

FULL-LENGTH ARTICLES

Community-based Participatory Translation: A Translation Methodology for Community-Based Participatory Research

Sonia Colina, Ph.D., MA¹, Maia Ingram, MS²¹ Spanish and Portuguese, University of Arizona, ² Department of Health Promotion Sciences, University of ArizonaKeywords: Community-based participatory research, language access, limited English proficiency, translation quality, back-translation, translation methodology
<https://doi.org/10.35844/001c.167188>

Journal of Participatory Research Methods

Vol. 7, Issue 5, 2026

Community-based participatory research (CBPR) refers to an approach to conducting research that equitably involves community members, researchers, and other stakeholders in the research process. CBPR centers the research on the experiences of those most affected by the issue, and all partners contribute expertise and share in decision-making. CBPR must address linguistic and cultural aspects of research, by developing a translation approach that is consonant with its principles, in particular in studies in which the community involved includes limited English proficient individuals (LEPs). However, in most cases CBPR proposals are not explicit about how their approach to the preparation of translated materials (surveys, questionnaires, etc.) responds to CBPR principles. Descriptions of procedures and quality assessment processes tend to be like those used in traditional research studies. This conceptual paper argues that the translation approach and processes utilized by CBPR must be aligned with the research methodology. It proposes a community-based participatory translation (CBPT) methodology based on a functionalist framework to translation and a process that trains and involves qualified community translators early in the process. It provides guidance on how to create capacity and develop infrastructure for CBPT.

Introduction

Federal regulations (e.g., Title VI of the Civil Right Act; Department of Health and Human Services regulations, 45 C.F.R. Section 80.3(b)(2)) require recipients of federal financial assistance to take reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to limited English proficient (LEP) individuals. ‘Meaningful access’ is often understood in connection to translation quality. However, the assessment of translation quality is complex and translation scholars have long debated how to assess it (Han, 2020; House, 1997, 2015; Martínez Melis & Hurtado, 2001; O’Brien, 2012). As a construct, quality is highly variable and dependent on one’s views on translation (Colina, 2019, 2026; House, 1997, 2015).

This paper focuses on translation quality in community-based participatory research (CBPR), a research approach that equitably involves community members, researchers, and other stakeholders in the research process (Brush et al., 2020; Horowitz et al., 2009). The process of centering research within the context of community inevitably raises questions about

the quality and appropriateness of translations, demonstrating that current translation methodologies are not adequate for community-engaged research, and more broadly, highlighting the need for a methodology that takes an adaptable view of translation quality.

Community-based Participatory Research

CBPR is a research approach grounded in the acknowledgement of the central role of communities in prioritizing and addressing the health issues that most affect them. Designed to address historical harm of a positivist research paradigm in marginalized communities, CBPR has been significant in transforming the nature of health assessment and intervention research (Wallerstein et al., 2019; Wallerstein & Duran, 2010). CBPR principles include identifying the community as the unit of study and ensuring that community representatives are equal partners in all phases of the research process, including in defining the research outcome of interest (Israel et al., 2017). Typically, CBPR studies involve community organizations and/or members as contracted partners or critical advisors to the research process. A focus on community benefit is an essential aspect of CBPR, rather than the attainment of generalizable knowledge that may not be applicable within a specific community context.

While CBPR ensures that research studies address the priorities and needs of community members, the approach also addresses unequal power relationships intrinsic to traditional research, improves the quality of health research by facilitating recruitment, ensuring cultural appropriateness of research protocols and interventions, and validating research findings (Balazs & Morello-Frosch, 2013; Wallerstein & Duran, 2010). Improvements in research quality from CBPR practices extend to the translation of research materials, such as recruitment flyers, research instruments and intervention materials, which are an essential component of health research. While the best approach is to develop materials in the language of the focus population, intervention studies commonly involve adapting materials from evidence-based interventions. Surveys and validated scales that are intrinsic to health research are most often developed in English and require translation.

Translation approaches as a determinant of quality

Redefining translation quality

In securing the quality of translated cross-cultural research materials (e.g., informed consents, questionnaires, surveys, etc.), numerous studies use a combination of procedural and product-based methodologies, following a process that is considered more likely to result in a quality translation product (see Epstein et al., 2015 for a review of methodologies). For instance, World Health Organization recommendations consist of a four-step translation process: *1. Forward translation, 2. Expert panel and back-translation, 3. Pretesting and cognitive interviewing, 4. Final testing and documentation of process.* Most studies follow some variation of these recommendations,

Table 1. Conceptualizations of translation quality in health care and social science research

Current	New
Equivalence to the source text	How well a translation meets translation specifications (including accuracy)
One definition for all projects	Flexible definition according to project needs
Approach: unimportant	Approach selected according to project needs/specifications

typically including an expert panel and/or committee, which may (or may not) include community members or representatives (Dhamani & Richter, 2023; Epstein et al., 2015; Hall et al., 2018; Maneesriwongul & Dixon, 2004; Teig et al., 2023; Valdez et al., 2021). The quality of the resulting translation product is frequently assessed by means of back-translation and testing/cognitive interviewing.

Back-translation (Brislin, 1970, 1986), which consists of translating the translation back into the original language and assessing the match, is historically the most-widely used quality assessment tool in international and cross-cultural social research, as well as in health care research, specifically in quality-of-life research (Acquadro et al., 2008; Colina et al., 2017; Douglas & Craig, 2007; Kowal, 2024).¹

However, back-translation has been criticized due to its reliance on misguided assumptions about translation (such as that a one-to-one correspondence is possible across languages) and translation quality, and its inaccuracy as a measure of overall quality. Furthermore, it is based on a monolithic notion of quality as perfect equivalence for all texts. As a result, some methodologies are critical of back-translation as a quality assessment tool or propose to eliminate it entirely (Behr, 2017; Colina et al., 2017; Douglas & Craig, 2007; Fourie & Feinauer, 2005; McKenna & Doward, 2005; Ozolins et al., 2020; Son, 2018).

In line with those critical of back-translation, we argue for a reconceptualization of translation quality that relies on how well a translation meets translation specifications, including the purpose of the translation (i.e., what one desires to accomplish with it) (Colina, 2019, 2026; Hague et al., 2014; Lauscher, 2000). It views the selection of a translation approach as a determinant of quality and it incorporates it in the translation methodology. The adequacy of this reconceptualization will be exemplified by CBPR. [Table 1](#) summarizes these concepts and compares them with current conceptualizations.

The importance of the translation approach

Many (if not most) translation methodologies lack an explicit presentation of their approach to translation, and, as a consequence, to quality. In fact, it is rare to find publications on evaluation of research instruments that describe

¹ Acquadro et al. (2008) report that 14 out of 15 translation guidelines for clinical research published between 1966 and 2005 included back-translation as one of the recommended components for multistep translation.

their approach and do so informed by current literature in translation studies, with few exceptions (Colina et al., 2017; Fourie & Feinauer, 2005; Tyupa, 2011; Verbillis-Kolp et al., 2023). We use the term ‘translation approach’ to denote the principles and criteria that guide the textual production aspect of the translation, to distinguish it from the translation process understood as the steps taken from the decision to translate to the use of the translated materials with research participants (e.g. WHO’s recommendations; TRAPD [Harkness, 2003]).² Studies tend to explain the process used, their procedural vision of quality, and the steps taken to ensure quality (Cruchinho et al., 2024; Epstein et al., 2015; Hall et al., 2018; Harkness, 2003, 2011; Harkness et al., 2010; Valdez et al., 2021). However, rarely do they state how they approach the actual process of converting the English text into the second language (i.e., what guides the translation decisions, how are conflicting solutions resolved?) (Colina et al., 2017). Their view of translation and their goal—the translation approach—are not explained.

Being explicit with respect to the translation approach is essential because: (i) it provides a set of guidelines against which to evaluate quality; (ii) articulating the translation approach helps align expectations among all involved—including translators who, as independent consultants, may not be part of the research team—and assists in the consideration of alternative strategies; (iii) research has shown that the approach selected can influence the quality of the translation product (Colina et al., 2022).

Examples of translation approaches

In most cross-cultural research methodology, the translation approach is not explicitly mentioned. However, one can surmise the adoption of an equivalence approach (combined with some degree of cultural adaptation) from the use of back-translation as a quality assessment mechanism (expecting that the translated text will match the source when translated back into the source language). Equivalence approaches (Newmark, 1981, 1988, 1991; Nida, 1964) have as their ultimate goal maximum faithfulness to the source text, although different aspects of equivalence could be prioritized (e.g. textual, functional, linguistic). These models are often criticized for their dependence on the notion of equivalence, a vague term in translation studies (Hönig, 1997). Furthermore, some translations are commissioned for a somewhat different function than that of the original. A new audience and time, among other factors, may require a slightly different function than that of the source text (Colina, 2025; Nord, 2018). In sum, equivalence will not work for all materials and all purposes. More specifically, it will not work for CBPR, as it is not consonant with its goals, as will be shown below.

² By ‘methodology’, we refer to both the procedures or processes employed and the approach to the translation of the text (i.e., how does a translator make concrete translation decisions?).

Other translation scholars argue for the use of a functionalist approach (Colina, 2025; Colina et al., 2017; Nord, 2018; Reiss & Vermeer, 1984; Vermeer, 1992) in which translation decisions are guided by the translation specifications (purpose/function, audience, motive, medium, etc.). In other words, given various options, the translator will select the one that best fulfills the purpose of the translation. For instance, the source text may use a highly formal term if the purpose is for an educated audience to answer a survey, but if the survey is to be answered by a high school educated population, a less formal term may be more adequate. It should be noted that a functionalist approach can encompass equivalence when necessitated by the translation instructions.

Translation approach and translators

The translation approach utilized can be affected by the profile of the translator selected for the work, especially in those cases in which the researchers do not explicitly define the desired approach. It is well known that most bilinguals—individuals with various degrees of proficiency in two languages and with no training/education in translation—tend to translate word for word, as they share the layperson's understanding of translation as a linguistic matching activity (Harkness et al., 2004; Harris, 1977; Kussmaul, 1995). This low-level equivalence does not work for most translation purposes. For instance, a study by Colina et al. (2022) investigated how translation approach affected the usability of a survey and how users responded to it. They compared an existing published survey, Personal Stress Survey, which exhibited a word-for-word approach, with one developed with a functionalist framework. Results showed that Spanish speakers preferred the functionalist translation. They found that it was easier to understand; they raised fewer questions; and had fewer comments in semi-structured interviews. The findings suggest that a word-for-word, equivalent approach may impede participant comprehension in research surveys.

Translators' failure to adjust their translations to the needs of the target populations and to translate for various contexts and populations can pose a challenge, especially if trained under equivalence frameworks. Additionally, professional norms that prioritize formal and prestigious varieties of a language can result in overuse of those varieties, even in cases where they do not respond to the translation instructions (also known as translation 'brief'). Although using qualified/certified professionals is a good first step towards ensuring quality, the absence of clear translation instructions or project-specific guidance can lead to inadequate approaches and, consequently, comprehension issues for certain populations.

In short, as summarized in [Table 2](#), the quality of a translation is impacted by the chosen translation approach (which is in turn influenced by the translator's profile), translation processes and methodologies, and quality assessment techniques. Among these, the translation approach has received the least attention, despite its significant interaction with commonly used methodologies.

Table 2. Factors influencing translation quality

Factors	Examples
Translation approach	Equivalence based; functionalism
Influenced by translator profile	
Translation process	Multistep recommendations (e.g. WHO recommendations; Baker et al., 2010; Cruchinho et al., 2024; Hall et al., 2018; Teig et al., 2023; Verbillis-Kolp et al., 2023, and multiple others)
Assessment techniques	Back-translation (favors equivalence approach); translation specifications (favors functionalist/specifications approach)

Translation approach and CBPR

Very frequently CBPR literature provides limited descriptions of how materials are translated (Garcia et al., 2008; Tajik et al., 2010), even though CBPR projects are centered on communities with diverse primary languages and with linguistic and cultural differences across subgroups. Even more extensive descriptions do not discuss the translation approach (Chasukwa & Crack, 2024; Sánchez-Johnsen et al., 2015); instead they tend to describe strategies for community partner engagement in improving back-translations or other formal translations, and emphasize tailoring translations to reflect regional language usage. For instance, Sánchez-Johnsen et al. (2015) discuss the translation process within a CBPR partnership, and recommend including bilingual staff on the research team, obtaining a translation from a professional company, working with community partners to review and edit the translated materials, and pilot testing the translation with community members; but they do not mention the translation approach.

We argue that the translation methodologies of CBPR projects are misaligned with CBPR goals and that this misalignment is a consequence of the insufficient consideration of translation quality and approach and of the limited involvement of community partners in the translation itself, who are often tasked only with providing translation feedback. The next section considers the sources of the misalignment further and proposes a methodology better aligned with CBPR – Community-based participatory translation (CBPT).

Community-Based Participatory Translation (CBPT)

Definitions, rationale, and community participation

CBPR projects recognize the importance of language variation and of cultural adaptation in developing study protocols and creating study materials. Intentional strategies include having community representatives on expert panels and focus groups/group deliberations, or working with community partners in instrument piloting or cognitive debriefing (e.g. Formea et al., 2014; Ospina-Pinillos et al., 2019; Sánchez-Johnsen et al., 2015; Tajik et al., 2010). However, translation in CBPR projects generally lacks the same level of community participation seen in CBPR research. Community members are mostly involved in modifying existing translations,

rather than in the actual translation process from the beginning. This is illustrated by Verbillis-Kolp et al. (2023) who state that "... participatory translation approaches combining professional translation with iterative back and-forth expert committee consensus processes ensure cultural equivalency, accuracy, and clarity of meaning in translation."³

Although not specifically designed for CBPR projects, TRAPD (Translation, Review, Adjudication, Pretest, Documentation) (Harkness, 2003, 2011; Harkness et al., 2010; Walde & Völm, 2023) is a frequently used methodology for questionnaire translation that can potentially be used in CBPR projects. It does, however, suffer from similar misalignments as the translation methodologies currently used in CBPR projects. Although TRAPD can involve community members, most often, community stakeholders only participate in the translation process during the team translation and review stages, instead of in the early stages of translation. In the TRAPD methodology, professional translators are not ideal due to their lack of expertise in questionnaire design, while bilingual survey designers lack professional language expertise. As a consequence, a team- or committee-based process is recommended as the most effective solution for reviewing and supplementing the work of professional translators (Harkness, 2003; Harkness et al., 2010). A more significant degree of community participation is present in Baker et al. (2010) who propose "... that researchers utilize community-based, process-oriented language translation to improve the consistency and quality of translation, in contrast to use of method-focused translation (431)." They describe a process-based translation methodology that includes principles of CBPR through community involvement and consultation in the translation process, including culturally sensitive research design, item equivalence (translatability, but also relevance and acceptability of each item), semantic equivalence, and cognitive interviewing. Four staff members ("certified in language translation") used blind translation to translate from Hmong to English and from English to Hmong. Another study relied upon community health worker staff to conduct initial translations, which were then discussed and finalized through group processes and piloting of materials. In this case, these frontline public health workers had developed the original materials in English and thus were translating their own work (Gandara et al., 2023). A similar degree of community involvement was attained for the ASL community, as described by Graybill

³ Verbillis-Kolp et al. (2023) use the term "community participatory translation" to refer to a type of translation process that involves the community in translation review and focus groups and argue for "community consensus-based translation as best practice (p. 277)". As noted above, this and similar methodologies, which apply to modify and/or evaluate an existing (previously produced) translation, lack the same level of community participation seen in CBPR. Verbillis-Kolp et al. (2023) reference the term 'community translation' in translation studies. It should be noted, however, that 'community translation' in this field refers to: (i) translation services provided to assist underserved populations with access to services or (ii) institutional (i.e., governmental) translation, in contrast to translation produced by members of the same community it seeks to serve. 'Community translation' is at times also used to mean translation produced by non-professionals for their own use (Pym, 2011, p. 79), although the more commonly used term is 'crowdsourcing'.

et al. (2010).⁴ Within the context of an NGO, Chasukwa and Crack (2024) describe a CBPT methodology for the production of English/Chichewa glossaries; however, their project did not involve textual translation.⁵

The above examples highlight that to be in full alignment with CBPR, a translation methodology must mirror the design principles of CPBR. Doing so will bear the additional benefit of contributing to more equitable participation of LEP research study participants. By ‘equitable’ we mean active participation in the translation (in addition to the research design, as in Baker et al., 2010), rather than the mere provision of materials in the participants’ language.

To accomplish these goals, we propose a collaborative, participatory translation model: Community-based Participatory Translation (CBPT). CBPT is a translation methodology for CBPR projects that comprises: a redefined role for community participation, an explicit translation approach aligned with CBPR and community needs, and a process-based methodology.

Developed within the context of a CBPR study addressing age-related hearing loss, CBPT centers the translation process in the expertise of community members. As described in Marrone et al. (2017), community health workers in this study were collaborative members of a research team, participating in all aspects of the study, including the development and translation of research materials. As cultural brokers for the study, the community health workers piloted CBPT techniques by comparing the translation of a standardized questionnaire to a translation that was conducted collaboratively among members of the research team. In the second translation, the CHWs brought their cultural interpretations of the language to the translation, correcting language that they felt would engender misunderstandings and even anxiety among local respondents (Colina et al., 2017). Also illustrating the genesis of CBPT and community involvement, other study documents were produced by soliciting two translations per source text: one prepared by a community member with field expertise and one by a professional translator. Community members with field expertise were later asked to select one of the translations, which was subsequently used for committee discussion and review (Colina et al., 2017, p. 286). This collaboration provided the foundation for the CBPT methodology as a concrete process of incorporating CBPR principles into the translation process.

⁴ Graybill et al., unlike our proposal, use back-translation and an equivalence approach. Although they refer to the need to “establish principles for making translation decisions” (2010, p. 438), they do not present an explicit translation approach.

⁵ Additional studies have proposed alternative methodologies that address language barriers through increased community participation, such as Boot Camp Translation (Magnusson et al., 2020; Medina et al., 2023). However, Boot Camp Translation is not strictly a translation methodology, as it relies on message co-creation with themes constructed collaboratively, rather than on translation alone.

CBPT constitutes the linguistic and cultural dimension of CBPR. It resorts to qualified, trained translators that belong to the community and are stakeholders and partners in the research project along with researchers, professional translators, and community members.⁶ It is guided by a functionalist approach to the translation of the relevant texts.

[Table 3](#) summarizes the components of CBPT and compares them with existing methodologies and their alignment with CBPR.

To recapitulate, CBPT is essential for CBPR projects for the following reasons:

- i. From the perspective of research participation, and as mentioned above, CBPR is in need of an explicit translation methodology that is congruent with its research methodology, and that does not limit participatory action to consultation (i.e. participation in panels), pilot testing and cognitive debriefing. The methodology should require active participation and guide both the production (including translation approach and translation processes) and the quality review aspects of translation.
- ii. From a translation studies point of view, anyone embarking on a translation should be guided by an approach against which to make decisions and evaluate their translation. We propose that a functionalist framework is consonant with this general principle, by guiding translation decisions according to the needs of the translation users (i.e., audience) and the purpose of the translation. In addition, functionalism is well aligned with the philosophy behind CBPT and its process-based translation methodology.⁷

CBPT's translation approach: Functionalism

CBPT takes as its point of departure a translation and evaluation approach rooted in functionalism and consonant with community involvement in translation (Colina, 2025; Nord, 2018).

Functionalism (which draws heavily from Skopos theory from the Greek *skopos*, meaning 'purpose,') is the theory of translation that argues that the translation process is guided by extra-linguistic factors. Under this approach, a translator makes translation decisions based on the extra-linguistic factors surrounding the target text, such as the purpose of the text, the needs of the

⁶ Note an important and inevitable distinction between translators who belong to the same community as the LEP participants and the LEP stakeholders themselves: the latter are monolingual or have limited English proficiency, whereas translators must be bilingual. Both groups, however, share membership in the non-English speaking community. LEP participants should also be involved in the translation process (see *Translation process* below).

⁷ Other types of participatory, democratic translation include fan sub and crowd source translations.

Table 3. Translation methodologies for Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR)

Existing methodologies	Aligned with CBPR?	CBPT	Aligned with CBPR?
No explicit translation approach (equivalence by default)	No	Explicit translation approach (functionalism) aligned with CBPR and community needs	✓
Limited community participation: feedback on completed translations, group/panel participation; translations initiated by non-community members	No	A redefined role for community participation: initiators of translation, professionals and experts provide feedback	✓
Process-based methodology	✓	Process-based methodology	✓
Assessment techniques: Back-translation	No	Assessment techniques: Translation specifications (favors functionalist/specifications approach)	✓

audience, the motive for production of the translation, the medium in which it will be delivered, and the time and place of reception. Extralinguistic factors (also known as situational features) are normally defined in the translation instructions. To translate according to the extralinguistic factors of the target text, the translator must first find out the answer to such questions as: Who is this translation for? What is the readers' educational level? What age are they, and what are their cultural beliefs? What do they know about the content of the text? What is the purpose of having the text translated? Is it to inform, to educate, to collect information, or perhaps to fulfill a legal requirement? Will the text be delivered in writing, orally, or in another format?

For instance, in the translation of the focus group questions of a study on hearing loss assessment for a US border community, the purpose of the text was to obtain information about hearing loss challenges from a Spanish-speaking community; the participants were monolingual Spanish speakers born and raised in Sonora, Mexico, older than 50, with high-school level of education or less and in an 40k or lower income bracket; the medium was written text to be delivered orally by the interviewer; and the motive for the study was to investigate the hearing health care habits of this population (to improve access).

Under functionalism, the evaluation of the translation product takes place in reference to the extra linguistic factors and the specifications for the translation: how well does the translation fulfill its purpose? Is it adequate for the target audience? Will it work well if delivered in a mixed medium (written but also to be read) etc.? (for an example of functionalist translation in the context of a public health audiology study, see Colina et al., 2017, pp. 283–284). Functionalist proposals allow for variable notions of quality, depending on case-specific values and customer-defined and negotiated quality criteria.

CBPT is characterized by a multi-step process spanning from translation assignment to translation use, which captures the defining elements of the methodology, i.e., an active role for the community in the translation, a translation approach (for making translation decisions) and a congruent

evaluation method. The multistep process (e.g., translator selection, review panels, quality assessment, piloting, etc.) must be made explicit, as it is another component of CBPT.

Translation process. Description of procedures

We propose the following steps, congruent with CBPR:

Step 1. Specification of translation requirements

In accordance with a functionalist approach, the translation requirements (Step 1) should include at least:

- a. Type of materials to be translated: text type (e.g., obtain information, fulfill a legal requirement), genre (e.g., questionnaire; semi-structured interview script)
- b. Characteristics of the users: socioeconomic background, details about the language variety spoken (e.g., Spanish from Northern Sonora, Mexico), educational background, etc.
- c. Purpose of the translation: e.g., to obtain demographic information from participants, to obtain feedback after a workshop/presentation, to obtain lifestyle information, to obtain a self-assessment of stress, etc.
- d. Motive for translation: e.g., a grant sponsor requires the participation of LEPs, so English questionnaires must be provided in Spanish.
- e. Medium of translation: e.g., written, oral, mixed, etc.

Step 2. Translator selection (bilingual community members, professional translators)

Translator selection is crucial for CBPT as it influences the approach and the quality of the translation (Step 2). Each of the two most used options—bilinguals and professional translators—comes with their own set of challenges: bilinguals may lack translation skills (and sometimes language proficiency, which is often not assessed), while professional translators may lack knowledge of the relevant community (linguistic and cultural). A selection committee could be useful if it is chosen in an informed manner, based on expert knowledge of the translation task at hand. In CBPT the committee should be conducive to community member participation, including LEP individuals.

Step 3. Translation by qualified bilingual community members

- a. Linguistic and translation skill assessment
- b. Training in CBPR and functionalism

For CBPT we propose that the translation be executed first by bilingual community members (with consultation with professional translators, committee), and that community members play a much more significant role than they often do (Step 3). In other words, community participation should start with the translation, rather than with the review process. In order to do that, we recommend involving community members who are bilingual, or bilingual staff who are community members (after having assessed their language skills), and supplementing their skills with translation/interpreter training.

Step 4. Translation (review) by professional translators and committee

a. Training in CBPR and functionalism

In Step 4, professional translators and researchers use the text produced by qualified bilinguals as a starting point for their translation, focusing on its form, accuracy, and adherence to the translation instructions.

Professional translators and committee members must be provided with detailed instructions to guide their work on the translation provided by community members. They should ensure that terminology and specialized content are accurate, and that the text flows well and adheres to the norms for the intended text type. It is important that professional translators do not modify the translation provided to make it more formal, if the translation brief does not require that, so that any community linguistic or cultural features are not erased.

It is commonplace in translation and interpreting to state that bilinguals should not replace professional translators, as they often do not have the required skills. CBPT does not advocate for replacing professional translators with bilinguals. Rather, it promotes a collaborative method in which qualified, trained bilinguals play a more central role in providing translated materials. This method mirrors their existing role in CBPT, where their expertise and cultural insight are integral to the process. The ‘qualified bilinguals’ in CBPT may or may not earn a living as translators, or be qualified to perform other types of translation, but are experts in the linguistic and cultural aspects of their community. As such, they should play a key role in the provision of non-English materials for their communities, in alignment with the philosophy of CBPR. Moreover, these bilinguals should be vetted, trained and have their translations reviewed by professional translators, educators/trainers to ensure the quality and accuracy of their work.⁸

⁸ Professional translators who are community members would be in principle qualified to perform this work, but they should also be vetted to ascertain their ability to apply CBPT and make translation decisions guided by the needs of the audience, rather than by professional norms of equivalence and prestigious linguistic varieties.

It is worth emphasizing again that the order of the CBPR translation process differs from that utilized in much instrument translation, including widely used models, such as TRAPD (Harkness, 2003, p. 2010): the process starts with bilingual ad hoc translators (Step 3), followed by the involvement of professional translators and researchers (Step 4), rather than starting with a professional translation that is reviewed by community members according to cultural nuances and linguistic variety. It is the community that dictates the language and the professional translators that check for translation accuracy and form. Community involvement can of course start earlier than actual translation with construct and instrument design for cultural sensitivity and validity (Baker et al., 2010).

Community involvement in language for this type of research is a crucial component in minority serving institutions and Hispanic Serving Institutions, as it builds on and develops community assets, and provides equity and professional development for qualified bilingual employees.

Step 5. Committee review

Step 6. Translation review (according to committee feedback)

Step 7. Pilot testing and/or cognitive interviewing

Steps 5-7 are similar to those in TRAPD (Harkness, 2003; Harkness et al., 2010), in Baker et al. (2010), and WHO recommendations. They differ in the recommendation to include LEP individuals in Steps 5 and 6 in addition to 7. Community translators and interpreters can facilitate communication with LEP individuals participating in Steps 5-7, as well as in Step 2.

To illustrate the types of changes effected by CBPR, consider one example from the *Oyendo Bien* project described in Colina et al. (2017). The Hearing Handicap Inventory for the Elderly-Screening Version (HHIE) (Lichtenstein & Hazuda, 1998) includes the following question in English and in Spanish:

Does a hearing problem cause you to feel embarrassed when you meet new people?

¿El problema auditivo (de no oír bien) le causa vergüenza cuando usted conoce por primera vez a las personas?

The *Oyendo Bien* translation process, more closely aligned with CBPR⁹, used '*¿Le da pena cuando conoce a personas por primera vez porque no oye bien?*' instead. Among monolingual Mexican audiences in living in Nogales, Arizona, along the Sonora-Arizona border, '*le da pena*' is more commonly used to convey the intended feeling, even though 'pity'—the closest lexical equivalent to '*pena*'—is not part of the meaning in this context. The target population is therefore more likely to identify with '*le da pena*' because of its

⁹ The fully developed CBPT process was not available yet.

Table 4. Steps of the CBPT process

1.	Specification of translation requirements/instructions
2.	Translator selection
3.	Translation by qualified bilingual community members
a.	Linguistic and translation skill assessment
b.	Training (if needed)
4.	Translation (review) by professional translators and researchers
a.	Training in CBPR and functionalism
5.	Committee review
6.	Translation review
7.	Pilot testing/cognitive interviewing

frequent use, rather the more literal dictionary equivalent, '*vergüenza*'. Notice also that the HHIE translation shows a closer structural parallel between the English and Spanish versions.

As mentioned earlier, the novel contribution of CBPT lies in the integration of community stakeholders early in the process, in alignment with CBPR methodologies, and in the specification of a translation approach (i.e. functionalism) (Steps 1-4). The CBPT multistep process is not intended for all types of research or materials but specifically for CBPR materials, in an effort to align the linguistic component of the research with the principles of the community-based participatory framework. If multiple languages are involved, the process should work mostly in parallel, each language following Steps 1-7 separately. Some overlap and efficiencies are, however, possible; for instance, the training in Steps 3b and 4a can be administered to all team members, regardless of language. In Steps 5 and 6, we recommend having at least one representative from the language/s not in focus, to include their perspectives in the overall process. [Table 4](#) presents an overview of the multistep CBPT process.

The CBPT framework presented above, which incorporates bilingual individuals as ad hoc translators, raises an important question of implementation: how can research institutions develop the infrastructure and capacity needed to effectively put this model into practice? Below we provide some guidance on how to address this challenge.

Building capacity and developing infrastructure for CBPT

Building capacity and developing infrastructure for CBPT requires a multi-pronged framework that: (i) establishes clear guidelines and protocols for all processes (including the recruitment and training of qualified bilinguals, translators and interpreters, etc...): (ii) develops and administers training, and (iii) ensures ongoing support for quality assurance throughout the translation process.

More specific ways to build capacity are the following:

1. Design and pilot a set of protocols to review qualifications of bilinguals and require training when needed. The protocols should be developed with translation studies expertise and cost-effectiveness in mind.

Table 5. Recommendations for building capacity for CBPT

1.	Design and pilot protocols to review qualifications of bilinguals
2.	Design and pilot a set of translation and interpreting protocols for translation and interpreting requesters
3.	Develop a CBPT training and certification process for research administrators and research teams.
4.	Develop a CBPT training and certification process for translators and interpreters
5.	Create a network of CBPT-vetted, qualified individuals

2. Design and pilot a set of translation and interpreting protocols to guide researchers in need of translated materials. The protocols should be developed with translation studies expertise and cost-effectiveness in mind.
3. Develop a training and certification process that can be offered to research administrators and research teams on how to navigate the provision of quality non-English language materials within a CBPT framework.
4. Develop a training and certification process that can be offered to translators and interpreters to work within a CBPT framework
5. Create a network of qualified bilinguals vetted to work with CBPT experts and of community experts that research teams can consult with.

Additionally, institutions will need to support the initiative, financially, and non-financially through dissemination and facilitation. Non-financial support can occur through existing research infrastructure, such as research support and development services that should disseminate and facilitate protocols, guidelines and training, such as those mentioned above. Research hubs (in particular, those involved in CBPT) can be used to implement the process and make it cost-effective. Centrally supported resources for all university researchers can make translation methodologies more accessible, economical, informed and consistent. Establishing and leveraging existing networks of community partnerships and previously trained, qualified individuals, especially in universities or other governmental institutions, is crucial for the dissemination and recruitment of community experts and bilinguals, especially when there are timeline or budget constraints. Financial support can be institutional (e.g. through indirect cost recovery funds) or grant based. [Table 5](#) summarizes the recommendations presented for building capacity for CBPT.

Conclusions

This article argued that CBPR would benefit from an explicit methodology for the translation of materials for limited English proficient individuals and from ensuring alignment with its research principles. By methodology, we refer to both the procedures or processes employed and

the approach to the translation of the text (i.e. how does a translator make concrete translation decisions?). Studies tend to explain the translation procedures used. However, rarely do they state how they approach the actual process of converting the English text into the second language (i.e., what guides the translation decisions, how are conflicting solutions resolved?). Being explicit with respect to the translation approach is essential because: (i) research has shown that translation approach can influence the translation product (Colina et al., 2022); (ii) the approach and the assumptions about translation goals provide guidelines against which to evaluate quality; (iii) an explicit translation approach facilitates the alignment of expectations among all stakeholders.

A CBPT methodology is proposed both for the production and the evaluation of translated materials. CBPT is based on a functionalist framework to translation and a process that trains and involves qualified community translators early on in the translation; as such, it does not limit participatory action to consultation (i.e. participation in panels), pilot testing and cognitive debriefing. CBPT is shown to align well with the goals of CBPR as an approach and a process. Finally, the article provides guidance on how to build capacity and develop infrastructure for CBPT.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to sincerely thank three anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions, which significantly improved the quality of this manuscript. Any remaining errors are our own.

Submitted: November 24, 2025 EDT. Accepted: June 01, 2026 EDT. Published: September 18, 2026 EDT.



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CCBY-4.0). View this license's legal deed at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0> and legal code at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode> for more information.

References

- Acquadro, C., Conway, K., Hareendran, A., Aaronson, N., & European Regulatory Issues and Quality of Life Assessment (ERIQA) Group. (2008). Literature review of methods to translate health-related quality of life questionnaires for use in multinational clinical trials. *Value in Health*, 11(3), 509–521. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1524-4733.2007.00292.x>
- Baker, D. L., Melnikow, J., Ly, M.-Y., Shoultz, J., Niederhauser, V., & Díaz-Escamilla, R. (2010). Translation of health surveys using mixed methods. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 42(4), 430–438. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2010.01368.x>
- Balazs, C. L., & Morello-Frosch, R. (2013). The three Rs: How community-based participatory research strengthens the rigor, relevance, and reach of science. *Environmental Justice*, 6(1), 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.1089/env.2012.0017>
- Behr, D. (2017). Assessing the use of back translation: the shortcomings of back translation as a quality testing method. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 20(6), 573–584. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2016.1252188>
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 1, 185–216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135910457000100301>
- Brislin, R. W. (1986). The wording and translation of research instruments. In W. L. Lonner & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural research* (pp. 137–164). Sage.
- Brush, B. L., Mentz, G., Jensen, M., Jacobs, B., Saylor, K. M., Rowe, Z., Israel, B. A., & Lachance, L. (2020). Success in long-standing community-based participatory research (CBPR) partnerships: A scoping literature review. *Health Education and Behavior*, 47(4), 556–568. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198119882989>
- Chasukwa, M., & Crack, A. (2024). Participatory translation and anti-racism in NGO development work: A method of co-producing translations with community members. *Development Policy Review*, 42, e12787. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12787>
- Colina, S. (2019). Quality. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *The Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 458–463). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315678627-98>
- Colina, S. (2025). *Fundamentals of translation* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009342780>
- Colina, S. (2026). Assessment of translation. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0053.pub2open_in_new
- Colina, S., Marrone, N., Ingram, M., & Sánchez, D. (2017). Translation quality assessment in health research: A functionalist alternative to back-translation. *Evaluation and the Health Professions*, 40(3), 267–293. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163278716648191>
- Colina, S., Rodríguez-Guerra, M., Marrone, N., Ingram, M., Navarro, K. J., Arizmendi, G., & Coco, L. (2022). Research documents for populations with limited English proficiency: Translation approaches matter. *Ethics and Human Research*, 44(1), 29–39. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eahr.500115>
- Cruchinho, P., López-Franco, M. D., Capelas, M. L., Almeida, S., Bennett, P. M., Miranda da Silva, M., Teixeira, G., Nunes, E., Lucas, P., & Gaspar, F. (2024). Translation, cross-cultural adaptation, and validation of measurement instruments: A practical guideline for novice researchers. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*, 17, 2701–2728. <https://doi.org/10.2147/JMDH.S419714>

- Dhamani, K. A., & Richter, M. S. (2023). Translation of research instruments: Research processes, pitfalls and challenges. *Africa Journal of Nursing and Midwifery*, 13(1), 3–13. <https://unisapressjournals.co.za/index.php/AJNM/article/view/14438>
- Douglas, S. P., & Craig, S. C. (2007). Collaborative and iterative translation: an alternative approach to back-translation. *Journal of International Marketing*, 15(1), 30–43. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jimk.15.1.030>
- Epstein, J., Santo, R. M., & Guillemin, F. (2015). A review of guidelines for cross-cultural adaptation of questionnaires could not bring out a consensus. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 68(4), 435–441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.11.021>
- Formea, C. M., Mohamed, A. A., Hassan, A., Osman, A., Weis, J. A., Sia, I. G., & Wieland, M. L. (2014). Lessons learned: Cultural and linguistic enhancement of surveys through community-based participatory research. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 8(3), 331–336. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2014.0037>
- Fourie, J., & Feinauer, I. (2005). The quality of translated medical research questionnaires. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 23(4), 349–367. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073610509486395>
- Gandara, E., Recto, P., Zapata, J., Jr., Moreno-Vasquez, A., Zavala Idar, A., Castilla, M., Hernández, L., Flores, M., Escareño, J., Castillo, C., Morales, V., Medellín, H., Vega, B., Hoffman, B., González, M., & Lesser, J. (2023). Using CBPR principles with CHWs to translate an English to Spanish language CHW COVID-19 and health inequities project ECHO within South Texas. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 44(3), 218–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01612840.2022.2029103>
- Garcia, C. M., Gilchrist, L., Campesino, C., Raymond, N., Naughton, S., & de Patino, J. G. (2008). Using community-based participatory research to develop a bilingual mental health survey for Latinos. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 2(2), 105–120. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.0.0011>
- Graybill, P., Aggas, J., Dean, R., Demers, S., Finigan, E., & Pollard, R. (2010). A community participatory approach to adapting survey items for deaf individuals and American Sign Language. *Field Methods*, 22(4), 429–448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X10379201>
- Hague, D., Melby, A., & Zheng, W. (2014). Surveying translation quality assessment: A specification approach. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 5(2), 243–267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2011.10798820>
- Hall, D. A., Zaragoza Domingo, S., Hamdache, L. Z., Manchaiah, V., Thammaiah, S., Evans, C., Wong, L. L. N., & International Collegium of Rehabilitative Audiology and TINnitus Research NETwork. (2018). A good practice guide for translating and adapting hearing-related questionnaires for different languages and cultures. *International Journal of Audiology*, 57(3), 161–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2017.1393565>
- Han, C. (2020). Translation quality assessment: A critical methodological review. *The Translator*, 26(3), 257–273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2020.1834751>
- Harkness, J. (2003). Questionnaire translation. In J. Harkness, F. J. R. Van de Vijver, & P. Ph. Mohler (Eds.), *Cross-cultural survey methods* (pp. 35–56). Wiley.
- Harkness, J. (2011). Translation. In *Guidelines for best practice in cross-cultural surveys. Full guidelines* (3rd ed., pp. 290–351). Survey Research Center. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

- Harkness, J., Pennell, B.-E., & Schoua-Glusberg, A. (2004). Survey questionnaire translation and assessment. In S. Presser, J. M. Rothgeb, M. P. Couper, J. T. Lessler, E. Martin, J. Martin, & E. Singer (Eds.), *Methods for testing and evaluating survey questionnaires* (pp. 453–473). John Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471654728.ch22>
- Harkness, J., Villar, A., & Edwards, B. (2010). Translation, adaptation, and design. In J. A. Harkness, F. J. R. van de Vijver, & P. Ph. Mohler (Eds.), *Survey methods in multinational, multiregional, and multicultural contexts* (pp. 117–140). John Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470609927.ch7>
- Harris, B. (1977). The importance of natural translation. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 12, 96–114.
- Hönig, H. (1997). Positions, power and practice: Functionalist approaches and translation quality assessment. *Current Issues in Language and Society*, 4(1), 6–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13520529709615477>
- Horowitz, C., Robinson, M., & Seifer, S. (2009). Community-based participatory research: from the margin to the mainstream. Are researchers prepared? *Circulation*, 119(19), 2633–2642. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.107.729863>
- House, J. (1997). *Translation quality assessment: A model revisited*. Narr.
- House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: Past and present*. Routledge.
- Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., Becker, A. B., Allen, A. J., Guzman, J. R., & Lichtenstein, R. (2017). Critical issues in developing and following CBPR principles. In N. Wallerstein, B. Duran, J. G. Oetzel, & M. Minkler (Eds.), *Community-based participatory research for health: Advancing social and health equity* (pp. 89–106). Jossey-Bass.
- Kowal, M. (2024). Translation practices in cross-cultural social research and guidelines for the most popular approach: back-translation. *Anthropological Review*, 87(3), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1898-6773.87.3.02>
- Kusmaul, P. (1995). *Training the translator*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.10>
- Lauscher, S. (2000). Translation quality-assessment: Where can theory and practice meet? *The Translator*, 6(2), 149–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2000.10799063>
- Lichtenstein, M., & Hazuda, H. (1998). Cross-cultural adaptation of the Hearing Handicap Inventory for the Elderly-Screening Version (HHIE-S) for use with Spanish-speaking Mexican Americans. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 46(4), 492–498. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.1998.tb02473.x>
- Magnusson, D., Murphy, N. J., & Pena-Jackson, G. (2020). Community-engaged research to translate developmental screening and referral processes into locally-relevant, family-centered language. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 24(5), 651–659. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-019-02853-x>
- Maneesriwongul, W., & Dixon, J. K. (2004). Instrument translation process: A methods review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 48, 175–186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2004.03185.x>
- Marrone, N., Ingram, M., Somoza, M., Sánchez Jacob, D., Sanchez, A., Adamovich, S., & Harris, F. P. (2017). Interventional audiology to address hearing health care disparities: Oyendo Bien pilot study. *Seminars in Hearing*, 38(2), 198–211. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0037-1601575>
- Martínez Melis, N., & Hurtado, A. (2001). Assessment in translation studies: Research needs. *Meta*, 46(2), 272–287. <https://doi.org/10.7202/003624AR>
- McKenna, S. P., & Doward, L. C. (2005). The translation and cultural adaptation of patient-reported outcome measures. *Value in Health*, 8(2), 89–91. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1524-4733.2005.08203.x>

- Medina, L. D., Woods, S. P., Mullen, R., John, S. E., Kunik, M., Pressman, P., Moeller, S., Martínez, M., Arroyo Miranda, M., Stocker, M., Lopez-Esquibel, N., & Vardemann, J. (2023). A boot camp translation of Alzheimer's disease in Hispanic/Latino communities. *Alzheimer's and Dementia*, 9(2), e12390. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trc2.12390>
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Pergamon.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Newmark, P. (1991). *About translation*. Multilingual Matters.
- Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a science of translating*. Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004495746>
- Nord, C. (2018). *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained* (2nd ed.). St. Jerome. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351189354>
- O'Brien, S. (2012). Towards a dynamic quality evaluation model for translation. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 17, 55–76. <https://doi.org/10.26034/cm.jostrans.2012.459>
- Ospina-Pinillos, L., Davenport, T., Mendoza Diaz, A., Navarro-Mancilla, A., Scott, E., & Hickie, I. (2019). Using participatory design methodologies to co-design and culturally adapt the Spanish version of the mental health eclinic: Qualitative Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 21(8), e14127. <https://doi.org/10.2196/14127>
- Ozolins, U., Hale, S., Cheng, X., Hyatt, A., & Schofield, P. (2020). Translation and back-translation methodology in health research - a critique. *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research*, 20(1), 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14737167.2020.1734453>
- Pym, A. (2011). Translation research terms: A tentative glossary for moments of perplexity and dispute. In A. Pym (Ed.), *Translation research projects 3* (pp. 75–110). Tarragona Intercultural Studies Group. http://isg.urv.es/publicity/isg/publications/trp_3_2011/index.htm
- Reiss, K., & Vermeer, H. (1984). *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translations-Theorie*. Niemayer.
- Sánchez-Johnsen, L., Escamilla, J., Rodriguez, E. M., Vega, S., & Bolaños, L. (2015). Latino community-based participatory research studies: A model for conducting bilingual translations. *Hispanic Health Care International*, 13(1), 8. <https://doi.org/10.1891/1540-4153.13.1.8>
- Son, J. (2018). Back-translation as a documentation tool. *Translation and Interpreting*, 10(2), 89–100. <https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.110202.2018.a07>
- Tajik, M., Galvão, H. M., & Siqueira, C. E. (2010). Health survey instrument development through a community-based participatory research approach: Health promoting lifestyle profile (HPLP-II) and Brazilian immigrants in Greater Boston. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health/Center for Minority Public Health*, 12(3), 390–397. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-008-9209-4>
- Teig, C. J. P., Bond, M. J., Grotle, M., Kjøllesdal, M., Saga, S., Cvancarova, M. S., Ellström Engh, M. A., & Martini, A. (2023). A novel method for the translation and cross-cultural adaptation of health-related quality of life patient-reported outcome measurements. *Health and Quality of Life Outcome*, 21(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-023-02089-y>
- Tyupa, S. (2011). A theoretical framework for back-translation as a quality assessment tool. *New Voices in Translation Studies*, 7, 35–46. <https://doi.org/10.14456/nvts.2011.4>
- Valdez, D., Montenegro, M. S., Crawford, B. L., Turner, R. C., Lo, W.-L., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2021). Translation frameworks and questionnaire design approaches as a component of health research and practice: A discussion and taxonomy of popular translation frameworks and questionnaire design approaches. *Social Science and Medicine*, 278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.113931>
- Verbillis-Kolp, S., Yotebieng, K., Farmer, E., Freidman, E., & Hollifield, M. (2023). Community participatory translation processes for mental health screening among refugees and forced migrants. *Traumatology*, 29(2), 277–288. <https://doi.org/10.1037/trm0000430>

- Vermeer, H. (1992). Is translation a linguistic or a cultural process? *Ilha do Desterro A Journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies*, 28, 037–051.
- Walde, P., & Völm, B. A. (2023). The TRAPD approach as a method for questionnaire translation. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1199989>
- Wallerstein, N., & Duran, B. (2010). Community-based participatory research contributions to intervention research: the intersection of science and practice to improve health equity. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(Suppl 1), S40-6. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.184036>
- Wallerstein, N., Oetzel, J. G., Duran, B., Magarati, M., Pearson, C., Belone, L., Davis, J., DeWindt, L., Kastelic, S., Lucero, J., & Ruddock, C. (2019). Culture-centeredness in community-based participatory research: contributions to health education intervention research. *Health Education Research*, 34(4), 372–388. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyz021>