

## Youth-Led Participatory Action Research

Emily J. Ozer

University of California-Berkeley School of Public Health

This is a draft of a chapter/article that has been accepted for publication in:  
In L. A. Jason & D. S. Glenwick (Eds.). (2016). *Handbook of methodological approaches to community-based research: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

### Acknowledgments

The research described in this chapter was supported by a William T. Grant Scholars' Award and funding from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The YPAR Hub web platform project is funded by an award from the Peder Sather Center for Advanced Study at University of California-Berkeley. The author thanks Jackson Masters and Christine Kyauk for assistance in manuscript preparation; the high school students who participated in the projects; San Francisco Peer Resources (especially Elizabeth Hubbard, Gary Cruz, Adee Horn, Morgan Wallace, and Pui Ling Tam) and SFUSD for collaboration in the research projects; and Laura Douglas, Miranda Ritterman, Marieka Schotland, Yolanda Anyon, Maggie Wanis, Eddy Jara, Sami Newlan, and the University of California-Berkeley graduate and undergraduate research teams who assisted with the research.

This chapter discusses youth-led participatory action research (YPAR), a change process that engages students in identifying problems that they want to improve, conducting research to understand the nature of the problems, and advocating for changes based on research evidence. After providing an overview of YPAR and its core processes, the chapter reviews the literature regarding the effects of YPAR on youth and their settings and identifies the benefits of YPAR. This is followed by a multimethods case study of YPAR projects involving more than 25 urban classrooms. Lastly, I consider existing resources and new resources in development to support the dissemination of YPAR as a community research and intervention method.

### **Introduction to Youth-Led Participatory Action Research**

#### **What Is YPAR?**

Youth-led participatory action research (YPAR) involves the training of young people to identify major concerns in their schools and communities, conduct research to understand the nature of the problems, and take leadership in influencing policies and decisions to enhance the conditions in which they live (London, Zimmerman, & Erbstein, 2003). It is a specialized form of community-based participatory research (CBPR; see Kral & Allen's Chapter 25). YPAR shares CBPR's emphases on promoting the power of marginalized groups via an iterative process of inquiry and action (Minkler & Wallerstein, 2003) and democratizing research to include the expertise and voice of those affected by it (Langhout & Thomas, 2010). Issues of power are central to YPAR in promoting the influence of young people in systems and communities—especially as they do not exercise the same rights as adults—as well as in considering how adult facilitators share ownership and decision making with youth in implementing YPAR projects (Ozer, Newlan, Douglas, & Hubbard, 2013).

YPAR shares some goals and advocacy methods with youth-organizing approaches aimed at promoting the critical consciousness and power of young people to improve their lives

and communities (Brown & Rodriguez, 2009; Cammarota & Fine, 2007; Freire, 1994; Ginwright, Noguera, & Cammarota, 2006; Kirshner, 2007; McIntyre, 2000). YPAR, however, is distinctive with respect to its focus on an iterative process of systematic *research* and action conducted by the young people themselves. The data generated by the youth inform their actions and advocacy in dialogue with their own social position and experiences.

### **Paradigmatic Considerations**

Although YPAR offers valuable methods to community researchers, it is important to note that YPAR also embodies a deeper epistemological approach in asserting that young people are experts who can create knowledge leading to empowerment and social justice (Langhout & Thomas, 2010). In considering the intellectual basis and value of YPAR, Fine (2007) made a compelling case for how what is often narrowly defined as research “rigor” can be broadened and strengthened by YPAR in its honoring of the distributed nature of expertise. Key expertise is viewed as residing within marginalized youth and others who directly experience the research “topics” in their lives but have historically been the objects rather than subjects of research. YPAR as a field of scholarly inquiry and practice has grown markedly in the past decade; as of 2015, a PsycINFO search for “CBPR and youth” yielded 570 citations across many disciplines (e.g. psychology, public health, education, nursing), languages, and countries.

### **Key Processes**

In prior work, we proposed a framework for core processes of YPAR, mindful that the implementation of projects require flexibility and will differ across contexts. Ozer, Ritterman, and Wanis (2010) identified core YPAR processes including: (a) iterative integration of research and action, (b) training and practice of research skills, (c) practice of strategic thinking and strategies for influencing change, and (d) adults’ sharing of power with students in the research and action process. Other processes that are important for high-quality implementation of YPAR

but are not unique to it include opportunities and guidance for working in groups to achieve goals, expansion of the social network of the youth, and the development of skills to communicate with other youth and adult stakeholders (Ozer & Douglas, 2015).

Power sharing is a theoretically central dimension of YPAR and typically a challenging one to enact given the inherent inequality of adult-youth relationships. In principle, the youth-led approach entails the young people exerting power over key aspects of the research and action process (e.g. defining the problem/topic to be addressed, research methods, data analysis and interpretation, action steps), with adults in a support role. Skillful scaffolding from adults is needed to promote young people's sense of ownership while helping them manage demands such as deadlines and conflicts (Larson, Walker, & Pearce, 2005; Mitra, 2004; Vygotsky, 1978). This process of sharing power is a nuanced "dance" in hierarchical settings, such as schools, characterized by institutionalized power differentials, with adults holding the power, deciding the rules, and determining what counts as knowledge (Kohfeldt, Chhun, Grace, & Langhout, 2011; (Ozer et al., 2013). As Sarason (1996, p. 363) observed, the typical classroom is one in which teachers rather than students ask questions, adults are rendered "insensitive to what their [children's] interests, concerns and questions are...and children are viewed as incapable of self-regulation." Thus, YPAR disrupts the status quo by its very nature of generating youth-driven inquiry and knowledge. This is especially so if the young people generate problems to address and solutions to consider that are not viewed as similarly important by adult staff or if both youth and adults see a high-priority problem but have a different analysis of causes.

It is important to note that the concept of young people having power over key decisions and processes in YPAR does not mean in practice that all ideas, methods, or data interpretations generated by the youth researchers should be supported uncritically by the adult facilitators or peers. Rather, it means that a dialogic and iterative process is intentionally enacted in which the

young people's ideas are voiced and respected and that they get a chance to see the strengths and limitations of their ideas rather than being shut down by the power of the adult (Kohfeldt, Chhun, Grace, & Langhout, 2011) provided an in-depth example of this complex process of how adult staff in an elementary school eventually understood and valued the process of youth-led inquiry as distinctive from their regular teaching practices. In a similar vein, Ozer et al. (2013) identified the types of constraints experienced by multiple YPAR cohorts in high-school settings, as well as the strategies used by the students and teachers to enhance student power and action despite the constraints of "bounded empowerment."

### **Sociopolitical and Developmental Relevance of YPAR**

YPAR can be viewed as an intervention approach intended to address inequalities in health and education; create and strengthen opportunities for youth to enhance their own knowledge, skills, and motivations; and expand the opportunities for meaningful influence or voice in the settings in which youth live (Berg, Coman, & Schensul, 2009; Cargo, Grams, Ottoson, Ward, & Green, 2003; Mitra, 2004; Nieto, 1996; Ozer & Wright, 2012; Shor, 1996). For example, youth researchers have advocated for policy changes to reduce diesel bus emissions (Minkler, Vásquez, & Shepard, 2006) and improve neighborhood food access (Breckwich Vásquez et al., 2007), educated communities regarding the judicial system (Stovall & Delgado, 2009), worked to prevent childhood obesity (Findholt, Michael, & Davis, 2011), and participated in urban planning processes (Horelli & Kanja, 2002).

The potential benefits of YPAR suggested by theory and research include key attitudinal and behavioral aspects of psychological empowerment, such as perceptions of control and efficacy in relevant domains; motivation to influence involved youths' schools or communities in constructive ways; decision-making and problem-solving skills; critical understanding of the sociopolitical environment; and participatory behaviors (Holden, Evans, Hinnant, & Messeri,

2005; Zimmerman, 2000). Other individual-level gains observed in qualitative YPAR research include increases in adolescents' sense of purpose, perceived support from caring adults, and more positive attitudes toward education and school (Mitra, 2004; Wilson et al., 2007).

Several studies in public health have examined if youth researchers who study a particular health issue actually change their own attitudes and behavior regarding the issue. For example, effects have been found with respect to reductions in marijuana use (Berg et al., 2009). Research on alcohol use found positive effects for empathy, positive control, and domains of self-efficacy but not for behavioral outcomes related to alcohol or violence (Wallerstein, Sanchez, & Velarde, 2005). Gibson, Flaspohler, and Watts (2015) examined whether a YPAR project on bullying in three middle-school sites affected bullying attitudes and behavior at the school level; the research found positive effects at the one site that actively engaged the school community via a bullying prevention message contest but not for the sites in which the youth research project culminated in presentations to the school community about bullying.

There are a number of reasons why YPAR is particularly relevant for adolescents and their schools. In the United States, K-12 education has been a major site of YPAR inquiry and action, as exemplified in our case examples highlighted in this chapter and in that of multiple other scholars. Much of this school-oriented work has focused on addressing rampant inequalities by race and class in educational opportunities, safety, and resources, as well as disproportionate discipline and special education placements for youth of color (Gregory & Weinstein, 2008). In Ozer, Ritterman, and Wanis (2010), we considered how YPAR can help address the developmental mismatch between adolescents and typical public secondary schools (Eccles, Midgley, Wigfield, & Buchanan, 1993; Simmons, 1987). Although older children and young adolescents demonstrate growing capacity and desire for autonomy, longitudinal research indicates that youth perceive fewer opportunities to exercise autonomy and participate in making

decisions and rules in junior high than they did in elementary schools (Midgley & Feldlaufer, 1987).

Furthermore, YPAR holds particular promise for adolescents because this developmental period is a time of fluidity and transition for individual and collective sense of identity and purpose (Damon, 2003; Ozer, Ritterman, & Wanis, 2010). Developmental theories focused on youth of color emphasize the influences of social position, racism and discrimination, and immediate environments (García Coll et al., 1996). YPAR that involves youth of color in analyzing and having an impact on the social, economic, and political conditions that shape their schools and communities thus provide developmental opportunities for youth to see themselves as leaders with a sense of purpose (Damon, 2003; Spencer, Fegley, & Harpalani, 2003) rather than internalizing negative stereotypes held by others (Cahill, Rios-Moore, & Threatts, 2008). Also, YPAR is intended to promote critical consciousness—critical reflection, motivation, and action — that pushes youth beyond individual-level explanations of problems faced by communities of color to investigate broader factors (Watts, Diemer, & Voight, 2011).

In their analysis of the integration of developmental psychology and liberation psychology, Watts and Flanagan (2007) raise the issue of a politically “sensitive” period for identity formation regarding civic engagement, making the case for sociopolitical activism as an important pathway to critical consciousness and civic engagement for youth of color beyond the traditional routes of civic engagement such as volunteer service. In addition to promoting civic and political engagement—and relevant skills in inquiry and advocacy—being youth researchers can also promote young people’s view of themselves as researchers and scientists, opening up possible pipelines into these fields when there are actual opportunities provided.

### **YPAR and Research Validity**

With respect to research validity, YPAR can be viewed as a special approach to address research questions that young people are particularly well equipped to define and investigate. Fine (2007) challenged the field to consider how YPAR enhances the quality and trustworthiness of research, even from the standpoint of classic psychological traditions, with respect to expanding the constructs of objectivity, construct validity, and generalizability (Cook & Campbell, 1979). For example, in a collaborative project with high-school students, Fine (2007) observed that YPAR enhanced construct validity when youth researchers responded to the adult researchers' focus on the "achievement gap" by redefining the problem as the "opportunity gap," thereby strengthening the construct and causal conceptualization to fit the phenomenon.

YPAR can improve the rigor (in the expanded sense noted above), relevance, and reach of science by affording insider expertise not only in the identification of questions that are important to study but also in enhancing the quality and validity of data and interpretation. Insider expertise is important generally and even more salient in the investigation of youths' experience of sensitive, hidden, or hard-to-report phenomena in which the presence of an adult observer would change the nature of the phenomena. Many key topics for research and health promotion regarding adolescent health and well-being relate to social phenomena that are less accessible to adult inquiry and/or affected by the presence of adult observers, such as bullying, dating relationships, substance use, aggression, and disproportionate discipline by teachers.

**Relevance.** As indicated earlier, a core early step in the YPAR process is the young people's identification of the topics to be addressed, but importantly also strengths or resources that run counter to stereotypically negative narratives of their communities (Dill, 2015). Thus, the relevance of the research process should be inherently strengthened by YPAR insofar as there are authentic opportunities for the youth researchers to determine their questions or to refine the focus of questions in situations in which the overall topic might already be constrained by prior

cohorts or other factors that establish parameters for their inquiry (Ozer et al., 2013). There are multiple methods that youth researchers use to generate issues of concern and then select from as an area of focus. In addition to interviews and observations, PhotoVoice and mapping are two specific methods that have been used to provide contextualized material for issue identification and selection (Catalani & Minkler, 2010). For example, both McIntyre (2000) working in the U.S. northeast and Vaughan (2014) in Papua, New Guinea, discussed how young people's photos of garbage in their communities became a focus of YPAR efforts.

**Rigor.** YPAR can enable situations in which youth insiders study phenomena that are accessible to them in ways that would likely not be accessible to adults in their communities or to academic researchers. Although there are important examples of adult ethnographers gaining the trust of young people to study hidden or stigmatized phenomena, such as racially motivated violence and the experience of structural inequalities for youth of color (Pinderhughes, 1997; Seyer-Ochi, 2006), ethnographies are relatively rare and extremely time-intensive research projects that are typically focused on generating novel social science theory. In contrast, YPAR can afford an insider phenomenological perspective on practical, relevant, and often time-sensitive issues for the improvement of young people's life conditions, nurturing the capacities of youth themselves to generate critical inquiry and empirical findings.

There are many examples in the YPAR literature that demonstrate the value of youth insider expertise. For example, Ozer, Ritterman, and Wanis (2010) engaged a group of female adolescents at a majority-Latino middle school as part of a classroom-based YPAR project. In the YPAR process, the students generated a range of problems to address, including the perceived pressure to join gangs or "claim colors." Although the school had a strict dress code that excluded gang colors, students shared the small ways that they noticed colors being claimed, an example of peer expertise about the trajectory of the process that was likely "under the radar"

for adults. The youth researchers also identified important causal factors regarding why their peers joined gangs.

With respect to rigor on the applied intervention side, YPAR also provides important opportunities for evaluation of programs in which youth participate (Youth Impact, 2001) as well as the adaptation of programs to be more relevant to their lives, strengths, and needs (Chen, Weiss, & Nicholson, 2010; Ozer, Wanis, & Bazell, 2010). Local tailoring of school and community-based interventions is a highly challenging effort, especially when we consider the many diversities inherent in the classrooms, schools, and communities meant to be served by such programs. Engaging the local expertise of young people in adaptation can help avoid relying on overgeneralization and untested assumptions about group differences in enhancing the relevance of community-based programs.

**Reach.** Recent work in public health has focused on YPAR's role in policy change as well as in reducing the research-practice gap. In an interview study of the utilization of YPAR versus academic research in five public health departments in California, Wanis and Ozer (2015) found that "research-friendly" public health departments utilized evidence generated by both academic research and YPAR but that some departments that did not tend to value or utilize academic research did utilize the findings of YPAR to inform policies and practices because it was seen as relevant to the youth they serve. Thus, in this case, YPAR demonstrated a potential for enhancing the utilization of research by practitioners, relative to academic research.

Garcia, Minkler, Cardenas, Grills, and Porter (2014), in their analysis of an effective partnership between academic partners, a community-based organization, and youth researchers living in an economically marginalized neighborhood of Los Angeles, identified how the YPAR project utilized neighborhood surveys as well as youth panels and videos to gather data about the young people's experiences and needs. They also successfully used these methods to redefine

public opinion about who lived in the neighborhood and to advocate for accessible and safe playgrounds as well as other resources.

## **Case Study**

### **Overview of Study**

The case study presented here was part of a 5-year, mixed methods intervention that investigated the effects of YPAR on participating youth and their school settings (Ozer & Douglas, 2015). The within-school design at five urban high school sites included 29 classes of high-school students who conducted YPAR projects; these were compared with 34 classes of students who participated in a direct service peer education class that did not include training in YPAR. The sample was ethnically diverse, with 35% of the adolescents being of Asian American ethnicity, 31% Latino/Hispanic, 14% African American, 7% European American, and 10% from other minority groups such as Native American or Arab American. The overall sample was 65% female and 35% male with an average age of 16.

The study represented a collaboration of University of California-Berkeley researchers with the high schools and a community-based organization (SF Peer Resources). Classroom teachers coordinated the YPAR projects in a daily elective class, with technical assistance from their supervisor and the university team (Ozer et al., 2008). The study assessed individual-level quantitative outcomes of psychological empowerment for young people who participated in the YPAR projects and gathered extensive qualitative data from students regarding the YPAR projects via interviews and participant-observation. Qualitative methods were used to assess school-level effects of YPAR (Ozer & Wright, 2012), to analyze constraints on student power in schools, and to identify processes to help promote student power (Ozer et al. 2013).

## **YPAR Projects**

The problems addressed in the YPAR projects were decided by the students, with facilitation from their teachers. Topics included the prevention of school drop-out; smoothing the transition to grade; stress related to family, academics, or peers; improving the school lunch; cyber-bullying; sexual health; safety and hygiene in the school bathrooms; improving teaching practices to engage diverse students; and improving interethnic friendships at the school. Each project lasted at least one semester; some continued for the year. At two sites, the subsequent year's cohort decided to continue with the same topic. The curriculum used by the teachers was adapted by SF Peer Resources, based on existing YPAR curricula (Silva, Zimmerman & Erbstein, 2001; Sydlo, 2000).

## **Intended Outcomes**

The intended outcomes, with respect to the school setting, were to establish opportunities for students to participate in school governance and shape school practices by sharing with administrators research-based recommendations aimed at improving the school in areas of concern to the students. Other intended school-level effects included improving alliances between students and adult staff, creating opportunities for students and adults to engage together in inquiry relevant to the school and to students, and enhancing students' collective efficacy to enact thoughtful and high-quality research and advocacy activities. The intended outcomes for students included (a) strengthening knowledge and skills regarding research, communication, strategic thinking, collaborative group work, and advocacy and (b) enhancing positive ethnic identity, sense of purpose, connection to school, and motivation to influence the school.

## **Overview of YPAR Processes**

In the issue selection phase, the teacher-facilitators led multiple class sessions intended to help students decide on a topic as a group and to pick a topic that was within the scope of

feasible action. The issue selection process started with students' creation of an "issue tree," consisting of branches of "leaves," that is, post-it notes representing problems that were organized in terms of domains and hypothesized "root" causes. These issues were generated by the students, based on their experiences and informal interviews with students, teachers, and parents. In structured activities, students advocated and voted for their choice of topics, with the teacher-facilitator assisting the group in respecting differing views and working together to achieve consensus. Students also looked for ways to combine topics or identify cross-cutting themes, for example, peer pressure being related to several topics, including sex and drugs.

With training and guidance from their teachers and the university team, students then engaged in a research phase to study and understand the problem, using a range of survey, interview, observational, and multi-media approaches for data collection. Following this, in the action phase, the teacher-facilitators helped students to identify specific and feasible actions that they could take to start to address the problem, with the understanding that it was likely beyond the scope of the project to fully solve it.

### **Students' Use of Multiple Methods**

The training of the teacher-facilitators and the curricula used in the YPAR projects emphasized the value of multiple types of research methods for data gathering. In one of the first training exercises, students engaged in a "research roundtable" in which they walked around the room to different "stations" with examples of data generated by surveys, interviews, observations, or photovoice and were invited to reflect on the strengths and limitations of each form of data. In their actual projects, after the YPAR students identified their topic, they engaged in parallel discussions to determine the methods they would use to gather data. As in professional multimethods research projects (Yoshikawa, Weisner, Kalil, & Way, 2008), the students sometimes used multiple methods sequentially, for example, starting with a survey to assess the

major concerns of students in the school and then moving into using other methods, such as observations, to obtain more fine-grained data regarding their specific topic.

One example of the sequential multimethods approach was the Best Practices Club, a project in which students focused on how to improve the teaching at a majority-Latino school with low graduation rates (Ozer & Wright, 2012). With guidance from their teacher-facilitator, the students decided to focus on “boring teaching” as a reason why some students didn’t attend and stay engaged in class. They developed an observation method (observing in pairs in order to compare notes) and conducted interviews with teachers before and after the observations to identify issues of concern for the teacher and provide feedback to teachers on practices that seemed to work to engage diverse learners.

In interviews conducted with the school principal and staff about the effects and challenges of this Best Practices Club project, a strong theme that emerged was that the students’ observations were actually more valid than the principal’s own observations of classroom practice. The teachers noted that they “forgot” that the student was an observer and therefore acted more naturally than they did when the principal or other adults conducted observations in their classroom. Our study findings also indicated that the transition to seeing students, especially low-performing students, as “experts” who had important perspectives and data that related to the issues of student engagement and academic performance was a major shift in how the adult staff viewed the students and in how the students viewed themselves (Ozer & Wright, 2012). Lastly, we noted that the ways that students were able to contribute to the school as youth researchers differed from the role of student leaders on an existing principal advisory board; the teacher who led both efforts noted that students’ advisory board input tended to be simplistic and punitive of students (e.g. steeper punishment for lateness), whereas the YPAR process led to nuanced, data-informed recommendations from students that considered multiple perspectives.

## **Research Team's Use of Multiple Methods to Study YPAR**

In addition to students' use of multiple methods within their YPAR projects, our research team developed and utilized a range of methods to study the processes and outcomes of YPAR on both the individual-student and the school-setting levels. Our integration of qualitative and quantitative methods occurred in multiple ways over the course of the project, with the relative dominance of quantitative versus qualitative data varying with the research questions and the stages of the project (Yoshikawa et al., 2008).

**YPAR outcomes.** For the assessment of outcomes with respect to psychological empowerment, we used group interviews with students, interviews with teachers, and observations in the early stages of the project to develop items to pilot new subscales of psychological empowerment and adapt existing measures (Ozer & Schotland, 2010). We used this formative research to consider the question of the potential effects of YPAR on the students, beyond what might be captured by existing psychological measures. Even after developing and testing the quantitative measure, however, we continued to conduct group interviews with all of the YPAR classes and with the teachers at the end of each semester to make sure that we captured the narrative of the project, as well as how the impact (or lack thereof) was understood and experienced by the students themselves.

**YPAR processes.** Having in-depth process data regarding what was happening in the YPAR projects was critical to avoiding a "black box" evaluation of YPAR. Because classroom and school contexts differed, and the projects' topics also varied, it was essential to assess rather than assume implementation with respect to YPAR processes and their degree of intensity and quality. To address these questions, we used initial open-ended field notes gathered by the research team to generate an observational rating scale with illustrative quotes. This observational rating scale was based on our theory of change and integrated existing

observational quantitative scales to assess general classroom practices (e.g., student engagement) as well as specialized scales we developed to capture the core YPAR processes discussed above (Ozer & Douglas, 2015). The research team then used this hybrid rating scale to generate implementation quality ratings in weekly observations of the YPAR classes at each site.

Although this in-depth assessment of classroom interactions was necessary, we found that it was not sufficient to capture larger intervention processes that occurred over the course of the project. Examples of what we termed “meta-level processes” included the degree of shared power between the teacher-facilitator and students and the integration of research and practice. These were assessed by the research group via a consensus coding process, based on triangulation of the range of quantitative and qualitative process data for each semester-cohort (i.e. teacher interviews, teacher meeting notes, student interviews, and observational ratings).

### **Conclusion**

This chapter has provided an integrative overview of the practice, evidence, and promise of YPAR as a multidimensional approach to community research and youth development with an explicit focus on reducing inequalities in schools and communities. YPAR serves as a potential pathway for schools and communities to benefit from youth’s expertise and as a pipeline for economically and politically marginalized youth into community-engaged inquiry and action. Furthermore, we note that the critical inquiry and communication skills emphasized in YPAR are consistent with the new Common Core standards that have been adopted in almost all U.S. states (Kornbluh, Ozer, Kirshner, & Allen, 2015).

With respect to YPAR resources, there are excellent curricula for conducting YPAR that are available at little or no cost that schools and organizations can access (Silva, Zimmernan & Erbstein, 2001; Sydlo, 2000) In addition, websites exist that provide rich photographic and video examples of the products of YPAR for adult facilitators, as well as models for young

people to see what is possible (Center for Regional Change, Public Science Project, The Institute for Community Research). Notably, a 2014 Emmy-nominated documentary, *The Revolutionary Optimists*, provided an in-depth narrative of a project conducted by youth researchers seeking to bring drinking water and promote immunizations in their slum neighborhood of Kolkata, India (Grainger-Monsen & Newnham, 2013). Finally, I am in the process of developing an interactive web platform, the YPAR Hub, to support and highlight the findings of YPAR (please contact me for further details).

Despite the existence of many exemplary YPAR projects, there has been little discussion in the YPAR literature about how to support networks of YPAR projects so that youth researchers learn from each other and potentially work together to maximize their impact on issues of shared concern. Several big questions currently facing the field include: (a) How can YPAR diffuse beyond specific sites to grow into a practice that can benefit youth and communities more broadly? (b) What are the potential opportunities and “spaces” to embed YPAR within other large-scale efforts, such as the reform of schools and other youth-serving systems? (c) How do we support the capacity to do YPAR well, particularly as it is a flexible process rather than a fixed, manualized curriculum? As has hopefully been evident throughout this chapter, the challenge of doing YPAR well is concerned not only with the quality and trustworthiness of the research inquiry and products but with the intentionality and skills in promoting the core empowerment and youth development goals of YPAR. Thus, supporting the high-quality diffusion of YPAR goes beyond the training of specific skills or tools and encompasses an equity and youth development framework.

YPAR is an important and growing approach to community research. Key challenges for YPAR researchers to address in the coming years are the promotion and assessment of YPAR’s impact beyond the relatively small projects conducted to date and the identification of

opportunities for YPAR and other forms of youth-generated data to inform youths' school systems and the communities in which they live.

## References

- Berg, M., Coman, E., & Schensul, J. J. (2009). Youth action research for prevention: A multi-level intervention designed to increase efficacy and empowerment among urban youth. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 43*, 345–359.
- Breckwich Vásquez, V., Lanza, D., Hennessey-Lavery, S., Facente, S., Halpin, H. A., & Minkler, M. (2007). Addressing food security through public policy action in a community-based participatory research partnership. *Health Promotion Practice, 8*, 342-349.
- Brown, T. M., & Rodriguez, L. F. (2009). *Youth in participatory action research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Wiley.
- Cahill, C., Rios-Moore, I., & Threatts, T. (2008). Open eyes-different eyes: PAR as a process of personal and social transformation. In J. Cammarota & M. Fine (Eds.), *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion* (pp. 89-124) . New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cammarota, J., & Fine, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cargo, M., Grams, G., Ottoson, J., Ward, P., & Green, L. (2003). Empowerment as fostering positive youth development and citizenship. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 27* (Supplement 1), S66-79.
- Catalani, C., & Minkler, M. (2010). Photovoice: A review of the literature in health and public health. *Health Education & Behavior, 37*, 424-451.
- Chen, P., Weiss, F. L., & Nicholson, H. J. (2010). Girls Study Girls Inc.: Engaging girls in evaluation through participatory action research. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 46*, 228-237.

- Cook, T., & Campbell, D. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings*. Chicago, IL: Rand-McNally.
- Damon, W. (2003). The development of purpose during adolescence. *Applied Developmental Science, 3*, 119-128.
- Dill, L. J. (2015). Poetic justice: engaging in participatory narrative analysis to find solace in the "killer corridor". *American Journal of Community Psychology, 1-2*, 128-35.
- Eccles, J. S., Midgley, C., Wigfield, A., & Buchanan, C. M. (1993). Development during adolescence: The impact of stageenvironment fit on young adolescents' experiences in schools and in families. *American Psychologist, 48*, 90-101.
- Findholt, N. E., Michael, Y. L., & Davis, M. M. (2011). Photovoice engages rural youth in childhood obesity prevention. *Public Health Nursing, 28*, 186-192.
- Fine, M. (2007). An epilogue, of sorts. In Cammarota, J., & Fine, M. (Eds.), *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion* (213-234). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum Press.
- Garcia A.P., Minkler, M., Cardenas, Z., Grills, C., & Porter C. (2014). Engaging homeless youth in community-based participatory research: a case study from Skid Row, Los Angeles. *Health Promotion Practice, 15*, 18-27.
- García Coll, C. T., Lamberty, G., Jenkins, R., McAdoo, H. P., Crnic, K., Wasik, B. H., & Vazquez García, H. (1996). An integrative model for the study of developmental competencies in minority children. *Child Development, 67*, 1891-1914.

- Gibson, J. E., Flaspohler, P. D., & Watts, V. (2015). Engaging youth in bullying prevention through community-based participatory research. *Family & Community Health, 38*, 120-130.
- Ginwright, S., Noguera, P., & Cammarota, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Beyond resistance! Youth activism and community change: New democratic possibilities for practice and policy for america's youth*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Grainger-Monsen, M., & Newnham, N. (Producers), & Grainger-Monsen, M., & Newnham, N. (Directors). (2013). *The revolutionary optimists* [Motion picture]. India: Zoetrope Aubry Productions.
- Gregory, A., & Weinstein, R. S. (2008). The discipline gap and African Americans: Defiance or cooperation in the high school classroom. *Journal of School Psychology, 46*, 455-475.
- Holden, D., Evans, W. D., Hinnant, L., & Messeri, P. (2005). Modeling psychological empowerment among youth involved in local tobacco control efforts. *Health Education and Behavior, 32*, 264-278.
- Horelli, L., & Kaaja, M. (2002). Opportunities and constraints of internet-assisted urban planning with young people. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 22*, 191-200.
- Kirshner, B. (2007). Supporting youth participation in school reform: Preliminary notes from a university-community partnership. *Children, Youth and Environments, 17*, 354-363.
- Kohfeldt, D., Chhun, L., Grace, S., & Langhout, R. D. (2011). Youth empowerment in context: Exploring tensions in school-based YPAR. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 47*, 28-45.
- Kornbluh, M., Ozer, E. J., Kirshner, B. & Allen, C. (2015). *Youth participatory action research and the new academic standards: Considerations for Educators*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

- Langhout, R. D., & Thomas, E. (2010). Imagining participatory action research in collaboration with children: An Introduction. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 26*, 60–66.
- Larson, R., Walker, K., & Pearce, N. (2005). A comparison of youth-driven and adult-driven youth programs: Balancing inputs from youth and adults. *Journal of Community Psychology, 33*, 57-74.
- London, J., Zimmerman, K., & Erbstein, N. (2003). Youth-led research and evaluation: Tools for youth, organizational, and community development. *New Directions in Evaluation, 98*, 33-45.
- McIntyre, M. (2000). Constructing meaning about violence, school, and community: Participatory action research with urban youth. *Urban Review, 32*, 123-154.
- Midgley, C., & Feldlaufer, H. (1987). Students' and teachers' decision-making fit before and after the transition to junior high school. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 7*, 225-241.
- Minkler, M., Vásquez, V., & Shepard, P. (2006). Promoting environmental health policy through community based participatory research: A case study from Harlem, New York. *Journal of Urban Health, 83*, 101-110.
- Minkler, M., & Wallerstein, N. (2003). *Community-based participatory research for health*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mitra, D. L. (2004). The significance of students: Can increasing student voice in schools lead to gains in youth development? *Teachers College Record, 106*, 651-688.
- Nieto, S. (1996). Lessons from students on creating a chance to dream. *Harvard Education Review, 64*, 392-426.
- Ozer, E. J., Cantor, J. P., Cruz, G. W., Fox, B., Hubbard, E., & Moret, L. (2008). The diffusion of youth-led participatory research in urban schools: The role of the prevention support

- system in implementation and sustainability. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41, 278-289.
- Ozer, E. J., & Douglas, L. (2015). Assessing the key processes of youth-led participatory research: Psychometric analysis and application of an observational rating scale. *Youth & Society*, 47, 29-50.
- Ozer, E. J., Newlan, S., Douglas, L., & Hubbard, E. (2013). "Bounded" empowerment: Analyzing tensions in the practice of youth-led participatory research in urban public schools. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 52, 13-26.
- Ozer, E. J., Ritterman, M., & Wanis, M. (2010). Participatory action research (PAR) in middle school: Opportunities, constraints, and key processes. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 46, 152-166.
- Ozer, E. J., & Schotland, M. (2010). Psychological empowerment among urban youth: Measure development and relationship to psychosocial functioning. *Health Education and Behavior*, 38, 348-356.
- Ozer, E. J., Wanis, M. G., & Bazell, N. (2010). Diffusion of school-based prevention programs in two urban districts: Adaptations, rationales, and suggestions for change. *Prevention Science*, 11, 42-55.
- Ozer, E. J., & Wright, D. (2012). Beyond school spirit: The effects of youth-led participatory action research in two urban high schools. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 22, 267-283.
- Pinderhughes, H. (1997). *Race in the hood: Conflict and violence among urban youth*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sarason, S. B. (1996). *Revisiting "The culture of the school and the problem of change."* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Seyer-Ochi, I. (2006). Lived landscapes of the Fillmore. Innovations in educational ethnography: Theory, methods, and results. In G. D. Spindler & L. A. Hammond (Eds.), *Innovations in educational ethnography: Theory, methods, and results* (pp.162-232). Mahwah, NJ: Psychology Press.
- Shor, I. (1996). *When students have the power: Negotiating authority in critical pedagogy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Silva, E., Zimmerman, K., & Erbsstein, N. (2001). *Youth rep: Step by step: An introduction to youth-led evaluation and research*. Oakland, CA: Youth in Focus.
- Simmons, R. (1987). *Moving into adolescence: The impact of pubertal change and school context*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Spencer, M. B., Fegley, S. G., & Harpalani, V. (2003). A theoretical and empirical examination of identity as coping: Linking coping resources to the self processes of African American youth. *Applied Developmental Science, 7*, 181-188.
- Stovall, D., & Delgado, N. (2009). "Knowing the ledge": Participatory action research as legal studies for urban high school youth. *New Directions for Youth Development, 2009*, 67-81.
- Sydlo, S. J. (2000). *Participatory action research: Curriculum for empowering youth*. Hartford, CN: National Teen Action Research Center, Institute for Community Research.
- Vaughan, C. (2014). Participatory research with youth: Idealising safe social spaces or building transformative links in difficult environments?. *Journal of Health Psychology, 19*, 184-192.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wallerstein, N., Sanchez, V., & Velarde, L. (2005). Freirian praxis in health education and community organizing: A case study of an adolescent prevention program. In M.

- Minkler (Ed.), *Community organizing & community building for health* (2nd ed.) (pp. 218-236). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Wanis, M., & Ozer, E. J. (2015). *The role of youth-led CBPR in influencing decision-making in five California public health departments*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Watts, R. J., Diemer, M. A., & Voight, A. M. (2011). Critical consciousness: Current status and future directions. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 2011, 43-57.
- Watts, R. J., & Flanagan, C. (2007). Pushing the envelope on youth civic engagement: A developmental and liberation psychology perspective. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35, 779-792.
- Wilson, N., Dasho, S., Martin, A., Wallerstein, N., Wang, C., & Minkler, M. (2007). Engaging young adolescents in social action through photovoice: The youth empowerment strategies (Yes!) project. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 27, 241-261.
- Yoshikawa, H., Weisner, T. S., Kalil, A., & Way, N. (2008). Mixing qualitative and quantitative research in developmental science: Uses and methodological choices. *Developmental Psychology*, 44, 344-354.
- Youth Impact. (2001). *Youth impact report*. San Francisco, CA: Youth In Focus.
- Zimmerman, M. A. (2000). Empowerment theory: Psychological, organizational, and community levels of analysis. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of community psychology* (pp. 43-63). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Press.