



## SUBJECT INDEX

- A**
- Academic community. *See* University institutions
- Academic-community partnerships. *See* CBPR partnerships
- Accountability: difficulties in defining, 365–366; researcher/community mutual, 243–244
- Action: data collection as essential part of taking, 307; in-depth interview feedback to help plan, 311; in-depth interview interpretation used in, 311–312; Inspirational Images Project forum for planning, 340–341; integrating research and advocacy, 389; moving from interpretation of interviews to, 312–313; Planning Grant planning for, 319–320. *See also* Policy advocacy; Policy change
- Action item, 60
- Action research discussions, 4
- Action science/inquiry discussions, 4
- Activist scholar traditions, 36–37
- Advocacy. *See* Policy advocacy
- African Americans: HEP focus groups inclusion of, 112; HEP survey inclusion of, 117, 118; Inspirational Images Project on breast cancer survivors, 328–345, 338*fig*; Promoting Healthy Lifestyles Among Women study on, 148–162. *See also* Racism
- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 6
- Agendas: open communication facilitated by, 58–59; Robert’s Rules to get through, 58
- American Heart Association, 119
- American Journal of Public Health*, 6
- American Lung Association, 235
- AOCD (action-oriented community diagnosis): challenges and limitations of, 94–96; described, 14; examining case example of, 15; lessons learned and implications for conducting, 96–97; multi-disciplinary approach of, 95; origins of, 79–81; purpose of, 74, 78–79; research design and methods used in, 81–84; UVE application of, 79–81, 84–94
- AOCD forum planning committee, 83–84
- AOCD research design/methods: case study research design, 82; constructivist research paradigm, 81–82; data collection and analysis, 82–83; dissemination, 83–84; duration of, 84
- Apsáalooke language, 135–136, 141
- Apsáalooke Reservation: CBOs found on, 130; community setting of, 129; cultural issues related to

- interviewing on, 132–133;  
interviewer training manual  
developed on, 132–137;  
MFH (Messengers for  
Health) conducted on, 128.  
*See also* MFH (Messengers  
for Health); Native  
Americans
- Assessment: A OCD used to  
conduct, 14, 15, 74–98; of  
CBPR partnerships, 68–69,  
255–274; of community  
assets and strengths, 34,  
62–63; environmental  
exposure, 19, 230–245, 282,  
286–305, 372–389;  
importance of partnership,  
68–69
- Asthma triggers study  
(CAAA), 287–305
- Asthma triggers study (Health  
Homes Project), 231–245
- Authorship: approval of  
abstract, 295–296; ground  
rules for coauthorship and,  
291–292; selecting lead  
coauthors and, 296
- B**
- Block Environment  
Inventory, 169
- Boothel Heart Health  
Coalitions, examining case  
of, 18–19
- Breast cancer survivors study,  
328–345, 338*fig*
- Breast and Cervical Health  
Project, 130
- “Broken windows” index, 170
- Brotha How’s Your  
Health, 195
- Brown University, 374
- Butzel Family Center, 149
- C**
- CAAA (Community Action  
Against Asthma): commu-  
nity forum organized by,  
299–300; dissemination  
committee formed by,  
288–293; examining case  
example of, 18; objectives  
of, 170; overview of,  
286–288. *See also* MCECH  
(Michigan Center for the  
Environment and Children’s  
Health)
- CAAA dissemination  
committee (DC): approving  
abstracts/abstract author-  
ship for presentations,  
295–296; challenges faced  
by, 300–302; establishing  
ground rules for coauthor-  
ship, 291–292; establishing  
procedures for feedback to  
community and partici-  
pants, 293, 297–300; forma-  
tion of, 288–293; guidelines  
for decisions/activities of,  
294*t*–300; handling requests  
for use of data, 296–297;  
lessons learned/implications  
for practice from, 302–304;  
selecting lead authors/  
coauthors for manuscripts,  
296; transition to SC  
(steering committee)  
from, 293
- CAAA Environmental  
Checklist, 170, 174–175
- CAAA Steering  
Committee, 170
- Cal/EPA (California  
Environmental Protection  
Agency), 378
- Cal/EPA Environmental  
Justice Advisory  
Committee, 382, 383, 384
- California Air Resources  
Board, 378
- The California Endowment,  
375, 388
- California Wellness  
Foundation, 388
- Case study research  
design, 82
- CBE (Communities for a  
Better Environment), 373,  
374, 385–386
- CBEPR (community-based  
ethnographic participatory  
research): as approach to  
development of culture-  
specific interventions,  
212–213; described, 17,  
105–106, 211; ECH  
(El Centro Hispano)  
experience using process  
of, 213–227. *See also*  
Ethnography
- CBO strategies: 1: reflecting  
on institution’s capacities to  
engage in partnership,  
36–38; 2: identify potential  
partners using networks,  
associations, and leaders,  
38–41; 3: negotiate/reframe  
ultimate health issues for  
research, 41–43; 4: for  
using structures to sustain  
partnerships, 43–47;  
listed, 35
- CBOs (community-based  
organizations): Apsáalooke  
Reservation, 130; back-  
ground information on,  
31–33; controlling power  
relationships/racism in, 41;  
cultural humility incorpo-  
rated into, 41; four strate-  
gies to help create, 35–47;  
starting places for, 33–35.  
*See also* Communities;  
NGOs (nongovernmental  
agencies); University  
institutions
- CBPR (community-based  
participatory research):  
approaches to environ-  
mental justice using,  
375–384; CBEPR blend of  
ethnography and, 17,  
211–227; competencies  
relevant to following  
principles of, 80–81;  
distinguished from other  
research approaches, 11–12;  
health disparities studied  
using, 9–11; impact on  
tenure/promotion  
guidelines, 46; increasing  
use and interest in, 4–6;  
knowledge-based goal of, 5;  
using photovoice as,  
326–345; principles of,  
6–9; used in public health  
and related fields, 5; rele-  
vance for professionals of,  
5–6. *See also* PPR  
(participatory policy  
research); Research

## 470 SUBJECT INDEX

- CBPR partnerships: adapting to transitions in participation, 323; addressing conflict in, 65–66; building organic relationships within, 388; CBOs (community-based organizations), 31–47; characteristics of, 52–53; co-facilitation by each partner in, 322–323; decision making in, 58, 66–67, 341–342; developing trust, 60–61; diverse, 67–68, 302; documentation and evaluation of, 68–69, 255–274; equitable participation/open communication, 55–59; establishing norms for working together, 59; goals and objectives of, 61–62; group membership of, 55; identifying community strengths and concerns, 34, 62–63; integral factors in effective, 53–54; open communication in, 323; power and influence balance in, 64–65; SCEJC to promote environmental justice activism, 371–389; shared leadership of, 63–64; strategies for working in diverse partnerships, 67–68. *See also* University institutions
- CBPR principles: 1: acknowledges community as unit of identity, 7; 2: builds on community strengths and resources, 7; 3: facilitates collaborative, equitable partnership, 7–8; 4: fosters co-learning and capacity building, 8; 5: integrates and achieves knowledge generation/intervention balance, 8; 6: focuses on local public health problems, 8; 7: involves systems development, 8–9; 8: disseminates results to all partners, 9; 9: involves long-term process and sustainability, 9; competencies relevant to following, 80–81; used in evaluations, 251–252
- CCAHS (Chicago Community Adult Health Study), 169, 173, 174
- CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention): assessing partnership role of, 264; CRN (Community Reintegration Network) supported by, 353; Project DIRECT funded by, 196, 200; Urban Research Centers program of, 4; URC financial support by, 148
- CDC's Division of Nutrition and Physical Activity, 149
- CDC's REACH, 149
- Centered-research, 4
- El Central* (Hispanic newspaper), 117
- Cervical cancer morality rates, 129*t*
- CES-D (Centers for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale), 170
- CHASS (Community Health and Social Services Center), 149, 159
- Children's Environmental Health Research Initiative (NIEHS), 286
- Children's Health Initiative (NIEHS), 4
- CHWs (community health workers): mapping planning meetings held by, 190–191; preprinted maps used by, 192–193
- Co-facilitation, 322–323
- Coding methods, 83, 265
- Columbia University Children's Environmental Health Center, 45
- "Coming Back to Harlem from Jail or Prison" (CRN report), 363
- "Coming Home from Jail" (CRN report), 363
- Communication: importance of open, 55–59; importance of partnership, 323. *See also* Language
- Communities: accessing assets and strengths of, 34, 62–63; action-oriented assessment of leadership in, 39–40; AOCD to identify dynamics/relationships within, 74; CAAA dissemination committee guidelines for giving feedback to, 293, 297–300; CRN project examining reentry from jail to, 281–282, 352–367; data judo process used by, 375; ensuring benefits from focus group interviews to, 162; having reputable connections in, 161–162; improving environment through active involvement by, 385–386; using members as data collectors, 240, 244–245, 301, 309–310, 315–317, 342; mutual accountability of researchers and, 243–244; reservations about neighborhood observation by, 183; socioeconomic position and health disparities in, 167–168; windshield tours of, 63, 87. *See also* CBOs (community-based organizations)
- Communities for a Better Environment (CBE), 373, 374, 385–386
- Community Action Against Asthma Environmental Checklist, 170, 174–175
- Community Action Against Asthma. *See* CAAA (Community Action Against Asthma)
- Community facilitators, 149
- Community Forum (breast cancer survivors photovoice), 339–341
- Community Forum (CAAA), 299–300

- Community Forum (CRN), 359–360
- Community Forum (Efland-Cheeks), 92–94
- Community health advocates, 149
- Community Health Scholars Program (UNC-CH), 4, 85, 195
- Community Outreach and Education Program (COEP) [HEP], 109, 119
- Community-based ethnographic participatory research. *See* CBEPR (community-based ethnographic participatory research)
- Community-Based Participatory Research for Health* (Minkler & Wallerstein), 12
- Community-Based Public Health Initiative (W.K. Kellogg Foundation), 4, 44
- Confidentiality: by Apsáalooke interviewers, 138–139; respecting, 61
- Conflict: addressing CBPR, 65–66; establishing norms for, 66
- Conflict resolution, 66
- Consensus: AOCD construction of, 84; decision making through, 67
- Constructive controversy process, 66
- Constructivist research paradigm, 81–82
- Cooperative inquiry, 4
- Council on Practice of the Association of Schools of Public Health, 46
- CRAs (community research advisers), 333, 335
- Critical action research, 4
- CRN (Community Reintegration Network): accomplishments of, 363–364; City Council hearing goals of, 362; impact of jail service costs on, 362; lessons learned and implications for practice from, 366–367; meetings with executive branch officials, 361–362; meetings with legislators and staff, 360–361; methods used during, 354, 356t–357t; objective of, 281; overview of, 352–353; participatory research team developed for, 353–354, 355t; policy reports by, 363; PPR approach used by, 281–282; PPR limitations and challenges for, 364–366
- Cross-cultural issues. *See* Cultural competence; Cultural humility
- Crow Tribal Health Board, 130
- Crow Tribal Legislature, 130
- CSIs (culturally-supported interventions), 42
- CUES (Center for Urban Epidemiologic Studies), 353, 354
- Cultural competence: comparing cultural humility and, 41; ensuring that dissemination is done with, 302; as professional goal, 10
- Cultural humility: academic-community partnership incorporation of, 41; comparing cultural competence and, 41; described, 10, 41; exposure assessment approached with, 239–240; as interview consideration, 132–134, 140–141, 142. *See also* Ethnic/racial issues
- Cultural interpretation, 105–106
- Cultural safety: achieved within CBPR partnership, 11; applied to medical education, 10; defining, 11
- D
- Daniel, M., 255
- Data collection methods: photovoice, 19, 326–345; qualitative and quantitative, 257, 259; questionnaires, 107–108, 114–115, 259–260, 266–269. *See also* In-depth interviews; Interviews; Surveys
- Data collection/analysis: AOCD approach to, 82–83, 86–91; environmental health research using secondary, 378–389; as essential part of taking action, 307; field notes used in, 87–88, 211; grounded theory used in, 332, 336–337; HH (Seattle–King County Health Homes Project), 236, 238–241; by Hispano Unidos, 204–205; in-depth interviews for, 310–311; key informant interviews for, 88–91; participant observation for, 86–88; photovoice, 335–345; using preliminary findings to guide future, 336; profile questionnaire used for, 95; secondary data gathered for, 86; sensitivity to embarrassment issues of, 244; surveys for, 102–103; URC method used for, 18, 153–154, 156–158, 264–266, 267–269; by Your Crib project, 198–200. *See also* Focus groups; Observation; Research
- Data collectors: matching ethnicity of participants and, 240; quality control/reinforcement of protocols in, 244; training community members to be, 240, 244–245, 301, 309–310, 315–317, 342
- Data judo process, 375
- Decision making: achieving equitable power among partners for, 341–342; consensus, 67, 84; decentralized, 65; deciding on process for, 66–67; majority rules, 58

## 472 SUBJECT INDEX

- Detroit Community–Academic Urban Research Center (URC), 56, 64
- Detroit–Genesee County Community-Based Public Health Initiative, 68
- Dissemination: A OCD approach to, 83–84; balance between feedback to community and, 301–302; CAAA approach to, 288–304, 294t; to enhance participation in environmental policies, 380–382; of HEP survey, 119; importance of, 279–280; interviewer training manual on, 137; media strategies used for, 380–381; PowerPoint presentations used for, 381; results available to all partners, 9; Rose Bowl Principle applied to, 291; timed so that findings influence policy process, 367. *See also* Feedback
- Dissemination committee (DC) [CAAA]. *See* CAAA dissemination committee (DC)
- Distributed-actions theory, 63
- Diverse partnerships: dissemination and involvement of, 302; specific strategies for working in, 67–68
- E**
- East Side Village Health Worker Partnership, 63, 112
- ECH (El Centro Hispano): background and setting of, 212–213; capacity building objective of, 222–224; CBEPR process used by, 215–221t, 222; challenges and limitations of CBEPR process used by, 224; Horizonte Latino role in project, 215, 219, 222–223, 224, 225; lessons learned/implications for practice by project, 224–226; study participants and meetings held by, 214–215
- Ecological theory, 189–190
- Ecosocial outlook, 385
- Efland-Cheeks. *See* UVE (United Voices of Efland-Cheeks, Inc.)
- EJ Advisory Committee, 382, 383
- EJ (Environmental Justice) Institute, 374, 381, 387
- Empowerment education techniques, 93–94
- Empowerment evaluation, 4
- Environmental exposure assessment: of asthma triggers (CAAA), 286–305; of asthma triggers (Health Homes Project), 231–233; CBPR approach to improving, 239–241; CBPR methods applicable to, 230–231; HH (Seattle–King County Health Homes Project) using, 233–239; lessons learned/implications for practice of, 241–245; SCEJC approach to, 19, 282, 372–389
- Environmental Health Perspectives* (journal), 6, 381
- Environmental justice: community organizing/advocacy fueling, 371–372; developing CBPR approaches to, 375–384; dissemination of findings to enhance participation in, 380–382; leveraging research promoting policy changes and, 382–384; SCEJC collaboration formed to promote, 19, 282, 372–389; secondary data used in, 378–380; transforming traditional approaches to research to promote, 384–386
- Environmental Justice Initiative (NIEHS), 4
- Environmental mapping: participatory meetings for planning, 190–191; using preprinted maps for, 192–193
- EPA National Ambient Air Quality Standards, 298
- EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 231, 286, 378
- EPA's National Air Toxics Assessment and Cumulative Exposure Project, 378
- Equitable participation strategies, importance of, 55–56
- ESIs (empirically supported interventions), 42
- Ethnic/racial issues: African Americans and, 112, 117, 118, 148–162; matching data collectors/participants ethnicity, 240; racism as, 41. *See also* Cultural humility; Latinos
- Ethnography: CBPR approach to, 212–213; general description of, 211–212; terms describing collaborative models of, 211–212. *See also* CBEPR (community-based ethnographic participatory research)
- Evaluating partnerships: using CBPR principles as guide in, 251–252; conceptual framework for, 256–257, 258fig; data collection methods as part of, 257–260; importance of, 68–69; URC (Detroit Community–Academic Urban Research Center), 260–274
- F**
- Facilitation strategies, 57–58
- Fact sheets, 298
- Family health advocates, 149
- Feedback: balance between dissemination and community, 301–302; CAAA dissemination committee guidelines for giving, 279–300, 293; on HEP survey questionnaire structure, 114–115; on HEP survey results, 119; importance of research,

- 279; from in-depth interviews, 311; photovoice pilot program to elicit, 331; Planning Grant member checking and, 317–318.  
*See also* Dissemination
- Field notes: described, 211; used in UVE observation, 87–88. *See also* Observation
- Focus groups:  
 anticipating/budgeting for needs of participants in, 161, 162; CRN (Community Reintegration Network) use of, 359; data collection using, 146–147; described, 146; engaging community members in, 111–113, 160–161; ensuring benefits to community from, 162; HEP use of, 172; interviewing, 91; planning for timelines of, 162; Promoting Healthy Lifestyles Among Women use of, 151–157; stress process exercise protocol by, 112; URC-affiliated projects on pregnant/postpartum women using, 148–162. *See also* Data collection/analysis
- Follow-through, 60
- Force field analysis, 93
- Ford Foundation, 388
- Foto novelas* dissemination strategy, 381
- The Future of Public Health* (IOM), 78
- G**
- Gender role/division of labor study (ECH), 219–221*t*, 222–226
- Goals. *See* Objectives
- Grounded theory, 332, 336–337
- Groups: agendas/minutes taken during meetings by, 58–59; establishing appropriate size of, 56; facilitation strategies applied to, 57–58; using individual and small-group work by, 56–57; membership of, 55; NGT (nominal group technique) used in, 57, 59
- H**
- A Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training, Vols. 1–10* (Pfeiffer), 55
- Harlem Urban Research Center, 353, 354
- HEAL (Home Environmental Assessment List), 236
- Health, RCT (randomized, controlled trial) to measure interventions for, 234
- Health disparities: CBPR used to study contexts of, 9–11; racial and ethnic, 210
- Health Disparities Initiative (NIEHS), 109, 171
- Health Education & Behavior* (journal), 5
- Health research issues:  
 asthma triggers study (CAAA), 287–305; asthma triggers study (Health Homes Project), 231–245; breast cancer survivors study, 328–345; CBO perspective on, 42–43; CRN project examining reentry from jail to community, 281–282, 352–367; HIV/AIDS study (El Centro Hispano), 213–218; negotiating or reframing for CBO partnerships, 41–42; transforming traditional approaches to environmental, 384–386. *See also* Public health; Research
- Healthy Homes Project (Seattle), examining process and lessons of, 17, 106
- Healthy Neighborhood Project (Berkeley), 35, 40, 45
- HEC (Home Environmental Checklist) [HH], 238
- HEP (Healthy Environments Partnership): affiliation between URC and, 109, 110, 111, 124; background and description of, 108–110, 171–172; creating structure for focused collaborative work, 113–114; engaging focus groups, 111–113; examining the, 16, 102–103, 168; neighborhood stressors identified during study of, 175*t*; specific aims of, 108–109. *See also* NOC (Neighborhood Observational Checklist)
- HEP Steering Committee: described, 111; field period overseen by, 115–118; HEP survey implemented by, 110, 125–126
- HEP survey: challenges encountered/lessons learned from, 119–125; dissemination of results of, 119; examining the, 108; field period implementing, 115–118; getting feedback/fine-tuning questionnaire for, 114–115; partners/community members' role in development of, 110–119; results of, 118–119
- HEP Survey Subcommittee, 110, 113–114
- HEP's Community Outreach and Education Program (COEP), 109, 119
- HH Parent Advisory Group, 235
- HH (Seattle–King County Health Homes Project): asthma triggers focus by, 233–235; data collection/analysis methods used by, 236, 238–239; deciding what to measure/exposure measures used by, 235–236, 237*t*; dust sampling/three-spot dust test used by, 239; HEC (Home Environmental Checklist) used by, 238
- Hispanics. *See* Latinos

## 474 SUBJECT INDEX

- Hispanos Unidos en la Prevención de Obesidad: background of research project, 202; CBPR partnership of, 200–202; data collection/analysis by, 204–205; mapping protocol developed by, 202–203, 205–207; research process stages and role of partners, 202–205; selection and recruitment of participants, 203
- HIV/AIDS study (El Centro Hispano), 213–218
- Horizonte Latino, 215, 219, 222–223, 224, 225
- I**
- IHS (Indian Health Service), 37
- In-depth interviews: CBPR approach to, 309; challenges and limitations of using, 320–322; data collection/analysis using, 310–311; developing interview guide/recruitment strategies for, 309–310; feedback and member checking following, 311; interpretation of, 311–312; key distinctions in approaches to, 259; lessons learned and implications for practice, 322–323; moving from interpretation to action, 312–313; used in Planning Grant project, 313–320; three approaches to, 308–309. *See also* Interviews
- Indian Health Service, 42
- Indian Reorganization Act (1925), 39
- Influence-power balance, 64–65
- Insider outsiders, described, 32
- Insiders: AOCD dissemination of views by, 83–84; privileged knowledge of, 77; UVE researchers consideration of, 80
- Inspirational Images Project: background and purpose of, 329; community forum conducted by, 339–342; examining use of photovoice in, 19; funding of, 331–332; need being addressed by, 329–330; participant selection and recruitment, 334; partners involved in, 328–329, 333–334; photovoice pilot study conducted by, 330–331; research methods used to reach objectives of, 332–333; setting of study by, 333. *See also* Photovoice
- Institute of Family and Community Health (South Africa), 79
- Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice, 382
- Interview guides: Apsáalooke Reservation, 131–137, 141; for in-depth interviews, 309–310; Planning Grant, 314–315
- Interviewer training manual (Apsáalooke Reservation): on beginning the interview, 134–135; on dissemination and use of survey findings, 137; goals of survey research and, 131–132; on use of language, 135–137, 141; on manner of interviewer, 133–134; on recruitment and enrollment, 132–133
- Interviewers: using community, 240, 244–245; cultural sensitivity used by, 132–134, 140–141, 142; lessons on using immigrants as, 225; strategies used to recruit, 309–310, 315–317
- Interviews: Apsáalooke Reservation, 103–104, 131–137; confidentiality kept by, 61, 138–139; cultural sensitivity during, 132–134, 140–141, 142; development of protocol for, 263–264; ECH (El Centro Hispano), 218; evaluating URC, 263–266; in-depth, semistructured, 259; lessons on immigrants conducting, 225; Promoting Healthy Lifestyles Among Women, 151–157; UVE key informant, 88–91. *See also* Data collection methods; Focus groups; In-depth interviews
- IOM (Institute of Medicine): *The Future of Public Health*, 78; *Who Will Keep the Public Healthy?* report by, 5
- IRB (institutional review board), UNC-CH, 89
- J**
- Jail services cost study, 362
- Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 5
- K**
- Key informant interviews: AOCD approach to, 88–91; face-to-face, 89–91; focus group, 91
- King County Asthma Forum, 234
- L**
- Language: Apsáalooke, 135–136, 141; culture transmitted through, 135; importance of partnership understanding meaning of, 323; interviews and use of, 135–137. *See also* Communication
- Lantz, P. M., 53
- Latinos: gender role/division of labor study by ECH on, 219–221*t*, 222–226; HEP focus groups inclusion of, 112; HEP survey inclusion of, 117, 118; HIV/AIDS study by ECH on, 213–218; Promoting Healthy Lifestyles Among Women study on, 148–162. *See also* Ethnic/racial issues

- LBHC (Little Big Horn College), 138
- Leadership: action-oriented assessment of community, 39–40; CBPR shared, 63–64; distributed-actions theory on, 63
- Liberty Hill Foundation, 373–374, 376, 377, 379, 381
- Likert scale, 267
- Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center (UNC), 330
- Literature reviews, 359
- Logic model, 263
- Los Angeles Times*, 380, 382
- M**
- Majority rules, 58
- Mapping technique:
  - challenges and limitations of, 205–206; discussion of methods for, 193–194; drawing maps, 190–191; Hispanos Unidos use of, 200–205, 202–207; lessons learned/implications for practice, 206–207; using preprinted maps, 192–193; theoretical underpinnings of, 189–190; working with communities in order to, 194–205; Your Crib project use of, 197–200, 205–207
- MCECH (Michigan Center for the Environment and Children's Health): Biostatistics and Exposure Assessment Facilities Cores of, 289; overview of, 286–288; "Philosophy and Guiding Principles for Dissemination of Findings of MCECH," 291, 293; URC affiliation with, 286. *See also* Community Action Against Asthma
- Media dissemination strategies, 380–381
- Meetings: using agendas and taking minutes, 58–59; improving group processes at, 69
- MFH (Messengers for Health): conducted on Apsáalooke Reservation, 128; interviewer training manual developed for, 132–137; interviewers selected by, 138–139; lessons learned/implications for practice from, 139–141; plans for updating community on progress by, 137; survey findings by, 129. *See also* Apsáalooke Reservation
- Michigan Center for the Environment and Children's Health, 18
- Minutes (meeting), 58–59
- Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services, 130
- Moving upstream analogy, 384–385
- N**
- NACR (Native American Cancer Research), 130
- NARCH (Native American Research Centers for Health), 37
- National Air Toxics Assessment and Cumulative Exposure Project (EPA), 378
- National Institute of Environmental Health Science's Health Disparities Initiative, 171
- National Institutes of Health Interagency Workgroup on Community-Based Participatory Research, 4
- National Institutes of Health (NIH), 37
- Native Americans: cervical cancer mortality rates by region, 129; cultural humility when interviewing, 132–134, 140–141, 142; research indiscretions committed when working with, 139–140. *See also* Apsáalooke Reservation
- Navajo Nation, 44
- Navajo National Data Resource Center, 44
- NC-BCSP (North Carolina Breast Cancer Screening Program), 329–330
- Neighborhoods: block club lamps issue of, 177–178; "broken windows" index of, 170; community reservations about observation of, 183; comprehensive assessment of, 168; HEP identification of stressors in, 175; identifying ethnic enclaves symbols in, 179; reviewing existing instruments for observing, 169–171; socioeconomic position/racial disparities in health in, 167–168; systematic (or social) observation of, 168. *See also* NOC (Neighborhood Observational Checklist)
- New York Academy of Medicine, 353, 360
- New York City reentry project. *See* CRN (Community Reintegration Network)
- NGOs (nongovernmental agencies): academic partnerships with, 40. *See also* CBOs (community-based organizations)
- NGT (nominal group technique), 57, 59
- NIEHS Children's Environmental Health Research Initiative, 286
- NIEHS Children's Health Initiative, 4
- NIEHS Environmental Justice Initiative, 4
- NIEHS (National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences), 4, 109, 286
- NINR (National Institute of Nursing Research), 213
- NOC (Neighborhood Observational Checklist): challenges/lessons learned during design of, 183–184; community participation in development of, 184; content discussions on purpose and focus of, 176–180; design/implementation of tasks, participants, and timeline of, 173; examining

## 476 SUBJECT INDEX

- construction and use of, 16, 105, 168; formation of the, 176; pilot testing and implementing, 180–181; review of previous data collection prior to designing, 172–175; selected outcomes of the design process for, 181–182. *See also* HEP (Healthy Environments Partnership); Neighborhoods
- Norming exercise, 59
- Norms: established for conflict, 66; establishing group, 59
- North Carolina Rural Economic Development Center, 333
- O**
- Oakland Community Health Academy, 44
- Objectives: of CAAA, 170; of CRN, 281; of ECH (El Centro Hispano), 222–224; of Inspirational Images Project, 332–333; of SCEJC, 372; selecting and prioritizing CBPR partnership, 61–62; of URC, 261
- Observation: community reservations about neighborhood, 183; NOC (Neighborhood Observational Checklist), 16, 105, 168, 172–185; PHDCN Systematic Social Observation, 169; reviewing existing instruments for, 169–171; systematic (or social), 168; UVE use of, 88–91; windshield tours as, 63, 87. *See also* Data collection/analysis; Field notes
- Occidental College, 374
- Open coding, 265
- Open-ended interview, 308
- Operation Health 27610, 195
- Orange County Health Department, 85, 86
- Outsiders: AOCD dissemination of views by, 83–84; CBPR role of expert, 32; perception of, 78
- P**
- Participant observation. *See* Observation
- Participatory action research, 4
- Participatory community research, 4
- Participatory feminist research, 4
- Participatory research, 4
- Partnerships. *See* CBPR partnerships
- PHDCN (Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods), 169
- PHDCN Systematic Social Observation, 169
- “Philosophy and Guiding Principles for Dissemination of Findings of MCECH,” 291, 293
- Photovoice: conducting community forum using, 339–342; described, 19, 326; ensuring safe/open environment during discussions, 343; goals of, 326–327; grounded theory used to interpret, 332, 336–337; involving partners in, 343, 344; using local expertise and support for, 343; origin, use, and theoretical underpinnings of, 327–328; QOL framework for, 337–339, 338*fig*; recruiting/training participants in, 334–335, 343–344; SHOWED questions to interpret, 336. *See also* Inspirational Images Project
- Planning Grant (SLU–SPH): action planning taken by, 319–320; background of, 313–314; data feedback and member checking, 317–318; interpretation of data, 318; interview approaches used in, 314; interview guide developed for, 314–315; recruitment of interviewers and data collection/analysis, 315–317
- Policies: considering context of, 351–352; defining, 350; examining costs of options for, 366; framing problem, 351; limited impact of research on, 365; methods used to understand/change reentry, 354, 358–363. *See also* Public health
- Policy advocacy: defining, 350; distinction between research and, 352; triangle strategy used for, 373; work integrating research and, 389. *See also* Action
- Policy analysis: CRN, 281–282, 352–367; defining, 350
- Policy change: dissemination to enhance participation in, 380–382; leveraging research to promote environmental, 382–384; SCEJC long term investment in, 388; time dissemination of findings to influence, 367. *See also* Action
- Pollution. *See* Environmental exposure assessment
- Positivist research paradigm, 81
- Postpositivist research paradigm, 81
- Power/influence balance, 64–65
- PowerPoint dissemination strategy, 381
- PPR (participatory policy research): CRN (Community Reintegration Network) use of, 281–282, 352–367; CRN lessons learned/implications for practice of, 366–367; described, 19, 281, 350; framing policy problem, 351; importance of policy context in, 351–352; involvement of relevant

- stakeholders in, 350–351; limitations and challenges of, 364–366. *See also* CBPR (community-based participatory research)
- PRCs (Prevention Research Centers), 314
- Pregnancy study. *See* Promoting Healthy Lifestyles Among Women
- Prevention Research Initiative, 4
- Professional culture, 34
- Professional strangers: described, 77; perspective/knowledge available to, 78
- Profile questionnaire, 95
- Program on Ethnicity, Culture, and Health Outcomes (UNC–CH), 201
- Program on Intergroup Relations (University of Michigan), 68
- Project DIRECT, 196, 200
- Promoting Healthy Lifestyles Among Women: challenges and limitations of, 159–160; data analysis by, 157–158; data feedback/products and CBPR interventions by, 159; examining the, 16; focus group interviews with policy, program, organization leaders, 154–157; focus group interviews with pregnant/postpartum women, 151–154; formation of, 149–150; lessons learned/implications for practice, 160–162; research design used by, 150. *See also* REACH Detroit Partnership
- Protegiendo Nuestra Comunidad, 214
- Public health: CBPR used to study, 5; examining impact of policies on, 349; mission of, 78. *See also* Health research issues; Policies
- Public opinion poll (CRN, 2002), 360
- PWG (Policy Work Group) [CRN], 354, 359, 361, 362, 363, 366
- Q**
- QOL (quality of life) framework, 337–339, 338*fig*
- Qualitative research method: data collection using, 257, 259; focus group as, 146
- Quantitative research method, 257, 259
- Questionnaires: closed-ended survey, 259–260; evaluation of URC, 266–269; getting feedback and fine-tuning, 114–115; for population-based community surveys, 107–108. *See also* Surveys
- R**
- Racism, 41. *See also* African Americans
- RCT (randomized, controlled trial), 234
- REACH 2010 (Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Health initiative), 4
- REACH Detroit Partnership, 149–150, 155, 156, 157, 159. *See also* Promoting Healthy Lifestyles Among Women
- REACH (Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health) [CDC], 149
- Research: AOCD approach to, 81–84; CBEPR approach, 17, 211–227; different types of participatory, 4; discussions on centered-, 4; PPR approach to, 19, 281–282, 350–367; survey, 131–132, 137, 358–359; work integrating advocacy and, 389. *See also* CBPR (community-based participatory research); Data collection/analysis; Health research issues
- Respect, 60
- Robert's Rules of Order, 57–58
- Rose Bowl Principle, 291
- S**
- SCEJC (Southern California Environmental Justice Collaborative): challenges and limitations of research approach by, 386–387; described, 282; environmental justice promoted using CBPR, 375–384; environmental research approach transformed by, 384–386; examining CBPR approach used in, 19; goals and objectives of, 372; lessons learned and implications for practice by, 387–389; partners in, 372, 373–375
- School of Public Health (UC Berkeley), 44
- Seattle Partners, 234
- Seattle–King County Healthy Homes Project. *See* HH (Seattle–King County Health Homes Project)
- Secondary data: analysis of, 379–380; identification and selection of, 378–379
- SHOWED questioning technique, 336
- SHOWED technique, 93
- SLU–SPH (Saint Louis University School of Public Health Prevention Research Center), 313
- Small-group work, 56–57
- Social cognitive theory, 189–190
- Southern California Environmental Justice Collaborative. *See* SCEJC (Southern California Environmental Justice Collaborative)
- STBF (Strengthening the Black Family, Inc.), partnership between Your Crib and, 194–195, 199, 200
- Strategic Retreat on Reentry Policy, 354

## 478 SUBJECT INDEX

- Stress process exercise, 112
- Survey research: CRN (Community Reintegration Network), 358–359; dissemination and use of findings, 137; goals of, 131–132
- Surveys: addressing geographical distance/difference, 121; balancing multiple priorities, 123–124; creating mechanisms for diverse participants in, 120–121; demonstrating contributions are valued, 124; ECH (El Centro Hispano), 218; gathering data using, 102–103; HEP (Healthy Environments Partnership), 108, 110–125; MFH (Messengers for Health), 129; population-based community, 107–108; providing flexible/organized support for participation, 121–122; recognizing when/from whom participation is needed, 122–123; sustaining mutual commitment, 124–125. *See also* Data collection methods; Questionnaires
- Synergy, 271
- Systematic (or social) observation, 168
- Systematic Social Observation instrument, 169, 174
- T**
- Targeted mediators, 263
- Teens Against AIDS, 196
- Tobacco Society (Apsáalooke Reservation), 130
- Triangle strategy, 373
- Trust development: attending other's interests/needs, 61; following through for, 60; matching ethnicity of data collectors with participants for, 240; respect confidentiality for, 61; showing respect, 60
- Turning Point Initiative (W.K. Kellogg Foundation), 4
- U**
- UNC Berkeley School of Public Health, 44
- UNC-CH Community Health Scholars Program, 4, 85, 195
- UNC-CH institutional review board, 89
- UNC-CH Program on Ethnicity, Culture, and Health Outcomes, 201
- University of California, Santa Cruz, 374
- University institutions: activist scholar traditions of, 36; CBPR impact on tenure/promotion guidelines of, 46; historical abuses of, 37; identifying potential community partners for, 38–41; power dynamics within, 37–38; reflecting on capacities to engage in partnership, 36–38; reframing health issues in context of CBO, 41–43; sustaining CBO partnerships, 43–47. *See also* CBOs (community-based organizations); CBPR partnerships
- University of Michigan School of Public Health (SPH), 262
- University of Michigan's Program on Intergroup Relations, 68
- University of New Mexico-Tribal CBO partnership, 42–43, 46
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH), 79, 80, 85, 194, 328
- University of North Carolina's Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center, 330
- Unstructured conversational interview, 259, 308
- Uranga-McKane, S. U., 4
- Urban Research Centers program (CDC), 4
- URC Community Action Board, 358
- URC (Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center): background of, 260–261; CAAA project of, 170; challenges and limitations of project by, 159–160; data collection/analysis by, 18, 153–154, 156–158, 264–266, 267–269; data feedback/products resulting in interventions by, 159; evaluating partnership of, 260–274; focus group interviews by, 151–153, 154–156; future directions of, 163; goals and objectives of, 261; inclusion of partners by, 56, 64; lessons learned/implications for practice by, 160–162; MCECH affiliation with, 286; project background of, 148–150; research design used by, 150
- URC partnership evaluation: of challenges and limitations of research methods, 269–271; design of, 261–263; of interviews, 263–266; lessons learning/implications for practice from, 271–274; of questionnaire, 266–269
- U.S. Census (2000), 172, 333
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 231, 286, 378
- UVE (United Voices of Efland-Cheeks, Inc.): affiliation between HEP and, 109, 110, 111, 124; AOCD applied to, 79–81, 84–94; case example presented on, 74–75, 79; Community Forum of, 92–94; gathering secondary data, 86; key informant interviews, 88–91; participant observation and gaining entry, 86–88; partnership background of, 84–86

- V**  
Visioning activities, 62
- W**  
WE ACT (West Harlem Environmental Action), 45  
We-Count Program (North Carolina), 330, 331  
*Who Will Keep the Public Healthy? Educating the Public Health Professionals for the 21st Century* (Gebbie, Rosenstock, & Hernandez), 5  
Windshield tours, 63, 87  
Wish lists, 61–62  
W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 4, 44, 85, 149, 195  
Women: breast cancer survivors study on African American, 328–345, 338*fig*; ECH study on division of labor/roles by Latino, 219–221*t*, 222–226; URC-affiliated projects on pregnant/postpartum, 148–162
- Y**  
Your Crib, Your Grub, and Your Moves project: data collection/analysis by, 198–200; mapping protocol developed by, 197, 205–207; partnership between STBF and, 194–195; primary purpose of, 195; research process stages and role of partners, 196–200; selection and recruitment of participants in research, 197–198

