trends in public health

MDPI

Article

Sociodemographic Characteristics, Research Roles, Training Needs, and Perceived Barriers Among Individuals Engaged in ACB Research and Data Governance in Canada

Josephine Etowa [1,*], Akalewold T. Gebremeskel [1], Amos Wung Buh [1], Egbe B. Etowa [2], Michelle Sraha-Yeboah [1], Apondi J. Odhiambo [3], Charles Daboné [4], Doris M. Kakuru [5], Francisca I. Omorodion [6], Anita Brown-Johnson [7], Glenda Muzenda [1], Amoy Jacques [8] and Jude Mary Cénat [9]

1 School of Nursing, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5, Canada
2 Daphne Cockwell School of Nursing, Faculty of Community Services, Toronto Metropolitan University, Toronto, ON M5B 2K3, Canada
3 Public Health Agency of Canada, Ottawa, ON K1A 0K9, Canada
4 Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5, Canada
5 School of Child & Youth Care, Faculty of Education, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC V8W 2Y2, Canada
6 Department of Sociology & Criminology, University of Windsor, Windsor, ON N9B 3P4, Canada
7 McGill University Health Centre, Department of Family Medicine, McGill University, Montreal, QC H3S 1Z1, Canada
8 Somerset West Community Health Center, Ottawa, ON K1R 6S3, Canada
9 School of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5, Canada
* Correspondence: josephine.etowa@uottawa.ca

Abstract

Background: Race-based data collection and governance remain inconsistent across Canadian health systems, limiting the visibility of African, Caribbean, and Black (ACB) communities. This paper presents a data profile of people working in or alongside ACB-serving organizations in Canada. **Methods:** A national cross-sectional survey captured sociodemographic characteristics, organizational affiliations, research roles, perceptions of data governance, training needs, barriers to participation, and self-rated research capacities of individuals engaged in ACB research and data governance. Eligible participants were individuals engaged in research, evaluation, data collection, data administration, or related activities in ACB-serving organizations across Canada. We conducted descriptive analysis. **Results:** Among 384 respondents, 45.8% lived in Ontario and 23.7% in Quebec. Most identified as female (72.1%), and 59.9% held a bachelor's degree or higher. Many reported involvement in data collection (48.2%), data analysis (41.7%), and data management (41.4%). Training needs were frequently identified in cultural competency (48.7%), research methodology (44.3%), and data analysis (44.3%). Common barriers included lack of representation (46.1%), language challenges (41.4%), historical mistrust (37.5%), and concerns about data sovereignty (37.5%). Confidence was highest for data collection (56.4% rating 7–9) and lowest for securing research funding (34.8% rating 1–3). **Conclusions:** This data profile provides foundational evidence to support equitable, community-aligned data governance policy and practice within ACB-serving organizational contexts in Canada.

Keywords: African, Caribbean, and Black Communities; ACB Data Governance Study; individual survey component; Canada

Check for updates

Academic Editor: Xiaochuan Pan

Received: 13 March 2026
Revised: 3 June 2026
Accepted: 28 July 2026
Published: 14 August 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.

1. Introduction

Race-based data collection and governance remain inconsistent across Canadian health systems, limiting the visibility of African, Caribbean, and Black (ACB) communities in health research and policy [1,2]. The absence of standardized approaches to collecting and reporting race and ethnicity data has resulted in fragmented datasets that constrain the ability to describe population characteristics, monitor inequities, and identify emerging trends. These gaps also reflect longstanding challenges related to trust, representation, and community participation in data-related decision-making, particularly in contexts where historical harms have shaped relationships between ACB communities and health institutions [3,4].

ACB communities in Canada experience well-documented disparities in access to care, health outcomes, and broader social determinants of health [5]. Structural factors such as racism, economic marginalization, and immigration status often contribute to these inequities, and the COVID-19 pandemic further highlighted the need for more complete and disaggregated data to understand differential impacts [6,7]. Limited availability of race-based information makes it difficult to quantify these patterns, assess variation across demographic groups, or design interventions that respond to the specific needs of diverse ACB populations. As a result, many inequities remain obscured within aggregate datasets, limiting opportunities for evidence-informed policy and program development [8].

Efforts to strengthen data governance frameworks have emphasized the importance of community-driven approaches. Models such as the EGAP (Engagement, Governance, Access, Protection) framework highlight principles that can guide ethical and transparent data practices, including meaningful community involvement, clear decision-making structures, equitable access to data, and safeguards against misuse [9]. These approaches underscore the need for governance systems that reflect community priorities, enhance accountability, and support the responsible use of data across research and service settings [10,11]. These examples also show that structured, community-driven governance can restore trust and make sure data practices reflect the values and expectations of ACB communities.

The ACB Data Governance Study was developed to examine data-related roles, practices, and capacity needs within organizations that serve ACB communities in Canada. As part of this broader initiative, the present paper provides a descriptive profile of people working in or alongside ACB-serving organizations. This manuscript reports descriptive quantitative findings from the individual survey component of the study. The aim is to summarize respondents' sociodemographic characteristics, research roles, perceptions of data governance, training needs, and self-rated research capacities. These descriptive patterns help situate the workforce within the geographic and policy landscape of ACB-serving organizations, where provincial variation in data governance practices is substantial, and identify concrete capacity-building needs that can inform training, policy development, and future qualitative inquiry. By establishing a baseline understanding of these characteristics, this paper aims to contribute foundational information that can support future analytical work on data governance and organizational capacity within ACB-serving contexts, and can inform ongoing efforts to strengthen equitable, community-centered data practices.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Design and Setting

The data presented in this paper come from the individual survey component of the ACB Data Governance Study, a national initiative examining data practices within organizations that serve ACB communities in Canada. The individual survey used a cross-sectional design and was administered online between October 2024 and July 2025, capturing sociodemographic characteristics, organizational affiliations, research roles, perceptions of

data governance, training needs, and self-rated research capacities among people working in or alongside ACB-serving organizations. The participatory development of the questionnaire, informed by community-based participatory research principles, further reduced measurement bias by ensuring cultural relevance, clarity, and alignment with community priorities [12]. Eligible participants were adults aged 18 years or older who were engaged in research, evaluation, data collection, data administration, or related service activities within ACB-serving organizations or in collaboration with them. Both ACB and non-ACB individuals were eligible if they met the engagement criteria. Participation was voluntary and anonymous.

2.2. Sample Size Considerations

Prior to data collection, the minimum required sample size was estimated using standard parameters for cross-sectional survey research. We applied an expected proportion of 50%, which is a conservative assumption used when the true population proportion is unknown because it yields the maximum variance and therefore the largest required sample size. Using this assumption, along with a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error [13], we identified a target of 384 participants to support adequate representation across diverse organizational settings and respondent identities.

2.3. Survey Instrument Development

The questionnaire was developed through a collaborative process informed by community-based participatory research principles. Items were drafted with input from ACB-serving organizations, advisory committees, and methodological experts to ensure cultural relevance, clarity, and alignment with community priorities. The instrument included sections on sociodemographic background, organizational context, research roles and activities, perceptions of data governance, training needs, barriers to participation, and self-assessed research capacities. The survey was available in English and French and was pilot tested to assess clarity and ease of completion.

2.4. Measures

Demographic variables included region of residence, age group, birthplace, immigration status, sex, sexual orientation, racial or ethnic identity, education level, household income, and employment sector. These items were added to support descriptive and intersectional analyses of respondent characteristics. Perceptions of data governance were assessed using two dichotomous items capturing beliefs about the importance of data governance and awareness of challenges related to governance. Training needs were measured using 13 dichotomous items assessing interest in skill development across areas such as cultural competency, research methodology, data analysis, and ethics (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.81$). Barriers to research participation were captured using 15 dichotomous items reflecting perceived obstacles such as lack of representation, mistrust, and resource constraints (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.77$). Safeguards and ethical practices were assessed using 14 dichotomous items related to informed consent, community review, data sharing agreements, and data protection protocols (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.84$). Self-rated research capacity was measured using 14 items rated on a 1–9 scale, with higher scores indicating greater confidence (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.96$).

2.5. Recruitment and Data Collection

Participants were recruited through multiple channels, including outreach to ACB-serving organizations, professional networks, community partners, and peer equity navigators. A purposive sampling strategy was used: eligible organizations were first identified, and individuals working within or alongside these organizations were invited to participate.

Because recruitment relied on decentralized distribution through organizational leads and snowball dissemination across networks, it was not possible to track how many individuals ultimately received the survey invitation. As a result, the total number of people contacted and the response rate could not be determined. Surveys were administered online or on paper, in English or French according to participant preference. Informed consent was obtained electronically prior to participation, and all responses were compiled into a secure database and underwent standard data-cleaning procedures.

2.6. Statistical Analysis

Analyses were descriptive and focused on summarizing participant characteristics and key variables. Frequencies and proportions were calculated for categorical variables, and mean scores were computed for continuous measures where applicable. No inferential statistical tests were conducted, consistent with the descriptive purpose of this data profile paper. All analyses were performed using Stata version 16.

3. Results

3.1. Sociodemographic Characteristics

As shown in Table 1, participants were located across Canada, with the largest proportions residing in Ontario (45.83%) and Quebec (23.70%). Smaller proportions were from the Prairies (13.28%), British Columbia (8.85%), and Atlantic Canada (8.07%), with minimal missing data (0.26%). Age distributions were concentrated among working-age adults. The largest groups were aged 25–34 years (32.29%) and 35–44 years (30.21%), followed by those aged 45–54 years (17.97%) and 55–64 years (11.20%). Most respondents were born in Canada (62.24%), while 37.50% were born outside Canada. Citizenship status was predominantly Canadian citizen (83.85%), with smaller proportions of permanent residents (10.16%), temporary residents (3.39%), and refugees (1.56%). The sample was mostly female (72.14%), with males representing 26.56% and non-binary respondents 1.04%. Sexual orientation was primarily heterosexual (84.90%), with smaller proportions identifying as bisexual (5.99%), gay (2.34%), lesbian (1.56%), queer (0.78%), asexual (0.52%), or other identities (3.65%). Educational attainment was high: 36.46% held a bachelor's degree, and 23.44% held a graduate or professional degree. An additional 28.65% had college or vocational training, and 10.94% had a high school education or less. Household income varied across categories, with the largest group reporting incomes of CAD 100,000 or more (40.36%). Approximately 14.32% reported income below CAD 40,000. Racial identity included White (51.04%), Black (26.82%), Latinx (6.51%), Southeast Asian (5.47%), East Asian (4.17%), Middle Eastern (2.08%), Indigenous (0.52%), and other identities (0.78%). Missing data accounted for 2.60%. Affiliated sectors included hospital settings (26.04%), nonprofit organizations (17.97%), government (13.02%), community health centres (10.68%), private for-profit organizations (10.68%), education (7.03%), long-term care (5.47%), and public health (3.14%). Missing sector information accounted for 5.99%.

3.2. Research and Data Related Experience

As shown in Table 2, respondents reported involvement in a range of research and data activities. The most frequently reported roles were data collection (48.18%), data analysis (41.67%), and data management (41.41%). Additional activities included community development (33.33%), data interpretation (30.73%), development of knowledge translation and exchange products (19.53%), study conceptualization and design (15.10%), and other knowledge mobilization activities (14.84%). Missing data for each item were minimal (0.26%).

Table 1. Sample characteristics (n = 384).

	% (*n*)
Region	
Prairies	13.28 (51)
BC	8.85 (34)
Atlantic Canada	8.07 (31)
ON	45.83 (176)
QC	23.70 (91)
Missing	0.26 (1)
Age	
18–24	8.07 (31)
25–34	32.29 (124)
35–44	30.21 (116)
45–54	17.97 (69)
55–64	11.20 (43)
65+	0.26 (1)
Birthplace	
Outside Canada	37.50 (144)
Canada	62.24 (239)
Missing	0.26 (1)
Immigration status	
Citizen	83.85 (322)
Refugee	1.56 (6)
Permanent resident	10.16 (39)
Temporary resident	3.39 (13)
Missing	1.04 (4)
Sex	
Female	72.14 (277)
Male	26.56 (102)
Other	1.04 (4)
Missing	0.26 (1)
Sexual orientations	
Straight	84.90 (326)
Asexual	0.52 (2)
Bisexual	5.99 (23)
Gay	2.34 (9)
Lesbian	1.56 (6)
Queer	0.78 (3)
Other	3.65 (14)
Missing	0.26 (1)
Education	
High school or less	10.94 (42)
Some college/vocational/associate degree	28.65 (110)
Bachelor's degree	36.46 (140)
Graduate or professional degree	23.44 (90)
Other	0.26 (1)
Missing	0.26 (1)
Household income (CAD)	
100,000+	40.36 (155)
90,000–99,000	12.24 (47)
80,000–89,000	9.64 (37)
60,000–79,000	9.64 (37)
50,000–59,000	5.21 (20)
40,000–49,000	8.33 (32)
<40,000	14.32 (55)
Missing	0.26 (1)

Table 1. *Cont.*

	% (*n*)
Racial identity	
Black	26.82 (103)
White	51.04 (196)
SE Asian	5.47 (21)
East Asian	4.17 (16)
Latinx	6.51 (25)
Middle Eastern	2.08 (8)
Indigenous	0.52 (2)
Other	0.78 (3)
Missing	2.60 (10)
Employment sector	
Education	7.03 (27)
Community health centre	10.68 (41)
Private for-profit organization	10.68 (41)
Government	13.02 (50)
Hospital	26.04 (100)
Long-term care	5.47 (21)
Non-profit	17.97 (69)
Public health	3.14 (12)
Missing	5.99 (23)

Table 2. Experience in research and data management activities (*n* = 384).

Type of Research Participation	Yes (% (*n*))	No (% (*n*))	Missing (% (*n*))
Study conceptualization and design	15.10 (58)	84.64 (325)	0.26 (1)
Data collection	48.18 (185)	51.56 (198)	0.26 (1)
Data management	41.41 (159)	58.33 (224)	0.26 (1)
Data analysis	41.67 (160)	58.07 (223)	0.26 (1)
Data interpretation	30.73 (118)	69.01 (265)	0.26 (1)
Development of KTE products	19.53 (75)	80.21 (308)	0.26 (1)
Other knowledge mobilization	14.84 (57)	84.90 (326)	0.26 (1)
Community development	33.33 (128)	66.41 (255)	0.26 (1)

3.3. Perceptions of Data Governance, Training Needs, and Barriers

As shown in Table 3, most respondents endorsed the importance of data governance (81.77%), while a smaller proportion reported awareness of data governance challenges (25.52%). Training needs varied across domains. The most frequently selected areas included cultural competency and sensitivity (48.70%), research methodology (44.27%), data analysis (44.27%), and community-based participatory research (40.10%). Lower proportions selected data management (33.59%), knowledge mobilization strategies (33.07%), and data privacy and security (26.82%). Commonly reported barriers to participating in research included lack of representation and diversity (46.09%), language barriers (41.41%), lack of data sovereignty (37.50%), historical mistrust (37.50%), and power imbalances or tokenism (35.94%). Fewer respondents identified lack of inclusive leadership (14.06%) or lack of community engagement (15.36%) as barriers. Support for safeguards and ethical practices was high across several domains. Frequently endorsed items included cultural competence and sensitivity (49.48%), culturally relevant research methods (45.83%), ethics and informed consent (43.75%), resource allocation to support ethical practice (42.45%), diversity in leadership (41.41%), and community engagement (39.84%). Moderate support was observed for training and capacity building (35.16%), data ownership and control (31.51%), flexibility in research processes (30.21%), research partnerships (28.13%), trans-

parency and accountability (25.26%), and policy advocacy (26.04%). Language access (21.35%) and feedback mechanisms (20.05%) were selected less frequently. Missing data for each item were minimal (0.26%).

Table 3. Data knowledge and management characteristics (n = 384).

	Yes (% (n))	No (% (n))	Missing (% (n))
Governance Perceptions			
Belief in importance of data governance	81.77 (314)	6.77 (26)	11.46 (44)
Aware of data governance challenges	25.52 (98)	63.02 (242)	11.46 (44)
Training Needs			
Cultural competency and sensitivity training	48.70 (187)	51.04 (196)	0.26 (1)
Grant writing and fundraising	38.54 (148)	61.20 (235)	0.26 (1)
Research methodology	44.27 (170)	55.47 (213)	0.26 (1)
CBPR training	40.10 (154)	59.64 (229)	0.26 (1)
Data management training	33.59 (129)	66.15 (254)	0.26 (1)
Data analysis training	44.27 (170)	55.47 (213)	0.26 (1)
Data privacy and security	26.82 (103)	72.92 (280)	0.26 (1)
Communication and public speaking	30.73 (118)	69.01 (265)	0.26 (1)
Knowledge mobilization strategies	33.07 (127)	66.67 (256	0.26 (1)
Ethics and informed consent	36.72 (141)	63.02 (242)	0.26 (1)
Networking and partnerships	32.81 (126)	66.93 (257)	0.26 (1)
Advocacy and policy engagement	32.03 (123)	67.71 (260)	0.26 (1)
Empowerment & Interest			
Feel empowered to lead research	43.23 (166)	45.31 (174)	11.46 (44)
Interested in workshops on data governance/KM	58.33 (224)	30.21 (116)	11.46 (44)
Barrier Description			
Lack of representation and diversity	46.09 (177)	53.65 (206)	0.26 (1)
Lack of data sovereignty	37.50 (144)	62.24 (239)	0.26 (1)
Historical mistrust and distrust	37.50 (144)	62.24 (239)	0.26 (1)
Power imbalance and tokenism	35.94 (138)	63.80 (245)	0.26 (1)
Lack of cultural sensitivity and competency	31.25 (120)	68.49 (263)	0.26 (1)
Limited research capacity	23.96 (92)	75.78 (291)	0.26 (1)
Language barriers	41.41 (159)	58.33 (224)	0.26 (1)
Complex research processes	32.81 (126)	66.93 (257)	0.26 (1)
Lack of inclusive leadership	14.06 (54)	85.68 (329)	0.26 (1)
Lack of clear protocols	26.30 (101)	73.44 (282)	0.26 (1)
Stigma, discrimination and bias	24.74 (95)	75.00 (288)	0.26 (1)
Lack of community engagement and involvement	15.36 (59)	84.38 (324)	0.26 (1)
Lack of data governance and control	20.57 (79)	79.17 (304)	0.26 (1)
Geographical disparities	20.05 (77)	79.69 (306)	0.26 (1)
Limited access to resources	27.86 (107)	71.88 (276)	0.26 (1)
Safeguards & Ethical Practices			
Cultural competence and sensitivity	49.48 (190)	50.26 (193)	0.26 (1)
Ethics and informed consent	43.75 (168)	55.99 (215)	0.26 (1)
Diversity in leadership and decision-making roles	41.41 (159)	58.33 (224)	0.26 (1)
Data ownership and control	31.51 (121)	68.23 (262)	0.26 (1)
Community engagement	39.84 (153)	59.90 (230)	0.26 (1)
Flexibility and adaptability	30.21 (116)	69.53 (267)	0.26 (1)
Research partnerships	28.13 (108)	71.61 (275)	0.26 (1)
Resource allocation	42.45 (163)	57.29 (220)	0.26 (1)
Training and capacity building	35.16 (135)	64.58 (248)	0.26 (1)
Policy advocacy and influence	26.04 (100)	73.70 (283)	0.26 (1)
Language access and communication	21.35 (82)	78.39 (301)	0.26 (1)
Transparency and accountability	25.26 (97)	74.48 (286)	0.26 (1)
Culturally relevant research methods	45.83 (176)	53.91 (207)	0.26 (1)
Feedback mechanisms	20.05 (77)	79.69 (306)	0.26 (1)

3.4. Self-Rated Research Capacity

As shown in Table 4, self-rated capacity scores (1–9 scale) showed variation across research tasks. Higher proportions of respondents rated themselves at the upper end of the scale (7–9) for activities such as finding relevant literature (47.86%), designing questionnaires (47.25%), collecting data (56.40%), using computer-based data management systems (45.74%), analyzing qualitative data (40.26%), analyzing quantitative data (40.54%), and writing research reports (44.21%). Lower confidence ratings (1–3) were more common for tasks related to grant writing and formal research processes, including securing research funding (34.75%), submitting ethics applications (31.01%), using referencing software (23.78%), writing research protocols (25.61%), and writing for peer-reviewed publication (27.43%). Missing data for capacity items were consistent across tasks (14.58%).

Table 4. Research capacity and culture assessment characteristics (n = 384)—Scale 1 (lowest) to 9 (highest).

	1 (% (*n*))	2 (% (*n*))	3 (% (*n*))	4 (% (*n*))	5 (% (*n*))	6 (% (*n*))	7 (% (*n*))	8 (% (*n*))	9 (% (*n*))	Missing (% (n))
Finding relevant literature	3.96 (13)	2.74 (9)	2.74 (9)	4.88 (16)	20.43 (67)	17.38 (57)	27.13 (89)	11.89 (39)	8.84 (29)	14.58 (56)
Critically reviewing the literature	3.96 (13)	2.44 (8)	3.96 (13)	6.10 (20)	18.60 (61)	25.30 (83)	17.07 (56)	14.02 (46)	8.54 (28)	14.58 (56)
Using a computer referencing system	12.50 (41)	3.66 (12)	7.62 (25)	9.45 (31)	15.55 (51)	14.02 (46)	18.90 (62)	10.06 (33)	8.23 (27)	14.58 (56)
Writing a research protocol	11.28 (37)	6.71 (22)	7.62 (25)	13.11 (43)	16.77 (55)	13.72 (45)	13.41 (44)	9.45 (31)	7.93 (26)	14.58 (56)
Securing research funding	18.29 (60)	8.84 (29)	7.62 (25)	10.37 (34)	14.94 (49)	16.77 (55)	11.28 (37)	7.32 (24)	4.57 (15)	14.58 (56)
Submitting an ethics application	17.38 (57)	6.40 (21)	8.23 (27)	7.62 (25)	13.72 (45)	13.41 (44)	16.16 (53)	8.23 (27)	8.84 (29)	14.58 (56)
Designing questionnaires	8.84 (29)	2.44 (8)	4.88 (16)	5.49 (18)	17.07 (56)	14.02 (46)	18.29 (60)	16.46 (54)	12.50 (41)	14.58 (56)
Collecting data	4.57 (15)	2.74 (9)	5.79 (19)	6.10 (20)	11.28 (37)	13.11 (43)	22.26 (73)	20.73 (68)	13.41 (44)	14.58 (56)
Using computer data management systems	9.45 (31)	4.88 (16)	5.18 (17)	6.10 (20)	12.50 (41)	16.16 (53)	19.21 (63)	16.16 (53)	10.37 (34)	14.58 (56)
Analyzing qualitative research data	9.45 (31)	3.35 (11)	8.23 (27)	5.49 (18)	13.41 (44)	19.21 (63)	18.29 (60)	12.80 (42)	9.76 (32)	14.58 (56)
Analyzing quantitative research data	10.37 (34)	3.05 (10)	7.32 (24)	7.01 (23)	15.24 (50)	16.46 (54)	15.85 (52)	15.85 (52)	8.84 (29)	14.58 (56)
Writing a research report	8.84 (29)	3.05 (10)	6.10 (20)	7.93 (26)	13.72 (45)	16.16 (53)	19.82 (65)	13.11 (43)	11.28 (37)	14.58 (56)
Writing for publication in peer-reviewed journals	14.63 (48)	6.40 (21)	6.40 (21)	7.93 (26)	16.16 (53)	15.55 (51)	13.11 (43)	10.98 (36)	8.84 (29)	14.58 (56)
Providing advice to less experienced researchers	15.55 (51)	4.27 (14)	7.62 (25)	7.32 (24)	16.46 (54)	13.72 (45)	16.16 (53)	11.59 (38)	7.32 (24)	14.58 (56)

4. Discussion

This paper offers a data profile of our survey respondents, outlining their characteristics, roles, and perspectives relevant to data governance and research capacity. Respondents described a research environment characterized by both strengths and ongoing structural constraints. Their diverse lived experiences, educational backgrounds, and professional roles contribute to research processes that may be culturally grounded and reflective of the communities they serve. At the same time, respondents noted barriers related to funding, mentorship, and publication opportunities. These constraints may influence the extent

to which individuals are able to participate across different stages of the research process, including leadership and decision-making roles [14]. Collaborative infrastructures across organizations and sectors may help address some of these gaps by facilitating access to expertise, resources, and opportunities for shared learning [15].

Data governance emerged as an important area of focus. Respondents emphasized safeguards such as cultural competence, informed consent, and diversity in leadership, reflecting a strong orientation toward ethical accountability and the protection of community interests. Support for culturally relevant research methods and community engagement further highlights preferences for governance approaches grounded in relational ethics and shared decision-making. Although fewer respondents selected items related to transparency, feedback mechanisms, or formal accountability structures, the overall pattern suggests recognition of the need for clear expectations around data access, ownership, and use. Formal data sharing agreements remain useful tools for clarifying these expectations and supporting transparency within partnerships [16]. In contexts where mistrust and power imbalances have shaped relationships with institutions, structured and culturally grounded governance arrangements may contribute to more consistent and community-aligned research practices [17].

Variation in respondents' confidence related to mentorship, leadership, and research navigation further highlights the value of networks that extend beyond individual organizations. Collaborative partnerships can support capacity building by connecting individuals at different stages of their research trajectories and facilitating the exchange of knowledge and experience [18]. Regular communication and structured mentorship may help individuals navigate complex systems of funding, publication, and governance, while also contributing to shared understanding and continuity within research communities [19].

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting these findings. All measures were self-reported and may be subject to recall or social desirability bias. Missing data was minimal for most variables but were higher for the self-rated capacity items, which may influence interpretation of those distributions. Because the survey was disseminated through decentralized organizational networks and snowball recruitment, it was not possible to determine how many individuals ultimately received the survey invitation; therefore, a response rate could not be calculated. This limits our ability to assess non-response bias and may introduce selection bias if individuals with greater interest in the topic or stronger engagement within organizational networks were more likely to participate. Finally, the cross-sectional design provides a snapshot of respondents' characteristics and perceptions at one point in time and does not capture changes over time or across organizational contexts.

The descriptive patterns documented in this study provide a foundation for future analytical work. Subsequent research may examine relationships among governance perceptions, research roles, training needs, and organizational characteristics, or explore how sociodemographic factors shape engagement in research and data activities. Comparative analyses across organizational types or regions may also help clarify how structural conditions influence research participation. In addition, longitudinal or mixed-methods studies could provide deeper insight into how governance practices, capacity-building efforts, and collaborative infrastructures evolve over time within ACB-serving contexts. Together, these directions can contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of data governance and research capacity across the sector.

5. Conclusions

The present paper provides a descriptive profile of individuals working in or alongside organizations that serve ACB communities in Canada, summarizing their sociode-

mographic characteristics, research roles, perceptions of data governance, training needs, and self-rated research capacities. These findings offer baseline information that can support future analytical work within the broader ACB Data Governance Study, including examinations of how governance perceptions, research engagement, and organizational characteristics intersect. By documenting these foundational patterns, the study contributes a resource for researchers, organizations, and policymakers interested in understanding and strengthening data governance and research capacity in ACB-serving contexts.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, J.E., A.T.G., A.W.B., E.B.E. and M.S.-Y.; methodology, J.E. and A.T.G.; software, A.W.B.; validation, A.T.G., A.W.B. and M.S.-Y.; formal analysis, A.T.G., A.W.B. and M.S.-Y.; investigation, A.T.G., A.W.B. and M.S.-Y.; resources, J.E.; data curation, A.T.G., A.W.B. and M.S.-Y.; writing—original draft preparation, A.T.G., A.W.B. and M.S.-Y.; writing—review and editing, A.J.O., C.D., D.M.K., F.I.O., A.B.-J., G.M., A.J. and J.M.C.; visualization, M.S.-Y.; supervision, J.E.; project administration, J.E.; funding acquisition, J.E. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council: 936-2021-00859.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Ottawa (protocol code H-01-23-8120, approval date 18 July 2023).

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data supporting this study are available from the authors upon reasonable request. Access is restricted due to privacy and confidentiality considerations.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Bernardo, B.M.; São Mamede, H.; Barroso, J.M.; dos Santos, V.M. Data governance & quality management—Innovation and breakthroughs across different fields. *J. Innov. Knowl.* **2024**, *9*, 100598. [CrossRef]
2. Jamieson, M.; Blair, A.; Jackson, B.; Siddiqi, A. Race-based sampling, measurement and monitoring in health data: Promising practices to address racial health inequities and their determinants in Black Canadians. *Health Promot. Chronic Dis. Prev. Can. Res. Policy Pract.* **2025**, *45*, 147. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
3. Rentsch, C.T.; Siddiqui, M.K.; Mathur, R. What Are High-Quality Race and Ethnicity Data and How Are They Used in Health Equity Research? *AMA J. Ethics* **2024**, *27*, E34–E43. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
4. Williams, M.T.; Khanna Roy, A.; MacIntyre, M.P.; Faber, S. The traumatizing impact of racism in Canadians of colour. *Curr. Trauma Rep.* **2022**, *8*, 17–34. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
5. Olanlesi-Aliu, A.; Alaazi, D.; Salami, B. Black Health in Canada: Protocol for a scoping review. *JMIR Res. Protoc.* **2023**, *12*, e42212. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
6. Etowa, J.; Hyman, I.; Dabone, C.; Mbagwu, I.; Ghose, B.; Sano, Y.; Osman, M.; Mohamoud, H. Strengthening the collection and use of disaggregated data to understand and monitor the risk and burden of COVID-19 among racialized populations. *Can. Stud. Popul.* **2021**, *48*, 201–216. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
7. Etowa, J.; Hyman, I. Unpacking the health and social consequences of COVID-19 through a race, migration and gender lens. *Can. J. Public Health* **2021**, *112*, 8–11. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
8. Lancet. Advancing racial and ethnic equity in health. *Lancet* **2022**, *400*, 2007. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
9. Demeke, J.; Roche, B.; Orridge, C.; McKenzie, K. *Engagement, Governance, Access and Protection (EGAP) Implementation Guide*; Wellesley Institute: Toronto, ON, Canada, 2024.
10. Black Health Equity Working Group. *Engagement, Governance, Access, and Protection (EGAP): A Data Governance Framework for Health Data Collected from Black Communities in Ontario [Internet]*; Black Health Equity Working Group: Toronto, ON, Canada, 2021. Available online: https://blackhealthequity.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Report_EGAP_framework.pdf (accessed on 10 December 2025).
11. NHS Race and Health Observatory. *Strategy 2025–2027*; NHS Race and Health Observatory: London, UK, 2025.

12. Etowa, J.; Hyman, I.; Unachukwu, U. Use of a Peer Equity Navigator Intervention to Increase Access to COVID-19 Vaccination Among African, Caribbean and Black Communities in Canada. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2025**, *22*, 1195. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
13. Yamane, T. *Statistics: An Introductory Analysis*, 2nd ed.; Harper & Row: New York, NY, USA, 1967.
14. Fountain, J.E. *Information, Institutions and Governance: Advancing a Basic Social Science Research Program for Digital Government*; Research Working Paper 03-004; Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2003.
15. Wallerstein, N.; Duran, B. Community-based participatory research contributions to intervention research: The intersection of science and practice to improve health equity. *Am. J. Public Health* **2010**, *100*, S40–S46. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
16. Manson, S.M.; Garroutte, E.; Goins, R.T.; Henderson, P.N. Access, relevance, and control in the research process: Lessons from Indian Country. *J. Aging Health* **2004**, *16*, 58S–77S. [PubMed]
17. Etowa, J.; Massaquoi, N.; Omorodion, F.; Brown-Shreves, D.; Hyman, I.; Gebremeskel, A.; Loemba, H.; Ghose, B.; Etowa, E.; Rayner, J.; et al. The development and implementation of an innovative community-based intervention to strengthen community capacity for HIV prevention and care among Canadians of African Caribbean and Black (ACB) women in Ontario: A research protocol. *Glob. Public Health* **2025**, *20*, 2436425. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
18. Cargo, M.; Mercer, S.L. The value and challenges of participatory research: Strengthening its practice. *Annu. Rev. Public Health* **2008**, *29*, 325–350. [CrossRef]
19. Etowa, J.; Jacques, A.; Malemo, L.; Ghose, B.; Etowa, E.B.; Dabone, C.; Sangwa, S. Restoring public trust in COVID-19 vaccine among Africans, Caribbean, and Black Canadians using Community based participatory research (CBPR). *Discov. Public Health* **2025**, *22*, 280. [CrossRef]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.