“Community-Based” research refers to activities of knowledge co-creation that are explicitly oriented beyond the customary academic publics. Ernest Boyer refers to this as “the Scholarship of Engagement,” reflective of a nuanced approach that synthesizes the Scholarships of Discovery, Application, Integration, and Teaching (cf. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*).

The Wingspread Conference on Civic Engagement in High Research Universities offers the following examples of this kind of research activity:

- Research aimed at public education-for-empowerment;
- Assessment/evaluation of interventions in the public sector or for the public good;
- Social problem solving (usually multidisciplinary);
- Policy analysis (particularly around implications of policy);
- Research aimed at the enhancement of democratic praxis (diagnostic, analytic, interventionist)

( cf. *New Times Demand New Scholarship II*, figure 1)

“Participatory” research seeks to engage the full diversity of affected/interested constituencies in all stages of the research process:

- Choosing the question(s) to be examined
- Designing the research methods
- Collecting the data
- Analyzing the data
- Communicating and promulgating the results

Philosophically, this approach flows from a recognition of the value of non-academic communities’ unique sources of knowledge, creativity, and other assets. As such, CBP(A)R can be seen as the research analogue of (and complement to) the various asset-based approaches to community development (cf. the work of the Asset-Based Community Development Institute, www.abcdinstitute.org).

The imperative of participation across the various stages of the research process affords an important axis for evaluation of CBP(A)R projects. The extent to which the different aspects of a project are participatory can vary widely, cf. figure 1.
“Action” is sometimes left out of descriptions of CBP(A)R. Its inclusion highlights the applied, activist nature of this kind of research, which tends to be driven by community/organizational interests as a complement to those of the academic researcher(s) and closely related to immediate, often-practical issues. Or as Randy Stoeker puts it, this approach to research focuses on “being useful” (Research Methods for Community Change, chapter 2).

This is not to say that CBP(A)R is without traditional “academic” impact, but rather aims to acknowledge the broader range of impacts that it makes possible. This, in turn, constitutes another important axis for evaluation of CBP(A)R projects, cf. figure 2.

“Action Research,” as a phrase, can also connote research conducted in practice-based settings, often by active practitioners (such as program administrators or classroom teachers). In some cases, then, the use of “CBPR” (instead of “CBPAR”) may indicate that the research in question, although highly participatory in many aspects, is being conducted by a research team that is distinct from other team members.

“Research” can be an alienating term for persons outside of the academy, particularly persons from communities that “have been oppressed and exploited by racial and class systems not of their own choosing” (Stoeker, chapter 1) who have been excluded from participation in higher education and its various discourses. In too many cases, these communities have been subjected to research that promotes the “influence and prestige” of the researcher without empowering the community members themselves, and/or that portrays those community members in ways that they find “humiliating, insulting, or otherwise just plain inaccurate” (ibid.).

And yet, as Stoeker continues, many of the activities crucial to community leadership of all sorts are “fundamentally research activities”: collecting client or neighborhood data, doing case histories, conducting investigations, writing grant applications that require needs-assessment or evaluations data, gathering oral histories, collecting and archiving materials, preserving and communicating narratives. CBP(A)R methodology aims to fully respect the value of these activities as the creation and promulgation of knowledge, connecting their practitioners with more traditional academics in collaborative, reciprocally beneficial, project-based partnerships.