Illustrating the Outcomes of Community-Based Research: A Case Study on Working with Faith-Based Institutions

James Cresswell, Rich Janzen, Joanna Ochocka

Abstract   Incoming immigrants to places like Canada tend to be religious and thereby have sympathies counter to prevailing secularizing trends that emerge in research praxis. This paper presents an illustrative case study of Community-Based Research (CBR) that starts from the community to be studied. We illustrate how CBR can be an effective tool for engaging community stakeholders in solving community problems when stakeholders are part of faith-based institutions. This is accomplished by drawing on Ochocka and Janzen (2014) and Janzen et al. (2016), who discuss the hallmarks of CBR that we used to structure a case study with The Salvation Army (TSA). This paper focuses on TSA as a religious institution and how CBR supports TSA's adjustment to enhance its relationships with a community it finds itself serving: newcomers. We first outline the hallmarks of CBR and show how they are expressed in our case study. Second, we extend Ochocka and Janzen (2014) and Janzen et al. (2016) by focusing on the functions of CBR to illustrate further the outcomes that can emerge from this sort of approach and make recommendations for researching with faith-based institutions.

KeyWords   Functions of community research, community-based research, newcomers, settlement, religious institutions, case study

Canadian-born residents of Canada are less religious than those coming to Canada (Clark & Schellenberg, 2006; Hansen, 2014). As newcomers adjust to Canada, their religious group membership tends to remain stable (Connor, 2009). Despite the noted importance of faith-based support to immigrants, Byrnes and Karzenstein (2006) found that immigrants to places such as Europe and Canada tend to be religious and thereby have sympathies counter to prevailing secularizing trends. This elicits tension as functional secularism positions religion's role in the private sphere (Bramadat, 2014). The challenge is that newcomers to Canada prompt conversations that can be at odds with current secularizing trends and push questions about the role of religious faith-based institutions to the forefront (Acres, 2011).

A significant challenge arises about *how* one should study this sort of phenomenon. Social scientists are typically research-theory driven, where researchers start from their own theoretical and epistemological biases that inform their research methods (Polkinghorne, 1983). Such an approach may be useful within the confines of a social scientist's community of researchers but can bypass the ability to offer efficacious functional support to a community outside of itself. We seek to discuss this challenge suggesting an approach to research that can support faith-based institutions.

This paper presents an illustrative case study of community-based research (CBR; Hall et al., 2015; Ochocka & Janzen, 2014) as a way to do research that is driven by the community under study. We illustrate how CBR can be an effective tool for engaging community stakeholders in community problem solving, laying a meaningful foundation for future partnership activities and institutional change. This agenda is accomplished by drawing on the *hallmarks* of CBR that we used to structure a case study with The Salvation Army (TSA). As such, CBR is a good fit to support the work of TSA. Similar values guide CBR and TSA to outcomes directly responsive to institutional needs. We first outline the hallmarks of CBR and show how they are expressed in our case study. Second, we focus on the functions of CBR to discuss implications for working within a CBR mindset and working with faith-based institutions. Recommendations for researchers using CBR are thereby developed.

The Case Study Context
CBR is unique to other research paradigms because it seeks to involve community stakeholders in every research stage. When modelling the theory of change presented by Janzen et al. (2016), CBR can "build a sense of community that inspires people to work together towards a common good" (p. 51). As an inclusive orientation to knowledge sharing and problem-solving, CBR utilizes values such as "empowerment, supportive relationships, social justice, ongoing reciprocal education, and respect for diversity" to seek to bring the community together to address various social issues impacting community stakeholders (p. 52). In this way, CBR has been described as "research *with* people not *on* people" (Nelson et al., 1998; emphasis added). Community-based research is not a methodology but a research approach that draws on qualitative and/or quantitative methods that best fit the given research purpose. As outlined in Table 1, CBR has several unique hallmarks that distinguish it from other research approaches.

CBR uses *community-driven processes*. Once community stakeholders have been engaged in the research process, they play an essential role in shaping the research process to maximize research efficacy and community engagement. Therefore, a community-driven process means that "the research process promotes voice and self-determination among community members and that research is relevant and significant to communities" (Janzen et al., 2016, p. 47). An orientation to community-driven processes fits TSA because TSA is itself community-based with a mission to spread hope, justice, and mercy as expressed in the phrase "heart to God and hand to man" (Street, 2002, p. 25). The TSA continues its tradition of supporting immigration to Canada by aiding refugees coming under private sponsorship agreements (Langfield, 2004; Moyles, 2017). CBR fits with TSA because community-driven processes involve speaking to the needs and current practices of a community. In short, there is compatibility between the pragmatic orientation of TSA and the value of community-driven processes within TSA.

An advisory panel composed of six members from TSA was formed to assist with the project and to ensure community-driven processes in the study. The advisory panel acted as a sounding board and check-and-balance that reviewed the research methods and interview guide. The guide involved open ended questions about the structures supporting newcomers, the vision of how newcomers could be supported, and the processes involved in supporting

Table 1: **Hallmarks and Functions of CBR**

Category		Definition
Hallmarks	Community driven processes	Promoting the voice and self-determination among community members in the research process
	Equitable stakeholder participation	Research design, implementation, and dissemination involves equal control and reciprocal involvement between researchers and community members
	Action change orientation	Research process and results are intended to be relevant and useful to the community members with the potentiality of creating social innovation and change
Functions (outcomes)	Knowledge Production	Attend to community members' way of seeing the world and the theories-in-use in contrast to the discovery of knowledge shaped by predetermined theory
	Knowledge Mobilization	Trusting reciprocal relationships between researchers and participants enables the productive and pragmatic use of knowledge
	Community Mobilization	Research aims at transformative social change that enables a contribution to the betterment of society

newcomers. The advisory panel guided the recruitment of participants, reviewed the data and any reports, and helped disseminate information. The panel was instrumental in ensuring that the needs in TSA drove the project.

CBR promotes *equitable participation* from all community stakeholders. The lived experience of community members is recognized as equal to social scientific knowledge, and community partners are given "equal control of the research agenda through active and reciprocal involvement in the research design, implementation, and dissemination" (Janzen et al., 2016, p. 47). Participation creates synergistic co-learning between the community and researchers. All stakeholders share their knowledge of the community and effective research processes to ensure the research process's effectiveness (Taylor & Ochocka, 2017). A CBR

focus on equitable participation further enables the practical needs of TSA to be addressed. In our case, it allowed for a discussion of how TSA can shift its institutional practice to better help newcomers.

The advisory panel also supported equitable participation because they contributed to what was learned in the study. They served as guides that spoke to the interpretation of the themes in the interviews. Their voice was as much a part of the results as it was of the research design. The advisory panel identified TSA ministry units that fit the scope of this research project. Within ministry units, the advisory panel identified research participants at each location that are centrally involved in supporting newcomers. Representatives from TSA contacted potential key informants' supervisors and secured permission for the lead author to directly contact potential participants. The result was 14 interviews with key informants from various TSA areas and multiple organization levels (other details are withheld to protect confidentiality).

CBR is *action and change*-oriented (Ochocka & Janzen, 2014). Ensuring that the process is community-driven, collaborative, and action-oriented maintains that the "research process and results are relevant and useful to the community members in making positive social innovation and change" (Ochocka & Janzen, 2014, p. 47). This involves successive action and reflection cycles throughout the research, where stakeholders reflect on power dynamics among stakeholders, the effectiveness of research methods, and how meaningful the approach is to the community (Kindon et al, 2007). Ensuring an effective and inclusive process increases the likelihood of finding creative and sustainable solutions to community-identified issues identified by TSA. It also enhances the chance the community will play a leading role in implementing solutions that work for TSA. The value of action and change are compatible with TSA and so using CBR is a useful way to provide ideas for institutional change.

We address action and change in more detail when we discuss the functional outcomes of CBR below, but action and change were also realized through the broader context of the case study[1]: a two-year research project lead by the Centre for Community Based Research that studied partnerships among faith-based and government-funded settlement organizations (see Janzen et al., 2019). It pursued a series of knowledge mobilization activities that would inform effective faith/settlement partnerships within policy and practice. It also involved developing a network of researchers and faith and settlement leaders to maximize their synergy in promoting effective faith/settlement partnerships. The case study discussed herein was part of this broader change-oriented initiative.

The three hallmarks of CBR fit well with the need for research enabling practical change in TSA. What is more pertinent to our purposes are the functions (outcomes) of CBR and what they allow. We will discuss these functions to illustrate CBR outcomes in a faith-based organization and draw generalizable recommendations for working with such institutions.

---

1 Detailing the full findings in the paper extends beyond the scope of a single article, but the full case study report can be found at https://www.communitybasedresearch.ca/faith-and-settlement

Functions of CBR

Our work draws on a case study. The advisory panel identified TSA ministry units with interview participants at each location that are centrally involved in supporting newcomers. Representatives from TSA contacted potential key informants' supervisors and secured permission for the lead author to directly contact potential participants. This ensured that supervisors were not approaching potential participants, which protected confidentiality. Direct superiors provided several potential interview participants, but they did not have access to which participants were part of the study. Efforts were made to obtain a cross-section of gender, diversity, and ministry units. The result was 14 interviews with key informants from various TSA areas and various levels within the organization (other details are withheld to protect confidentiality). We draw on this case study to explore the following three functions of CBR proposed by Janzen et al. (2016) as a means of addressing a different approach to social scientific research and the outcomes that this approach enables: (1) knowledge production, (2) knowledge mobilization, and (3) community mobilization. Quick reference definitions are located in Table 1.

Knowledge Production

Chirkov (2016) discusses some of the challenges that researchers in community-based settings face, and one of them highlights the importance of the distinction between knowledge discovery and knowledge production. The notion of knowledge discovery treats research as a means of uncovering universal covering laws that underlie phenomena (see also Crotty, 1998; Polkinghorne, 1983). This approach treats research methods as a mirror by which we can see the reflection of universal covering laws. CBR takes a different direction to produce knowledge valuable to the community members participating in the research. Researchers who do CBR note that the knowledge-as-discovery approach can be problematic because researchers have to specify *a priori* what would count as a discovery (Primavera & Brodsky, 2004). In this context, researchers in CBR claim that research methods are not just a neutral means by which reality is reflected like a mirror reflects an image. Power and social relationships can heavily influence what is taken to be the case before research even starts, and doing so can cause researchers to miss what is happening in the community (Primavera & Brodsky, 2004). The research processes in this approach to knowledge can lead to situations where the findings are an artifice of the methods grounded in presuppositions (Foster-Fishman & Behrens, 2007; Halseth et al., 2016).

Janzen et al. (2016) argue that effective CBR demonstrates how, in a community context, knowledge is better approached as a joint production. The notion of knowledge being co-produced means firstly that the research process should not be about applying methods stemming from presupposed theory generated solely by researchers. It means that there is a turn to the community members' way of seeing the world and the theories-in-use that the members employ in the conduct of everyday life (Schraube & Højholt, 2016), irrespective of what researchers may presuppose about the social-scientific functioning of humans. What participants know is treated as a source of expertise, and so their life experiences are important

and centrally relevant for developing knowledge. A result is an approach to knowledge that emerges in an interactive, participatory manner (Ochocka & Janzen, 2014).

Case Study Illustration. One of the strongest themes that emerged in the interviews was that faith-based organizations have the potential to connect newcomers with holistic services. One participant noted that there is opportunity for mutual learning in this context as

> it would be helpful for some settlement agencies to learn about faith issues as well. There are people who are coming [to Canada, and] their faith is very important to them and when [settlement agencies] don't address that part, it's kind of like they are overlooking a big part of that person in a way. (FS007, 2711)[2]

These opinions may not have been a priority for those interviewed or the researchers, but the research interview enabled its joint production. Such co-production of knowledge further enables a more sophisticated discussion about the TSA shifting its orientation from crisis-oriented service delivery of basic needs to community development. Traditionally, TSA had been an organization that supported people in immediate need. The perceived stigma from potential partners is that TSA is there for the "drunks on the street" (FS003, 149). The key informants note that this challenge to community mobilization is not wholly ungrounded because they identify that service delivery in a church could itself be a barrier and the denominational affiliation may lead to partners in the settlement sector thinking that newcomers, according to one key informant, "have to be a Salvationist to come to other programs here" (FS001, 20). Moreover, TSA has a distinct identity that makes it

> hesitant to be a part of that bigger collaborative, because we are not seen with the picket signs and lobbying, we are not lobbyists…We want to maintain good relations with our government partners, because they're partners as well, and they are our funders. (FS006, 215)

A challenge to shift this orientation was made possible through the researchers' openness to the knowledge that included transitioning of the institution to focus more on community development. The participants discussed "integrated mission," which is about a shift to community development where "newcomers can come in and get supports, that is not just needs-based, but is actually community-building based, and child asset development based, then that is going to change the child's trajectory in Canada and then makes them less vulnerable" (FS003, 177).

The research enabled a discussion about tension in the lives of the key informants: an orientation to emergency service delivery is in tension with a motivation for institutional

---

2 Quotes are demarcated with the participant's identification code followed by the line number of the transcript after the comma.

changes towards community development. Asking questions in the interview did not reveal knowledge so much as it enabled a discussion involving their concern for "a transformation in [a] community…So when communities are transformed, that's when you know that something has happened" (FS006, 239). Had the researchers stuck to *a priori* suppositions, the current lived tensions promoting organizational change would have been missed.

Because of the commitment of researchers to engage with the TSA community as an equal partner, it was possible to help the key informants articulate a tacit value that ran throughout the key informant interviews: the importance of developing a sense of community. A sense of community is having a sense that one is known and belongs somewhere and key informants took the position that

> you are a name, not a number, so that's why we really encourage that, and if there is a language barrier, we try to connect one of our existing parents with the new parent of the same language, of the same culture. (FS002, 13)

A sense of community involves the perception that one is treated like a whole person. It means that we can foreground knowledge about how TSA must care for someone

> …as a whole, not just like we are only concerned about making sure that you know, you get a job and earn a house but we are also concerned about you as a whole person, and how you are dealing with living here. And that you feel like you belong here, and you feel like you know people and you are not all isolated. (FS007, 283)

It involves providing a place for newcomers to do things like participate in a sewing group where they can have a space for emotional and social support and

> they're just happy to be able to come to a place where people… [accept] them for who they are… language challenges or plain challenges… You're here for a break, you're here for a cup of coffee. Bring your children here, and just, we'll try and figure it out. (FS002, 257)

These efforts are about playing a significant and holistic role that is currently not filled. Doing so would take the initiative on the part of faith-based organizations like TSA. The knowledge that emerges in the research is a clear vision for how TSA can provide multigenerational communities helping with the holistic needs not currently addressed.

Knowledge mobilization

Janzen Strobbe et al. (2016) argue that knowledge mobilization is central to CBR. Implicit in this mobilization is that efficacious consultation and community engagement if done well in the context of knowledge production, leads community members to be more likely to see

the research's relevance even when the results may not be favourable. Valuing experiential and practical knowledge means that the trusting relationships among researchers, key informants, and stakeholders can create new understandings grounded in social involvement that sets the 2016 stage for using knowledge (Ochocka & Janzen, 2014). Thus, CBR outcomes are related to the research impact, which amounts to a utilization focus and efforts at a more extensive mobilization of knowledge produced in research (Janzen et al., 2016).

Case Study Illustration. Consider an illustration where the key informants discussed partnerships through the research process. One key informant mentioned that

> in working with faith-based and non-faith-based organizations…I think we are always looking to strengthen our working relationships and looking at ways to do that…To help share information and resources [to make] our services more accessible and beneficial to the individuals that we both serve (FS012, 140).

The research facilitated a valuable discussion of how key informants are supposed to enhance service by creating a "pool of resources" that are more transparent and available. The research enabled a discussion of a deeply rooted commitment to partnerships as activities that bridge service gaps and contribute to a positive community overall. One of the most useful discussion points perceived from partnerships is tied to how people in the field

> try to avoid duplication of services. We see what resources are outside, and available for our clients and we are a good resource for them, because we see all kinds of clients, even non-status… so there are certain parts of the population they cannot see but we can, so they send them to us. (FS011, 159)

The duplication of services goes hand-in-hand with bridging a gap where some newcomers would not be served were it not for the role that faith-based organizations play. The study's findings implied the next steps in terms of partnership development, and this knowledge was disseminated throughout the institution because it resonated with a need expressed by TSA.

One of the TSA case study outcomes was a research poster designed for the Canadian Psychological Association Annual Convention (Howell & Cresswell, 2017). Such posters usually focus on methods, findings, and implications related to current academic literature discussions. In the development of the poster, however, the authors simplified these details and focused more on the aforementioned opportunities for partnership and institutional change. Over half of the poster was devoted to outlining potential models to consider to move forward from the presented information. It represents the spread of knowledge about what to do with the impetus to develop partnerships. The result is that the poster hangs in the Territorial Headquarters of TSA, where it can be used as a discussion point.

There were, and continue to be, many different parties interested in the project described herein. Interested parties included decision-makers at the Territorial Headquarters of TSA, and

the results of this study were disseminated via a conversation facilitated by the first author. This conversation involved department heads and those responsible for various areas. Presenting the results was done through canvas-based software[3], and the goal was not to get through the findings. The goal was to select aspects of the research that could prompt discussion about eventual change and not present static research findings.

Consider how one of the ideas that emerged from the research was a need for education on intercultural competence training. One form of training and professional development mentioned by key informants was cultural sensitivity training. One key informant noted that "because I was taking the settlement worker course, it helped me a lot to understand…it's just actually normal for them" (FS004, 139). They then explained how this justified the importance of training. Partners can provide such training, and it allows workers in TSA — many of whom have happened into working with newcomers without a specific mandate to do so — to be reflective and more understanding. This enhances service delivery because it helps the members of the TSA "to understand more about different cultures. Because sometimes in that ignorance, we make judgments on people. So just helping people understand other cultures" (FS006, 257). The key informants reported that, currently, TSA does not have a well-developed policy on training and that "the majority of people working with the Salvation Army do not know about immigration, or immigration issues… [and what is needed is] education, and being aware that we have to reflect the community outside. And we do [not]" (FS011, 427). The research found that non-judgmental understanding helps front line workers better work with others and be realistic about what others can do. To mobilize this knowledge for frontline workers in TSA, the lead author worked with students in a Psychology of Immigration class.

The students spent the semester studying the topic, and they were also required to read the final report of TSA case study. The student groups developed training videos for TSA, and the best videos were forwarded to the TSA Family and Social Services Unit. These videos are for frontline worker training in listening to others from other cultures and cultivating intercultural sensitivity. The research outcome was information conveyed in a valuable tool that can support change in the institution.

Community Mobilization

Knowledge production and dissemination to diverse audiences via various means leads to community mobilization (Janzen Stobbe et al., 2016). Part of this work means addressing potential tensions and divergences in values to work out tensions to realize shared goals. CBR is a relational endeavour wherein ideas are linked to people, and so mobilizing ideas is about mobilizing people to develop innovations collaboratively. Ochocka & Janzen (2014) note that mobilizing people to act based on information is central and much more likely when the research connects with their experience. Ideally, joint collaboration leads to innovative solutions that can help a community chart new ways forward and put the resources in place that support such actions (Dulak & DuPre, 2008; Elias, 1987). Community mobilization

---

3 See http://prezi.com/rxq7qawt6d1h/?utm_campaign=share&utm_medium=copy

involves broader societal and systematic issues being addressed through research (Janzen et al., 2016). This function of CBR means that transformative social change is possible by applying ideas with the express intent to contribute to the betterment of society.

Case Study Illustration. Key informants noted a pitfall that emerges with faith/settlement partnership activities is that partnering organizations must grapple with perceived incompatibilities. While there are some practical incompatibilities such as different rules and practices in service delivery, a more significant issue that the key informants identified is that faith-based organizations often bring issues of faith-based guiding missions and identity to the foreground. Such discussions are central as faith-based organizations are directed to general questions of religious notions relatively more often than other organizations, which are comparatively more oriented to service pragmatics. The result is a sentiment where, as one key informant noted,

> there is sometimes a challenge of how to secure our mission in the midst of a partnership, you know…but other organizations have wanted us to compromise but it's just something that we need to be always aware of that we don't compromise our values, our mission for [whatever] activities we are involved in. (FS006, 111)

As such, the research mobilized a generative discussion about a desire to work with others, even as members of the TSA were concerned about giving the impression that they were trying to convert others:

> I would say a lot of the Christian groups are scared to share their faith in some ways, they are scared that they're going to go overboard and it's going to seem like they are only supporting if the refugees convert. And that's not their intention at all, and because they're so scared of giving that impression, they are not saying anything. So they're kind of backing away from the expression of why they are doing it. (FS007, 121)

Such action compounds the compatibility pitfall because it can look as if faith mission is being eroded, and this perception can be even more magnified in conjunction with the depth of the relationship:

> If it's just a networking group where you're just coming together, sharing ideas and saying, you can borrow this and here is a sample document that you can borrow, you can use, and that's different, it's kind of a loose partnership. It's when we get more into partnerships where we are sharing staff, facilities and programs… (FS006, 143)

It is in these situations that forgoing compatibility pitfalls become enhanced and potentially obstructive to partnerships. This discussion illustrates community mobilization in the sense of identifying and grappling with challenges inherent in implementing change.

The research articulated the complexity of change in the context of a deeply rooted care for meeting newcomers' needs that simultaneously motivates potential institutional change. This value is an expression of empathetic care for others where key informants explain that they sought to "see the difference in peoples' lives…the testimonials from the individuals saying this is what my life is like now you know. This is what my life was like before this policy; this is what my life is like now" (FS006, 231). This is an example of how change in policy involving partnerships is understood to be effective. There is a value that newcomers have needs that the key informants would like to see met, and so the hope is that

> Our services are able to respond to the needs of individuals and the unique needs of newcomers. I think that means being timely, providing timely services, accessible services, non-judgmental services…I think that being aware of the broader context of what that individual or family may be, whether emotional or psychological or physical, or whatever challenges they may also be experiencing which they may still carry with them. (FS012, 96)

There were a wide range of needs identified in the research: for example, helping people know their rights, breaking the cycles of poverty and violence, providing holistic health, and so forth. Such needs were unified by a value-driven motivation to help, and it is this motivation currently driving new partnership activities in TSA. Consider, as another illustrative point, how some key informants spoke about innovative ways forward by presenting leadership in navigating differences among partners. The point was raised that faith-based organizations are the right places to find natural leaders. Such organizations

> …could be the catalyst in creating that change…We are good at navigating the few resources and we are good at, you know, trying to work collaboratively because that is how we have always had to with the lack of resources that we have had. (FS008, 554)

Finding creative solutions and ways to collaborate has always been a part of faith-based service delivery and so the milieu of partnership is one in which faith-based institutions ought to be comfortable. That being said, a challenge was levelled at faith-based leadership:

> If you want to be a leader you also have to be able to be a follower. And so is [The] Salvation Army willing to be a follower in some sense? Not that you have to follow everybody, but you also have to look at what's happening in the community and look at what other people are doing. (FS010, 154)

Leadership that enables partners to navigate tricky differences means putting oneself in a position where one is consistently engaging the wider sector and doing so with a willingness to be on equal footing with others. The kind of leadership that enables partners to navigate gaps is leadership that promotes working

> with the settlement agencies that are local to them to figure out ways to bridge that gap, and bring the newcomers… what they need instead of just, kind of expecting them to show up because they are not going to do that. Get out there and find out what they need. (FS007, 319)

The research enabled the discussion of the idea that the TSA could take on a leadership role in the community. In the words of one participant, they noted:

> The Salvation Army has a huge reputation…I think that we should use that, the name, just to create an umbrella to reach out to these other people... I think that [The] Salvation Army easily could be a leader in this role. (FS008, 339)

There are many ways in which TSA could take such a leadership role, and participants advised accessing the creativity and resources within TSA to realize this vision. The part of increasing voice concerning government and media also means that leaders in TSA will naturally take on communicating about TSA. This role involves

> identifying…[the] sphere of influence ...Right now I am not in a position that my sphere of influence extends beyond it, this is my team, so I do work here but if people want to talk to me, I will talk to them. But I have to start with where I am. (FS003, 261)

This excerpt illustrates the importance of starting where one is at and communicating with others that TSA is a safe place. It involves taking up the role of reaching out within one's sphere of influence to showcase what TSA can provide. The key informants presented how partnerships can make others aware of what TSA is and what it does. In the words of one key informant:

> We've worked, we have good policies in place in terms of being welcoming, in terms of being inclusive, like those policies are in place. So the missing gap is people knowing this is a good place to send people to. (FS003, 217)

Implications and Recommendations
Table 2 below outlines the implications that we drew from the forgoing and the recommendations that follow.

Table 2. Implications and Recommendations for Working with Faith-Based Institutions

Implications	Recommendations
Assess one's own presuppositions	Draw on CBR to develop critical self-reflexivity
Recognize mission identity	Use CBR to raise central discussions about mission
Illuminate dynamic tensions	Draw on CBR to address interacting processes instead of representing static systems
Illuminate tacit normativity	Draw on CBR to reveal what is known but not in focal awareness
Imagine creative means of dissemination	Identify expressions of knowledge that works for the community: (a) modes of expression and (b) content that resonates
Identify leaders	Use CBR as a means to build bridges

The first implication when working with faith-based institutions is to *assess one's presuppositions*. Authors such as Bramadat (2014) have noted that countries like Canada operate based on a "functional secularism" that presupposes the relegation of religion's role to the private sphere. Bramadat (2014) notes that "when governments do engage religious communities or religious issues, it is with great caution; after working with policymakers for roughly fifteen years, my impression is that most prefer to avoid such engagements altogether" (p. 914). Our research illustrated how religious institutions are so integral to the process of newcomer adjustment that they are not contained in the private sphere, which is where functional secularism often locates religion (Janzen Brnjas et al., 2019). What is enabled through co-production of knowledge is a unique articulation of participants' experiences involving the following: religious institutions play a significant role in the processes involved in newcomers adjusting to Canada even when there is the ambiguity of what that role is and how it fits in broader secularized contexts. Because researchers work in such a context, it is important to be critical about one's presuppositions that may run counter to members of a religious institution supporting newcomers. Although checking one's presuppositions is a common part of regular CBR, it became vital when engaging faith-based institutions that are reticent about working with other non-faith partners like researchers.

What we suggest is that researchers leverage the flexibility of CBR to develop critical reflexivity. That is, the functions and hallmarks of CBR implicitly involve space for the voice of stakeholders, and we found that these offer the possibility of developing knowledge

inductively. When engaging faith-based institutions that support newcomers, it is important to create ways to attend to this potential. Future research in this domain should make critical self-reflexivity central. More specifically, work needs to be done that explicitly addresses critical self-reflexivity both in how knowledge is co-produced (i.e., critical reflection on the CBR process – see Janzen & Ochocka, 2020), but also like the knowledge produced (i.e., critical reflection on the research findings).

A second implication is that it is essential to *recognize mission identity* when working with faith-based institutions. The notion of "mission identity" links to the importance of religiously-oriented mission for faith-based organizations that is potentially more significant than other community organizations working with newcomers. This kind of mission is often central to faith-based institutions in ways that are pronounced and drive decision-making at organizational and individual levels (see Tamlin et al., under revised review). It is so central that we link this notion of mission to the idea of identity. Although some organizations may pay lip service to a mission, faith-based organizations treat it as absolutely central to their sense of who they are and what they do. In light of this implication, we recommend that CBR with faith-based organizations explicitly bring the issue of faith identity to the foreground (e.g., Janzen et al., 2016; Reimer et al., 2016). As we noted, there is some reluctance of members of faith-based organizations to discuss mission identity in the context of functional secularism even though it is central and likely discussed 'in house.' CBR researchers would be well advised to create a space for the open and frank discussion of mission identity, and future research should explore the role of mission identity in faith-based institutions directly (e.g., Janzen et al., 2017).

A third implication from the forgoing is that CBR with faith-based institutions was aptly suited to *illuminate dynamic tensions*. Faith-based institutions are, of course, systems and so involve interacting phenomena and not singular static entities. It is possible to think of systems as determinate mechanical structures of interacting components, but they are much more organic, and not all aspects of a system cohere or align. This implication means that researchers should look for patterns of influence as phenomena that mutually impact each other instead of static representations akin to a system map. This implication leads us to recommend that CBR researchers working with faith-based institutions recognize that they are dealing with heterogeneous systems and not homogenous faith groups. CBR is often concerned with dynamic designs and Foster-Fishmann et al. (2007) write that systems involve actions, actors, activities, and settings directly or indirectly perceived to influence or be affected by a given problem. We are highlighting the importance of recognizing the dynamic tensions and avoiding static representations when there may be a temptation to characterize a religious group as homogeneous. Future research should explore the difference between static and dynamic representations in a faith-based context and how it links to identifying leverage points for change.

Fourth, we drew the implication that CBR can be efficacious in *illuminating faith-based institutions' tacit normativity*. Although there are many definitions of culture and the normativity that culture entails, we have found it helpful to think about culture in terms of a community of

practice in the sense that members embody normative behaviour in a tacit, unspoken manner (Cresswell, 2012). It is lived-out as second nature and may not even be visible to members that naturally enact it. Consider how our work illuminated a tacitly lived notion of community that is markedly different from a typical academic approach to a "sense of community" that treats it as only as a psychological state that can be prompted or triggered in people (e.g., Chavis et al., 1986). Instead of treating a sense of community as a psychological experience that we try to prompt in newcomers, the research enabled a broader conceptualization of how interagency partnership is part of the sense of community. Consider how, instead of focusing on research about 'sense of community' in a psychologically focussed manner (McMillan, & Chavis, 1986), the researchers were able to explore the sentiment as an unstated social value. It involved an unspoken, yet shared, driving value of the key informants who presented their own lived experience as entwined with those that can come to Canada and become isolated or depressed.

We recommend that researchers focus on using CBR to reveal what is known but not in focal awareness for the members of faith-based organizations. The status of being an outsider as a researcher is what enables tacit normativity to be recognized: it is not second nature to the researchers! When this recommendation is coupled with the forgoing on critical self-reflexivity, it offers a powerful way to make explicit what a community holds implicitly to be true. Future research's potential is to capitalize on helping those working in faith-based institutions to see their practices in new ways and thereby support change efforts that can better support newcomers.

A fifth implication is that work with faith-based institutions requires one to *imagine creative means of dissemination*. Knowledge mobilization in CBR can look much different than traditional forms of social research, and this tendency was magnified in research involving faith-based institutions. The activities involved in the dissemination of knowledge must be creatively developed to meet the needs expressed by community members in a context where regular reports may not find resonance. The burden shifts to researchers to be open-minded enough to develop creative and innovative means by which knowledge can be mobilized (see also Ochocka & Janzen, 2014). Knowledge mobilization with faith-based groups involves creative ways of disseminating knowledge because research must be shared in a manner that speaks to various audiences that enable people to use the knowledge. Strong mission identities mean that dissemination that resonates with members in faith-based institutions can be especially effective.

We recommend that future research with faith-based organizations use CBR to identify knowledge mobilization expressions that work for the community with whom we engage in research. There are audiences that one would normally consider such as community members and academic researchers, but the former itself can be a multileveled and complex constellation of different populations (Trickett, 2009). It is essential to recognize the content that faith-based institutions find resonance. Topics like mission identity and the implicit normativity would find interest in such a highly motivated population. Websites and newsletters are popular in CBR, but interactive and dynamic modes like those we tried in this study can be useful.

Following this recommendation means that future work should be done to creatively imagine ways of expression that would not commonly be used.

The last implication that we noted is that work with faith-based institutions is effective when researchers *identify leaders*. Such leaders may be formal or informal as they can be persons who would implement research findings and continue the ongoing process of explorations and reflections (see Nelson et al., 2014; Nelson et al., 2010). A CBR approach enabled researchers to take the role of leaders. Regardless of whether the researchers or members of a community function as leaders, leaders are persons interested in facilitating an action-oriented discussion about taking the lead in co-producing information and then taking the lead in focussing on the shared value of wanting to help others. CBR is a bridge-builder, and a collaborative environment enables identifying leaders in faith-based institutions where leadership is an important feature of the systems. We recommend that CBR with faith-based institutions be approached as a tool for networking leaders. This means that future work with faith-based institutions should be approached with the intention to build bridges of communication between leaders of faith-based and other institutions.

Conclusion

In this paper, we have argued that community-based research can be a useful tool for engaging community stakeholders in community problem solving when stakeholders are part of faith-based institutions. Of course, this paper is oriented around an illustration and not making an empirical claim. This limits the potential scope, and it would be helpful for research to be done that focussed on exploring our recommendations more practically. Moreover, The Salvation Army is one institution and may not be representative of all religious institutions. It would be appropriate for researchers to compare our implications and recommendations to those emerging from other denominations and religions.

Treating knowledge as co-produced first enables a discussion of how the institution can change. The interviews themselves helped articulate tension in the lives of the participants that is prompting institutional change. We attempted to demonstrate the functional outcomes of a case study predicated on community-driven processes, equitable stakeholder participation, and an action-change orientation. In terms of results, we presented what emerges in knowledge-production as opposed to knowledge-discovery. Our case study illustrates how institutions can develop to connect newcomers with holistic services. We contributed to a transition from crisis-oriented services to community development that can fill a niche in service provision. Entailed in this change is the ability to inspire a sense of community that differs from an individualistic approach. We presented knowledge mobilization as an outcome that includes different modes of dissemination. In particular, we showed how a CBR approach involves dissemination for utilization. The posters and training videos that emerged from the project could be missed by researchers doing more traditional research. We, lastly, demonstrated community mobilization and how it connected to the complexities of organizations. This raised important conversations about challenges to partnerships and the values that inspire change to overcome those challenges.

About the Authors

James (Jim) Cresswell (*corresponding author*) is a professor at Ambrose University. His work involves community-based research aimed at using research to support community organizations. Other areas of interest include: poverty; theoretical, historical, and philosophical psychology; cognitive science of religion; and immigration. Email: jim.cresswell@ambrose.edu

Rich Janzen is co-executive Director of the Centre for Community Based Research and associate professor adjunct at Renison University College at the University of Waterloo. He sees research as a tool for social innovation and change. Rich has an academic background in community psychology and religious studies.

Joanna Ochocka is co-executive director of the Centre for Community Based Research, co-chair of community Based Research Canada, and associate professor adjunct at the University of Waterloo. She has conducted community-based research on a range of social issues, including community mental health, disabilities, immigration, family support and faith and justice.

References

Acres, W. (2011). Discourses of Religious Diversity: A Paradox?. *The International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations, 11*(1), 193-211.

Bramadat, P. (2014). Don't ask, don't tell: Refugee settlement and religion in British Columbia. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 82 (4), 907-937. https://doi.org/10.1093/jaarel/lfu040

Byrnes, T. A., & Karzenstein, P. J. (2006). Religion in an expanding Europe. *Sociologický Časopis, 42*(3), 605-608.

Chavis, D. M., Hogge, J.H., McMillan, D. W., & Wandersman, A. (1986). Sense of community through Brunswick's lens: A first look. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 14(1), 24-40.

Chirkov, V. (2016). *Fundamentals of research on culture and psychology: Theory and methods.* Routledge.

Clark, W., & Schellenberg, G. (2006). *Who's Religious? Canadian Social Trends*. Catalogue no. 11-008. Statistics Canada.

Connor, P. (2009). Immigrant religiosity in Canada: Multiple trajectories. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *10*(2), 159-175.

Cresswell, J. (2012). Including Social Discourses and Experience in Research on Refugees, Race, & Ethnicity. *Discourse & Society,* 23(5), 553-575.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Sage.

Dulak, J. A., & DuPre, E. P. (2008). Implementation Matters: A Review of Research on the Influence of Implementation on Program Outcomes and the Factors Affecting Implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 41*, 237-350.

Elias, M. J. (1987). Establishing enduring prevention programs: Advancing the legacy of Swampscott. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 15*(5), 539-553. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00929908

Foster-Fishman, P., & Behrens, T. (2007). Systems change reborn: rethinking our theories, methods, and efforts in human services reform and community-based change. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 39*, 191-196.

Foster-Fishman, P., Nowell, D., & Yang, H. (2007). Putting the system back into systems change: A framework for understanding and changing organizational and community systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 39*, 197-215.

Hall, B., Tandon, R., & Tremblay, C. (2015). *Strengthening community university partnerships: Global perspectives*. PRIA and University of Victoria Press.

Halseth, G., Markey, S., Ryser, L., & Manson, D. (2016). *Doing Community-Based Research*. McGill-Queen's University Press.

Hansen, T. B. (2014). Migration, religion and post-imperial formations. *Global Networks, 14*(3), 273-290. https://doi.org/10.1111/glob.12059

Howell, M. & Cresswell, J. (2017, June). Meeting the Challenge of Charting Community Development: Opportunities for Intervention & Prevention in a Faith-Based Settlement. Poster presented at the Canadian Psychological Association 78th Annual National Convention. Toronto, Ontario.

Janzen, R., & Ochocka, J. (2020). Assessing excellence in community-based research: Lessons from research with Syrian refugee newcomers. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement.13*(1). https://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/journals/index.php/ijcre/article/view/7037

Janzen, R., Brnjas, C., Cresswell, J., & Chapman, M. (2019). Faith and settlement partnerships: Perspectives of community stakeholders. *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies.* https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2019.1658007

Janzen, R., Chapman, M., Reimer, S., & Ochocka, J. (2017). Community-based research and the faith-based campus. *The Engaged Scholar Journal: Community-engaged Research, Teaching, and Learning. Special Faith Issue. 3*(1), 63-81. https://doi.org/10.15402/esj.v1i1.225

Janzen, R., Stobbe, A., Chapman, M., & Watson, J. (2016). Canadian Christian churches as partners in immigrant settlement and integration. *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies.* https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2015.1123792

Janzen, R., Ochocka, J., & Stobbe, A. (2016). Towards a theory of change for community-based research projects. *The Engaged Scholar Journal: Community-engaged Research, Teaching, and Learning. 2*(2), 44-64. https://doi.org/10.15402/esj.v2i2.165

Kindon, S., Pain, R. & Kesby, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Participatory action research approaches and methods: Connecting people, participation and place*. Routledge.

Langfield, M. (2004). Voluntarism, Salvation, and Rescue: British Juvenile Migration to Australia and Canada, 1890–1939. *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History, 32*(2), 86-114.

McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14*(1), 6-23. https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629(198601)14:1<6::AID-JCOP2290140103>3.0.CO;2-I

Moyles, G. (2017). "Help for Manitoba's Farmers and Housewives": The Salvation Army and official immigration agency. *Manitoba History, 83,* 35-40.

Nagel, C. & Ehrkamp, P. (2017). Policing the borders of church and societal membership: immigration and faith-based communities in the US South. *Journal of Territory, Politics, Governance, 5*(3), 318-331. https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2017.1290545

Nelson, G., Ochocka, J., Griffin, K., & Lord, J. (1998). Nothing about me, without me: Participatory action research with self-help/mutual aid organizations for psychiatric consumer/survivors. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 26*(6), 881-912.

Nelson, G., Janzen, R., Ochocka, J., & Trainor, J. (2010) *Participatory action research and evaluation with mental health self-help initiatives: A theoretical framework.* In L. Brown and S. Wituk (Eds.), *Mental health self-help: Consumer and family initiatives.* Springer.

Nelson, G., d'Ailly, H., Ochocka, J., Janzen, R., Maiter, S., & Jacobson, N. (2014). *Planning transformative change for mental health services for diverse cultural-linguistic communities.* In G. Nelson, B. Kloos, & J. Ornelas (Eds.), *Community psychology and community mental health: Towards transformative change* (pp. 177-201). Oxford University Press.

Norman, J. (2011). The fluidity of human capital: Theorizing the relationship between religion and immigration. *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion, 23*, 48-63. https://doi.org/10.1163/157006811X54706

Ochocka, J., & Janzen, R. (2014). Breathing life into theory: Illustrating of community-based research: hallmarks, functions and phases. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement, 7*, 18-33.

O'Mahony, C., Burns, K., & McDonnell, C. (2014). *Community based research: An introductory guide for higher education staff: Fact sheet.* Campus Engage/Irish Universities Association.

Polkinghorne, D. (1983). *Methodology for human sciences systems of inquiry.* State University of New York.

Primavera, J., & Brodsky, A. E. (2004). Introduction to the special issue on the process of community research and action. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 33*(3-4). https://doi.org/10.1023/B:AJCP.0000027213.18639.30

Reimer, S., Chapman, M., Janzen, R., Watson, J., & Wilkinson, M. (2016). Christian churches and immigrant support in Canada: An organizational ecology perspective. *Review of Religious Research.* https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2015.1123792

Schraube, E., & Højholt, C. (2016). *Psychology and the conduct of everyday life.* Routledge.

Street, R. (2002). *Servants together: Salvationist perspectives on ministry.* Salvation Army Books.

Tamlin, H., Cresswell, J., & Hoppe, A. (under revised review). Experiencing visions of Canadian church workers: Exploring the mentality fueling systems involved in poverty reduction.

Taylor, M., & Ochocka, J. (2017). Advancing community-based research in Canada. *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Development, 8*(2), 183-200. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJKBD.2017.10006154

Trickett, E. (2009). Multilevel community-based culturally situated interventions and community impact: An ecological perspective. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 43*(3-4), 257-266.