

Considering Culturally-Relevant Practices and Knowledge-Sharing when Creating an Activity-
Promoting Community Research Agenda

Angela M. Coppola & Tara-Leigh F. McHugh

University of Alberta

Author Note

The project described in this paper was funded by the Interdisciplinary Health Research Academy at the University of Alberta.

The authors would like to thank Susan Sinclair and the participants in this project for sharing their knowledge and experiences.

Corresponding Author: Angela M. Coppola, Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2H9,
angela.coppola1@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of the article is to discuss and reflect upon a process of building relationships and conducting community consultations to co-create a relevant community-based participatory research agenda exploring Indigenous youth activity-promoting programming. Four consultations were conducted with approximately 30 community members in Edmonton, Alberta to relevantly and respectfully engage Indigenous Peoples and community members in discussions about Indigenous youth activity-promoting programming. A research question was created from the community consultations to inform relevant knowledge generation. A research agenda was also created with community members to inform future community engagement in the research. We reflect upon our process and discuss the strengths, challenges, and recommendations of incorporating culturally-relevant practices and sharing knowledge within and outside of the community group. This work contributes to literature enhancing relevant and respectful methodological and relational research practices with Indigenous Peoples and communities.

Considering Culturally-Relevant Practices and Knowledge-Sharing when Creating an Activity-
Promoting Community Research Agenda

The role of sport in affirming Indigenous cultures and identities has been documented in the sport literature, and research has demonstrated the role of sport for the holistic development and overall health of Indigenous¹ youth (Forsyth & Wamsley, 2006; Hanna, 2009). Specifically, scholars have indicated that sport may be one of the “most salient mediums for recapturing spirits” among Aboriginal² Canadians (Forsyth & Wamsley, 2006, p. 294) and may positively impact the physical, mental, and emotional health of Aboriginal youth (Hanna, 2009). Sport is just one of the many forms of physical activity that can contribute to health. For instance, the Alberta Indigenous Games Resource Manual for Walking in Balance (2013) reports Indigenous community members’ support of a holistic approach to youth development and leadership in areas such as sport and activity.

Several Indigenous athletes, such as Olympic medalists Billy Mills and Waneeq Horn-Miller, and high-school scholar athlete Sheridan Fox-Many Grey Horses, were featured in the Alberta Indigenous Games Resource Manual, and shared sport and activity experiences in their lives. These athletes discussed the role of others, as well as culture and traditions, in holistic development and activity promotion. For instance, Fox-Many Grey Horses competes nationally in rodeo, barrel racing, and breakaway roping and has excelled in both high school academics and athletics. She discussed the inspiration of her aunties, parents, and grandparents who supported and encouraged her to achieve her full potential. Waneeq Horn-Miller discussed the role of traditions and culture in enhancing her sport experience. She said:

¹ The term “Indigenous” is capitalized when referring to Indigenous Peoples, who are native to a land (NAHO, 2012) and represent a population (e.g., youth).

² The term “Aboriginal” is used when the Indigenous population referred to is native to Canada.

Ceremonies like the Sundance are our sports psychology. That's how we prepare our warriors for battle, whether it's in a water polo pool, in an academic setting, on the business front, or political front, we need to have our grounding in that...the essence, the meaning, and the teaching of it will never change (Alberta Indigenous Games Manual, 2013, p. 36).

Given the salient role that sport has played and continues to play in the lives of Indigenous Peoples, academic and non-academic communities are exploring activity-promoting programming and opportunities for Indigenous youth (e.g., Schinke, Yungblut, Blodgett, Eys, Peltier, & Ritchie et al., 2010).

Whereas previous literature has identified terms such as physical activity, health, and sport as distinct, in the current article and research program these terms will be included in “activity-promoting³.” Activity-promoting is an encompassing term that includes health, activity, and sport practices of Indigenous Peoples, many of whom consider the terms to be interrelated (Hanna, 2009; Lavallée, 2008). For instance, the medicine wheel is a traditional teaching of balancing and enhancing physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual well-being. Lavallée (2008) has explored how activity can help balance the medicine wheel. Exploring young Aboriginal women's experiences in martial arts, Lavallée (2008) concluded that the women were able to begin a journey to healing through their participation, citing stories about confronting identity and self-esteem issues, and feelings of ‘undeservingness.’ The term also encompasses the idea that the programming is not solely about increasing activity of Aboriginal youth, it might foster emotional, spiritual, or mental health through reading or language learning as well. Activity-

³ The term “activity-promoting” is used to encompass both physical activity and sport programming or programming that incorporates physical activity or sport as a program component.

promotion has been advocated by scholars and communities (e.g., Blodgett et al., 2010) and documented as beneficial and relevant to the holistic development of Indigenous youth (Hanna, 2009).

Sport and activity promotion literature has identified the health and behavioural benefits associated with participation for youth (Strong et al., 2005; Hanna, 2009), however these benefits may only occur in certain contexts (Perkins & Noam, 2007). There is little support from the literature linking the direct benefits of engaging in sport and healthy development or active lifestyles (e.g., Kidd, 2008). Some scholars claim that it is not sport itself that produces positive or negative outcomes for health but the sport organizations and the interactions one has within the organization or environment, making context of sport an important factor in considering the sport and health relationship (e.g., Perkins & Noam, 2007). Thus, the health and behavioural benefits of sport and physical activity participation may depend on the messages we send to youth in these contexts. For instance, sport and sport programs have been used as an assimilator among youth to White or western ways of being (Kidd, 2008). Hokowhitu (2004) sheds light on the historical or genealogical constructions of Indigenous Peoples' physical bodies throughout colonization to contemporary constructions of Indigenous Peoples in sports. He argues that this perpetuates the dominant message that has been constructed throughout history and inadvertently in contemporary society, that achieving through physical labour or in sport may be their only means of achieving in life (Hokowhitu, 2004). The aforementioned research indicates that activity-promoting programming is a constructed context, and can be addressed by co-creating a supportive activity-promoting programming context for youth with the community (Blodgett et al., 2010).

Community members may play a role in developing and participating in activity-

promoting programming for Indigenous youth (Blodgett et al., 2010), and researchers have engaged with Indigenous Peoples in sport research to inform Indigenous youth activity-promoting programming (McHugh, Coppola, & Sinclair, 2013; McHugh, Kingsley, & Coppola, 2013; Schinke et al., 2010). In terms of program development, Aboriginal youth, family members, and school staff have reported the need to better understand how communities can support sport opportunities for Aboriginal youth (McHugh, Kingsley, & Coppola, 2013). When Blodgett and colleagues (2010) conducted talking circles with a reserve community (e.g., youth, teachers, coaches, family members), the community discussed the importance of integrating Elders in activities, promoting Aboriginal role models, and developing a volunteer base for youth sport programming. This finding is consistent with Schinke and colleagues (2010) work reporting that family members in a reserve community play a role in sport programming. For instance, parents were expected to commit to funding, encouraging, and managing their child's participation in sports. The aforementioned findings provide valuable information for developing programs and incorporating relevant community members, particularly from a community-based participatory research (CBPR; Israel et al., 1998, 2001) approach or decolonizing approach (Smith, 1999; 2012). For instance, Smith (2012) discusses Indigenous Peoples' perceptions of research:

The word itself, 'research,' is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world's vocabulary. When mentioned in many indigenous contexts, it stirs up silence, it conjures up bad memories, it raises a smile that is knowing and distrustful (Smith, 2012, p. 1).

CBPR frameworks promote practitioners engagement with communities and development of self-determined and decolonizing research agendas with communities. Decolonizing research agendas facilitate Indigenous Peoples autonomy or control over the

research process, which is their right (Battiste, 2002). Indigenous Peoples' and communities' past experience with unethical research systems influenced by Westernized power structures and notions of objectivity have left indigenous communities feeling over-researched, under-served, and exploited (Schnarch, 2004). For example, Schnarch (2004) describes how university members have extracted knowledge from Indigenous Peoples and communities with no return or potential benefit to the community. A focus on recreating a decolonizing space in which Indigenous Peoples and non-Indigenous Peoples can work together has been recommended (Smith, 2009; 2012). Decolonizing methodologies challenge Westernized epistemologies that may stem from colonization and perpetuate the assumption that objective means of knowledge production are superior to Indigenous ways of knowing. Thus, decolonizing methodologies facilitate Indigenous Peoples' self-determination, participation, and representation in the research process (Smith, 1999; 2012).

Several recommendations and considerations for facilitating a decolonizing and participatory research agenda when working with Indigenous Peoples have been documented (Bishop, 2008; Fletcher, 2003; Halas et al., 2012). Broadly, these recommendations include building relationships and a working community group, establishing culturally-relevant or safe practices, and relevantly and respectfully generating and sharing knowledge. Cultural safety is a relatively new concept emerging in New Zealand in the healthcare discourse. This concept has also been used in the field of nursing, knowledge translation (KT), and clinical practice for Indigenous Peoples in Canada (Browne et al., 2009). Cultural relevance involves reaffirming Indigenous youth's cultural identity and providing them with a space to engage in activity that is relevant to their community or culture (Canadian Heritage, 2005).

Decolonizing spaces are promoted in research with Indigenous Peoples given the history

of research on, as opposed to with, Indigenous Peoples (Schnarch, 2004). Their passive and unsolicited role in the research process led to the exploitation of Indigenous Peoples and children even in recent history (Owens, 2013). Actively considering how to support and include the voices of Indigenous Peoples in the research process is important. Whereas the terms “cultural relevance” or “decolonizing spaces” on paper can be seen as passive, it is important to critically reflect upon these terms and how non-Indigenous researchers are actively engaging Indigenous Peoples in the research process. **Furthermore, within the physical education curriculum context, Gard and colleagues (2013) discuss how the term itself can seem “unhelpfully vague” (p. 105), and the authors suggest that considering how increase relevance would lead to a new physical education, or in this context, physical activity-promoting space.**

Cultural relevance or culturally-relevant practices in the current paper include acknowledgement and inclusion of cultural practices to promote a safe space of acceptance and comfort that I feel cannot be assumed. Whereas cultural relevance may be established differently depending on the program and community, existing literature suggests that there are strategies to enhance cultural relevance that relate to active self-reflection and engagement with community members (e.g., Browne et al., 2009; Tervalon & Murray-Garcia, 1998; Ukpokodu, 2011).

Specifically, self-awareness, constant reflection, and on-going dialogue with communities may facilitate cultural relevance. Iterative and on-going reflection has been recommended to practice cultural humility, or constantly exploring one’s position in a community context (Tervalon & Murray-Garcia, 1998). Ukpokodu (2011) explored strategies for developing cultural competence among teachers in order to enhance students’ activities and behaviors to function in different cultural contexts and build positive relationships. Similar to previous literature, self-reflection, awareness of assumptions and expectations, and a critical

reflection of how assumptions fit within larger social and cultural institutions was recommended as an on-going process. Browne and colleagues (2009) report that cultural safety practices may involve the critical reflection of political, economic, and social assumptions in practice through dialogic reflection. The purpose is to challenge race-based discourses by exploring key concepts and terms, by being transparent, and by initiating reflexivity to examine how we are all positioned within wider structures and discourses. Specific to research, an exploration of terms such as “culture,” “safety,” and “cultural safety” with community members was recommended to engage in iterative critical self and group reflection regarding relevant practices (Browne et al., 2009). Whereas there are strategies to enhance cultural relevance, it is important for scholars to document the process of establishing cultural relevance and engaging in culturally-relevant practices with communities. This process is important to document because learning about different processes of establishing cultural relevance can inform one’s own context.

Exploring the *process* of engaging in CBPR that is focused on activity promotion for Indigenous youth may provide insights into the methodological and relational practices that are necessary for addressing the quality of participatory research methodologies (Schinke, Smith, & McGannon, 2013) and enhance culturally responsive practices in activity programming and research. This process can be shared so that researchers can consider and apply strategies for working relevantly and respectfully with Indigenous communities within their context (McHugh, Coppola, & Sinclair, 2013). Thus, the purpose of this article is to discuss and reflect upon a *process* of co-creating a relevant research agenda focused on Indigenous youth activity-promoting programming. **We describe the background of the project informing this article. The focus of this article is on the process, not the outcomes, of the project.** Thus, we then describe how building relationships and community consultations were essential components in

co-creating a relevant research agenda. Upon describing the process, we reflect upon the strengths and challenges to be considered when incorporating culturally-relevant practices and sharing knowledge.

Project Description and Reflections

Our research provides a practical example of building relationships and engaging in the process of community consultations to co-create a relevant research agenda within a larger **community-based participatory research (CBPR)** project⁴. The first author used field notes and reflection upon field notes and experiences to create the current article discussion points. She then collaborated with the second author to iteratively and reflectively discuss the notes and discussion points. We drew upon reflection-on-action and delayed reflection-on-action as a guiding methodology to reflect upon and learn from previous experiences (Cropley, 2010; Holt, McHugh, Coppola, & Neely, 2014; Knowles, Gilbourne, Borrie, & Neville, 2001) in order to convey ideas and strategies for relevantly creating a community-based agenda in the future.

First, we position our selves in the research process. Then, drawing upon existing literatures (e.g., Browne et al., 2009; Smith, 2012), we describe and reflect upon the following components of the project: building relationships, consulting with the community, incorporating culturally-relevant practices, and sharing knowledge.

Researcher Positionality: What is our role in creating research agendas with Indigenous Peoples and communities?

The first author, who conducted the research, identifies as Caucasian-American and is a doctoral candidate at the University of Alberta. The second author identifies as an English-

⁴ The larger CBPR project was a multiphase project exploring how to support Indigenous youth health programs in Alberta, Canada.

Canadian Associate Professor, whose research is focused on the body image and physical activity experiences of youth. Her role in this work was supervisory to the first author. We operate under the assumption that both Indigenous Peoples and non-Indigenous Peoples should work together to produce knowledge and action regarding Indigenous youth activity promotion. When generating knowledge and change with the researcher and others, the participant is meant to engage in equitable and self-determined research (Lather, 2006; Sparkes, 1992). Thus, this research is meant to be transformative with and not manipulative of the participant.

I (the first author) recognize, as a non-Indigenous researcher, that my feminist perspective facilitates a balancing of power dynamics and facilitates a decolonizing research process. However, I also recognize that I have not experienced colonization and racial oppression and neither have my ancestors, making my beliefs, influences, and reasons for engaging in the research process substantially different from the Indigenous Peoples I will work with. I also recognize that I have been afforded several advantages such as my education, and that I am of a privileged race. It is my responsibility as a researcher to commit to self-evaluation and self-critique to acknowledge power imbalances in research partnerships (Chávez, Duran, Baker, Avila, & Wallerstein, 2008).

A feminist participatory research approach can enhance my process of cultural humility as a part of a research partnership. For instance, feminist research from a participatory approach stresses the need for inclusion, participation, action, social change, research reflexivity, and placing the experiences and perspectives of participants at the core of the research (Frisby, Reid, Millar, & Hoeber, 2005; Reid, 2004). This approach as well as cultural humility will help me consider and reflect upon my roles as a non-Indigenous critical feminist participatory researcher and the roles of the participants in this research to bring about social change. The process of

engaging in this approach may bring about individual and social change as we work together from different perspectives and experiences to achieve a common goal.

Building Relationships

Relationship-building is a key component to working with Indigenous Peoples because developing a self-determined research agenda involves the identification of community needs and the discussion and development of a research relationship (Fletcher, 2003). My partnership with a *cree* Elder began in January 2012 at a predominantly Indigenous junior-senior high school in Edmonton where she was an Aboriginal studies and *cree* language teacher. After volunteering with her in a classroom setting and at the school as a program evaluator and lunch aide, we engaged in our first research project together (McHugh, Coppola, & Sinclair, 2013) when we used photovoice to explore Aboriginal youth's meanings of sport. Our continued work led to the development of a *cree* sport program in a school community, however, we realized that even if physical activity-promoting programming was created for Indigenous youth, how could it be sustainable? We discussed the importance of including family members and other Elders in developing programming, as they could share traditional knowledge with Indigenous youth. But how were we going to engage them?

During the Spring of 2013, my community partner and I were awarded a grant from the Interdisciplinary Research Academy (IHRA) at the University of Alberta. The generation of a research project with a community partner should begin by taking the time to mutually-develop a research plan (Castleden, Morgan, & Lamb, 2012), including the identification and acquisition of funding (Ball & Janyst, 2008). Thus, it was beneficial for us to apply for funding together to plan the development of a community-based research agenda. The purpose of the grant was to build relationships and co-create a research agenda with a community group. Specifically, we

proposed that we would hold community consultations with Indigenous youth, parents, Elders, and families, and other interested community members, to learn how to engage them in “culturally-relevant” sport, and physical activity programming for Indigenous youth. The funding was used to honor our community partner, to support feasts, and to provide participant honorariums and tobacco peace offerings.

Recognizing the importance of co-creating an understanding of our partnership, my community partner and I wrote and negotiated a memorandum of understanding (MOU) for this phase that was supported by the IHRA. This was an agreement between the Elder and I, not the community. However, we did outline participant ethics and engagement. There were no discrepancies in opinion between her and I when developing the MOU. We simply discussed how we would support each other to achieve our goals. Thus, the MOU was developed through iterative discussions. This was an opportunity for us to speak to each other honestly, openly, and equally about our roles in the community consultations.

CBPR practitioners have recommended developing a MOU to outline project goals and roles and responsibilities of partners (e.g., Flicker et al., 2007). MOUs have been advocated for in health-related fields with Indigenous Peoples and communities in various countries to outline research or working agreements and terms of reference to establish a mutual understanding among partners (e.g., Cunningham, Reading, & Eades, 2003; Health Council of Canada, 2012). Specifically, MOUs are drafted to build relationships and a research agenda in a “good way” and conduct “good” research practices as the community sees it (Ball & Janyst, 2008). Ball and Janyst (2008) recommend considering the effectiveness of this tool by having frank discussions between partners and by making the effort to understand one another’s perspectives and work demands or environments. For instance, an academic might take the time to understand

community perspectives and cultural practices, and the community might take the time to understand university and grant procedural requirements.

Ultimately, the MOU was co-developed for the purpose of conducting the first phase of this research. This process was beneficial to communicate what we wanted to do and how we were going to get there. We outlined individual partners' interests, roles, and responsibilities, such as supporting cultural protocols and creating interview guides (see Appendix A). We also were able to discuss ethical considerations and grant agency stipulations. Whereas a key strength was being able to communicate contextual considerations, it is difficult to ensure follow-through and continuous understanding. Thus, we planned frequent meetings to go over the progress of the consultations and attempted to practice humility in the community context. Based on the CBPR literature (e.g., Guishard, 2009; Tervalon & Murray-Garcia, 1998), in the broadest sense humility could be characterized as an ongoing process of praxis involving reflection, dialogue, and action regarding CBPR partners' positions or influence on the project. At these meetings, our "needs" for support were discussed. In the MOU, we gave this the term "process evaluation" (Butterfoss, 2006). Although a MOU does not guarantee that what is said and planned for will be done, a key strength is that the needs of partners and goals of your project are explicit and not assumed. Thus, we noticed that a process of on-going discussion and reflection was important.

Given our goal to engage in community consultations, we recognized the need to engage as many community members and Elders as possible. In an effort to connect with community members and identify a location for community consultations, we developed a partnership with the director of a local traditional healing society called The Bent Arrow Society, in Edmonton, Alberta. With the support of the director of the Bent Arrow Society, participants were recruited primarily through list serves and word-of-mouth. Quality community scholarship in this context

involved reflecting upon sustainability, MOU agreements, and funding discussions, as well as praxis regarding sustainability of community programs. Also key to the establishment of a quality community scholarship agenda was consulting with the community.

Consulting the Community

Four consultations were held at Bent Arrow Society from August to October 2013. The community consultations were attended by a total of approximately 30 Elders, Indigenous youth, parents, school workers (e.g., social workers, teachers), and members of organizations in Edmonton, such as the City of Edmonton and Alberta Recreation and Parks Association (ARPA) identifying as Indigenous or non-Indigenous. Indigenous and non-Indigenous Peoples participated in the consultations and the diversity was welcomed. My community partner and I created the agendas for these consultations, which included demonstrations, presentations and ceremonies, and notable contributions from community members. **We asked questions such as, “What does “physical activity” mean to you?,” and “What does “culturally-relevant” mean?” and “how do we create a “culturally-relevant” program for Indigenous youth in Edmonton?”** Community members described terms (e.g., PA, cultural relevance, community) holistically, including life examples of each and what these terms embody or mean for the self and others. They also expressed the importance of connecting and working with multiple agencies or peoples who have the same goal.

Bringing together a community group and encouraging on-going meetings were essential to set the foundation for sustainable projects and programming (e.g., Cargo & Mercer, 2008; Israel et al., 1998). Previous community-based research literature with Indigenous Peoples has also encouraged working with community members throughout all phases of the research (e.g., Battiste, 2002; Fletcher, 2003; Smith, 1999; 2012). This may include participation in accessing

and applying for funding (Ball & Janyst, 2008) to dissemination, KT, or future project planning (Browne, Varcoe, Smye, Reimer-Kirkham, Lynam, & Wong, 2009). Despite the evidence that researchers are working with community members throughout all phases of research (e.g., Schinke et al., 2010), the literature documenting and reflecting upon the process of working with a community group is relatively new and emerging. Upon reflection of our process of bringing together a community group, we identified the important role of connecting multiple agencies and community members as well as navigating funding successes and challenges.

The community consultations created an opportunity for Elders, youth, school social workers, parents, and others interested in physical activity and sport opportunities for Indigenous youth to connect with each other. Youth and community members were encouraged to speak their thoughts and ideas about activity-promoting programming. These consultations also provided a forum for Indigenous and non-Indigenous Peoples to speak about what brought them to the consultations. Peoples with different interests and backgrounds shared their feelings and ideas. However, this did not come without challenges. There was one incident where an Indigenous woman felt a non-Indigenous woman was “speaking for” Indigenous youth in saying that youth were unfamiliar with their culture. This sparked a debate that had to be mediated. My community partner and I suggested prefacing meetings with a vision or axiology. McKenzie and colleagues (2014) discuss the importance of including an axiology or philosophy for working together as a collaborative to address health-related community programming. This axiology could include that all thoughts are welcomed and open for discussion, and that we are all here because we care about the well-being of Indigenous youth in our community regardless of our background or ethnicity.

We recognized the importance of networking when consulting with the community and

developing an agenda or next steps in the research process. Of particular importance when developing an agenda is incorporating culturally-relevant practices. Specifically, addressing the conflicts that may arise when others are not comfortable with the culturally-relevant practices that have been identified is important.

Incorporating Culturally-Relevant Practices

Our experiences also involved incorporating culturally-relevant practices that revealed several considerations for those wanting to work respectfully with Indigenous communities. Whereas previous research exploring cultural relevance and safety was in the context of healthcare and was explored among healthcare providers (Browne et al., 2009), our reflection was related to health and activity programming. These reflections are relevant and beneficial because of the call for cultural relevance and safety in physical education (Halas et al., 2012), physical activity (Young & Katzmarzyk, 2007), and sport opportunities for Indigenous youth (McHugh, Coppola, & Sinclair, 2013). It may be difficult to engage Indigenous Peoples in shaping sport programming when they are untrusting of others and do not feel that a “safe space” has been fostered given past experiences with research (Paraschak, 2012). There may be various reasons as to the lack of engagement, yet researchers are exploring how sport and physical activity participation should be culturally-relevant to enhance engagement of Indigenous youth (e.g., Halas et al., 2012). Thus, we considered cultural practices a key component of developing the consultation meetings and discussions, and identified several strengths and challenges of incorporating culturally-relevant practices to be considered. Specifically, we refer to pipe ceremonies and cultural traditions that were incorporated into the research process and community members’ discussions of the relevance of the term “culturally-relevant.”

When hosting community consultations my community partner and I were committed to

respecting cultural protocols and incorporating culturally relevant practices. Previous research supports the inclusion of cultural practices in research with Indigenous communities to ensure cultural sensitivity and self-determination in the research process (Brant-Castellano, 2000; Smith, 1999; 2012). For instance, Brant-Castellano (2000) argued that it is important to consider the role of Elders and cultural teachings in the research program to respect traditional knowledge and practices in self-determined research agendas. Specific to this context, sport and physical activity research with Indigenous youth has included cultural practices, such as sharing or talking circles (e.g., McHugh, Coppola, & Sinclair, 2013). Thus, we found it relevant to include cultural practices and traditions in our project.

Based on our experiences and reflections, the benefit of incorporating “culturally relevant” practices may be to generate a sense of inclusiveness for some community members. For instance, the Elder included the youth in ceremonies and it was an opportunity to share cultural traditions with Indigenous youth. However, not all community members appreciated the cultural protocols. One community member was offended by the way in which an Elder was conducting a pipe ceremony and left the ceremony with his child, as it was not consistent with his cultural practices. Thus, it is important to consider the diversity of cultural practices among Indigenous Peoples in urban centres where Indigenous Peoples who practice different cultural traditions may convene. Browne and colleagues (2009) discuss “culturalism” or the assumption that one group of people practice the same traditions which is detrimental to cultural safety or providing a safe space for discussions with Indigenous Peoples. In the aforementioned experience, the sense of cultural safety was compromised in that even though we worked together to identify relevant and respectful cultural practices with the community, a community member was still offended because the cultural practice was not his own. Whereas these

situations may be unavoidable, we recommend considering a plan for remedying these particular instances where community members take offense to certain cultural practices.

Previous cultural relevance and safety literature in the healthcare setting recommends exploring and establishing meanings of “cultural relevance” through critical reflection and discussion of key terms and assumptions with community members (Browne et al., 2009). In this case, building relationships to address power relations is also recommended (Browne et al., 2009). In the current context, it involves addressing assumptions and power with Indigenous youth and communities to facilitate Indigenous youth engagement in physical activity. For instance, culturally-relevant physical education in the school setting may involve being an ally to Indigenous youth, understanding day-to-day cultural landscapes, and providing a supportive learning environment that includes a meaningful and relevant curriculum (Halas et al., 2012). The exploration of “cultural relevance and safety” is an emerging literature. Thus, the current article extends upon the previous literature by identifying and reflecting upon the challenges of establishing cultural relevance in an urban community research setting.

The term “cultural relevance” was discussed at the consultations and interpreted and described in the context of Indigenous youth activity-promoting programming. Culturally-relevant programming was described as teaching with kindness, including Elders, and having respect for others. It was also described as using role models and bringing youth together to help grow one’s own sense of culture and identity. Whereas some preferred the consideration cultural relevance in this context, others disliked and were critical of the term.

An Elder disliked the term “cultural relevance” because of history of residential schooling and colonization. He felt it was another means of pushing societal terms and agendas on Indigenous Peoples. This was not surprising considering the history of colonization and

unethical practices of researchers with Indigenous Peoples and communities (see Schnarch, 2004). Thus, it is important to note that although this type of research or programming is encouraged, as Browne and colleagues (2009) suggested, the term and concept of “cultural relevance” should be explored with community members and perhaps other definitions or terms should be generated that are relevant and respectful to the community.

As for the programming context, those who are involved in implementing programming may matter just as much as whom it is for when establishing “culturally-relevant” programming. Health promoters might consider cultural relevance for those involved in running programming as well as those receiving the programming. For instance, if a program includes Indigenous language learning or cultural traditions, the teachings will have to be relevant to not only the youth but also the programmer. This reflection extends upon current research by recommending that culturally-relevant activity-promoting programming be not only considered program participants (e.g., McHugh et al., 2013; Young & Katzmarzyk, 2007), in this case youth, but also for program providers or the community, given they may be implementing the programming. This may have implications for sustainability of programming and research, and sheds light on the complexities of being “culturally-relevant” to all community members involved in projects.

These experiences led us to ask the questions: How relevant is “culturally relevant” for programming and consultations when we take into account the different cultural practices of urban Indigenous Peoples and youth? Who decides what cultural practices are incorporated? And how can we mediate potential feelings of discomfort and offense from community members who do not agree with others’ cultural practices? All researchers and CBPR practitioners may consider the aforementioned questions when creating research agendas and programs. **Table 1 provides a summary of additional questions for consideration when co-creating an activity-**

promoting community research agenda.

INSERT TABLE 1

Sharing Knowledge

Sharing knowledge within and outside of the group posed strengths and challenges to strengthening relational practices, acquiring financial support, establishing on-going communication, and representing group knowledge when co-creating the research agenda and implementing the community consultations. Sharing knowledge with other peoples and groups who may be interested is a key component of our CBPR project, particularly after prolonged engagement and consultation (Schinke et al., 2013). Prolonged engagement and consultation is considered a part of quality criteria for community-based research in sport and physical activity (Schinke et al., 2013). With prolonged engagement and consultation comes the building of relationships, however, in certain contexts it may be difficult to have continued face-to-face interaction. Thus, it is important to consider how you will maintain engagement and consultation when in-person interaction is limited. This is particularly important when sharing knowledge and communicating within and outside the group, and setting the agenda for the rest of the CBPR. It is important to consider what, and how, information will be shared with community members. Newsletters written by my community partner and I were sent to community members as a form of communicating the progression of the consultations and the experiences shared by community members. Throughout the consultations, community members emphasized the important role of recreation, sport, and physical activity programming. However, those who should conduct this type of programming, how, when, and what is needed, should be further discussed.

The four consultation discussions were used to guide research question development as a part of co-creating a research agenda (e.g., **Fletcher, 2003**). As a researcher, my (first author)

role is to develop relevant research questions and sub-questions with community members and to co-design a project based on these questions. The information gathered during consultations, and summarized in the form of newsletters, was used to construct research questions to bring back to the community for feedback. Based on the emergent questions, the next phase research question was constructed.

Research questions were not the only knowledge sharing concern to be addressed. After the final consultation, my community partner and I (first author) were interviewed about the consultations with *Alberta Sweetgrass: Alberta's Aboriginal News Publication*. *Alberta Sweetgrass* publishes more than 9,000 copies monthly on topics such as Indigenous politics, health, and sovereignty. Thus, my community partner and I immediately saw the benefits of having an article published about our work to be shared with Indigenous Peoples in Alberta. However, I knew that it was important not to share any personal stories and discussions from the consultations without the consent of the community members. I felt I could not discuss with the interviewer the messages that the community conveyed given we did not discuss how the information from consultations would be summarized and publicly disseminated. Before any information could be shared freely, there needed to be a discussion with my community partner and the group members about what we could share. This discussion among partners is important considering media representations, specifically non-Aboriginal media outlets, reproduce colonial discourses concerning Aboriginal peoples, such as being hopeless regarding their health and social status (Coleby & Giles, 2013). Important to note is that there is evidence that Aboriginal media actively challenges these discourses (Coleby & Giles, 2013), thus, working with *Alberta Sweetgrass* was less concerning. Aboriginal media sources in Canada, like *Alberta Sweetgrass*, provide a decolonizing media source (Knopf, 2010) to share community-based knowledge that

highlights Indigenous initiatives accurately and from a strengths-based approach (Coleby & Giles, 2013). Our responsibility as initiative leaders was to represent the community respectfully and share knowledge approved by the community.

Given my apprehension about sharing knowledge from the community consultations, it was necessary for me to have an open discussion with the journalist. A key concept to consider when engaging with the media as project coordinators is representation. **Representation involves considering who is involved in creating and sharing knowledge regarding a project (Bishop, 2008).** When considering representation, my community partner and I asked our selves, “What does the community group need to know about the article? What does the journalist want to share about the project?, What are we willing to share in the article?” When these questions were addressed, we ensured that we were clear on what we were willing to share with the media. I also asked for questions in advance. We were also in constant discussion with the Elders and partners guiding the project.

When discussing the project, it was important not to “speak for the group,” rather we discussed our own perspectives based on our experiences with the group and only shared mutually-agreed upon information. Decision-making was something to be considered in this situation. Consensus-building is a more inclusive, participatory, and cooperative approach to decision-making (Baldwin & Linnea, 2011) where the group establishes a consensus or discussion process to reach consensus when making decisions regarding a project (e.g., funding allocation, community consultations, interviewees). Thus, future considerations for discussions include: How many people need to agree on what was to be shared and how will decision-making occur? How do you begin a discussion about sharing information outside of the group? CBPR practitioners might reflect upon the aforementioned components of knowledge sharing

when developing a research agenda, specifically one that strives to promote a self-determined space for engagement.

Developing a plan for communicating and staying in touch was crucial to ensuring the connectedness of the group and the democratic nature of the group processes. Developing a democratic process and action-oriented outcome are considered quality considerations to enhance a CBPR project (Bradbury & Reason, 2008; Schinke et al., 2013). One strategy to build a stronger bond within the community group would have been to hold more meetings, which was contingent on continued funding from the institution. The granting agency acknowledged the need for ongoing participation to foster sustainability of community programming. For instance, when we were awarded the funding, the institution made plans to fund the first year and help the group acquire future funding for up to three years. With budget cuts in Alberta, the organization through which we received funding was disbanded and no funding was available after the first year. Furthermore, the consultations needed to happen within two months as funds needed to be spent quickly before the organization was officially disbanded.

The goal of establishing an on-going process and opportunity for communication among community members was a challenge that we considered easier with the funding to host and honor participants. The funding cut, unfortunately, compromised the authenticity of our relationship-building with the community in that if it was not explained to the consultation participants, it would seem like we were extracting knowledge from them without any intention of continuing a relationship. The challenge of navigating funding has been documented as a barrier of CBPR (Savan, Flicker, Kolenda, & Mildemberger, 2009). Whereas funding is not the only integral component of building relationships, it is still beneficial to acknowledge participants with food, honorariums, and support cultural protocols when working with

Indigenous communities (McHugh et al., 2013). Funding was planned for and attained but fell through because of decisions outside of our control. Thus, it was important to establish an on-going process of communication given future in-person meetings were a challenge to be considered.

Conclusion

Decolonizing approaches and discussions of cultural relevance are important in research to facilitate a self-determined space for working with Indigenous Peoples to address health issues important to a larger community and society. **The following two phases of this work were influenced by the knowledge shared in this phase. For instance, the research question guided knowledge generation in phase two which is an exploration of programmers experiences of co-creating Indigenous youth activity-promoting programming in Alberta. Based on their feedback, a gathering was held to discuss how to support this programming and to discuss multiple agencies role in supporting programs.** Thus, a democratic and on-going process of decision-making with research participants and community groups is proposed as a means of creating a self-determined and decolonizing spaces for knowledge sharing. **This research contributes to discussions of establishing cultural relevance (e.g., Gard, Hickey-Moodey, & Enright, 2013) by discussing how to go about supporting the development of “culturally-relevant” programs and research practices, and supports the critical approach to exploring “cultural relevance” with a community.** Creating a space for relationship-building and not assuming that the research is ethical may be particularly important to conceptualize culturally-relevant practices and terms, and mediate conflicts within a community setting.

Discussing roles and responsibilities, funding, culturally-relevant terms, and

communication and feedback plans for the project can facilitate self-determined research spaces. Decision-making and ethical considerations regarding knowledge-sharing support the importance of representation of community members in the research process (Bishop, 2008). A key question moving forward with the study of cultural relevance may be, how can we support those who do not feel included in established culturally-relevant practices? Contributing to the quality community scholarship literature (Schinke et al., 2013), the study of this process can facilitate community praxis, or dialogue, reflection, and action, in community-based research and programming agendas. These aspects are key to co-constructing a decolonizing research agenda (Smith, 1999; 2012), and ultimately, a research and programming context that is supportive of youth and communities in sport and activity (e.g., Agans et al., 2015).

This paper highlights strategies for establishing mutually-beneficial, ethical, and relevant research relationships and methods when working with communities to develop youth sport programming, specifically for Indigenous youth. The insights and reflective questions facilitate collaborating and relationship-building with participants for those who conduct research from all approaches and paradigms in sport, education, and society. Partnerships are key regardless of the type of research, and the authors recommend exploring the complexities of the community in which you are working and listening to the community insights that may inform the research. Based on our experiences and reflections, we recommended discussing the relevance for all involved and bringing participants together as partners to discuss research agendas, roles, and responsibilities.

Future research might expand upon activity-promoting research and programming literature by describing how mutually-relevant agendas are negotiated. Exploring and reflecting upon key processes of developing and implementing a project may be beneficial to inform

activity-promoting program development that is relevant to and inclusive of youth and communities. Future research and reflections might also explore the development of partnerships and ask partners for recommendations and feedback on the process creating cultural safety and relevance in the context of sport. Project negotiations, such as roles and responsibilities, could be described as well as how partners have identified, addressed, and resolved potential tensions.

References

- Agans, J. P., Champine, R. B., Johnson, S. K., & Erickson, K. (2015). Promoting healthy lifestyles through activity participation: Lessons from research. In E. P. Bowers, G. J. Geldhof, S. K. Johnson, L. J. Hilliard, R. M. Hershberg, J. V. Lerner, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Promoting positive youth development: Lessons from the 4-H phase* (pp. 137-157). Switzerland: Springer International.
- Baldwin, C. & Linnea, A. (2010). *The circle way: A leader in every chair*. Foreword by M. J. Wheatley. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Ball, J., & Janyst, P. (2008). Enacting research ethics in partnerships with Indigenous communities in Canada: "Do it in a good way." *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 33-51. doi: 10.1525/jer.2008.3.2.33
- Battiste, M. (2002). Decolonizing university research: Ethical guidelines for research involving Indigenous populations. In G. Alfredsson & M. Stavropoulou (Eds.), *Justice pending: Indigenous peoples and other good causes* (pp. 33-44). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Bent Arrow Society. (2014). *Strategic Plan*. Available from <http://bentarrow.ca/about/strategic-plan> [27 January 2014].
- Bishop, R. (2008). Te Kotahitanga: Kaupapa Māori in mainstream classrooms. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 439-458). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Blodgett, A.T., Schinke, R. J., Fisher, L., Yungblut, H. E., Recollet-Saikkonen, D., Peltier, D., Ritchie, S., & Pickard, P. (2010). Praxis and community-level sport programming

strategies in a Canadian Aboriginal reserve. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 8, 262-283. doi: 10.1080/1612197X.2010.9671953

Bradbury, H., & Reason, P. (2008). Issues and choice points for improving the quality of action research. In M. Minkler & N. Wallerstein (Eds.). *Community-based participatory research for health: From process to outcomes* (pp. 225-242). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Brant-Castellano, M. (2000). Updating aboriginal traditions of knowledge. In G. Dei, B. Hall, & D. Rosenberg (Eds.) *Indigenous knowledges in global contexts* (pp. 21–36). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Browne, A. J., Varcoe, C., Smye, V., Reimer-Kirkham, S., Lynam, M. J., & Wong, S. (2009). Cultural safety and the challenges of translating critically oriented knowledge in practice. *Nursing Philosophy*, 10, 167-179.

Butterfoss, F. (2006). Process evaluation for community participation. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 27, 323-40.

Canadian Heritage (2005). Sport Canada's policy on Aboriginal peoples' participation in sport. *Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, Catalogue No.: CH24-10/2005*.

Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, 2010. *TCPS 2-Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*. Available from: http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/pdf/eng/tcps2/TCPS_2_FINAL_Web.pdf [Accessed 10 April 2013].

- Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR). (2014). *About knowledge translation and commercialization*. Available from: <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/29418.html> [Accessed 27 January 2014].
- Cargo, M., & Mercer, S. L. (2008). The value and challenges of participatory research: Strengthening its practice. *Annual Review of Public Health, 29*, 325-350. doi: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.29.091307.083824
- Castleden, H., Morgan, V. S., & Lamb, C. (2012). 'I spent the first year drinking tea:' Exploring Canadian university researchers' perspectives on community-based participatory research involving Indigenous peoples. *The Canadian Geographer, 56*, 160-179.
- Chávez, V., Duran, B., Baker, Q. E., Avila, M. M., & Wallerstein, N. (2008). The dance of race and privilege in CBPR. In M. Minkler & N. Wallerstein (Eds.). *Community-based participatory research for health: From process to outcomes* (pp. 91-106). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Coalter, F. (2010). The politics of sport-for-development: Limited focus programmes and broad-gauge problems? *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 45*, 295-314. doi: 10.1177/1012690210366791
- Coleby, J., & Giles A.R. (2013). Discourses at work in media reports on Right To Play's "Promoting Life-Skills in Aboriginal Youth" program. *Journal of Sport for Development, 1*, 39-52.
- Cropley, B. (2010). *Reflective practice and consultant effectiveness: An examination of sport psychology practice*. PhD thesis, University of Wales Institute, UK. Retrieved September 5 2015 from <https://repository.cardiffmet.ac.uk/dspace/handle/10369/895>

- Cunningham, C., Reading, J., & Eades, S. (2003). Health research and Indigenous health. *The British Medical Journal*, 327, 445-447. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7412.445
- Fletcher, C., 2003. Community-based participatory research relationships with Aboriginal communities in Canada: An overview of context and process. *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health*, 1, 27-62.
- Flicker, S., Travers, R., Guta, A., McDonald, S., & Meagher, A. (2007). Ethical dilemmas in community-based participatory research: Recommendations for institutional review boards. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 84, 478-493. doi: 10.1007/s11524-007-9165-7
- Forsyth, J., & Giles, A. R. (2012). *Aboriginal peoples and sport in Canada: Historical foundations and contemporary issues*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Forsyth, J., & Wamsley, K. (2006). “‘Native to native we’ll recapture our spirits’: The world Indigenous nations games and north-american Indigenous games as cultural resistance,” *International Journal of History of Sport*, 23, 294-314.
- Frisby, W., Reid, C. J., Millar, S., & Hoeber, L. (2005). Putting “participatory” into participatory forms of action research. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 367-386.
- Gard, M., Hickey-Moodey, A., & Enright, E. (2013). Youth culture, physical education and the question of relevance: after 20 years, a reply to Tinning and Fitzclarence, *Sport, Education and Society*, 18, 97-114, doi: 10.1080/13573322.2012.690341
- Guishard, M. (2009). The false paths, the endless labors, the turns this way and that: Participatory action research, mutual vulnerability, and the politics of inquiry. *Urban Review*, 41, 85-105.
- Hanna, R., 2009. *Promoting, developing, and sustaining sports, recreation, and physical activity*

- in British Columbia for Aboriginal youth*. Document created for First Nations Health Society. Available from: http://www.fnhc.ca/pdf/Sports_Recreation_and_Physical_Activity_BC__Aboriginal_Youth.pdf [Accessed 15 April 2013].
- Hokowhitu, B. (2004). Tackling Māori masculinity: A colonial genealogy of savagery and sport. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 16, 259-284.
- Holt, N. L., McHugh, T-L. F., Coppola, A. M., & Neely, K. C. (2014). Using critical incident reflection in qualitative research: Transferable skills for sport psychologists? In Z. Knowles, D. Gilbourne, B. Cropley, & L. Dugdill (Eds.), *Reflective practice in the sport and exercise sciences: Contemporary issues*. London: Routledge
- Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 19, 173-202. doi: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.19.1.173
- Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (2001). Community-based participatory research: Policy recommendations for promoting a partnership approach in health research. *Education for Health*, 14, 182-197.
- Kidd, B. (2008). A new social movement: Sport for development and peace. *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics*, 11, 370-380. doi: 10.1080/17430430802019268
- Knopf, K. (2010). "Sharing our stories with all Canadians": Decolonizing Aboriginal media and Aboriginal media politics in Canada. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 34, 89-210.
- Knowles, Z., Gilbourne, D., Borrie, A., & Nevill, A. (2001). Developing the reflective sports coach: A phase exploring the processes of reflection within a higher education coaching programme. *Reflective Practice*, 2, 185-207.

- Lather, P. (2006). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19, 35-57. doi: 10.1080/09518390500450144
- Lavallée, L. F. (2008). Balancing the medicine wheel through physical activity. *Journal of Aboriginal Health*, 4, 64–71.
- McHugh, T-L. F., Coppola, A. M., & Sinclair, S. (2013). An exploration of the meanings of sport to Aboriginal youth: A photovoice approach. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise, and Health*, 5, 291-311. doi: 10.1080/2159676X.2013.819375
- McHugh, T-L., F., Kingsley, B. C., & Coppola, A. M. (2013). Enhancing the relevance of physical activity research by engaging Aboriginal peoples in the research process. *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Health*, 11, 293-305.
- McKenzie, J. F., Neiger, B. L., & Thackeray, R. (2012). *Planning, Implementing, & Evaluating Health Promotion Programs: A Primer* (6th Ed). Benjamin Cummings Pub.
- National Aboriginal Health Organization, n.d. *Publications: Terminology*. Available from: <http://www.naho.ca/publications/topics/terminology/> [Accessed 10 April 2013].
- Paraschak, V. (2012). Aboriginal peoples and the construction of canadian sport policy. In J. Forsyth, & A.R. Giles (Eds.). *Aboriginal peoples and sport in Canada: Historical foundations and contemporary issues* (pp. 95-123). Vancouver, British Columbia: UBC Press.
- Perkins, D. E., & Noam, G. G. (2007). Characteristics of sports-based youth development programs. *New Directions for Youth Development*, Fall, 75-84. doi: 10.1002/yd.224
- Reid, C. J. (2004). Advancing women's social justice agendas: A feminist action research framework. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(3). Article 1. Retrieved June

- 21, 2015 from http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/3_3/html/reid.html
- Savan, B., Flicker, S., Kolenda, B., & Mildenberger, M. (2009). How to facilitate (or discourage) community based research: Recommendations based on a Canadian survey. *Local Environments: The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability*, 14, 783-796.
- Schinke, R. J., Smith, B., & McGannon, K. R. (2013). Pathways for community research in sport and physical activity: Criteria for consideration. *Qualitative Research in Sport Exercise and Health*, 5, 460-468. doi: 10.1080/2159676X.2013.846274
- Schinke, R., Yungblut, H., Blodgett, A., Eys, M., Peltier, D., & Ritchie, S. et al. (2010). The role of families in youth sport programming in a Canadian aboriginal reserve. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 7, 156-166.
- Schnarch, B. (2004). *OCAP: Ownership, control, access, and possession (OCAP) or self-determination applied to research: A critical analysis of First Nations research and some options for First Nations communities*. Sanctioned by the First Nations Centre. Ottawa: National Aboriginal Health Organization.
- Smith, L. T. (1999; 2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Sparkes, A. C. (1992). The paradigms debate: An extended review and a celebration of difference. In A. C. Sparkes (Ed.), *Research in physical education and sport: Exploring alternative visions* (pp. 9-60). Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Tervalon, M., & Murray-Garcia, J. (1998). Cultural humility versus cultural competence: A critical distinction in defining physician training outcomes in multicultural education. *Journal of Healthcare for the Poor and Underserved*, 9, 117-125. doi: 10.1353/hpu.2010.0233

- Ukpokodu, O. (2011). Developing teachers' cultural competence: One teacher educator's practice of unpacking student culturelessness. *Action in Teacher Education*, 33, 432-454. doi: 10.1080/01626620.2011.627033
- Warburton, D. E. R., Nicol, C. W., & Bredin S. S. D. (2006). Health benefits of physical activity: The evidence. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 174, 801-809. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.051351
- Young, T.K., & Katzmarzyk, P. (2007). Physical activity of Aboriginal people in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 98, 148-160.

Table 1

Potential Questions and Reflections for Co-creating an Activity-Promoting Community Research Agenda

Building Relationships and Consulting the Community
How can we promote stronger interagency work to support culturally-relevant activity-promoting programming?
What are our roles and responsibilities in supporting each other to achieve our project goals?
How can we all promote a democratic process of decision-making?
How can we engage in continued dialogue to co-create project outcomes?
What is our partnership philosophy?
How will we address conflicts that arise?
Incorporating Culturally-Relevant Practices
Is the term “culturally-relevant” or “cultural relevance” appropriate within our group? And how are we exploring or understanding how the community’s culture is honored?
Who should be involved in conducting culturally-relevant activity-promoting programming?
How do we engage youth leaders in culturally-relevant activity-promoting programming?
Are we promoting culturally-relevant practices for all members of the group?
Are we using terms that are appropriate and non-offensive within the group?
Sharing Knowledge
How can we promote on-going meetings?
What is the best way for our group to communicate?
What does the community group need to know about sharing outside the group?
How do you begin a discussion about sharing information outside of the group?
What are we willing to share about the project?
How many people need to agree on what is shared, and how will decision-making occur?
How are we creating opportunities for networking?
How are we creating a safe space for growth and support for our partners?
Have we considered how and when we will translate knowledge to other groups or partners, and who should receive this knowledge?