriel Cámara to document how the digital divide in México affected Mexican citizens' ability to make informed decisions regard the relative risks of immigration vs. remaining in México. Mexican teachers in twenty-nine regions of rural México gathered students' questions about the relative merits of immigration while bilingual researchers in the U.S. conducted 200 hours of Internet research in order to address the students' questions (Ryan, 2007; Ryan, Salas, Anastario, & Cámara, 2010).

Stewart et al. (2008) describe the added value of integrating qualitative interviews with Canadians experiencing health disparities coupled with quantitative measures of intervention efficacy stressing the value of participatory studies in refining interventions. Challenges noted include resulting increase in time and labor to analyze vast amounts of qualitative and quantitative data; complex decisions vis-a-vis combining data gathered by different methods; as well as questions regarding how an interdisciplinary group interprets the results. Community-based studies even when effectively providing evidence-based research to document policy

recommendations, might be delayed due to concerns expressed by the community partner, or shifts in political context. Ryan (2018) describes one mixed method study, the publication of which was long delayed due to several of the challenges noted above. In short, the risks suggested that scholars and community partners would need to amass experience and distill best practices for knowledge co-production. It would take work, and work takes time and resources.

In sum, CBR researchers describe collaborations as challenging but worthwhile. The depth of collaboration may vary along a continuum from very partial to full, depending on the context, the need, and the resources at hand. Some studies simply document a standing problem while others advance new concepts and theories as research deepens over iterative cycles. For instance, Maney and collaborators in a series of studies engaged in grounded research in materials produced by social movement organizations and tracked their oppositional strategies over time (Coy, Maney, & Woerhle, 2003; Maney, Woerhle, & Coy, 2005). From these materials, they distilled a concept of oppositional knowledge (Coy, Woerhle, & Maney, 2008). While this work might not be considered CBR per se, Maney and Abraham, then, built on this work to collaborate with community-based organizations to document backlash against immigrant communities in New York (Abraham & Maney, 2008; Maney & Abraham, 2008). Their studies flagged the utility of community-based methods not only for data gathering but for the co-production of oppositional knowledge: “By encouraging systematic reflection upon the reproduction and alteration of social boundaries, community-based action research can assist in the development of more inclusive community practices and public policies” (Abraham & Maney, 2012, p. 183).

Intervention - Guidelines for Peer Review of Community-based Research

Initiated by Gregory Maney, we developed the following guidelines as members of the Publication Committee of the Sociology node of URBAN (Urban Research Based Action Network). Our primary objective was to facilitate the production of community-based research, its publication in scholarly journals, and its dissemination in other venues. Chart 1 captures the key points for producing, evaluating, and disseminating community-based research.

“Take in Chart 1”

The guidelines built on the rich traditions of scholarship previously cited, and on our own community-based research experiences. Our intentions were three-fold:

- 1) To aid editors and reviewers assessing manuscripts featuring community-based research.
- 2) To support community-based researchers in designing studies for critical peer review.
- 3) To help community-based partners understand better how social scientists organize knowledge production. By grasping how university-based researchers operate, community-based organizations can maximize mutual benefits.

We briefly define terms, then, elaborate on the criteria introduced above.

Defining community

Researchers should provide an explicit definition of the community along with a justification for this definition. As with most frequently used terms, there is no consensus on how to define community. Definitions of community are socially constructed and, therefore, unstable, contested, and shaped by power relations. Many sociologists engaged in CBR emphasize constructions of community by those whose voices are marginalized, their strengths denied, and human rights violated. While recognizing the importance of differences in collective identities and structural locations, some scholars and practitioners focus upon relationships when defining

community. Put simply, those who have ongoing relationships with one another form a community. Being part of a community, however, does not necessarily empower individuals or social groups.

Defining participation

Since community-based participatory studies vary greatly in terminology as well as in the content and extent of engagement, Participatory researchers at McGill University proposed guidelines to standardize understandings of community engagement and the stages in which engagement occurred. A detailed checklist flags any decisions to be considered at each stage of the research process—problem definition, method and sample selection, data gathering and analysis, dissemination of results, and decisions regarding future research. This allows collaborators to discuss expectations regarding participation and control step- by- step, project by project.^x

Criteria for Evaluating Methodology

Researchers should provide adequate methodological justification detailing why the specific community-based methods employed are consistent with the research study's aims. Terms such as community and participation should be defined, and researchers should explain how they were operationalized. Methods of data collection, organization, and analysis also should be described. When viable, researchers should triangulate methods to strengthen data quality. Relevant ethical issues should be addressed including decisions regarding data use, dissemination, and protection of human subjects.

Other Standards of Evaluation

CBR should meet the discipline's prevailing standards of methodological rigor (e.g. selection of appropriate specific statistical tests and other tools, unbiased research design, reliability and validity in selection of data and modes of analysis). The way that rigor is attained, however, often differs from conventional means. CBR scholars have identified several practices that can assist activist-scholar teams in keeping ideological blinkers from influencing selection of research methods or interpretations of findings. For example, John Heron and Peter Reason have developed a technique known as challenging consensus collusion where some of the participants formally adopt the role of devil's advocate, questioning the group's reasoning whenever consensus is reached (Heron and Reason 2008).

Embracing multi-positionality, community-based researchers employ evidence-based, systematic methods but question automatic—often taken-for-granted—equations of rigor with disengaged notions of objectivity. As social science methods texts encourage, community-based researchers often triangulate methods. Augmenting traditional approaches, however, CBR researchers include actors representing multiple perspectives and social locations in defining and assessing the social problem at hand, interpreting findings, and reflecting critically on research limitations. So conducted, multi-positional CBR can contribute to greater reliability and validity rather than distort results. Wimpenny and Savin-Baden (2012) propose a process for systematizing collaborative data analysis by researchers and research subjects as well as collaborative meta-analysis of comparable cases.

Criteria for Evaluating Theoretical Contributions

Augmenting knowledge typically generated by more conventional academic approaches, CBR creates new knowledge, different forms of knowledge, and knowledge that predicts the effects of behaviors. We recommend using the following three criteria to evaluate the theoretical contributions of CBR: The integration of multiple forms and sources of knowledge; the enhancement of knowledge based upon its application and/or identification in practice; and the development of action-based theories with predictive power.

(1) Integration of multiple forms and sources of knowledge.

Academics generate and test hypotheses about social issues. The knowledge generated by scholars is more helpful to community members when it is integrated with the local knowledge that community members already possess. Community members theorize about the causes of their problems as well as effective paths to eliminating these problems within a given social context. Moreover, community members often hold other forms of knowledge to a greater extent than scholars such as knowledge derived from direct, personal experience, knowledge of ways to persuasively present findings to targeted audiences [e.g., visual presentations], and practical knowledge such as relevant assets, stakeholders, culturally-based variations, and power dynamics within the community.

(2) Enhancement of knowledge through practice.

Multiple forms and sources of knowledge can be applied in and assessed through practice and/or discovered through the research process itself. Iterative cycles of action and reflection allow for revision of theory based upon lessons learned in practice. Certain CBR methods such as asset mapping, conscientization^{xi}, interpretive focus groups,

participant-action workshops, and policy as process—carefully cultivate knowledge based in the community.

(3) Development of action-based theories with predictive power.

CBR develops and refines theory through practice with practice understood to involve cycles of action and reflection. By generating theories with greater predictive power, iterative cycles of reflection take us beyond *ex post facto* explanations that currently dominate our discipline and make our theories much less appealing to practitioners than other disciplines such as economics (Jasper 2010). The iterative quality of the research process also reduces the likelihood of researchers becoming overly confident in the external validity of our findings. Further reflection upon unexpected consequences can lead to different actions that more consistently produce expected outcomes. Predictive power requires developing small to middle range theories that are sensitive to contextual variations. In this light, case studies create critical data-points that enable us to identify various combinations of factors that result in the same or similar outcomes when the same action is applied.

CBR actually shares many of the objectives of more traditional social science methods. The primary goal is to develop new knowledge and to do so with tools that produce valid and reliable evidenced-based findings. But CBR is more explicitly oriented to the creation of knowledge that can change the situation being studied. And it brings more tools to the research process that often generate knowledge that might not be produced by more traditional methods.

Criteria for Presenting Findings

Regardless of a scholar's willingness or ability to conduct collaborative research, knowledge produced by standard sociological methods can be useful to activists provided that scholars develop accessible and context-specific applications of this knowledge (e.g., a

spreadsheet facilitating the application of criteria for selecting board members). Using simple terms, brevity, visually compelling graphics, and user-friendly applications all make knowledge generated by our field more useful to activists and to the public. Per our growing commitment to public sociology, findings should be presented in ways that go beyond scholars in a particular field to speak to multiple audiences, including policy makers, journalists, and above all those who are directly affected by what is being researched. This may mean that researchers prepare multiple research products tailored to distinct audiences. Authors should clarify the role of collaborators in producing and disseminating research.

Discussion

Social movements generate social change in part by creating new ideas, thoughts, and knowledge (Morris, 1986, 2015; Eyerman and Jamison, 1991:55). Through these ideas, movements define themselves in society (Eyerman and Jamison, 1991:55), then one would expect movements to seek every opportunity to strengthen their ability to draw lessons from experience. Similarly, if movements serve as incubators and testing grounds for social knowledge one would expect scholars to be eager to work with movements to document their strategies, cultures, ideas, and practices. And, one would expect scholars to welcome chances to test their own theories in practice. Theory is, after all, intended to have predictive value. In short, one would expect social movement scholars to value working relationships with the movements that create new concepts and ideas.

Moreover, the working relationship need not be one-way or parasitic. It could be symbiotic; scholars could share ideas, practices, and lessons from social movements in other times and places. Scholars could also help movements streamline and strengthen the gathering of empirical evidence about movement projects, strategies, and practices and other relevant topics

of study. Scholars could include movement organizations as active partners in testing the thoughts and ideas emerging in both movements and in academic discourses.

One would also expect movements to value working relationships with scholars. If a movement's thoughts and ideas define it in society, one would expect movement activists to welcome any support that strengthens their ability to create, articulate, and develop their ideas. For instance, movement activists would appreciate scholars' ability to distill and share concepts, lessons, and practices from social movements in other times and places. And they could tap scholars' training in methods for identifying social patterns and gathering evidence.

We do not privilege community-based research, or more broadly, engaged scholarship as the only or best approach to understanding social movements as collective actors. That said, its limited acceptance in Global North research on social movements, conflict and change is illogical and sad. For their part, movements lose access to information about social movement experiments in other times and places. This leaves movement actors less prepared to create, articulate, and formulate "new thoughts and ideas—new knowledge" (Eyerman and Jamison, 1991: 55). Finally, scholar-activist divides limit movement activists' access to methods that would help them systematically test movement-building theories. From the scholars' perspective, limiting collaboration with movements reduces opportunities to gather empirical evidence. Scholars lose partners who could test their movement-building theories in concrete social practice. And scholars become marginalized from the generation of new ideas and knowledge that Eyerman and Jamison flagged as the signature of social movements.

In terms of which journals receive CBR submissions, self-selection may be in play; community-based researchers understandably gravitate toward journals such as JASS with a proven record of publishing community-based and/or other engaged research.^{xiii} Additionally, we

recognize the academy's intensified demands for more and faster peer-reviewed publications by junior faculty and graduate students. Our limited impact on increasing submission of CBR studies to sociological journals could also reflect the limits of what we attempted; our efforts to clarify standards and criteria for peer review of CBR did not reduce most of the challenges named above that can make CBR more time consuming and risky.

Efforts to tackle these challenges are ongoing. Maney and Ryan offered a 2014 workshop for emerging social movement scholars in which editors of several highly regarded journals participated. Ryan joined with colleagues in the Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP) Jessica Lucero and Felicia Sullivan to sponsor sessions and trainings at SSSP conferences. Squires and other URBAN faculty engaged in similar efforts within the American Sociological Association.

While editors' responses to the peer-review guidelines were encouraging, institutional barriers in the discipline, in funding sources, and within universities remain daunting, especially for the untenured, and those working within highly competitive research institutions. We continue to conduct community-based research, share lessons, and promote guidelines for its critical review, but have come to expect progress to remain slow.^{xiii}

Conclusion

Here we have argued for community-based research methods not as magic bullets for resolving social sciences' long unresolved epistemological debates, but rather as systematic approaches to research that are well-suited for identifying and documenting patterns of social inequality, and for studying social movement organizations as intentional strategic agents—social actors who can create shared goals, shared mappings of social forces, and can develop and

test strategies for challenging those inequalities. The capacity to accomplish this deepens when ongoing conversations build relations of trust (Warren et al. 2018; Ryan & Jeffreys, 2019). This insight is not new: over a decade ago, feminist theologian Margaret Mies reminded academics that “Scholars... are only as good as the conversations in which we participate” (2006, p. 9).

Community-based research methods offer one way to systematize conversations with movement organizers and community leaders who theorize among themselves constantly. This is easier than many scholars imagine. Yearly, social science departments produce graduates who become citizen activists, public servants, and/or community advocates. U.S. workers in public and community service often have undergraduate training to identify and document social problems, but this training is often underutilized by their employing organizations. Conversely, in Global South countries, those with social science degrees quite often function as social scientists working with grassroots communities and with academic colleagues to map and address social inequalities. If this is unimaginable in the U.S., perhaps scholars are failing to imagine it.

We suggest that engaged research, especially research conducted as part of ongoing conversations between social movement actors and the researchers who study them can be mutually beneficial. It can rekindle and reinvigorate public debates on current social inequalities even as it advances evidence-based research about social movements. In dialog about existing social inequalities, collaborators can devise simple methods that document inequalities, and then, track collective interventions to challenge them. So conducted, collaborative research can enhance the quality of scholarship while increasing the likelihood that emerging theories and strategies can be tempered in sustained practice. In so doing, collaborative research produces

possibilities to break with activist practices that have not been examined reflexively and with social movement theories that have remained untested.

The capacity to theorize builds over time. In ongoing conversations, community-based researchers and their community partners establish and deepen shared conceptual language and tools for identifying social patterns through iterative cycles of dialog, action, reflection, and documentation. Ongoing conversations and relationships allow scholars and activists to innovate.

Over the course of collaborative cycles, social knowledge can (but does not necessarily) accrue. Integrating everyday knowledge/lay sociologies into academic discourse has the potential to enrich knowledge production and theorizing (Ryan and Jeffreys, 2019). Moreover, engaged scholars working in tandem with community partners are particularly well situated to reflect systematically on knowledge production as a historically embedded process conducted by positioned researchers.

But despite the evidence and the advocacy of community-based research over decades, despite the interest of communities studied, despite sustained support for engaged scholarship from the Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP), the International Sociological Association (ISA), as well as many interdisciplinary and applied professional associations and research centers, community-based research and related approaches—participatory action research, collaborative research, etc.—remain marginal at best^{xiv} within U.S. sociology. CBR studies still rarely appear in top peer-reviewed journals save for special issues or unless the journal specializes in applied and/or community issues.

This last point is sobering: academic job security often depends on a scholar's success publishing research in peer-reviewed academic journals. Increasingly, tenure and promotion review committees have raised the bar: not only must the scholar publish regularly in peer-

reviewed journals, the journal must be a “top journal in the field,” those that for whatever reason have not traditionally published much CBR. And in many institutions, tenure committees’ expectations regarding the number of peer-reviewed publications continue to rise.

Academic publishing is needed for survival in university settings, but this attention to professional survival could obscure the original intention of peer-reviewed scholarship, namely that we conduct social science research to understand patterns in human society, and that close review by peers—sharing common language, theories, and methods—strengthens systematic, evidence-based analyses of those social patterns. We have argued that, in addition to academic peers, community and movement actors operating within the patterns under study have much to contribute to researchers’ understanding of social problems and their solutions. We also fear that when quantity of publications in top journals becomes the litmus test for faculty promotion, scholars lack incentives to question their own positionality much less explore whether their isolation undermines efforts to advance and test movement-building theories and strategies.

Alternatively, more consistent dialog with communities directly affected can strengthen theorizing and can improve social interventions. It matters, for instance, that research on power inequalities is conducted in dialog with the questions, experiences and insights of communities living within and challenging those inequalities. And it matters that these understandings become accessible, rigorously documented social knowledge used to inform and change human behaviors.

Bridges are possible. Thinking activists and acting thinkers can work together to design research that advances community understanding of social problems *and* addresses scholarly publication needs. Collaboration can be risky but also rewarding. It is time we shift our focus from the question of whether co-production of social knowledge is possible, to the question,

“How?” (Gans, 1989, 2003, 2011). And we join community thinkers who ask not only how, but “How long, how long?” (Robnett, 2000).

Acknowledgements

Gregory Maney was the lead author of the original draft of URBAN’s Guidelines for Peer Review of Community-based Research. Along with Ryan and Squires, Maney served on the URBAN Publications Committee. We thank editors Lisa Leitz and Eitan Alimi for invaluable criticism of multiple drafts.

References

- Abraham, M. & Purkayastha, B. (2012). Making a difference: Linking research and action in practice, pedagogy, and policy for social justice. *Current Sociology* 60(2), 123-141.
- Abraham, M. & Maney, G. M. (2012). Transforming place and belonging through action research, community practice, and public policy: Comparing responses to NIMBYism.” *Current Sociology* 60(2), 178-201.
- Acker, J. (2005.) Comments on Burawoy on public sociology. *Critical Sociology*, 31(3), 321-331.
- American Sociological Association Task Force on Institutionalizing Public Sociologies. (2005). Public sociology and the roots of American sociology: Re-establishing our connections to the public. Report and recommendations submitted by the American Sociological Association Task Force on Institutionalizing Public Sociologies (July).

- Aronowitz, S. (2005). Comments on Michael Burawoy, 'The critical turn to public sociology.' *Critical Sociology*, 31(3), 333-338.
- Arribas Lozano, A. (2014) Lógicas emergentes de acción colectiva y prácticas colaborativas de investigación: Apuntes para una antropología junto y con los movimientos sociales." *Gazeta de Antropología*; 30(1) Article 7.
- Arribas Lozano, Alberto. (2018). Reframing the public sociology debate: Towards collaborative and decolonial praxis. *Current Sociology* Vol. 66(1), 92–109. Retrieved from doi/10.1177/0011392117715897
- Baiocchi, G. (2005). Interrogating connections: From public criticisms to critical publics in Burawoy's public sociology, *Critical Sociology* 31(3), 339–51.
- Becker, H.S. (2007.) *Writing for social scientists: How to start and finish your thesis, book, or article*. 2d ed. Chicago Guides to Writing, Editing, and Publishing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bevington, D., & Dixon, C. (2005). Movement-relevant theory: Rethinking social movement scholarship and activism. *Social movement studies*, 4(3), 185-208.
- Brewer, R. (2005). Response to Michael Burawoy's commentary: 'The Critical Turn to Public Sociology.' *Critical Sociology* 31(3), 353-359.
- Brown, P., Brody, J. Morello-Frosch, R., Tovar, J., Zota, A.R., & Rudel, R. (2012). Measuring the success of community science: The Northern California household exposure study. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 120(3), 326–331.
- Brydon-Miller, M., Greenwood, D., & Maguire, P. (2003). Why action research? *Action Research* 1(1), 9-28.

- Bullard, R. (2007). *Growing smarter: Achieving livable communities, environmental justice, and regional equity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Burawoy, M. (2005). For public sociology. 2004 presidential address. *American Sociological Review* 70(1),4-28.
- Calhoun, C. (2008). Foreword. In C. Hale (Ed.), *Engaging contradictions: Theory, politics, and methods of activist scholarship* (pp. xiii-xxvi). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (2018). Retrieved from www.ccph.info
- Cornwall, A., & Jewkes, R., (1995). What is participatory research? *Social Science and Medicine*, 41(12), 1667-1676.
- Coser, L. A. (1977). *Masters of sociological thought: Ideas in historical and social context*. Long Grove, ILL: Waveland Press.
- Coy, P. G., Woehrle, L. M., & Maney, G. M. (2008). A typology of oppositional knowledge: Democracy and the US peace movement. *Sociological Research Online*, 13(4), 1-15.
- Coy, P. G., Maney, G. M., & Woehrle, L. M. (2003). Contesting patriotism. *Peace Review*, 15(4), 463-470.
- Croteau, D. (2005). Which side are you on? The tension between movement scholarship and activism. In D. Croteau, W. Hoynes, & C. Ryan, (Eds.) *Rhyming hope and history: Activists, academics, and social movement scholarship* (pp. 20-40). Minneapolis: MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Croteau, D. & Hicks, L. (2003). Coalition framing and the challenge of a consonant frame pyramid: The case of a collaborative response to homelessness. *Social Problems* 50(2), 251-72.

- Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Ryan, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Rhyming hope and history: Activists, academics, and social movement scholarship*. Minneapolis: MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- De Vos, A. S., Delport, C. S. L., Fouché, C. B., & Strydom, H. (2011). *Research at grass roots: A primer for the social sciences and human services professions*. Pretoria, South Africa: van Schaik.
- Dias, S. & Gama, A. (2014). Investigação participativa baseada na comunidade em saúde pública: potencialidades e desafios. *Revista Panamericana Salud Pública*. 35(2), 150-4.
- Eyerman, R., & Jamison, A. (1991). *Social movements: A cognitive approach*. State College, PA: Pennsylvania State Press.
- Fals Borda, O. & Rahman, M. A. (1991). *Action and knowledge: Breaking the monopoly with participatory action-research*. New York: Apex Press.
- Flacks, R. (2005). The question of relevance in social movement studies. In D. Croteau, W. Hoynes, & C. Ryan, (Eds.) *Rhyming hope and history: Activists, academics, and social movement scholarship*. (pp. 3-19). Minneapolis: MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fonow, M.M. & Cook, J. (2005). Feminist methodology: New applications in the academy and public policy. *Signs*, 30(4), 2211-2236.
- Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. (1994). Introduction, in S. A. White, K.S. Nair, J.R. Ascroft (Eds.). *Participatory communication*. (pp.12-13). Delhi: Sage Publication.
- Gans, H. J. (1989). Sociology in America: The discipline and the public. American Sociological Association 1988 presidential address. *American Sociological Review*, 54(1), 1-16.
- Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2095658>

- Gans, H. J. (2003). *Democracy and the news*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gans, H. J. (2011). Multiperspectival news revisited: Journalism and representative democracy. *Journalism*, 12(1), 3-13.
- Gasior A., R., Morello-Frosch, R., Brody, J.G., Rudel, R., Brown P. & Averick, M. (2008). Pollution comes home and gets personal: Women's experience of household chemical exposure. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 49(4), 417-435.
- Gedicks, A. (2004). Liberation sociology and advocacy for the Sokaogon Ojibwe. *Organization and Environment*, 17(4), 449-470.
- Ghamari-Tabrizi, B. (2005). Can Burawoy make everybody happy? Comments on public sociology. *Critical Sociology*, 31(3): 361-9.
- Green, L. W., George, M.A., Daniel, M., Frankish, C J., Herbert, C.J., Bowie, W. R., & O'Neill, M. (1995). Study of participatory research in health promotion. *Review and recommendations for development of participatory research in health promotion in Canada*. Ottawa, Ontario: The Royal Society of Canada (1995). Retrieved from <http://pram.mcgill.ca>
- Haluza-Delay, R. (2003). When the topic is racism: Research and advocacy with a community coalition. *Social Justice*, 30(4), 77-90.
- Harding, S. (2004). Introduction: Standpoint theory as a site of political, philosophic, and scientific debate. In S. Harding (Ed.) *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies* (pp. 1-15). New York: Routledge.
- Heron, J. & Reason, P. (2008). Extending epistemology within a cooperative inquiry. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 366-380). London, GB: Sage.

- Hill-Collins, P. (2011). The new politics of community. American Sociological Association 2010 presidential address. *American Sociological Review*, 75(1), 7-30. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27801509>
- 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. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 19(1), 173-202.
- Jagosh, J., Macaulay, A.C., Pluye, P., Salsberg, J., Bush, P.L., Henderson, J., Sirett, E. et al. (2012). Uncovering the benefits of participatory research: Implications of a realist review for health research and practice. *Milbank Quarterly*, 90(2), 311-346.
- Jasper, J. (2010). Social movement theory today: Toward a theory of action? *Sociology Compass*, 4(11), 965-976.
- Jeffries, V. (Ed). (2009). *Handbook of public sociology*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kidd, D. (2003). Become the media: The global IMC network. *Contributions to the Study of Mass Media and Communications*, 66, 224-240.
- Kreuter, M. W., Kegler, M.C., Joseph, K.T., Redwood, Y.A., & Hooker, M. (2012). The impact of implementing selected CBPR strategies to address disparities in urban Atlanta: A retrospective case study. *Health Education Research* 27(4), 729-741. Retrieved from doi:[10.1093/her/cys053](https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cys053)
- Krinsky, J. & Barker. C. (2009). Movement strategizing as developmental learning. In H. Johnston, (Ed.), *Culture, Social Movements, and Protest* (pp. 209-226). Farnham, SY: Ashgate.
- Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 2(4), 34-46.
- Maney, G. M. (2000). Transnational mobilization and civil rights in Northern Ireland. *Social*

- Problems*, 47(2), 153-179.
- Maney, G. M., Woehrle, L. M., & Coy, P. G. (2005). Harnessing and challenging hegemony: The US peace movement after 9/11. *Sociological Perspectives*, 48(3), 357-381.
- Maney, G. M., & Abraham, M. (2008). Whose backyard? Boundary making in NIMBY opposition to immigrant services. *Social Justice*, 35(4), 66-82.
- Massey, D. S. & Denton, N. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mayer, M., Thörn, C., & Thörn, H. (Eds.). (2016). *Urban uprisings: Challenging neoliberal urbanism in Europe*. Berlin, DE: Springer.
- Mies, M. (2006). Amid the uncertainty, valuing the joy. *Harvard Divinity Today*, 2, 9-10.
- Milan, S. (2014). The ethics of social movement research. In D. della Porta (Ed.), *Methodological practices in social movement research* (pp. 446-464). New York, NY; Oxford University Press.
- Minkler, M. & Baden, A. (2008). Impacts of CBPR on academic researchers, research quality and methodology, and power relations, in Minkler & Wallerstein (Eds.), *Community-based participatory research for health: From process to outcomes* (pp. 243-262). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Minkler, M., Garcia, A.P., Williams, J., LoPresti, T., & Lilly, J. (2010). 'Si se puede:' Using participatory research to promote environmental justice in a Latino community in San Diego, California. *Journal of Urban Health*, 87(5),796-812.
- Mohanty, C. (2004). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Morris, A. D. (1986). *The origins of the civil rights movement: Black communities organizing for change*. New York, NY: Free Press
- Morris, A. D. (2015). *The Scholar denied: WEB DuBois and the birth of modern sociology*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Murphy, J. W., Franz, B., Callaghan, K. A. (2015). Is community-based work compatible with data collection? *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*. 42(4) Article 2. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol42/iss4/2>
- National Law Center on Homeless and Poverty (NLCHP). (2013). Cruel, inhuman, and degrading: Homelessness in the United States under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Submitted to the UN Human Rights Committee August 23, 2013. Retrieved from https://nlchp.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Cruel_Inhuman_and_Degrading.pdf
- Nhamo, G. (2012) Participatory action research as a platform for community engagement in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 10(1), 1–21.
- Noy, D. (2009). When framing fails: Ideas, influence, and resources in San Francisco's homeless policy. *Social Problems*. 56(2), 223-242. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2009.56.2.223>
- Padgug, R. A. (1989). Gay villain, gay hero: Homosexuality and the social construction of AIDS. In K.L. Peiss, C. Simmons., & R. Padgug (Eds.), *Passion and power: Sexuality in history*, (pp. 293-313). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Parkes, J. (2008). The power of talk: Transformative possibilities in researching violence with children in South Africa. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 11(4), 293-306.

- Payne, C. M. (2007). *I've got the light of freedom: The organizing tradition and the Mississippi freedom struggle*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Payne, C. M., & Kaba, M. (2007). So much reform, so little change: Building-level obstacles to urban school reform. *Social Policy*, 37(3/4), 30-37.
- Perks, R. & Thomson, A. (Eds.) (1998). *The oral history reader*. London, GB: Routledge.
- Peters, C. (2005). Knowing what's wrong is not enough: creating strategy and vision. In D. Croteau, W. Hoynes, & C. Ryan, (Eds.), *Rhyming hope and history: Activists, academics, and social movement scholarship* (pp. 41-56). Minneapolis: MN: U of Minnesota Press.
- Petersen, D., Minkler, M., Vásquez, V. B., & Baden, A. C. (2006). Community-based participatory research as a tool for policy change: A case study of the Southern California environmental justice collaborative. *Review of Policy Research*, 23(2), 339-354.
- Public Science Project (2018). Retrieved from <http://publicscienceproject.org>.
- Rahman, M. A. (2008). Some trends in the praxis of participatory action research. *The Sage handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice*, 49-62. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rapoport, R., Bailyn, L., Fletcher, J. K., & Pruitt, B. H. (2002). *Beyond work-family balance: Advancing gender equity and workplace performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Reason, P. (2006). Choice and quality in action research practice. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 15(2), 187-203. Retrieved from doi:10.1177/1056492606288074.
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Riaño, P. (Ed.) (1994). *Women in grassroots communication: Furthering social change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Robnett, B. (2000). *How long? How long: African-American women in the struggle for civil rights*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rossi, P. (1981). The challenge and opportunities of applied social research. American Sociological Association 1980 presidential address. *American Sociological Review*, 45(6), 889-904.
- Ryan, C. (2004). Can we be compañeros? *Social Problems* 51(1), 110-113.
- Ryan, C. (2007). 'Who are these people?' Under-recognized internet audiences. *Revista Iberoamericana de Comunicación*, Winter, 2007, 11- 26.
- Ryan, C. Manski, B., & Maney, G. (2016). Social movement thinkers, activist scholars discuss emerging agenda for movement relevant research. *Critical Mass*, 41(2), 6-7.
- Ryan, C. (2018) Research collaboration in a communication rights campaign; Lessons learned. *NEW SOLUTIONS: A Journal of Environmental and Occupational Health Policy*, 28(2), 303-320. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/10482911177524>
- Ryan, C., Salas, V., Anastario, M., & Cámara, G. (2010). Making communication research matter: Matter to whom? *International Journal of Communication* 4,1-10. Retrieved from <http://ijoc.org/ojs/index.php/ijoc/index>
- Ryan, C., Jeffreys, K., Ryczek, J., & Diaz, J. (2014.) Building the public will: The battle for affordable—and supportive—housing. *Journal of Poverty* 18(3), 1-20. Retrieved from doi:10.1080/10875549.2014.923967
- Ryan, C. & Jeffreys, K. 2019. *Beyond Prime Time: Communication Activism for Social Change*. New York: Routledge.
- Saelinger, D. (2006). Nowhere to go: The impacts of city ordinances criminalizing homelessness. *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy*, 13(3), 545-566.

Sandoval, J. A., Lucero, J., Oetzel, J., Avila, M., Belone, L., Mau, M., Pearson, C., Tayofa, G.,

Duran, B., Rios, L. & Wallerstein, N. (2011). Process and outcome constructs for evaluating community-based participatory research projects: A matrix of existing measures. *Health Education Research*, 27(4):680-690.

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Broadway Business.

Skura, B. (1976). Constraints on a Reform Movement: Relationships between SSSP and ASA, 1951-1970. *Social Problems*, 24(1), 15-36. Retrieved from

<https://doi.org/10.2307/800319>

Smith, L. T. (2013). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London, GB: Zed Books.

Squires, G. D. (Ed.) (2018). *The fight for fair housing: Causes, consequences, and future implications of the 1968 Fair Housing Act*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Squires, G. D. & O'Connor, S. (2001). *Color and money: Politics and prospects for community reinvestment in urban America*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Stall, S. & Stoecker, R. (1998). Community organizing or organizing community? Gender and the crafts of empowerment. *Gender and Society*, 12(6), 729-756. Retrieved from

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0891-2432%28199812%2912%3A6%3C729%3ACOOOCG%3E2.0.CO%3B2-1>

Stewart, M., Makwarimba, E., Barnfather, A., Letourneau, N. & Neufeld, A. (2008). Researching reducing health disparities: Mixed-methods approaches. *Social Science & Medicine*, 66(6):1406-1417.

Stoecker, R. (2009). Are we talking the walk of community-based research? *Action Research*, 7:385-404. Retrieved from doi:10.1177/1476750309340944

- Stoecker, R. & Beckwith, D., (1992). Advancing Toledo's neighborhood movement through participatory action research: integrating activist and academic approaches. *Clinical Sociology Review*, 10(1):18.
- Taylor, V. (1998). Feminist methodology in social movements research. *Qualitative Sociology*, 21(4), 357-379.
- Treviño, A. J., (2012). The challenge of service sociology. Society for the Study of Social Problems presidential address. *Social Problems*, 59(1), 2-20.
- Treviño, A. J. (2013). On the facilitating actions of service sociology. *Journal of Applied Social Science*, 7(1), 95-109.
- URBAN. (2018). Retrieved from www.urbanresearchnetwork.org
- Wallerstein, N. & Duran, B., (2010). Community-based participatory research contributions to intervention research: The intersection of science and practice to improve health equity. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100 (S1), S40–S46. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2837458/> doi:10.2105/AJPH.2009.184036.
- Warren, M., Calderon, J., Kupscznk, L., Squires, G., & Su., C. (2018). Is collaborative, community-engaged scholarship more rigorous than traditional scholarship? On advocacy, bias and social science research. *Urban Education* 53(4), 445-472. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0042085918763511>
- Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of practice and social learning systems. *Organization* 7(2), 225-246.
- Whyte, W. F. (1991). Participatory action research: Through practice to science in social research. *Participatory action research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Wimpenny, K. & Savin-Baden, M. (2012). Exploring and implementing participatory action synthesis. *Qualitative Inquiry* 18(8), 689-698.

Chart 1 Guidelines for Peer Review of Community-based Research

The URBAN Publication Committee drafted these guidelines to help editors and reviewers identify high-quality community-based research for publication. The guidelines also may help researchers conduct high-quality studies. The full guidelines with exemplars are posted at www.urbanresearchnetwork.org.

Definition – Community-based Research (CBR)

In broad terms, community-based research (CBR) includes community members at some level in directing, designing, implementing, analyzing, using and/or evaluating research aimed at empowering the community and facilitating social change.

Criteria for Evaluating Methodology

CBR submissions should meet prevailing standards of methodological rigor, such as careful research design, and, if applicable, reliable and valid data sources and coding. How rigor is attained, however, may differ from conventional approaches to research objectivity. In this way CBR highlights epistemological questions at the core of research. For instance, CBR researchers argue that analyzing data with community-based actors representing multiple perspectives and social locations can strengthen rather than weaken reliability and validity. To maintain rigor, CBR researchers (as do all social researchers) should:

- 1) Define terms (e.g., community, participation), and how they are operationalized.
- 2) Describe communities involved (e.g., geographic, socio-economic, ethnographic, etc.).
- 3) Spell out the nature and degree of community involvement in research process.
- 4) Explain why the selected community-based methods suit the study's aims.
- 5) Make explicit strategies and methods of data collection, organization, and analysis.
- 6) Triangulate methods to address characteristic strengths and weaknesses.
- 7) Address all relevant ethical issues such as data use, dissemination, protection of human subjects, etc.
- 8) Specify understandings outside traditional research arrangements (editorial control of presentation, data ownership, etc.).
- 9) Delineate limitations and advantages of the resulting study in design and execution.
- 10) Include community partners in evaluating research's relative and mutual benefits.

Criteria for Evaluating Theoretical Contributions

CBR may generate different forms of knowledge than conventional academic approaches. To evaluate theoretical contributions of CBR, reviewers should assess how researchers:

- (1) Integrate multiple forms and sources of knowledge, including a theoretical orientation that helps address the methodological challenges specific to a research project.
- (2) Enhance knowledge based on its application in practice;
- (3) Develop action-based theories with predictive power.

Criteria for Presenting Findings

Community-based researchers should:

- (1) Clarify collaborators' roles in conceptualizing, producing, and disseminating research.
- (2) Commit to producing knowledge in formats useful to all collaborators, including activists. This may entail preparing publications tailored to distinct audiences.

ⁱ We focus on the U.S. with occasional examples from Canada. Within the U.S., scholar-movement collaboration is more common in public health and applied social sciences than in academic sociology. Movement-scholar collaboration also is more common among marginalized constituencies in the Global North and in regions with Freirian traditions of scholar-community-movement engagement or with recent histories of social liberation battles.

-
- ⁱⁱ See for instance, the Public Science Project, Union of Radical Political Economists, the Grassroots Policy Project, the Media Research Action Project, the Political Research Associates, Center for Labor Research and Education (UCLA), the Center for Budget Priorities, Highlander Center, Center for Urban Research and Learning (CURL) and many others. An earlier guide to peer-review of CBR can be retrieved from www.urbanresearchnetwork.org.
- ⁱⁱⁱ In arguing for collaborative approaches to social movement research, we do not claim they are always preferable. Method selection depends research partners' resources, needs, time frame, and skills as well as the problem at hand.
- ^{iv} Many studies cited herein used collaborative research approaches in conjunction with other approaches.
- ^v The Community Reinvestment Action is a 1977 federal law prohibiting redlining.
- ^{vi} Croteau (2005) argues convincingly that social activists and social movement scholars inhabit a shifting continuum of roles with many of us attempting to operate as activists who theorize and scholars who act. Here we dichotomize the roles of scholars and activists to clarify discrete tasks entailed in building collaborative research relationships.
- ^{vii} See MRAP Working Paper: A Guide to Engaged Scholarship. Retrieved from www.mrap.info.
- ^{viii} Gregory M. Maney wrote the first draft of these guidelines. Maney, Gregory Squires, and Charlotte Ryan were the core members of the URBAN Publication Committee and anchored the guidelines' creation and dissemination. We summarize the guidelines later. Full guidelines can be retrieved from <https://urbanresearchnetwork.org/guidelines-for-peer-reviewing-community-based-research>
- ^{ix} Public health studies are a possible exception.
- ^x See: "Guidelines and Categories for Classifying Participatory Research Projects in Health Promotion." <http://www.lgreen.net/guidelines.html> See also Participatory Research at McGill (PRAM) retrieved from www.pram.mcgill.ca
- ^{xi} Conscientization is the action or process of making others aware of political and social conditions, especially as a precursor to challenging inequalities of treatment or opportunity; the fact of being aware of these conditions. Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/conscientization>
- ^{xii} A list of journals that regularly publish community-based research can be retrieved from www.mrap.info and www.urbanresearchnetwork.org
- ^{xiii} SSSP 2019 conference will feature a CBPAR pre-conference workshop.
- ^{xiv} This article focuses on the limited status of CBR, PAR, etc. in the discipline of sociology especially, sociological studies of social movements. The application of PAR in the global south, and in global north disciplines such as public health, social work, education, and other applied social sciences is beyond the scope of this article.