

## References

- Boyer, Ernest L. 1987. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bringle, Robert G., Richard Games, and Edward A. Malloy. 1999. *Colleges and Universities as Citizens*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bruner, Jerome. 1996. *The Culture of Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Fisher, Robert, and Robert Fisher. 1997. *Let the People Decide: Neighborhood Organizing in America (Social Movements Past and Present)*. New York: Twayne Pub., Inc.
- Kretzmann, John P., and John L. McKnight. 1993. *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community Assets*. Chicago: ACTA Publications.
- Mattessich, Paul, and Barbara Monsey. 1997. *Community Building: What Makes It Work: A Review of Factors Influencing Successful Community Building*. St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.
- Maurrasse, David J. 2001. *Beyond the Campus: How Colleges and Universities Form Partnerships with Their Communities*. London: Routledge.
- Sigmon, Robert L. 1998. *Building Sustainable Partnerships: Linking Communities and Educational Institutions*. Raleigh, NC: NSEE.

# Practices and Challenges of Community-Based Research\*

Randy Stoecker

## Abstract

This article identifies common challenges facing a new model of community engagement called community-based research (CBR). While including service-learning components, it differs in that it emphasizes community control over the partnership, and focuses the partnership on research activities that further community goals. The article describes the steps of a typical CBR project, and then discusses the challenges, including conflicts between career, curricular, and community needs; conflicts between teacher and facilitator roles; conflicts between researcher and activist roles; the different life rhythms of community and higher education; community politics; distribution of funding and other benefits; and student services versus academic affairs orientations to CBR.

## Introduction

This article explores the practice of community-based research (CBR) and the common challenges faced by a diverse group of eleven higher education institutions that developed CBR centers. Sponsored through the Corella and Bertram F. Bonner Foundation (2001) and funded through a three-year Corporation for National Service (2001) grant, their goals were to do CBR projects and establish centers to support the expansion of CBR. With an average per-institution grant of only \$11,000 per year, the institutions provided small grants to faculty developing CBR courses, brought in trainers to develop CBR skills and models on campus, provided stipends for students doing CBR, and funded community-university meetings. The centers involved in this project ranged from the University of Michigan's Edward Ginsberg Center for Community Service and Learning (which won a \$5 million endowment during the grant period), to small colleges that

---

\* Sincere thanks to Bobby Hackett, Vice President of the Bonner Foundation, and Professor Laura O'Toole of Guilford College for involving me in this project during its early stages. Also thanks to Campus Compact (2001) for a \$7,600 grant to support this research. Finally, sincere thanks to Hank Dobin, Patrick Donohue, Steve Fisher, Thomas Plaut, and Chris Roose for detailed comments on draft reports from this research. This is part of a larger research project, a report of which can be found at <http://coserver.sa.utoledo.edu/drafts/cbrreportb.htm>.

have been able to identify a faculty volunteer and a vacant office. A few centers existed prior to the program, but most either began or expanded as a result of the program.<sup>1</sup>

The research findings presented here are based on a participatory research process. The main research questions were developed at a 1999 gathering of all the schools. The author conducted focus groups and individual interviews with faculty, administrators, students, and community organization representatives at many of the schools. The Bonner Foundation CNS grant also supported student interviewers at three campuses. Participants reviewed all descriptions and quotes used in this paper. Directors and staff of the centers included in this research reviewed and revised the descriptions of their centers and commented on report drafts.<sup>2</sup>

### **What Is CBR?**

CBR is regularly presented as both a new practice and an academic invention. It is in fact a practice that dates back to many models, some inside academia but many outside.

Perhaps the most important and unrecognized influence on CBR in the United States is the Highlander Research and Education Center (1998) in the hills of Tennessee. Highlander was where the Congress of Industrial Organizations developed its philosophy of racially integrated labor organizing, and where Rosa Parks studied how to implement the *Brown v. Board of Education* school integration decision. One of the most famous pieces of work that set the standard for community-based research was the Appalachian land ownership study where academics, lawyers, and community activists mapped land ownership patterns across Appalachia and compared those patterns to quality of life measures. Out of the data they organized community mobilizations, made demands on local and state governments and mining companies, and took important issues to court (Adams 1975; Bledsoe 1969; Glen 1988; Horton 1989; Horton 1993).

U.S. CBR has also been influenced by the 1950s industrial psychology research of Kurt Lewin and colleagues who conducted applied research with industry to increase worker productivity and satisfaction.

Seen by many as the most conservative influence on CBR because it did not challenge existing power relationships, it was nonetheless important because of its emphasis on mixing theory and practice, such as the union-management research collaboration to save jobs and improve worker satisfaction facilitated by William F. Whyte (1991).

The third-world development movement of the 1960s also influences CBR. Even then global corporations were replacing indigenous agriculture with "banana plantations," causing third world farmers to lose their land and go hungry while they fed the world. Progressive academics and activists joined indigenous community residents to research, educate, and plan for development projects that would be sustainable, community-controlled, and resistant to corporate exploitation. The practice of "participatory research" that came out of India, Africa, and South America and such participatory research and popular education practitioners as Rajesh Tandon and Paulo Freire have had the most influence on CBR around the globe (Brown and Tandon 1983; Freire 1970; Paulo Freire Institute n.d.).

Finally, the roots of CBR are in service-learning. As academics who were involved in third-world development and the activism of the 1960s reached middle age, they became distressed at how many of their students voted for Reagan and Bush, thought poor people were stupid and lazy, and believed African Americans got jobs only because of affirmative action. These faculty sought ways to reinstate a sense of civic engagement in students that would counter their shockingly unfilled politics. So they started encouraging students to do volunteer work in poor neighborhoods to better understand the realities of poverty, race, and other oppressions. As these community-service programs grew, the faculty began to incorporate service activities into courses. Students were also looking for more meaning in their education through Ralph Nader's Public Interest Research Group (National Association of State PIRGs 2000) and through the Campus Outreach Opportunity League (n.d.). But this new service-learning movement, formed within the institutional confines of academia, did not yet have a social-change emphasis (Barber 1992; Brown 2001; Eby 1998; Kahne and Westheimer 1996).

## The CBR Model

There are three basic principles of CBR (Strand et al. 2002).

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

CBR is centered on social change and is community focused, changing the way institutions must act and think about themselves. Because CBR is about doing research, and involving students in research, it dissolves the historical division of labor and status between research megaversities and small teaching and community colleges. In some cases, it can even build partnerships between different kinds of institutions that have complementary resources. Finally, CBR values the experiential knowledge of community people who have historically been treated as ignorant and knowledge-less.

Doing CBR means more than just doing research. It is organizing planning meetings, building relationships, managing conflicts, empowering students and community members, and making change. And when we begin working with community organizations, we begin to see that our research role in their social-change project is small in comparison to the many other tasks that must be accomplished to make the social change happen. If you want to stop the upstream factory from poisoning your water, you need to do research on the water quality. But you also need to organize the residents, raise funds to pay lawyers, lobby elected officials, get the attention of the press, pressure the factory's corporation, and a myriad of other activities.

When you think about doing research in a CBR framework, the research steps—defining a question, organizing a methodology, collecting data, analyzing, and reporting the results—change in important ways.

## Choosing the Question

Choosing a research question requires first building a relationship with a community or community group and then fitting the research with their social-change goals. The Appalachian Center for Community Service at Emory and Henry College in Virginia held focus groups that involved over 100 people from area community organizations to identify research and service opportunities and support relationship-building between the organizations themselves in the hopes of doing mutually beneficial projects (Stanley 2000). A number of CBR centers also send requests for proposals to area community organizations to identify possible research questions and to make an initial contact that can lead to lasting relationships. The Community-Based Learning Initiative at Princeton University, where students are the source of many connections between the university and the community, created a 70-page book profiling area community organizations and their research needs to help students find CBR opportunities (Dobin 2000).

## Choosing the Method

Contrary to academic tradition, choosing a research method is not a purely technical task. It may also include considerations of how involved the community group wants to be in the actual research, perhaps to build members' skills, to facilitate community education, or even to build community relationships. Surveys might get good information, but face-to-face interviews might build better relationships. When Professor Thomas Plaut (2000) started working with a local physician to improve health care in the communities around Mars Hill College in North Carolina, they started by doing surveys of people's health care needs. But many community people, who had been surveyed before and stereotyped as poor and dumb based on those surveys, refused to participate. Instead, the researchers began an 18-month natural focus group process that ultimately led to a regional emergency system. Social scientists, who are the bulk of the academic CBR users out there, tend to see the methodological choices in terms of surveys, interviews, etc. But research methods can involve intensive water, soil, air, and other testing procedures when health and environ-

mental factors are involved. Helping community folks assess the relative value of highly technical research methods becomes paramount in such cases.

### Doing the Research

Here again combining the need to get good information with broader goals of involving community constituency members and students is important. Students are a cheap and eager labor force who can learn a great deal from the hands-on experience CBR provides. Community members may also gain a great deal from collecting the data themselves. Faculty members may need to be closely involved when the stakes are high and measurement accuracy is important. The University of Denver Center for Service Learning and Civic Engagement completed a project that evaluated area after-school programs, done in partnership with the Piton Foundation, the school administrations, and four graduate students from a seminar taught by Professor Nick Cutforth (2000). The graduate students designed an evaluation instrument and recruited fifteen high-school students who interviewed middle-school students in the after-school program.

### Analyzing the Data

Academics used to data analysis being a quiet, solitary process may, in fact, find this step to be quite boisterous, for the researcher might only do a first swipe at analysis, categorizing information for community meetings where the meaty interpretation is done. Students and community members might collaboratively write a report. When Guilford College in North Carolina announced a plan to outsource its bookstore, a group of students on campus did their own CBR project. They researched the history of activism on campus to inform their strategy. They researched the college's plan and its costs, even getting parents involved in analyzing the situation and developing an alternative plan (Pryor 2000; Roose 2000). In another case, the Georgetown University-sponsored Youth Action Research Group gave a workshop on tenant issues in Washington DC's Mt. Pleasant/Columbia Heights neighborhood based on research it had done. As residents thought

about and worked with the information, they decided to form an association for tenants to deal with absentee landlords (Strand et al. 2002).

### Reporting the Results

CBR is not primarily about writing a journal article. In fact, an increasing number of community organizations make academics sign agreements not to publish anything without community permission (which, when the academics are sensitive, they readily give). In CBR, reporting the results could mean an oral report at a community meeting, a testimony at city council, a glossy brochure, a web site, or even (gasp!) a protest. One result of a mapping project in Greensboro's Old Ashboro neighborhood, done with Guilford College students, was a mailing to all the absentee landlords owning property in the neighborhood reminding them of the importance of maintaining their properties and relevant city ordinances (Pryor 2000). A group of women students from a Women Writers class at Mars Hill College and Helpmate, an area organization serving abused women, participated in the national Clothesline Project. The Clothesline Project displays T-shirts decorated to depict different forms of discrimination and violence against women. The students researched regional, national, and global statistics on violence against women. They held a decorating day on campus producing their own T-shirts to be included with those of local women. On the day of the event, which was held on campus but invited the whole community, the T-shirts were presented. Throughout the day, cut into an audiotape of music and poetry, were the statistics the students had uncovered (Smialowicz 2000).

### The Challenges of CBR

As clean and organized as this research process may seem, doing CBR still involves many challenges within and outside of academic culture and the higher education institutional structure. Below are the issues that are common across the campuses.

## Career, Curricular, and Community Interests—Whose Needs Are Met?

Academics who leave graduate school with their Ph.D.s have been told that they really only know about one very narrow subtopic of one very narrow discipline. So they often approach communities looking for projects that fit our exceedingly narrow definitions of our own skills and interests and the discipline-defined goals of our courses. But communities don't have concerns that fit either disciplinary boundaries or course objectives. They often need multi-disciplinary resources and research methods, such as evaluations or needs assessments, that do not fit in the average course. When professor Lori Wollerman (2000) of Hood College in Maryland took the plunge into CBR, her training was in animal behavior, but she was asked to lead a needs assessment for the Monocacy Battlefield historic site. Getting help from other faculty, the project succeeded, but it required her to dramatically redefine herself as an academic.

Effective CBR can also begin to change academic culture so that faculty are willing to broaden their own skill and knowledge base and to organize classes around community projects rather than fit community projects to classes. At the University of Denver, Professor Nick Cutforth (2000) designed a graduate seminar around an evaluation of after-school programs. Outside funding allowed him to buy out his time from a course he was scheduled to teach and put together the evaluation seminar.

### Teacher or Facilitator?

We were taught to teach by listening to lectures. Some of us hardcore academics loved it. Many of us who love academia, though, have become more and more troubled by the lecture method. The explosion of popularity in experiential education, service learning, popular education, and other non-lecture methods of teaching signals that something is afoot. And once you see a really good community organizer out there in the field doing a training with community folks who are there volunteering their time and would never return if they were lectured, you begin to realize how ill-fitting the academic environment is

for CBR. Being a CBR educator requires not primarily knowing, but knowing how. It requires knowing how to facilitate a discussion, resolve conflicts, support participation, build knowledge from experience, and employ a variety of ground-up as opposed to ivory tower-down education tactics.

This means adopting a wholly different style of teaching as a facilitator. Professor Steve Fisher (2000), director of the Appalachian Center for Community Service at Emory and Henry College, emphasizes the importance of reflective learning, facilitating students to develop a deep and integrated understanding of their field experience, their own emotions and biases, and more abstract academic concepts.

"If you do it right you lose total control of the classroom. There has to be structured reflection. That's really time consuming. Students need to be growing. If you don't devote class time to reflection then students see [CBR/SL] as peripheral. It goes against what people have been taught to believe about teaching."

Of course, faculty don't have to make the switch all at once. One professor says, "There's about two to three lectures I haven't been able to do because of this but the amount of learning students get [from the CBR project] more than compensates for that." Emory and Henry professor Ronald Diss (2000) observed school children doing projects and the variation in outcomes:

I spoke with the teachers and said it must be hard for kids without parental help on projects. I thought I should send some of my students down here to work with them, but I was reluctant to give up a few lectures to send students there. Then I was reading my course evaluations, and reading that the number one positive thing of the class was working with children and I thought duh!... I had to get over the fact that my students can learn without my lecturing at them. And that's really hard.

### Researcher or Activist?

Those of us who can make the shift to valuing community knowledge and multi-disciplinary knowledge are often faced with another dilemma in CBR. Our academic training has pressured us to be only disinterested observers. But CBR, done in partnership with a commu-

nity, is about being committed to the resolution of a social problem or the pursuit of a social change. And in the worst case, our colleagues begin to call us activists and dismiss our research as political trash. Even those colleagues out there who agree with the critique of objectivity draw a line between admitting to biases and acting them out. Many academics have yet to be convinced that there is not a negative relationship between the degree of one's involvement in an issue and the accuracy of one's research. The opposite is just as easily the case—being committed to an issue means making sure the accuracy of your research is indisputable. Accuracy, not objectivity, is what's important, and there is no relationship between the two.

Some community organizations understand the connection between research and action and are very good at figuring out how to get the most from a CBR project because they see students not just as researchers but also as potential recruits. When Church Women United, a service and advocacy organization in Frederick, Maryland, requested students for their project to study and advocate for the service needs of recently incarcerated women, they were thinking long term: "We were getting old and we need younger women involved. And those women [from Hood College] are now getting involved."

This has important pedagogical implications for students. Some professors go to great lengths to help students not only get engaged in CBR, but also do intensive reflection to connect their experience to social justice issues. Mars Hill College attracts a large number of students from rural Appalachian communities historically disenfranchised by and thus suspicious of formal education. Too often, in such situations, higher education pressures students to separate from those roots. But Stan Dotson (2000), director of the Lifeworks Center at the college argues:

Wendell Berry said there's only one major in higher ed—upward mobility. There should be another major—homecoming. I have a student who is now thinking about Buddhism and feminism, but I want her to be able to go home again and learn from that too. . . . We do a lot of prep work on helping students to respect the communities they work with. Our

chaplain brings missionaries in to talk about mutuality—we're not carrying the truth; we're sharing our truths with theirs.

## Rhythms of Life across the Great Divide I—The Question of Timing

We've seen that CBR isn't like an academic research project and academia isn't like the real world. Most of us already recognize the different schedule rhythms of academic life and community life, and understand that CBR projects often take longer than one term. Students at Princeton University worked with the local public housing authority to develop a summer-program plan for youth involving web training and community history activities. But they graduated and had jobs out of the area before funding for the program was in place (Dobin 2000). Students can become frustrated with how long the action phase of a CBR project may take. They want to see something happen from all their hard work. One Denver University student involved with a mental health center needs assessment was hoping she might still be around to see something come of it: "I expected it would happen faster. I expected to be part of the implementation." Those on the community side may also have unmet expectations. When Professor Nick Cutforth worked with the Piton Foundation on the after-school program evaluation, the Foundation research officer was surprised when the project stopped before she had a full report and a detailed analysis and had to do that herself (Bailey 2001).

Both academics and students need to make provisions to actually produce a finished product, even if it takes longer than the term. Students at Princeton University worked for two months past the end of the term to complete the State of the African Community report in Trenton with the Trenton Urban League. And it was worth the extra work, as the Mayor of Trenton called a press conference to receive the report (Dobin 2000). Careful planning can prevent some scheduling problems. The Appalachian Center at Emory and Henry College begins months ahead to make sure everything is ready on both the community and the classroom side well before the class begins (Stanley 2000). Some institutions offer faculty stipends to develop courses

ahead of time and have everything in place by the time the term begins.

Just as challenging as maintaining a commitment past the end of term is meeting an externally set deadline that may fall in the middle of a term. In contrast to “shelf research” that gets printed on paper and put on shelves, CBR is research designed to be used, usually in a particular social-change project. If it is research for a grant proposal that has to be in the foundation office on November 1, all the work is wasted if the proposal arrives on November 2. This is in stark contrast to academia, where deadlines are usually self-imposed and even when they are imposed by the outside world, being weeks late rarely incurs any penalty. At Georgetown University, a group of ten faculty members and ten community organization members decided to go in together and write a grant proposal to the Federal Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) program, which they eventually received. The regular meeting schedule forced the academics to get out of semester mode and the COPC deadline forced everyone to meet an inflexible deadline (Marullo 1999).

### **Rhythms of Life across the Great Divide II—The Question of Culture**

The degree of cultural difference between those in higher education—students and faculty alike—and those in the community go beyond time issues. Different languages, values, experiences, and of course, the incomes those differences are based on can be tremendous. In urban areas the degree of educational, health care, and housing segregation between academics and the communities they work with, even when separated by only a few miles, can create prejudices on both sides. Intriguingly, this divide may be less intense in rural areas where, “faculty [and community members] live on the same street, have kids in the same schools, are involved together in the PTA” (Stanley 1999). At Concord College in West Virginia, many of the Social Work graduates take jobs in the area organizations, helping to maintain strong relationships. Community colleges also may have some advantage here. At Middlesex County College in New Jersey, students did research to sup-

port a funding requirement for the local housing authority. The students are from the local community and “are bi-lingual—and they had no problems going door to door at a housing authority.” Additionally, there is far less pressure on community college faculty to publish in obscure academic journals, making them more available to build and maintain community relationships (Donohue 2000).

Dress and deportment are also important here. Community organizations, often being in a begging position, often feel compelled to take what they can get or nothing. They will sometimes choose nothing if their first impression is that the academic or student can’t understand their culture. As the two sides come into more and more contact, helping students (and in some cases faculty, too) learn and respect the local cultures with which they are working, and even dressing and speaking respectfully, becomes important. Many institutions provide diversity training for faculty and students. One student, having gone through a CBR experience notes, “I tend to be more professional and cautious in my dress, speech, and mannerisms now.”

### **Community, What Community, Which Community?**

One of the most confusing things about CBR is trying to figure out what “the community” means. The ideal type CBR project organizes grassroots community members, or organization members, to create change that transforms not just the structure of knowledge creation and distribution so that voices previously ignored are better heard, but also transforms the structure of power relations so that those without power gain power. Much of the CBR that we do, however, works with mid-range organizations—social service organizations, community development corporations, and government agencies. There are many critiques of how those helping organizations ultimately are disempowering because they preserve inequality while passing those at the bottom of the heap. When we do CBR from the middle, working with such organizations as our partners rather than with grassroots community members, some might question whether we are really doing CBR.

The test, ultimately, is whether the partnering organizations themselves are trying to become more community-based—bringing their constituencies onto their boards to make policy decisions, organizing relatively independent constituency groups, or working with already organized grassroots groups. In organizing the research, will the organization/agency actively recruit constituency members to be involved in planning and carrying out the research? Will the organization/agency make an active effort to educate the constituency about the research results? Will the organization/agency bring constituency members together to do planning? Many mid-range organizations, when asked, are quite willing to involve constituency members in the project once they have a model that shows them how it can be done. A CBR project done with such an organization can both empower the constituency and transform the organization.

Following a rigid CBR model that emphasizes working with grassroots social-change organizations is also extremely difficult in some rural areas. While there may be as many such groups per capita as in urban centers, they are spread over greater distances. In one case, a partnership between a college research center and a social action group is separated by a two-hour drive. As a consequence, the CBR model developed in rural areas expands to include partnerships with social service agencies, schools, health-care providers, churches, and even organizations such as volunteer fire departments not normally included in the ideal CBR model. Even these organizations can be spread over great distances. In some impoverished rural areas, the organizations themselves can also be resource poor. This is no different than the case for many organizations in poor urban areas, but in rural areas, a lack of organizational resources can make the challenges imposed by distance extra difficult to overcome. Driving is more expensive, phone calls are long distance, and even Internet access may require long-distance phone rates.

There are inter-community power issues involved here as well, and understanding how community members define their community boundaries is extremely important. As Guilford College was developing its program, it was unaware of one organization working behind

the scenes to get exclusive access to the college's resources and deny other groups access. Even "natural" community units such as neighborhoods can contain multiple community identifications. When Thomas Plaut (2000) started working with Madison County health and emergency services to do research supporting an effort to establish a regional 911 phone system, the unit of analysis was the county. But discussions with residents showed a complicated array of 72 distinct communities, and these communities formed the basis for the Madison Community Health Consortium that led the emergency phone system effort.

### **Who Pays? Who Receives?**

One of the increasingly controversial aspects of CBR is when it is used to get the institution grants to pay for faculty time, while community groups are expected to volunteer their time. Programs, like the U.S. federal Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) grant program, are set up with an anti-CBR bias in requiring the bulk of the funds to go to institutions rather than community groups. Community groups find it very difficult to add to their workload for free and often have difficulty maintaining their participation, supervising students, providing needed information for the research, and doing anything useful with the research once it is done. As one community organization representative laments, "Because we don't have time to do it [research] ourselves, we don't have time to supervise students." Consequently, it is very hard to keep control from devolving to the institution.

There are a number of strategies for dealing with this inequality. First, many projects are managed on the university or college side, with faculty or staff arranging meetings, documenting student hours, etc. Second, some CBR projects are actually designed around helping community groups get their own grants and writing in greater support for them to hire university expertise. The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (2000) is far ahead in funding CBR partnerships between community groups and institutions of higher education that can be run by universities, community groups, or an independent



dent, combined organization. Here the problem must be managed at the partnership level. The two community facilitators and one faculty facilitator of the Georgetown University bi-weekly study group each got a 20 percent workload buyout paid for by the University. And when they actually got the COPC grant, which by law had to be weighted heavily in the University's favor, only the strength of relationships formed by the study group controlled the infighting over that unequal distribution (Marullo 1999). Guilford College tried to maintain equity by giving stipends to faculty the first year of the program and to community members the second year.

### **CBR, Service-Learning, Student Services, and Academic Affairs**

Critiques of service-learning have been building recently (Barber 1992; Kahne and Westheimer 1996; Eby 1998; Brown 2001; Marullo and Edwards 2000). To some, because service-learning focuses on students doing charity work, it maintains the perspective that poor communities are helpless. To others, because service-learning is centered in the university rather than the community, it maintains the unequal relationship between campus and community. But perhaps more importantly, service-learning has been historically limited to the teaching mission of higher education, meaning that research faculty have not been given a path to join in.

Service-learning has a longer history and more institutional support than CBR. Consequently, faculty and students interested in doing CBR, and whose institutions have an already established service-learning mission, must figure out how to leverage resources without creating competition and conflict.

Some combine service-learning and CBR. For Patrick Donohue (2000) at Middlesex County College, "When you just start with a research project, you need trust. We started with service and then built a relationship to do a research project." Now they also work the other direction. A class of sociology students conducted a client-needs survey for a local soup kitchen. As a result of the survey, the soup kitchen director came back to the Community Research Center and asked the Community Scholars Corps—the student community service group at

Middlesex—to design and staff a bag lunch program. Donohue notes that "direct service addresses urgent needs while research helps the agency think more strategically."

Others separate service-learning and CBR. As CBR programs develop in institutions with an administrative structure divided into student affairs and academic affairs, an increasing number of them find a home on the academic affairs side, where support for research is stronger. Service-learning at Hood College began under the student affairs division. But when it became clear that the program was not gaining legitimacy with faculty, it was moved over to academic affairs. The placement of the Georgetown University Volunteer and Public Service Center on the student services side reinforced the notion that service-learning and CBR are service rather than research and hindered its efforts to help the faculty involved with it gain legitimacy among their peers. Consequently, a group of faculty, including those affiliated with the Volunteer and Public Service Center, helped form the Center for Urban Research and Teaching and then the Partners in Urban Research and Service-Learning with ten community organization partners. The climax of this transition has been the creation of the Center for Social Justice Research, Teaching and Service, an academic center combining all of the other efforts (Marullo 1999).

### **Conclusion**

Please don't conclude that the presence of these challenges in a CBR program is a sign of failure. Indeed, these challenges are signs of success. In partnerships whose members have competing and even conflicting interests, these challenges are inevitable. It is only in those places where CBR has begun to build beyond individual faculty projects that the tensions will really make themselves known. It is also only those CBR projects that are working toward the principle of social change where the tensions will be truly felt, for social change is about changing people's thinking and their power relations, and that necessarily involves tension.

There are no cookbook answers for managing the tensions. This article describes examples of what different people have done when

confronted with the challenges of doing CBR. Perhaps the main overriding lesson behind all the examples, however, is that those who successfully manage the tensions are good at process—they are good facilitators, good at social relationships, good at conflict management. Those CBR practitioners with such skills learn to welcome the tensions as a sign that movement is occurring, which to many of us is a welcome relief from the often inert halls of academe.

## Notes

1. Institutions participating in this research included Concord College in Athens, West Virginia; University of Denver in Denver, Colorado; Emory and Henry College in Emory, Virginia; Georgetown University in Washington, DC; Guilford College in Greensboro, North Carolina; Hood College in Frederick, Maryland; Mars Hill College in Mars Hill, North Carolina; University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, Michigan; Middlesex County College in Edison, New Jersey; Morehouse College in Atlanta; Princeton University in Princeton, New Jersey.
2. Only those individuals who reviewed research drafts and gave permission are identified in this research.

## References

- Adams, Frank. 1975. *Unearthing Seeds of Fire: The Idea of Highlander*. Winston-Salem, NC: John F. Blair.
- Bailey, Terri. 2001. Email correspondence, Piron Foundation.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 1992. *An Aristocracy of Everyone: The Politics of Education and the Future of America*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Bledsoe, Thomas. 1969. *Or We'll All Hang Separately: The Highlander Idea*. Beacon Press.
- Brown, Danika. 15 July 2001. "Putting it Together: A Method for Developing Service-Learning and Community Partnerships Based in Critical Pedagogy." Monograph online. Corporation for National Service, National Service Fellowship Program. No archive known. Accessed 25 May 2002 from: <http://www.outervarsity.org/shmonograph.html>
- Brown, L. David, and Rajesh Tandon. 1983. "Ideology and Political Economy in Inquiry: Action Research and Participatory Research." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* (19): 277–294. Journal article online. Campus Compact, 2001. Archived. Accessed 25 May 2002 from: <http://www.compact.org>.
- Campus Outreach Opportunity League. n.d. Home page. Accessed 25 May 2002 from <http://www.COOL2SERVE.org/>.
- Corella and Bertram F. Bonner Foundation. 2001. Home page. Accessed 25 May 2002 from: <http://www.bonner.org>.
- Corporation for National Service. 2001. Home page. Accessed 25 May 2002 from: <http://www.cns.gov/>
- Cutforth, Nick. 13 October 2000. Interview by Author, University of Denver, Denver, CO.
- Diss, Ron. 7 March 2000. Interview by Author, Emory and Henry College, Emory, VA.
- Dobin, Hank. 20 October 2000. Interview by Author, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
- Donohue, Patrick. 25 February 2000. Interview by Author, Middlesex County College, Edison, NJ.
- Dotson, Stan. 19 October 2000. Interview by Author, Mars Hill College, Mars Hill, NC.

- Eby, John. 1998. "Why Service-Learning is Bad." Paper online. Accessed 25 May 2002 from: <http://www.mesiab.edu/agape/pdf%20files/wrongvc.pdf>
- Fisher, Steve. 7 March 2000. Interview by Author, Emory and Henry College, Emory, VA.
- Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Glen, John M. 1988. *Highlander: No Ordinary School*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.
- Highlander Research and Education Center. 1998. Home page. Accessed 25 May 2002 from: <http://www.brcc.org/>.
- Horton, Aimee Isgrig. 1989. *The Highlander Folk School: A History of Its Major Programs, 1932-1961*. New York: Carlson Publishing.
- Horton, Billy D. 1993. "The Appalachian Land Ownership Study: Research and Citizen Action in Appalachia." In *Voices of Change: Participatory Research in the U.S. and Canada*. Edited by Peter Park, Mary Brydon-Miller, Budd L. Hall, and Ted Jackson, 85-102. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Kahne, Joseph, and Joel Westheimer. 1996. "In the Service of What? The Politics of Service-Learning." *Phi Delta Kappan* 77 (May): 592.
- Marullo, Sam. 1999. "Designing Local Initiatives: PURS & COPC." Community Research Project Institute, Morehouse College, 12-14 November in Atlanta, GA.
- Marullo, Sam, and Bob Edwards. 2000. "From Charity to Justice: The Potential of University-Community Collaboration for Social Change." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43: 895-912.
- National Association of State PIRGs. 2000. Home page. Accessed 25 May 2002 from: <http://www.pirg.org/>.
- Paulo Freire Institute. n.d. Home page. Accessed 25 May 2002 from: <http://www.paulofreire.org/>
- Plaut, Thomas. 19 October 2000. Interview by Author, Mars Hill College, Mars Hill, NC.
- Pryor, Scott. 9 November 2000. Interview by Author, Guilford College, Greensboro, NC.
- Roose, Chris. 9 November 2000. Interview by Author, Guilford College, Greensboro, NC.
- Srnialowicz, Amy. 29 October 2000. Interview by Author, Mars Hill College, Mars Hill, NC.
- Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. 2000. Community-University Research Alliances: A Pilot Program from SSHRC. Web page. Accessed 25 May 2002 from: <http://nmml.sshrc.ca/english/programinfo/grantsguide/cura.html>
- Stanley, Tal. 1999. Presentation at a gathering of participating schools, Morehouse College, Atlanta.
- Stanley, Tal. 7 March 2000. Interview by Author, Emory and Henry College, Emory, VA.
- Strand, Kerry. 29 September 2000. Interview by Author, Hood College, Frederick, MD.
- Strand, Kerry, Sam Marullo, Randy Stoecker, Nick Cutforth, and Patrick Donohue. 2002. Community-Based Research in Higher Education: Methods, Models and Practice. Unpublished book manuscript.
- Whyte, William F., ed. 1991. *Participatory Action Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wollerman, Lori. 29 September 2000. Interview by Author, Hood College, Frederick, MD.

# The Journal of Public Affairs

Volume VI, 2002

Supplemental Issue 1: Civic Engagement and Higher Education

## EDITORIAL BOARD

**John Bourhis**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**Harry Boyte**  
University of Minnesota  
**Patricia Feltes**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**Roger Bennett**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**John T. Pardeck**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**Kant Pantel**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**Dimitri Ioannides**  
Southwest Missouri State University

## EDITOR IN CHIEF

**John Strong**  
Southwest Missouri State University

## SENIOR MANAGING EDITOR

**Rhonda Stanton**  
Southwest Missouri State University

## ASSISTANT MANAGING EDITOR

**Alyssa Medlin**  
Southwest Missouri State University

## CONSULTING EDITOR

**Lorene Stone**  
Southwest Missouri State University

## GUEST EDITOR

**John Saltmarsh**  
Campus Compact

## ASSISTANT TO GUEST EDITOR

**Sarah Long**  
Providence College

## COVER AND LAYOUT DESIGN

**Amy Schuldt**  
Southwest Missouri State University

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

**Mike Allen**  
University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee  
**Roberta Aram**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**James Baumlín**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**Ruth Bamberger**  
Drury University  
**Phillip Hall**  
St. Ambrose University  
**Robert Jones**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**Lynn Harter**  
Morehead State University  
**Steven Jones**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**Donn Kaiser**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**Melodye Lehnener**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**F. Thornton Miller**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**R. Stephen McDuffie**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**John W. Murphy**  
University of Miami  
**James Parsons**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**Kishor Shah**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**Ralph Sheets**  
Southwest Missouri State University  
**Max Skidmore**  
University of Missouri—Kansas City  
**Bobby Vaught**  
Southwest Missouri State University



A publication by Southwest Missouri State University  
Printed by SMSU Printing Services

Kristen Day

# The Journal of Public Affairs<sup>SM</sup>

Volume VI, 2002

Supplemental Issue 1:  
Civic Engagement  
and Higher Education