

**ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF COMMUNITY BUILDING EFFORTS ON THE SOCIAL
NETWORKS OF INNER CITY RESIDENTS**

BY

DOUG. WATSON

A Thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Anthropology
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

© Doug. Watson, August 2004

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION**

**ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF COMMUNITY BUILDING EFFORTS ON THE SOCIAL
NETWORKS OF INNER CITY RESIDENTS**

**BY
DOUG. WATSON**

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University of
Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirement of the degree
Of
MASTER OF ARTS**

Doug. Watson © 2004

Permission has been granted to the Library of the University of Manitoba to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to University Microfilms Inc. to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum.

This reproduction or copy of this thesis has been made available by authority of the copyright owner solely for the purpose of private study and research, and may only be reproduced and copied as permitted by copyright laws or with express written authorization from the copyright owner.

Acknowledgements

While many people deserve mention, the following individuals were particularly important to the completion and quality of this thesis. First, for sitting on my Thesis Committee I would like to thank Dr. Brian Schwimmer, Dr. Christopher Leo and Dr. Rae Bridgman. In particular, Dr. Schwimmer provided many valuable insights and suggestions that made the information contained herein more easily understood and lucid in its presentation and content. Second, I would like to express my extreme gratitude to my girlfriend Beth. She managed to be encouraging and supportive throughout the emotional roller-coaster of the past year. It would have been very difficult to have gotten to this point without her. Third, to my friend Jean-Louis who expended a lot of time and energy in helping me edit earlier drafts. Fourth, I would like to thank the following people for the guidance and help they provided in either getting me to the University of Manitoba or in the initial development of the thesis: Monica Wiest, Dr. J.L. Chodkiewicz, Dr. Ray Wiest, Dr. Harold McGee, Professor Susan Walters and Professor Chris Fletcher. Fifth, and extremely important, I would like to thank Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity's staff and volunteers for their cooperation and assistance in this research. Sixth, and certainly not least, for without them there would not be this large pile of paper called a thesis, I would like to express my gratitude to the homeowners who participated in the network interviews. Specifically, I would like to thank the 10 Habitat homeowners for their candor, patience, humour and enormous help in collecting the necessary social network information central to this thesis.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	p.i
Table of Contents.....	p.ii
List of Tables.....	p.iv
List of Acronyms.....	p.vi
Chapter One – Introduction.....	p.1
Chapter Two – Literature Review.....	p.10
Urban Decay.....	p.12
Residential Mobility.....	p.16
Urban Danger/Fear.....	p.18
Urban Revitalization.....	p.20
Discussion of Concepts.....	p.26
Chapter Three – Methodology.....	p.29
Social Networks.....	p.31
Methodology.....	p.34
Chapter Four – The William Whyte Neighbourhood.....	p.47
Winnipeg (CMA) and William Whyte.....	p.49
Research Area.....	p.61
Chapter Five – Habitat for Humanity.....	p.75
Habitat for Humanity.....	p.78
Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity.....	p.81
Observations.....	p.96
Conclusions.....	p.98
Chapter Six – Established Homeowner Interviews.....	p.99
Demographic Characteristics.....	p.103
Interviews.....	p.104
Conclusions.....	p.114
Chapter Seven – Prospective (Habitat) Homeowner Interviews.....	p.117
Demographic Characteristics.....	p.119
Interviews.....	p.122
Conclusions.....	p.130
Prospective Habitat and Established Homeowner Comparisons....	p.132
Chapter Eight – New (Habitat) Homeowner Interviews.....	p.140
Transition to Chickney, Kapusko and Ruperts Avenues.....	p.142
Interviews.....	p.148
Conclusions.....	p.158
Chapter Nine – Conclusions.....	p.162
Policy Recommendations.....	p.170
Areas for Future Research.....	p.173

Notes.....	p.175
Appendices.....	p.176
Appendix A.....	p.177
Appendix B.....	p.179
Appendix C.....	p.182
Appendix D.....	p.185
References.....	p.183

List of Tables

1. Ethnic Origins (Winnipeg CMA and William Whyte).....	p.50
2. A) Family Structure Characteristics (Winnipeg CMA and William Whyte).....	p.51
B) Households with Dependent Children (Winnipeg CMA and William Whyte).....	p.52
3. Age Characteristics (Winnipeg CMA and William Whyte).....	p.53
4. Highest Level of Schooling Attained (Winnipeg CMA and William Whyte).....	p.54
5. Occupation Breakdown (Winnipeg CMA and William Whyte).....	p.56
6. Residential Mobility (Winnipeg CMA and William Whyte).....	p.57
7. Residential Housing Stock (Winnipeg CMA and William Whyte).....	p.58
8. Ethnic Origins (Research Area).....	p.62
9. A) Family Structure Characteristics (Research Area).....	p.63
B) Households with dependent children (Research Area).....	p.63
10. Adult Age characteristics (Research Area).....	p.64
11. Highest Level of Schooling Attained (Research Area).....	p.66
12. Employment Status (Research Area).....	p.67
13. Occupation Breakdown (Research Area).....	p.68
14. Length of Tenure on the Three Blocks (Research Area).....	p.69
15. Length of Tenure in the William Whyte Neighbourhood.....	p.70
16. Family Age Characteristics (Established Homeowners).....	p.103
17. Intimate Network Characteristics (Established Homeowners).....	p.105
18. Support received from intimate network members (Established Homeowners).....	p.107
19. Place-based networks (Established Homeowners).....	p.109
20. Family Age Characteristics (Prospective Homeowners).....	p.120
21. Intimate Network Characteristics (Prospective Homeowners).....	p.122
22. Support received from intimate network members (Prospective Homeowners).....	p.124
23. Place-based networks (Prospective Homeowners).....	p.126

24. Intimate Network Comparisons (Prospective and Established Homeowners).....	p.135
25. Comparison of support received from intimate network members (Prospective and Established Homeowners).....	p.136
26. Comparison of place-based networks (Prospective and Established Homeowners).....	p.137
27. Intimate Network Comparisons (Prospective and New Homeowners).....	p.146
28. Intimate Network Characteristics (New Homeowners).....	p.150
29. Support received from intimate network members (New Homeowners).....	p.152
30. Place-based networks (New Homeowners).....	p.153
31. Intimate Network Comparisons (New and Established Homeowners).....	p.158
32. Comparison of place-based networks (New and Established Homeowners)...	p.160
33. Comparison of support received from intimate network members (New and Established Homeowners).....	p.161

List of Acronyms

WHFH – Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity
HFH – Habitat for Humanity
ESWP – Ed Schreyer Work Project
CFP – Community Fix-Up Project
NIP – Neighbourhood Improvement Program
RRAP – Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program
M/WCRP – Manitoba/Winnipeg Community Revitalization Program
CIP – Community Improvement Program
CAI – Core Area Initiative
NCERC – North End Community Renewal Corporation
WHHI – Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiative
NEHP – North End Housing Project
CMA – Central Metropolitan Area
WW- William Whyte neighbourhood
LICO – Low Income Cutoff figures
WDA – Winnipeg Development Agreement
WWRA – William Whyte Residents Association

CH. 1 - INTRODUCTION

When I heard that Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity was attempting to initiate a project targeting a neighbourhood in need of help – William Whyte – I leapt at the opportunity to get involved and offered my services as a researcher. My first observations in this Winnipeg neighbourhood included several homes in disrepair (peeling paint, rotting wood, broken windows, etc.), litter on the streets including shopping carts, graffiti, empty lots and condemned notices on boarded-up houses¹. I knew the area had problems.

Located on the northern edge of Winnipeg's inner city, the William Whyte neighbourhood has been marked by a steadily decreasing population, economic decline, physical deterioration and a relatively high crime rate over the last thirty to forty years. As a result, the area has experienced a large portion of its existing housing stock being converted to rental units, a significant number of vacant lots and several abandoned or condemned houses dotting its streets.

These are symptoms of an important issue facing Winnipeg at the turn of the millennium: urban decay. An emigration of population, arson and other criminal activities, an aging housing stock, among other factors, have all contributed to the current state of affairs present in Winnipeg's inner city residential neighbourhoods.

As residents who can afford to, move away and sell their homes, often of older stock, the population for an area declines (Leo, Shaw et al. 1998). The remaining residents tend to be people who cannot afford to leave. Fewer people and a smaller tax base leads to aging infrastructure and decreased municipal services. Residential homes that are sold are often converted into cheap rental units leading to an increase in the

number of low-income renters. House maintenance often suffers under new landlords and residents who can no longer afford the cost of up-keep and repairs.

As the movements of new and short term residents in and out of the area becomes more frequent, the neighbourhood begins to transform into one in which neighbours are strangers and transitional. With this movement of residents, those individuals remaining become more wary of their neighbours and tend to withdraw socially, only keeping in contact with those people previously known (Merry 1981). Incidents of crime such as prostitution, drug use and juvenile delinquency increase. People no longer feel safe walking on area streets at night or alone (Ross and Mirowsky 1999).

The perceptions of urban danger/fear associated with residential mobility and urban decay often lead to social strategies of isolation. Social isolation signals a loss of social capital in an area, the web of protective networks between neighbours and local institutions. Social capital is often linked to the concept of neighbourhood stability.

The higher concentration of lower-income and more mobile people, and the attached stereotypes and perceptions, begin to change the image of the neighbourhood amongst residents and through the media.

To counter this growing problem of urban decay and its associated issues, Winnipeg has been the birthplace for several urban revitalization and renewal projects organized and funded on the municipal, provincial, and federal levels since the 1960's. Not all of these efforts have been confined to government initiatives, as local residents and the non-profit sector have initiated numerous projects. One such organization is Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity (WHFH), which has been building homes in Winnipeg since the early 1990's.

In the year 2000, under the leadership of former Executive Director Mary Williams, WHFH had the idea to help people declining neighbourhoods in the inner city. William Whyte fit the criteria.

As part of its plans to help reverse urban decay in the neighbourhood, Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity initiated its Millennium Project in late 2000, culminating in July 2001 when 10 houses were built on three different residential blocks in William Whyte (Ruperts, Kapusko and Chickney avenues) through its Ed Schreyer Work Project (ESWP)². The ESWP was the second construction project to be undertaken under the umbrella of the Millennium Project. The objective of the now-defunct Millennium Project was to build fifty Habitat homes in one neighbourhood over a five-year period. Focusing on the north end neighbourhood of William Whyte, Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity (WHFH) wanted to help reverse the prevalence of urban decay in the area by improving the local housing stock, promoting a stronger sense of community among residents and by introducing more home ownership opportunities to local renters (WHFH Millennium Project Proposal, 2000: 2).

A subtle, but pointed, difference between the ESWP and previous construction blitzes was the pre-construction canvassing and public information awareness campaign carried out by Habitat volunteers among residents of the three affected blocks and the introduction of the Community Fix-Up Project (CFP). Canvassing was introduced to provide local residents with information about Habitat for Humanity and the changes about to take place on their block. The hope was to disseminate information about the organization and its aims in order to lessen local residents' fears that Habitat Homeowners would have a negative effect on the neighbourhood. To increase the levels

of acceptance, Winnipeg Habitat introduced the CFP. The plan was to initiate contact and interaction between the organization, current residents, and new homeowners through renovations of existing homes and beautification efforts (park clean-ups and painting, garbage pick-ups and grass cutting on boulevards, etc.) on the three affected blocks.

At the core of these efforts appears to be concern with the local perception of danger stemming from introducing new Habitat homeowners into the neighbourhood. Past experience had shown that building Habitat homes and moving families into new areas had often been met with misunderstanding and problems. Misperceptions of the new homeowners as being in receipt of social assistance led to disharmony amongst neighbours. Local residents, usually renters, wondered why such people received a new home while they did not. Local homeowners, on the other hand were apprehensive about the kinds of people their new neighbours would be. This misperception was often the basis for problems with Habitat homeowners integrating into their new neighbourhood and being accepted (Mary Williams – personal communication #1, 2000). Community building became an issue for the organization as a result of the aforementioned problems with previous construction projects. The organization began to realize that the success of placing Habitat homeowners in new homes, and sometimes new neighbourhoods, required paying more attention to the issues involved in the social integration with local residents.

The concept of the Community Fix-Up Project included strengthening ties between local residents while building new connections between them and the new homeowners. Instead of merely building a physical neighbourhood, WHFH embarked on building a community in a social sense. Concentrating on home renovations, Habitat's

objective was to give residents additional support and resources by encouraging neighbours to help one another, thereby mitigating the levels of fear. In attacking the prospect of the unknown, the project hoped to achieve personal connections between neighbours that would extend beyond the project itself.

By focusing significant attention on the affected residents and improving their local social ties, revitalization projects in inner city neighbourhoods are apt to be more successful in establishing greater neighbourhood stability than those projects with a focus solely on physical and/or cosmetic improvements. By strengthening and increasing the number of relationships between neighbours, more knowledge about the people living in the area is gained and trust can then develop. Knowing one's neighbours mitigates the fear of the unknown. Less fear often leads to more local involvement and involvement in an area supports a greater sense of belonging among residents. Involvement, personal investment and a sense of belonging help create vibrant neighbourhoods. A sense of belonging, local involvement, communication between residents, and personal investment creates and maintains local social capital.

This research attempts to assess the process and degree to which Habitat homeowners were integrated into their new neighbourhood and the reasons for their level of acceptance. The social networks (intimate and place-based) of participants were examined to determine the process of integration and acceptance using the following methodological techniques: survey/census, two formal interviews of Habitat homeowners conducted before and after their move-in dates, a formal interview with locally established homeowners conducted after Habitat homeowners moved into the neighbourhood, participant observation of Habitat construction and CFP activities and

general observation of Habitat meetings regarding the ESWP.

Intimate and place-based network information was collected to allow for an analysis of how the issues of residential mobility and urban danger/fear may have affected the integration process over time. Researchers such as Merry (1981), Sampson (1997) and Thomese and Tilburg (2000) have shown that mobility and fear affect the amount and types of interaction in a neighbourhood.

Before and after interviews of the Habitat homeowners involved in the ESWP were used to compile baseline data. This baseline compared the changes in neighbourhood/place-based networks, neighbourhood involvement and interaction, and the general sense of belonging. Essentially, this baseline compared the experiences and actions of Habitat families as they made the transition from being renters (prospective Habitat homeowners 'before' interviews) to being homeowners (new Habitat homeowners 'after' interviews). The comparisons of these interviews allowed conclusions to be drawn regarding changes in the group's intimate and place-based networks.

This research had four main objectives. They were: 1) to present existing neighbourhood conditions using standard social indicators (based on census data from Statistics Canada and this project's survey/census) and to use pre-build surveys of the affected blocks to gauge the perceptions of local residents (renters and homeowners alike) regarding where they live; 2) to illustrate the existing neighbourhood social networks (a formal interview of selected locally established homeowners) and patterns of social interaction (pre-build WHFH Residential Survey); 3) examine the process and impact of the Ed Schreyer Work Project on the existing social organization in the

neighbourhood using information gathered through informal interviews with the CFP Coordinator and two WHFH Executive Directors, the CFP Coordinator's Project Report, participant observation notes and the pre-build canvassing survey; 4) assess the level of integration and acceptance of the Habitat homeowners into their new neighbourhoods by analysing the formal interviews with homeowners (Habitat and local), Habitat managers' interviews and reports, and participant observation. Also, an evaluation of the effects of homeownership on the intimate and place-based networks of the Habitat families is carried out.

To this point a general outline of the main issues surrounding this research and its target location have been provided. What follows is a discussion of how these issues will be addressed and approached in order to evaluate Habitat's efforts.

Urban decay, residential mobility, poverty, urban danger/fear, the development cycle of families and revitalization efforts are all major concepts that will be addressed in more detail to show their interrelations in chapters two and three of this thesis.

A discussion of the methods employed in collecting the information used in this research and an operationalization of terms will be presented in the third chapter. Existing neighbourhood conditions will be presented and placed within the larger context of the Winnipeg Central Metropolitan Area (CMA) in chapter four. Habitat for Humanity's construction experiences in Winnipeg and the process and impact of the Ed Schreyer Work Project on existing neighbourhood social ties will be examined in the fifth chapter.

The sixth, seventh and eighth chapters summarize the responses provided by locally established homeowners, prospective and new Habitat homeowners during interviews. Chapter seven compares and analyzes the interview data provided by

prospective Habitat homeowners and locally established homeowners. This comparison revealed similarities and differences in the two groups' intimate and place-based networks, as well as their patterns of social interaction in their neighbourhoods. Chapter eight dealt with the transition from prospective to new Habitat homeowners. This chapter tracked the changes in their intimate and place-based networks as well as their patterns of neighbourhood social interaction. The similarities and differences between new Habitat and established homeowners were evaluated to assess the effects of homeownership. That is to say, to gain insight into the possibility that the intimate and place-based networks of new homeowners begin to take on the form and function of established homeowners. Chapter nine ties the issues and data presented in this thesis together to assess two objectives: 1) assess the level of integration of Habitat families into their new neighbourhoods; and 2) evaluate the notion that homeownership increases personal and neighbourhood stability.

10/1/11

10/1/11

10/1/11

CH. 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW

The National Crime Prevention Council of Canada (1997:4) stated that social capital is the:

“...protective network of supportive and positive relationships among children, parents and families, social institutions, and all community members. When these relationships are strong and working effectively, they improve the ability of a community to meet the material, emotional, physical, mental, and spiritual needs of all its members. ...When these relationships are weak or ineffective, they limit the ability of communications and social institutions to reduce risk factors, isolations, and vulnerability in families and youths.”

The above statement brings together many of the ideas presented in this chapter. Stable and socially interactive neighbourhoods require residents who choose to stay in one place for an extended period of time and who know, or at least talk informally to, one another. Through prolonged exposure this process of communication paves the way for trust and mutual concern to develop between neighbours. Concern and trust are often developed during conversation, but also through such activities as trading personal property and exchanging child-care. A sense of belonging and attachment to an area depend on these types of relationships among neighbours.

The overriding themes in this thesis are the relation of neighbourhood interactions among residents and the factors affecting such behaviour. In this research, the probable factors influencing interactions between neighbours are urban decay and its associated trends of residential mobility and a sense of urban danger/fear. Neighbourhoods experiencing urban decay display specific social and physical symptoms. Some of these symptoms include social problems such as criminal activities, a significantly high school drop-out rate, neglected properties, and a lack of neighbourly interaction and concern for one another.

The task in this chapter is to discuss the concepts of urban decay, residential mobility, urban danger/fear and urban revitalization to better outline the approaches and definitions used here as well as to show the interrelationships of the concepts. This discussion will also show the relevance of these concepts to building social capital and/or social stability in decaying neighbourhoods.

Urban Decay

Inner cities in North America and around the World suffer from a popular media-created image depicting them as violent, crime-ridden, dangerous, and home to society's lowest members and lacking any sense of social control or sense of social unity. Several researchers agree that coverage by the media is disproportionate to the levels of violent crimes being committed overall and lends to the dismissal of the inner city by the general public (Flusty 1997; Glassner 1999; Low 2001; von Hoffman 2003). Low (2001) argued that a fear of this violence and crime leads to the desire to leave the inner city for suburbs and urban fringes.

As more and more residents have left the inner city, urban sprawl has been the result. The pattern known as 'urban sprawl' involves the relocation of commercial and residential development to an urban area's edges and bordering areas from its traditional sites in urban centres (Burgess 1929; Bradway Laska et al. 1982; Leo, Shaw et al. 1998; Gainsborough 2002). This pattern has resulted in a shifting of urban residents from inner city neighbourhoods to those in the suburbs, causing a decline in the number of people living in city centers and adjacent areas. Burgess (1929) noted that as business and industry were moving into areas adjacent to residential neighbourhoods, those people

with the financial means opted to move to the suburbs where it was less crowded. As municipal infrastructure was developed and transportation to peripheral areas continued to improve, the number of inner city residents moving into those areas increased. Gainsborough (2002) argued that sprawl not only diverts investment and people away from the inner city, but also siphons off local resources, such as municipal taxes and funding, to provide infrastructure development in the new areas.

According to Leo, Shaw et al. (1998), as the exodus of middle class residents and businesses continued, the inner city began to be perceived as an area good only for those people with no other options available to them. The population of the inner city declined, while at the same time the proportion of lower income people increased. This process served to isolate the lower income portion of society from other socio-economic classes.

In these areas of increasing isolation, social problems such as substance abuse, low education levels, gang activity, prostitution, juvenile delinquency and unemployment tend to be prevalent. More serious forms of crime (such as violence and theft) tend to result from a concentration of these social problems. The increasing prevalence of crime in a specific area forces normally law-abiding people to participate, flee or be victimized (Nettler 1974; Merry 1981). An area with increasing, or consistently high, crime rates is an indicator of high risk to insurance companies. These companies often start refusing to open policies regarding theft and/or fire. Similarly, bank loans become harder to attain for mortgages and home or business renovations (Leo, Shaw et al. 1998).

Douchant (1994) has argued that emigration from the inner city to the suburbs leaves the older housing stock behind to be filled by lower income households. However, older housing stock often requires more up-keep, and therefore more cash infusions

(Galster 1987). An influx of lower income residents essentially precludes investing in house and property maintenance, which adds to the deteriorating image of the area. Meanwhile, other houses are often bought and rented out by landlords seeking to earn a profit. In areas of declining property value, regular or needed property maintenance may be delayed as a result of the associated costs or as a result of landlords trying to maximize profitability. As area property values decrease, so too does the ability of homeowners to recoup investments in housing and property maintenance. It no longer becomes worth the money or effort for some homeowners to maintain their property. Houses and properties begin to fall into disrepair.

Over time, less comprehensive insurance policies and lower property values can result in owners abandoning houses and commercial structures to avoid paying property tax for dilapidated buildings. Houses are torn down and not replaced, leaving empty lots on the neighbourhood landscape. Abandoned and boarded-up houses symbolize the assumed attitudes of neglect and apathy present in neighbourhoods. These structures create an image that the area is dirty and unhealthy and, in some areas, dangerous. They serve as a visible daily reminder of the area's fortunes and inability to improve local conditions. Specifically, vacant or condemned houses as a result of acts of arson may be a very strong reminder of the potential for crime to occur in that area. While crimes committed against persons or personal property tends to be centred on, and largely visible only to, individuals experiencing them there are some actions that affect an entire neighbourhood. In particular, acts of arson resulting in abandoned or condemned structures may serve to keep local residents persistently aware of potential local dangers. Acts of arson may therefore have a longer-lasting impact on the wider neighbourhood, in

comparison to more personally experienced crimes.

Research has shown that more crimes tend to be committed within the area immediately surrounding abandoned houses (Brown University - website #14, 2004). These crimes include vandalism, graffiti and drug use. Therefore, boarded up houses and uncared for properties affect crime prevention and local perceptions of safety and danger (Accordino and Johnson 2000).

Various social agencies and the three levels of government in Canada have employed demographic measures to track the symptoms of urban decay. Some of these social indicators are:

- Physical signs of disorder such as - older housing stock, derelict or abandoned buildings, empty lots, properties in disrepair (Brownlee 1995; Ross et al. 2000);
- High proportions of - renters, low-income households, lone-parent families, unemployment and social assistance-dependency;
- Low proportions of formal educational attainment,
- Decreasing populations.

It is difficult to say how the chain of urban decay begins exactly, but each of the social indicators listed above interrelates directly or indirectly with each other. To summarize the information on urban decay briefly: Low-income individuals generally display certain characteristics that help to explain the low annual income their household earns, or their lack of disposable income. For example, people with low-incomes tend to have lower levels of formal education that often serves to limit career opportunities to

low-paying jobs. Unemployment and a reliance on government assistance are also common among this group, as is a propensity for non-traditional family structures. Married couples, while still significant, give way to higher percentages of common-law couples and lone parent families. Statistically, these non-traditional families tend to earn lower annual incomes than married couple families (Statistics Canada website #10a, 2004). A significant proportion of low-income households tend to have children, many of whom are young, which essentially means less disposable household income. In general, ethnic minority households, particularly immigrants, may be more prone to earning low annual incomes than the society majority. This trend may be due, in part, to recent immigration or a lack of familiarity with the English language and culture of the host society.

Entrepreneurs buy relatively inexpensive older houses to make a profit by renting them out to tenants at relatively low rates. These suites attract low-income households, simultaneously increasing a neighbourhood's proportion of renters. Earning low-income increases a household's vulnerability to fluctuations in rental rates, often leading to a propensity for mobility.

Residential Mobility

Residential mobility affects the ability and willingness of neighbours to create and maintain social relationships. Relationships between neighbours require trust and a reason for personal investment in them. One such reason is the expectation that an individual plans to live at a specific address for the foreseeable future. If new neighbours are apt to move away within a relatively short period of time after moving into an area,

people tend to be cautious in extending friendship.

According to Rohe and Stewart (1996), neighbourhoods with lower resident turnover rates are more likely to have higher resident satisfaction, more local friendship ties, and more confidence in the future of the area. Jacobson (1971 in Merry 1981) proposed that the development of relationships with an expectation of continuity is crucial to creating trusting relationships within urban settings. Sampson et al. (1997) continued this idea by suggesting that mobility diminished the ability of neighbours to develop and maintain informal social relationships and created obstacles for neighbours to work together to enforce local social control, thus increasing the likelihood that neighbours would remain strangers. Thomese and Tilburg (2000) furthered this line of thought when they argued that greater mobility in a neighbourhood is connected to including fewer neighbour's in one's personal network.

However, Merry (1981) cautions that long-term co-residence in a neighbourhood does not necessarily guarantee harmony and goes on to suggest that close proximity may even escalate hostility in a neighbourhood if inconsiderate behaviour by one's neighbours is interpreted in ethnic terms. In relation to this point, Leo, Shaw et al. (1998) bring attention to the detail that ethnic minorities tend to be represented in higher proportions in inner city neighbourhoods, such as William Whyte. Therefore, the possibility that such interpretation could occur increases. Racism and ethnic stereotypes/prejudices can affect relations between neighbours, particularly short-term residents. The opportunity to become familiar with these frequently mobile residents is fleeting at best.

Pérez (2002) suggests that people may develop "supportive, place-based networks" with merchants, neighbours and local institutions such as schools. This leads

to the wider concept of neighbouring, which is made up of neighbours' social interactions. Unger and Wandersman (1985) defined these social interactions as including activities such as informal visiting, relying on neighbours for emergency aid and trading partnerships with personal belongings. Bolland and McCallum (2002) furthered this definition of social interactions by arguing that neighbouring helped establish and test the limits of trust and goodwill between residents. Mechanisms of social control in the neighbourhood, such as neighbour-intervention, rely largely on conditions of mutual trust and solidarity among neighbours (Sampson et al. 1997). A conceptual thread linking these arguments of neighboring is that residential mobility lays the foundation for being unable to trust one's neighbours. It creates an unknown quantity in a neighbourhood where people are constantly moving in and out of the area.

Urban Danger/Fear

Buendia (1989:ix) stated that the high incidence of crime in urban areas carries "...a heavy toll of human suffering, economic waste, the despair of concerned citizens, and general deterioration in the quality of life." With violent images of their neighbourhood reported by local media and local incidents providing a constant reminder of living in a decaying area, local residents have to deal with their living environment in ways very different from suburbanites. Feelings of isolation, danger, and a fear of the unknown may be omnipresent amongst inner city residents.

An important factor for measuring community cohesion and neighbourhood satisfaction is the local perception of neighbourhood disorder and the resulting sense of danger. Ross and Mirowsky (1999: 413) defined social disorder as "...signs indicating a

lack of social control that involve people. Signs...include fights, trouble among neighbours and the presence of people hanging out on the streets drinking, taking drugs, panhandling and creating a sense of danger." These signs and others, such as litter on the streets and unmaintained properties etc., act as signals to residents and visitors alike that an area may not be safe (Merry 1981).

Referring to this sense of danger that residents experience in an urban setting, Merry (1981) argued that fear of crime contributes to the prevalence of crime, serving to break down social cohesion and undermine neighbourly sociability and concern for others. If people are no longer talking with or looking out for each other, then a feeling of isolation in one's own neighbourhood may set in. Riger (1993) argued that informal conversations among neighbours are one of the most important forms of participation in a neighbourhood. The importance of these types of conversations comes from their ability to allow a resident to choose with whom they will interact on an on-going basis. This interaction, according to Bolland and McCallum (2002) will occur only when there is mutual trust.

Social adaptations such as isolationism can be encouraged by a perception of danger and other unknown factors in a neighbourhood. This strategy affects the entire neighbourhood when a majority of residents participate. If people no longer care about, or can control, their living environment then larger societal expectations of values and behaviour may be deemed no longer applicable. Outsiders come to think of an area's residents as unpredictable and capable of violence or other crimes. Local residents no longer know whom to trust, as new residents are continually cycling through. Media reports focus almost solely on these crimes, largely ignoring the efforts of some

neighbours to change their surroundings for the better. Therefore, an image of an area where improvement is near impossible and where danger abounds takes root in an individual's mind, whether they are a neighbourhood resident or not.

Brodsky (1996) investigated this phenomenon by performing intensive interviews with ten women living in a dangerous area of Washington, D.C. She reported that the women who were apparently doing quite well "in the face of considerable uncertainty and danger" had adapted by focusing their attention and energies on their families rather than their neighbourhood. She went on to argue that this allowed these women to focus on their own abilities and resources, rather than the negative parts of where they lived.

For those residents who want to improve their neighbourhood, Bolland and McCallum (2002) argued that Brodsky's (1996) findings present a significant challenge. They suggested that in order to strengthen the bonds of neighbourhood, residents must appeal to the individuals like those in Brodsky's study whose own success was predicated on isolating themselves from their neighbourhood.

The question remains: what is the best approach to use in turning back the tide of urban decay and its associated symptom of urban danger/fear?

Urban Revitalization

With problems ranging from low property values, high numbers of rental units, low incomes and relatively high crime rates - how can neighbourhood satisfaction, safety and stability be enhanced? Many different approaches have been employed as the revitalization of urban areas can take many forms. Four types of revitalization projects are: large scale redevelopment, gentrification, in-fill housing, and incumbent upgrading.

Large-scale redevelopment often takes the form of money-intensive mega projects encompassing large tracts of land, such as London's Docklands in the 1980's and 90's (Hall 2001) and Winnipeg's Portage Avenue area in the 1980's (Winnipeg Core Area Initiative 1992). Many large-scale projects tended to be designed by developers and planners and imposed on citizens. More recently however, public consultation and input has become part of the planning and development process, as in the case of the Winnipeg Core Area Initiative. As the scale of Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity's project investigated here is not compatible with this form of urban revitalization, the remainder of this section will focus on the other three types.

Gentrification is the process resulting from the movement of several middle and high-income households into inner city neighbourhoods with a declining population, predominantly low-income households and an aging housing stock. The housing stock is restored and renovated through private investment by these new households which often leads to two things: an increase in local property values and the out-migration of low-income residents who can no longer afford to live there anymore (Kerr 1992; Carter and Douchant 1999).

Clay (1979) described incumbent upgrading as the physical improvement of a house (possibly including property) by the current resident. As a form of neighbourhood improvement, this approach maintains neighbourhood ambience, and largely takes place in lower income, working class areas. Douchant (1994) further specified that incumbent upgrading takes place in low-income areas with a large proportion of homeownership, higher than normal for other inner city neighbourhoods.

The main difference between gentrification and incumbent upgrading is that

incumbent upgrading does not result in a change in the socioeconomic characteristics of the area's residents. In-fill housing is very similar to gentrification with the exception of the smaller scale in which it takes place, usually one house at a time. Therefore, Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity's efforts should not be confused with gentrification, as their homeowner partners are by definition low-income households much like their new neighbours. Any home renovations, property enhancements or beautification of the surrounding neighbourhood completed via the Community Fix-Up Project did not affect the demographic make-up of the residential block. In-fill, incumbent upgrading and gentrification are all based on the assumption that homeownership leads to greater area stability.

In-fill housing seeks to construct buildings on empty or abandoned property in existing urban residential neighbourhoods (Douchant 1994; Suchman 2002). Abandoned or condemned structures are often torn down, and the land is prepared for new housing. Suchman (2002) has reported several successful projects targeting inner city neighbourhoods in American cities such as Cincinnati, Sacramento, Houston and San Antonio.

Private land developers preferring the larger tracts of land in urban fringe and suburban areas often ignore city cores. Larger housing developments minimize costs and maximize profits while smaller in-fill projects vary in their needs and tend not to be as cost-efficient. Inner city empty lots vary in size and shape as well as price and availability.

Municipalities, in conjunction with non-profit organizations such as Habitat for Humanity and California's Rancho Housing Alliance, are taking advantage of this land

opportunity by building houses for low-income families (The Desert Sun - website #15, 2004). Municipal governments have a vested interest in replacing empty lots or vacant buildings with new and actively used structures. On the other hand, non-profit housing organizations have a vested interest in obtaining cheap land for their projects in order to keep costs low. In the case of California's Rancho Housing Alliance and many Habitat for Humanity affiliates, arrangements are made with municipalities to obtain inner city vacant lots or buildings for very low prices. The result of these arrangements are often the placement of tax-paying families, often dedicated to an area and their new home, where none had previously been.

Some of the issues facing in-fill constructions are the availability of land for development, maintaining the natural landscape of the area, inconveniences to local residences such as increased traffic and noise, and neighbourhood character. Developers have made efforts to blend the design of the new buildings into the architecture of the existing neighbourhood for some time. This allowed for the continuity of landscape and maintenance of neighbourhood character. The idea is to maintain social cohesion between neighbours by attempting to keep emotions such as envy in check (Suchman 2002).

One of the main advantages to non-profit organizations conducting in-fill housing is the generally low cost of obtaining property in inner city neighbourhoods suffering from urban decay and its associated issues. A major drawback of in-fill housing, for the purposes of housing low-income people, is the fact that the houses are constructed predominantly in inner city neighbourhoods. Individuals receiving housing in inner city areas must also deal with the associated prevalence of local crime, physical signs of disorder and social issues. However, Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity has attempted to

address this issue by recruiting low-income families, meeting the organization's homeowner criteria, from the inner city neighbourhoods in which the houses are being built. In this way, potential homeowners are already familiar with the neighbourhood and its particular issues and can maintain their attachments to the area and its residents, as they make investments in their new home and property.

Steele (1990) argued that several advantages of homeownership included control over housing maintenance and moving decisions, more equity, and more 'security of tenure'. While alluding to social and personal benefits, Steele appeared to focus more on the financial aspect of homeownership. Blum and Kingston (1984) argued that homeowners had a finance-based bias toward social stability, as this type of area stability would help protect their investment in property. Based on the research regarding neighbourhood so far, social stability refers to generally positive perceptions of the neighbourhood, feelings of safety and security, relative predictability of neighbours and activities affecting the local area, and a healthy and strong social bonds among neighbours.

Rohe and Stewart (1996:39) listed four neighbourhood aspects that could be stabilized by homeownership. They are: "1) Length of tenure of current residents; 2) Property values; 3) Physical conditions of property; 4) Social conditions in the neighbourhood, such as school drop-out or crime rates". In essence, Rohe and Stewart said that homeowners make a significant contribution to an area's social stability through their own personal stability. Several other researchers have argued that a positive connection exists between homeownership and neighbourhood stability. Harkness and Newman (2003) concluded that homeownership had a positive influence on the outcome

of children, irregardless of the type of neighbourhood – stable or unstable. Aaronson (2000) agreed that homeownership increased residential stability, in terms of mobility, and that it also correlated to higher levels of education. DiPasquale and Glaeser (1999) argued that even with the positive effects on children, owning a home may generate other favorable social benefits such as more active and informed neighbourhood residents.

In terms of Rohe and Stewart's (1996) position on length of tenure, Lee et al. (1994) agreed, stating that being a homeowner or a long time resident reduced the chances of changing addresses in the future. By staying at one address for an extended period of time, residents have more opportunities to get involved in relationships with neighbours and local organizations working toward resolving issues that affect the neighbourhood. A resident begins to form social attachments to the local area through their connections to neighbours, local resources and businesses. Blum and Kingston (1984:173) argued that homeowners were more likely to join voluntary organizations and "...be enmeshed in local, neighbourhood-based social networks." They went on to state that an active community life is an asset to property value and homeowners may participate in voluntary organizations motivated out of concern for this value.

Despite the motivations that lead residents to socially interact with neighbours and the benefits that homeownership bestows, informal mechanisms for social control in the neighbourhood is a different matter. One aspect of this social control is keeping up with property and house maintenance. Galster (1987) argued that the level of social interaction in the neighbourhood had no apparent impact on the upkeep of property. Familiarity with one's neighbours and contact was only important if 'collective solidarity sentiments' were the results. Collective solidarity refers to a simultaneous presence of

individual and collective identification with the neighbourhood between residents (Galster 1987). In essence, it is not enough for one resident to identify with an area to affect other neighbours' behaviour. It is not enough for several neighbours to identify with their neighbourhood to affect an individual's behaviour. Both individual and group must share a concern with neighbours and neighbourhood simultaneously in order to affect change.

Discussion of Concepts

Revitalization projects aimed at helping areas in need have to understand that changing the physical landscape does not necessarily ensure a change for the better in the social landscape. Some issues that are important to take into account are residents' well-being and providing for their needs. Some of the most basic needs are material (housing and nutrition), while other needs allow for an individual's well-being. In essence, 'well-being' refers to the presence of strong social capital, as the National Crime Prevention Council of Canada has defined it (see page 1 of this chapter). Strong protective ties among neighbours and local institutional resources increase the ability of a community to meet its members' varied needs. The Millennium Project, initiated by Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity (WHFH) in 2001, attempted to increase social capital and social stability by improving relations between residents on three inner city blocks.

Many factors affect social stability, especially in inner city neighbourhoods affected by urban decay and its associated issues of residential mobility and a pervasive perception of danger/fear. These factors serve to weaken a neighbourhood's social capital by undermining its social stability. Stemming from the shorter length of tenure of low-

income renters, long-term residents come to expect a lack of continuity in the area. The short-term stays of many new residents results in an inability to predict their behaviour and a breaking down of a neighbourhood's social solidarity. Higgitt (1994) states that some of the factors that inducing low-income renters to move frequently may involve changes in family composition, the physical condition of housing or problems with building caretakers and/or landlords. In addition, fluctuating rental rates may also influence the decision to change addresses. Due to the shorter length of tenure, low-income renters have a more difficult time of developing social attachments to an area.

The unknown factor represented by many short-term neighbours, more children and a noticeable crime rate creates mistrust among neighbours as they are unsure what to expect. Mistrust and a fear of the unknown undermine neighbourly interactions and social cohesion in the area. The social capital elements of safety, security and a protective network of relationships between neighbours change into strategies of isolation.

A basic assumption in many plans designed to increase social stability in a specific area is to increase homeownership. Rohe and Stewart (1996) based their assertions on the assumption that homeownership led to greater trust and therefore more neighbourhood solidarity. Their logic is understandable. The longer one lives in an area, the more opportunity neighbours have to get to know one another – either through direct conversation, observation, or gossip. This lends to a certain predictability of an individual's behaviours and habits. Once you can reasonably predict another person's behaviour, a certain amount of trust appears inevitable.

Researchers have found that homeowners are invested in their home and neighbourhood. Due to their motivation to stay in one place for an extended period of

time, homeowners are more likely to develop social attachments to the place in which they live. They tend to have place-based networks with neighbours and become involved in local organizations. All of these tendencies promote social stability through establishing neighbourly relationships and social cohesion, which allows an area's residents to enact informal mechanisms of social control. Nozick (1992:162) argued that:

“Crime and violence are the products of social alienation; the antidote is building communities where people feel a sense of belonging and identity. It has been demonstrated that when people feel ownership of their neighbourhood, when they bond together as a community, then incidents of crime decrease.”

These processes of control also provide a means with which residents can address threats to the local area's stability.

Social stabilization through home ownership is a key part of the ESWP's objectives for William Whyte. By introducing people who want to stay in a particular area, it is Habitat's hope that this will stem the tide of a decreasing population in at least part of Winnipeg's inner city. This in turn will aid in the creation of a more stable social structure, through stronger personal ties between neighbours on the affected blocks.

Employing its traditional strategy of in-fill housing, but also by venturing into incumbent upgrading with the participation of local homeowners, WHFH attempted to break down the barriers of danger associated with new residents in the area. The organization was aware that issues of residential mobility and an enhanced sense of caution regarding new residents were important factors to local residents. Therefore, WHFH attempted to go beyond their mandate of simply building houses by trying to build a sense of neighbourhood as well. It was the organization's aim to help build social capacity in William Whyte by increasing social stability in the neighbourhood.

CH. 3 - METHODOLOGY

The basic issues this research attempts to address are the enhancement of social stability through homeownership and the integration of Habitat homeowners into their new neighbourhood of William Whyte. Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity's Ed Schreyer Work Project completed work on ten new houses on three different residential blocks (Kapusko, Ruperts and Chickney avenues) in 2001. This project provided insight into the processes through which new homeowners were integrated into the area. This integration included the creation of social networks with local residents and the establishment of place-based social resources within the neighbourhood.

Social networks (notably, intimate and place-based networks) were used to uncover patterns related to these interactions and neighbourhood social structures. As examined in the Literature Review, the issues of residential mobility and a sense of fear/danger were addressed in relation to the formation and maintenance of social networks. Four methods (formal interviews were one method) were used in this research:

- Participant observation during Habitat activities;
- Formal interviews with Habitat staff;
- Formal social network interviews with locally established and new Habitat homeowners;
- Demographic survey/census of the three affected blocks in William Whyte;
- Observation of Habitat meetings.

These methods were designed to uncover different aspects and influences on participants' social networks by providing five different sets of data addressing different aspects of the neighbourhood and the revitalization project.

Social Networks

Everyone knows and interacts with other people. These people make up an individual's 'social network', which may include co-workers, family members, friends, neighbours, classmates, etc. These networks vary in size, composition and structure and can be seen in all social processes such as dances, sporting events and politics. For the purpose of this research, social networks refer to intimate and place-based networks. Through the analysis of social networks, researchers have examined social organization and larger societal issues from rural to urban settings.

A focus on how the notion of community was affected by industrialization helped develop network analysis' interest in social support relationships (Wellman 1982; Beggs et al. 1996). Based on research conducted in the 1970's by Wellman and Tilly in this area, Hampton and Wellman (1999:476) stated: "It is the sociable, supportive, and identity-giving interactions that define community, and not the local space in which they might take place." Therefore, this research did not limit itself to network members who lived in the same neighbourhood or on the same residential block, but instead placed an emphasis on social support relationships in general.

In this research, as has been shown by previous researchers such as Bott (1955), Epstein (1961) and Gutkind (1965), networks are viewed as important to an individual's well-being and as a support system. In recent years, network analysts such as Granovetter (1982), Wireman (1985), Hampton and Wellman (1999), Phillipson et al. (1999), and Thomese and Tilburg (2000) have investigated the resources that can be tapped through these ties. These ties can range from intimate (family and/or friends) to secondary relationships (coworkers, neighbours, acquaintances etc.) to those people barely known

(sales clerks, bus drivers, etc.). The available resources that are often accessed through intimate and neighbourhood-based networks range from emotionally supportive relationships, practical support (e.g. trading favours, personal property, labour and child-care) and locally based organizations (i.e. Schools, Residential Association, Church, Neighbourhood Watch, etc.). These relationships and group associations reinforce common values and trust between members, as people depend on one another.

Depending on their personal situations, individuals may rely on their social networks as sources of monetary and non-financial support. Fischer (1982:2) defined this network as “an individual’s relatives, friends and associates, the set of people with whom an individual is directly involved.” He went on to describe the concept of informal support as encompassing actions of counseling (listening or giving advice on personal matters), companionship (social activities, discussion of hobbies or interests), and practical care (discussion of work, help around the house, financial loan, etc.).

An interest in investigating local social interactions and connections has resulted in a focus on the intimate and place-based networks of local and Habitat homeowners on Ruperts, Kapusko and Chickney avenues. Interview questions were targeted to reveal different aspects of a family’s social network in order to provide insight on their formation, maintenance and function. Information such as the location of network members, frequency of contact, sources of support, and the nature of these relationships were sought.

Physical proximity can affect the opportunities to give assistance to intimate network members, opting instead for nearby secondary ties (Wellman and Hampton 2000). Secondary ties can include acquaintances, coworkers and neighbours, among other

people. In essence, a portion of this research's focus was placed on an investigation of these secondary ties, namely interactions and relationships with those neighbours not mentioned as intimate networks.

In terms of urban neighbourhood relationships, several social analysts agree that physical proximity affects their maintenance. Fischer (1982), Phillipson et al. (1999), Hampton and Wellman (2000), and Thomese and Tilburg (2000) argued this in relevance to relative locations of neighbourhood residents. Neighbours who live next door or directly across the street from one another are more likely to see each other and have more opportunity to communicate. This communication leads to a familiarity with each other and can result in a deepening friendship or other type of relationship. Establishing this relationship is based on the creation and extension of trust between neighbours. The level of trust between neighbours can be seen in the type of relationship they share. Different levels of trust are associated with different activities, such as talking about emotional issues, borrowing or lending personal property, helping one another with house maintenance or watching each other's child or children.

Related to this issue is how near a member lives to individuals in her/his network. No weighted value was placed on the physical proximity of network members, in relation to the nature or depth of their relationship, as multiple and convenient means of communication were currently available (i.e. telephone, e-mail, postal mail).

Methodology

The Ed Schreyer Work Project (ESWP) was carried out and involved several different groups of people. As the project targeted three residential blocks in the neighbourhood of William Whyte, all of their residents were either directly or indirectly affected. Ten families were chosen as partners to assume ownership of the Habitat homes built on these blocks. Habitat staff and volunteers planned, organized and carried out the ESWP and its associated activities such as the Community Fix-Up Project (CFP).

Four methods were employed to solicit information from these groups of participants and affected residents:

- A) **Participant Observation** - Participant Observations were conducted during Habitat construction activities to look for interactions between local residents and new Habitat families. These observations permitted a viewing of the initiation of social ties, or withholding of them, between these two groups. These insights provided depth to the information gathered through the formal interviews.
- B) **Census/Survey** - The survey/census gathered demographic information from residents of all three affected blocks, allowing for an analysis of patterns in education levels, ethnicity, and employment among both renters and homeowners.
- C) **Interviews** - Interviews were conducted with prospective Habitat homeowners (nine families before and after move-in) and locally established homeowners (four families) to garner in-depth information on local social interactions and sources of personal support³. Other

interviews were conducted with five other individuals who were connected to Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity and William Whyte revitalization efforts.

- D) **Observation of WHFH** - Observations of Habitat meetings involving staff, volunteers and the ten Habitat partners provided an opportunity to receive updates on Habitat's project activities and remain aware of developing relationships between the partners.

A) Participant Observation

Although Crane and Angrosino (1992) described participant observation's ideal as being one where the researcher spends several continuous months in the community of study, this was not possible here. The opportunity for participant observation was limited to the Community Fix-Up Project and WHFH construction activities, all of which were sporadic and short in duration (with the exception of the week-long ESWP). Jorgensen (1989) argued that a research problem, which he considered to be a special event by its limited size and location, could be tackled with qualitative data from direct observation and other applicable methods.

Hampton and Wellman (2000) and Jorgensen (1989) argued that participant observation permitted access to data otherwise difficult to obtain while aiding the process of building rapport with research participants. While I attempted to build rapport with both WHFH staff and the ten Habitat families, my efforts largely focused on the latter.

It was this interest in developing trust and a rapport that partially informed the decision to partake in participant observation. Rapport functions as a way to develop

trust. To do this in my investigation, I strove to be open and honest about the research, listen to what people had to say, provide disclosures about my life, establish common experiences (such as construction activities), keep my word and commitments, and offer my help to various Habitat homeowners for moving into their new home.

Hampton and Wellman (2000) illustrated how separating oneself from a service-providing organization can be beneficial to one's research. They were able to continue their research after problems arose in an experimental housing development between two corporations and the homeowners they were investigating. Based on their experience, part of my strategy was to inform all research participants - whether census/survey respondent, interview participant, volunteer or staff member - that I was working *with* WHFH but was not *part* of their organization. The immediate reaction from most people was a relaxing of shoulders and facial muscles, as they were tensed waiting for the catch after my introduction.

Through Mary Williams' (WHFH Executive Director in 2001) endorsement, I was able to gain access to all pre-construction sites, some WHFH files and meeting minutes, and the ESWP week of activities. In May and June (2001), WHFH began pre-build efforts - laying house foundations and plumbing, basement and first floor construction, etc. It was here that I participated in the construction efforts and observed HFH procedures, Habitat homeowner interaction and any involvement by local residents or passersby. I also used this time to build rapport with Habitat homeowners, to explain the research, and arrange meeting times for the formal interviews.

The Ed Schreyer Work Project took place in early July, 2001. It had been previously arranged with WHFH's Executive Director and Volunteer Coordinator for me

to work half a day on each of the ten houses under construction. It should be mentioned why I requested this arrangement. First, my personal reasons: I wanted to play a part in each homeowner getting their own home. It was important for me to help each — as a small way to thank them for their help with in my research. Second, for research purposes, working on all ten houses afforded maximum observation of the entire construction area and its participants, allowed a continuing rapport with homeowners, and permitted a different perspective on the build, its different stages, crews, and timetables for breaks and meals. It also eased any potential conflict between homeowners wondering why I only worked on one home for the week.

The work began on Friday, July 6th (2001), paused on Sunday and continued throughout the week of July 9th to the 13th. I was on-site July 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 and half of the 13th. I worked full days like any other volunteer, and stayed to work on the evening of July 9th.

During breaks in the morning and afternoon, crews from each block would gather around for refreshments laid out by Habitat volunteers. While I participated in the mingling and conversation that took place, I made an effort to observe any interactions Habitat homeowners might have with neighbours or each other. When possible I sat either with, or near, homeowners during these breaks and just joked or talked about the day.

Work for the day ended at 4pm and crews either dispersed for home or came together for supper at a local location. After supper, everyone would go home or to their dormitory, except those people working the Elf Crews.

The Elf Crews worked from 6 to 9pm and included day volunteers, Habitat homeowners and other volunteers who could not be there during the day. On Monday, July 9th, I worked an Elf Crew shift on one of the houses. The volunteers for that night consisted of the homeowner-couple and me. We were responsible for picking up construction debris (nails, packaging and wood scraps) from their yard, as well as other tasks not finished during the day. While working, the homeowners and I talked about their experiences with their soon-to-be neighbours and I observed the neighbourhood on a summer evening.

B) *Census/Survey*

Using categories from the Statistics Canada 1996 National Survey (Social Planning Council of Winnipeg 1996), a questionnaire was developed to gather recent census data for the three affected blocks (see Appendix A). It was designed to elicit general neighbourhood characteristics on mobility patterns, employment status and job information, level of education, and basic ethnic origins. This information allowed for the determination of basic social characteristics of renters and owners, as well as patterns in family size and stage in the family development cycle.

Families change over time with members' needs and interests. Fortes (1958) argued these changes are involved in a sequence he labeled a 'development cycle'. His conception contained three main phases encompassing marriage and child-rearing, the grown up children leaving home and starting their own families, and the death of the parents and assumption of the role of the old family by the new ones. However, Wiest (personal communication #10, 2000) stated that Fortes did not deal with domestic groups

that were outside of the 'nuclear family' conception of family at the time.

The point that should be emphasized, however, is that family members' needs and situations change as they age. Families with young children have different needs that connect them to other people than those families with teenagers or grown up children who no longer live with their parents. For example, in families with young children, babysitters are sometimes required and children have neighbourhood friends or are involved in local organizations (e.g. Girl Guides, Scouts, etc.). All of these things often have the affect of families becoming familiar with other families. As the children grow, they exert more independence and therefore tend to be less of a link between their parental figures and their friends' parents.

The census/surveys were administered face-to-face with residents as I traveled to the neighbourhood and knocked on doors on several occasions between September and December, 2001. Having their questions answered regarding the length, purpose and scope of the questionnaire, most residents decided to take part. Out of the ninety-two counted residences on Kapusko, Ruperts and Chickney avenues, sixty-two participated, ten chose not to, and twenty could not be reached after three attempts. This census questionnaire accounted for 178 block residents (88 females, 90 males).

C) Interviews

Structured/formal interviews were conducted with Mary Williams (former Executive Director of Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity [WHFH] at the time of the ESWP), Ken Bishop (Executive Director of WHFH after the ESWP) and Brent Gillon (Coordinator of the CFP in 2001). The interviews with Habitat staff clarified the details

and intentions of the organization's activities related to the ESWP and CFP before and after they were completed.

Unstructured interviews were carried out with Paul Hiebert (a founding member of WHFH), Annette Champion-Taylor (Co-Chairperson of the William Whyte Residents Association) and Dave Dessins (Winnipeg Housing Policy Coordinator, Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiative). These interviews provided background information on WHFH and more details on revitalization efforts taking place in William Whyte.

Three formal interviews, with structured formats, were carried out with nine of the ten Habitat partners and four local homeowners. Each of the three homeowner interviews comprised a different set of data related to the different social group being interviewed. Refer to appendices for detailed questionnaire as appropriate. The two social groups were: Habitat families (prospective and new Habitat homeowners) and locally established homeowners. Habitat families were interviewed twice, once before their new house was built and a second time seven months after moving into their new house. Established homeowners were interviewed once; a year after the Habitat families had taken up residence on Chickney, Kapusko and Ruperts avenues.

This data was compiled in order to permit three comparisons of the social patterns exhibited by each of the two groups. The first comparison involved the responses from the renters and the established homeowners to find where there were differences and similarities between the two groups. Was there a difference in intimate and place-based networks between renters and established homeowners? The second comparison involved the responses given by renters, before moving into their new houses and those supplied

by the new homeowners, seven months after their move-in, in order to determine whether or not social patterns had changed for these people with the addition of a new home. The third comparison involved the interviews with the new homeowners and established homeowners to determine the similarities and differences between the two groups. The main question to be answered for the third comparison was - "Does owning a home change your social patterns to more closely match established homeowners?"

Interview questions were open-ended in their structure to allow for the widest breadth of information from participants. Based on the work of Gunnarson (1990), Wellman and Wortley (1990) and Hampton and Wellman (2000), the interviews were designed as blocks of questions pertaining to specific issues.

The first interview involved thirty-eight questions and was administered before the ESWP began (see Appendix B). This set of interviews was carried out in late June and early July 2001, ending as the Blitz Week began (July 6th). In this interview, questions pertaining to intimate networks, emotional support, knowledge and interaction in the neighbourhood, practical and social support, people with children, local participation, and area perceptions were posed. Participants' responses provided a 'snapshot' of what renters' intimate and place-based networks looked like before buying homes and becoming area residents in August and September 2001.

The second interview asked forty questions after the Habitat families' move-ins were completed (see Appendix C). In this interview, the same categories and questions from the first interview were asked again, with the addition of questions concerning the Community Fix-Up Project (CFP) and the transition to their new neighbourhood. These interviews occurred in February and March, 2002. By this time, Habitat homeowners had

settled into their new homes – everything was unpacked, children were in school, new routines had emerged; etc. – permitting a view into any new social patterns or relationships which may have been formed in the interim.

The third interview, of local homeowners, posed the same forty questions as the second Habitat homeowners' interview with the addition of six questions regarding neighbourhood experiences and perceptions (see Appendix C). Due to scheduling and introduction problems local homeowner interviews took place in autumn 2002 and winter 2003.

While the three interviews focused on local (neighbourhood) relationships, emphasis was placed on the individual's network of intimate ties, regardless of where these people lived. Respondents listed those people considered as 'closest' to them (intimate ties) and they were accepted by this research, regardless of being kin or not, and regardless of the frequency in which these people were in contact with one another. In short, this research did not overrule respondents. If a respondent felt that someone belonged on their list, that individual stayed – even if the respondent never saw or spoke to them – based on informants' subjective evaluation of who was or wasn't "close".

Utilizing both Fischer's (1982) concept of informal support and Wellman and Wortley's (1990) sample interviews as references, the three formal interviews for this research were designed to solicit information on the issues of emotional support, companionship, and services extended or accepted. In terms of the types of support involved, relationships were examined to detect patterns of reciprocity. Not only did the interview questions soliciting information regarding intimate network members, they also focused on neighbourly exchanges by examining the types and frequency of support

traded. Different types of support indicate differing levels of concern and trust. For example, there is a significant difference in the level of intimacy and trust involved in lending personal property such as a rake and talking about the death of a loved one.

It is widely accepted by social network researchers that social networks, and the nature of relationships encapsulated within them, are dynamic and constantly changing (Bott 1955; Fischer 1982; Lerner 1990). As such, a time delay between administration of the first and second interviews was incorporated into the research design to provide Habitat homeowners time for acclimation to their new environment. This decision was supported by the research of Gunnarson (1990) and Hampton and Wellman (2000), as they argued that changes in social networks could be tracked in this format. Hampton and Wellman (2000) went on to highlight that neighbour selection for creating strong ties is usually completed within the first three months of moving into a new area.

Interview responses helped uncover patterns of reciprocal relationships (for goods and services), connections to neighbours through one's children, and the importance of kin and non-kin in individual intimate networks. Interview responses also permitted the communication between respondents and the location of their neighbours on the residential block on which they both lived to be tracked. The section of answers related to neighbourhood experiences shed light on the perception of danger/fear in the area.

In relation to the interviewed families and their responses, three notes are worthy of mention. The first involves an explanation as to why only nine of the ten Habitat partners were interviewed for this research. The second note explains how the established homeowners were selected and approached. The third note involves information regarding the interpretation of the data gathered from one of the interviews.

1. One out of the ten Habitat partners was not interviewed for this research as a result of circumstance. However, I was able to spend time with the partner-couple working on their house during the Ed Schreyer Work Project. This was accomplished during the one Elf Crew shift that I had filled on the evening of July 9th, 2001.

The day that I had scheduled to work on the partner-couple's house was towards the end of the Blitz Week. By the time the day had rolled around, there was very little left to do and most volunteers were encouraged to work on other houses. This was the mutually pre-arranged day to conduct the first (renter) interview with the partner-couple, but they ended up getting busy and could/would not find the time.

As a result of circumstances involving this couple's relationship together, they became unavailable for interviewing after moving into their new home and as a result were never interviewed.

2. The original research plan for this project involved interviewing local homeowners that participated in the WHFH's Community Fix-Up Project (CFP). As there was a lack of the anticipated level of participation in the CFP by block homeowners, a new group of local homeowners had to be found and contacted. The census/survey was used to find suitable candidates.

To narrow the field down, criteria such as homeownership and residence on the block for at least the previous nine years was adopted. Once these were met, the list was further pared down to include only those residents who fit into the same stage of the family development cycle as the Habitat homeowners – couples or single parents (preferably between the ages of twenty and fifty) with dependent children living at home. Ethnicity, education and employment status were not involved in the selection criteria. I

was looking for stable, established local homeowners. Ten names were identified and contacted, four decided to participate in the interview and six did not.

3. An important note to keep in mind for questions pertaining to neighbourly interactions in the second interview is the timing of the interview's administration. Most respondents noted a decrease in block activity with the onset of a Winnipeg winter and this affected their answers (although efforts were made to include experiences before winter's onset).

D) Observations

I attended several Habitat meetings in the first half of 2001 with WHFH prospective homeowners to discuss construction issues, their concerns, HFH guidelines, etc. At the first meeting, Mary Williams introduced me as a student researcher to those in attendance (homeowners, committee members and Brent Gillon). This acknowledgement and endorsement gave me credibility with the people I would later need to interview and interact with. Through this act, Mary Williams had provided me with the needed initial access to two groups of people who were important to this research: Habitat homeowners and WHFH staff. During these meetings, I kept track of the type and frequency of Habitat homeowners' interactions with one another. I also used this time to speak to each individual homeowner (lone-parent and/or couple) to introduce myself informally, quickly explain the nature and objectives of my research, and to request a time to meet and explain the research more extensively. This was met with success, as we agreed to meet during pre-construction activities.

The initial introduction and a letter providing me access to WHFH records by Mary Williams certainly eased later introductions to other WHFH staff and volunteers at construction sites and the office. This access also provided me with the Minutes of meetings, even those I could not attend, and a spot on the WHFH office e-mail list informing committee members of meeting times.

CH. 4 – THE WILLIAM WHYTE NEIGHBOURHOOD

All three levels of government and various non-profit organizations concluded that the William Whyte neighbourhood is in the grips of urban decay and requires assistance. This aid has taken the form of various funds, projects and programs from the government, private sector and non-profit organizations. The last section of this chapter describes a selection of these programs aimed at revitalizing areas of Winnipeg's inner city, particularly the William Whyte neighbourhood.

Using data collected from the 2001 Canadian National Census, this chapter describes the demographic characteristics of the inner-city neighbourhood of William Whyte. This data was used to make comparisons with the Winnipeg Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) for the purpose of providing a general description of the characteristics present in William Whyte. The social indicators presented in Chapter Two of this thesis were used as measures presented in this chapter: Education, Employment and Occupation, Ethnic Origin, Family Structure and Age Characteristics, and Residential Mobility.

A census/survey was administered by this researcher to the residents of Chickney, Kapusko and Ruperts avenues between September and December 2001. The collected data was used to describe the demographic characteristics of the three residential blocks affected by the Ed Schreyer Work Project. This description however, took on the added dimension of examining the differences and similarities between block homeowners and renters to establish the associated characteristics of neighbourhood stability.

Winnipeg (CMA) and William Whyte

Winnipeg is a slow-growth city in the south-central part of the Canadian province of Manitoba. In 2001, the National Census set the population of Winnipeg's CMA at 671,274 people (Statistics Canada website #10a, 2004). In Winnipeg, between 1971 and 1996, the largest increases in neighbourhood population took place outside of the inner city, while 60% of the neighbourhoods with the largest population decline were located within the boundaries of the inner city (Lezubski et al., 2000:28). William Whyte was one the neighbourhoods with the largest population decline.

William Whyte is the name of the north Winnipeg neighbourhood bounded by Main Street to the east, Arlington Street to the west, Redwood Avenue to the north, and Selkirk Avenue to the south (Dharsee and Edel 1994: 15). According to one of the two co-chairpersons for the neighbourhood's Residential Association, William Whyte is quite large in comparison to other inner city neighbourhoods and encompasses sixty-six city blocks (Annette Champion-Taylor - personal communication #8, 2004).

The neighbourhood has had a population decline of nearly 43% of its residents over the past thirty-years. Statistics Canada national census figures show that the population of the William Whyte neighbourhood has declined from 10,005 in 1971 to 5,730 people in 2001 (Dharsee and Edel 1994; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg 2001).

Historically, the neighbourhood has been known as an area consisting primarily of immigrants. Once dominated by people of eastern European descent, by 2001 it was more ethnically diverse as ethnic minority groups made up 59% of the neighbourhood population (see Table 1).

A significant proportion of the CMA's total population was those identifying themselves with specific ethnic groups (see Table 1).

Table 1: Ethnic origins⁴

Identity	Winnipeg CMA (total responses 1,150,125)	Identity	William Whyte (total responses 7,780)
North American Indian	3%	North American Indian	18%
Métis	3%	Métis	10%
Filipino	3%	Filipino	9%
Ukrainian	9%	Ukrainian	9%
Polish	4%	Polish	4%
English/French	21%	English/French	14%
German/Scottish/Canadian	32%	German/Scottish/Canadian	27%
Other (European, Asian, etc.)	25%	Other (European, Asian, etc.)	9%
Total	100%	Total	100%

Percentages calculated by figures and identity groups provided by Statistics Canada (website #10b, 2004; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, 2001).

What the data in Table 1 shows is the concentration of First Nations, Filipino and Métis people in the neighbourhood of William Whyte. The CMA was dominated by people of European descent (91%). William Whyte, while primarily composed of residents with European descent, also had over one-third (37%) of its population whose ethnic origins were First Nations, Métis or Filipino. This indicates a continuing trend of members of minority groups taking up residence in the neighbourhood and populations of previously dominant groups (Ukrainian and Polish) either moving away or remaining stable.

Families and Age Groups

The total number of families in Winnipeg during the 2001 National Census was 182,190 and was composed of married and common-law couples and lone parents. However, in 2001 single households comprised 30% of the total number of private households in the CMA (269,985) (Statistics Canada website #10a, 2004). In the smaller context of William Whyte, the total number of families in 2001 was 1,315 and comprised married couples, lone-parents and common-law couples (see Table 2A). Forty-one percent of the 2,355 households in the William Whyte neighbourhood were occupied by a single resident (Social Planning Council of Winnipeg 2001).

From this data it is apparent that, while the CMA has a much higher proportion of married couples, William Whyte has double the proportion of lone parents and almost double that of common-law couples. In addition, dwellings with single occupants were more likely in William Whyte than the CMA.

Table 2A: Family Structure Characteristics

Family Type	Winnipeg CMA (Total families: 182,190)	William Whyte (Total families: 1,315)
Married	72%	47%
Common-Law	10%	17%
Couple households with dependent children at home	52%	58%
Couple households without dependent children at home	48%	42%
Lone Parent	18%	36%

Percentages calculated by figures provided by Statistics Canada (website #10a, 2004; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, 2001).

The proportions of couple households, with and without dependent children, were calculated by adding the couple household (not families) information together for a

total. The two component parts - couples with dependent children and those without - then divided this total to provide a percentage of the total couple households (see Table 2B). Based on these calculations, William Whyte couples were more likely to have dependent children still living at home than CMA couples (Statistics Canada website #10a, 2004; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, 2001).

Table 2B: Households with Dependent Children

Family Type	Winnipeg CMA (Total families: 182,190)	William Whyte (Total families: 1,315)
Couple households with dependent children at home	52%	58%
Couple households without dependent children at home	48%	42%

Percentages calculated by figures provided by Statistics Canada (website #10a, 2004; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, 2001).

The average number of children varied with differing family structures. In Winnipeg CMA families, lone parents tended to have more children on average (1.6) than married (1.1) or common-law (0.7) couples (Statistics Canada website #10a, 2004). No reliable or usable data was available for William Whyte on this topic. Therefore, it appears that lone parent families tended to have more children, which translates into: the more lone parent families, the more children. The more children living in a neighbourhood means a higher proportion of young people in the area.

The Winnipeg CMA is composed of people primarily older than the age of forty-five and between twenty-five and forty-four years old. William Whyte is largely composed of people between twenty-five and forty-four years of age and people older than forty-five years old (see Table 3).

Table 3: Age characteristics of Winnipeg CMA and WW 2001 population

Age groupings (in years)	Winnipeg CMA Total Population (671,260)	William Whyte Total Population (5,730)
0-4	6%	8%
5-14	13%	17%
15-19	7%	7%
20-24	7%	7%
25-44	30%	31%
45-64	23%	19%
Over 65	14%	11%

Percentages calculated using figures and age groups provided by Statistics Canada (website #10a, 2004; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, 2001).

This table demonstrates a higher proportion of children younger than fourteen years of age in William Whyte and a corresponding higher percentage of people over the age of forty-five in the Winnipeg CMA. Therefore, there is a concentration of dependent children in William Whyte and a concentration of middle-aged and senior citizens in the CMA.

Education

In general, the Winnipeg CMA consisted predominantly of people with a High School diploma and/or post-secondary education. Among William Whyte residents however, a low level of education was normal as most individuals lacked a High School diploma (see Table 4).

Table 4: Highest level of schooling attained

Type of schooling	Winnipeg CMA total population over 20 years of age (403,245)	William Whyte total population over 20 years of age (3,900)
Less than High School (HS) graduation	22%	56%
With HS &/or some post-secondary	26%	19%
Trades certificate or diploma	12%	11%
College certificate or diploma	17%	8%
University degree certificate, diploma	23%	5%

Percentages calculated by figures and education levels provided by Statistics Canada (website #10a, 2004; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, 2001).

Overall, William Whyte residents had less formal education than those of the CMA. Notably, William Whyte had more than twice as high the proportion of residents who were without a High School diploma and only one quarter of the proportion of residents with a University degree or certificate as the CMA.

Income and Employment

The Canadian Federal government uses LICO (Low Income Cutoff figures) to identify “which families will likely devote a larger share of income to the necessities of food, shelter and clothing than the average family would” (Statistics Canada website #9, 2003). LICO is produced based on household size and the size of the community lived in, therefore, thirty-five different LICOs were being used in the latest federal census. In 2001, for a city the size of Winnipeg (500,000 people are more), the after-tax incomes included on this list were: for a family of three, \$24,013; for a family of four, \$29,908; for a family of five, \$33,428, etc (Paquet 2002).

In 2000, the federally published Low Income Cutoff (LICO) figures showed that 19% of residents living in Winnipeg's CMA had low-incomes (Statistics Canada website #10a, 2004). In William Whyte, the incidence of low-income in 2000 among the total population of private households was 54% (Social Planning Council of Winnipeg 2001).

Sixty-nine percent of Winnipeg CMA residents (total over 15 years of age – 345,730) were active participants in the labour force as compared to half of William Whyte's residents (total over 15 years of age – 4,280). Those individuals who did not participate in the labour force were not seeking employment, nor were they employed. Sixteen percent of William Whyte's labour force participants were unemployed as compared with six percent of CMA participants (Statistics Canada website #10a, 2004; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg 2001).

In 2001, the median income of husband-wife families living in Winnipeg's CMA was \$61,140 (Statistics Canada website #10a, 2004)⁵. In that same year, the median income for lone-parent families was \$29,548. Comparatively, in 2001 the median income for husband-wife families in William Whyte was \$37,279. Common-law couples earned a median income of \$29,575 and lone parents earned a median of \$17,764 (Social Planning Council of Winnipeg 2001).

A very dense concentration of low-incomes, higher unemployment rates, lower participation rates in the labour market and lower median incomes were clearly observable in the William Whyte neighbourhood. The prevalence of low-incomes was nearly three times as high among William Whyte residents in comparison to CMA residents. Perhaps this concentration is associated with the levels of formal education of its residents.

A quick read through the classified ads of any daily newspaper will show that most employers require at least a High School diploma or some post-secondary education. These positions do not guarantee high-wages. Table 5 lists the top six employment sectors for residents of the Winnipeg CMA and William Whyte.

Table 5: Occupation breakdown

Sectors of Occupation	Winnipeg CMA Total Experienced Labour Force (361, 725)	Sectors of Occupation	William Whyte Total Participating Labour Force (2,235)
Sales and Services	25%	Sales and Service	25%
Business, finance and administration	20%	Business, finance and administration	15%
Trades, transport, equipment operator and related	14%	Trades, transport and equipment operator and related	22%
Management occupations	9%	Management occupations	3%
Unique to manufacturing, processing and utilities	7%	Unique to manufacturing, processing and utilities	18%
Social Science, education, government service	8%	Social science, education, government service	3%

Percentages for Table 5 were calculated by figures and occupation groups provided by Statistics Canada (website #10a, 2004; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, 2001).

The most significant differences between CMA and William Whyte residents were the proportions engaged in largely lower skilled and menial labour positions. The largest difference was the concentration of 'Trades, transport, etc.' and 'Unique to manufacturing, etc' (i.e. factory work) employment among William Whyte residents.

Residents and Housing Stock

Between 1991 and 2001, the proportion of homeowners in the CMA increased from 61 % to 65% while the proportion of tenants decreased from 39% to 34% (Dharsee and Edel 1994: 4; Statistics Canada website #10a, 2004). During this period of time, 17,490 new dwellings were constructed within the CMA, which may account for this trend in increasing homeownership (see Table 7). However, in William Whyte the area's housing stock continued to fall into disrepair resulting in a shrinking number of homeowners. Between 1986 and 2001, William Whytes' owner occupancy declined from 45% to 37%, while tenant occupancy steadily grew from 55% to 63% (Dharsee and Edel 1994: 4; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg 2001). According to Fredrickson (1999), the William Whyte neighbourhood had experienced a sizeable increase in absentee ownership, rooming houses, and in public housing. These increases led to higher proportions of low-income renters living in the area and fewer locally-based landlords.

In relation to the proportion of renters and homeowners in the two areas, residents of the CMA were more likely to live at the same address for longer periods of time than William Whyte residents (see Table 6).

Table 6: Residential Mobility

Length of tenure at the same address	Winnipeg CMA total pop'n over 1yr old (654,055), over 5yrs old (622,520)	William Whyte total pop'n over 1yr old (5,660), over 5yrs old (5,285)
More than one year	85%	78%
More than five years	58%	46%

Percentages for Table 6 were calculated by figures provided by Statistics Canada (website #10a, 2004; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, 2001).

Most of the William Whyte residents were renters, as opposed to the predominant proportion of homeowners in the CMA. Despite this fact, Table 6 shows a predominant proportion of residents from both areas staying at one address for more than one year. The significant difference between the residents is long-term stability. William Whyte residents were more likely to move within five years of living at one address. Therefore, residential mobility was a significant issue for the neighbourhood as more than half of its residents moved to a new residence at least once every five years.

The situation in both the Winnipeg CMA and William Whyte in 2001 was one in which older housing stock continued to dominate the residential landscape (see Table 7). This stock in the CMA was slowly being replaced by newer homes (Statistics Canada website #11, 2004). However, between 1991 and 2001 the number of dwelling units existing in William Whyte declined from 2,635 to 2,350 (Dharsee and Edel 1994: 4; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg 2001).

Table 7: Residential Housing Stock

Years of housing stock construction	Winnipeg CMA - 2001 Total dwellings (269,985)	William Whyte - 2001 Total dwellings (2,355)
Before 1946	19%	61%
1946-60	20%	19%
1961-70	17%	8%
1971-80	21%	7%
1981-90	16%	4%
1991-2001	6%	Less than 1%

Percentages for Table 7 were calculated by figures and age groupings provided by Statistics Canada (website #11, 2004; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, 2001).

Dwellings built prior to 1960 (80%) dominated the housing stock in William Whyte. In comparison, a relatively similar proportion of the housing stock in the CMA

was constructed before 1980 (77%). Another significant difference between the two areas was the nearly complete lack of houses built in William Whyte after 1980, as opposed to 22% of the CMA housing stock. Therefore, it is readily apparent that Winnipeg's housing stock was being replenished by new constructions while William Whyte has a densely concentrated proportion of older and deteriorating dwellings.

According to Ogaranko (2001), 102 houses were demolished in Winnipeg between 1983 and the year 2000. William Whyte ranked second out of twenty neighbourhoods with the highest number of demolitions. In 1999 and 2000, William Whyte had 21 houses demolished, while area residents obtained 88 building permits. In the year 2000, almost 75% of all residential permits obtained in Winnipeg were for the purpose of alterations or additions to existing homes (Ogaranko 2001:33).

Summary

This data leads to the conclusion that there was a higher concentration of urban decay in William Whyte than in the rest of the CMA. William Whyte experienced many social problems that were associated with these concentrations. The higher proportions of the social indicators present were: low-income earners; low-income renters; lower levels of education; predominantly older housing stock; more residential mobility; less family stability, i.e. double the rate of lone parent and common-law families within William Whyte; and higher percentages of young dependent children.

Social Problems

Over the last twenty years William Whyte's social and economic problems have increased significantly. This is illustrated by the rising rates of crime and poverty.

The local environment has created a setting for illegal acts. For example, 40% of the commercial buildings in the north end were abandoned in the late 1990's and early twenty-first century (Western Economic Diversification Canada website - #16, 2003). Many criminal activities had been reported in the area in which no individual had been charged or prosecuted for a long period of time. A prominent example of this in Winnipeg's north-end was a rash of 80 arsons that took place in late 1998. The William Whyte neighbourhood had the highest incidence of fires set by these arsonists (Western Economic Diversification Canada - website #16, 2003). Abandoned commercial buildings, back-alley garbage bins, abandoned houses and garages were the most popular targets. It took several months before anyone was charged with these crimes (McIntyre 2000).

The rash of arsons illustrate that crime was occurring in the William Whyte neighbourhood. In addition, other forms of crime (such as prostitution and drug trafficking) have been reported by local residents and other researchers (Kohm 1997; Carter and Douchant 1999). It is this fact and local residents' perception of the number of crimes being committed in their area that leads to the issue of urban danger/fear. Based on personal experience, residents had their own perception of the frequency of criminal acts being committed.

Research Area

Sixty-two out of approximately one hundred dwellings situated on Ruperts, Chickney and Kapusko avenues participated in the census/survey, which accounted for 178 residents. The census/survey was administered only to the adult heads of the dwelling, although all of the dwelling's residences were, to my best knowledge, accounted for. However, some of the social indicator categories were limited to certain age groups or responses for the entire dwelling and therefore did not account for all of the blocks' residents. These categories were Employment and Occupation, Highest Level of Education Attainment, and Residential Mobility. Of the sixty-two residences, thirty-five were single-detached houses, twenty were duplexes and seven were apartments/suites in houses, as no apartment buildings were present in the research area in 2001.

In order to examine the issues of neighbourhood stability and the implications of homeownership on this stability, census/survey responses have been laid out in terms of renters and homeowners. In the research area, 53% of all resident respondents were renters, while 47% were homeowners. This division permitted a direct comparison and better understanding of the different issues each group faced and the factors involved in their situations.

A significant presence was the proportion of First Nations people who made up the largest ethnic identity group in the research area. First Nations and Métis people were more than two times as likely to be renters than were homeowners. Filipino individuals were more than six times as likely to be homeowners as renters, while local residents of European descent made up the largest proportion of homeowners in the research area (see Table 8).

Table 8: Ethnic origins

Identity	Homeowners (Total - 69)	Renters (Total - 46)
First Nations and Métis	26%	54%
Filipino	26%	4%
European, French, Ukrainian, Polish	39%	24%
Other (Southeast Asian, Religious, Multiple)	3%	17%

Thirteen homeowners and more than half of the renters claimed 'no identity' in response to this question. Therefore, these responses were omitted from the Table.

Families and Age Groups

Of the sixty-two respondent dwellings, there were 21 married couples, nine common-law couples, eight lone-parents and 50 single adults (see Table 9A). Of these single adults, twenty lived in a homeowner household and fifteen lived in a renter household. Only seven of these single adults lived alone in the home they owned and only eight lived alone in the residence they rented.

The information presented in Table 9A reveals the main differences in family structure between homeowners and renters. Homeowners consisted of three times more married couples than renters, while renters comprised nearly all (16/17) of the three block's common-law and lone-parent families. Renters were also more likely to have children and more of them.

Table 9A: Family Structure Characteristics of the three blocks

Family Type	Homeowners (Total – 29)	Renters (Total – 33)
Married	16	5
Common-Law	1	8
Single (individuals with no partner or children) - sole occupant	7	8
Single (individuals with no partner or children) - living with other occupants	20	15
Lone Parent	0	8

Out of twenty-one married couples, nine had no dependent children living with them, while twelve couples had dependent children living at home (see Table 9B). These twelve married couples had an average of two children living with them at the time of the census/survey. One-third of these children were younger than the age of ten, slightly fewer than half were between the ages of fifteen and nineteen and one quarter were between eleven and fourteen years old.

Table 9B: Households with dependent children

Family Type	Homeowners (Total – 29)	Renters (Total – 33)
Dwellings with dependent children	10	16
Dwellings without dependent children	19	17
Average number of children	2.0	2.4

Only two of the nine common-law couples were without children. The other seven common-law couples had an average of 2.6 dependent children living at home. Half of these children were younger than ten years old, one third were between the ages of eleven and fourteen and one quarter was between the ages of fifteen and nineteen.

The average number of children per lone parent household was 2.4, and slightly more than three quarters of these children were younger than ten years of age.

Therefore, common-law couples had the most dependent children on average. Lone parents had the highest proportion of dependent children under the age of ten and married couples had the highest concentration of older dependent children between the ages of fifteen and nineteen. Parents of young dependent children are usually more involved in school functions, with other parents and their children's friends, and in their child's activities. The older the child, the more that individual attempts to exert independence from their parents and thus begins the separation of parents from their child's social circles and activities.

The largest age group on these blocks was people over 20 years old (65%) and dependent children younger than 19 (35%). As the research area's residents were predominantly adult in age (older than 20 years), Table 10 displays the proportions of this population.

Table 10: Adult age characteristics of the three blocks

Age groupings (in years)	Homeowners Total- 61 (% of homeowner total)	Renters Total - 55 (% of renter total)
20-24	8%	11%
25-44	29%	45%
45-64	33%	31%
Over 65	30%	13%

What the breakdown between renters and homeowners reveals is a much younger group of renters (56% under the age of 45, as opposed to 37% of homeowners).

Inversely, the breakdown illustrates the higher proportion of older people living in homeowners' dwellings, i.e. 63% of these people are older than forty-five years of age as opposed to 44% of renters. It appears as if renter families were typically involved in the earlier stages of the development cycle and homeowners in the later stages. Younger parents with younger children comprised the majority of renters' households accounted for by the census/survey. Homeowners tended to be older in age, have fewer dependent children living at home, and a higher proportion of older children who were dependent and living at home.

While it is an assumption of this research that most individuals moving out of their parents' home for the first time tend to become renters, it is also assumed that the propensity of these individuals is toward eventually buying a house. This is not to say that all individuals wish to buy a house or property, simply saying that owning one's own home is generally viewed as beneficial. However, the question posed here is whether or not the renters in the research area are at an earlier stage of the development cycle or illustrate a polarization in the neighbourhood. This polarization refers to the question of whether or not these renters will ever have the opportunity and means to become homeowners.

Education

Earning potential and current employment was observed to correlate positively with the level of formal education received by an individual. Half of the census/survey respondents over the age of 18 had at least a high school degree or some post-secondary education. However, it was also revealed that half of all respondents had not earned a High School diploma (see Table 11). Eight homeowners and renters' education levels were not known by respondents and therefore omitted from the Table.

Table 11: Highest level of schooling attained

Level of schooling	Homeowners Total - 55 (% of homeowner total)	Renters Total - 53 (% of renter total)	Percentage of total population over 18 years of age (108)
Less than High School graduation	38%	64%	51%
High School graduation or some post-secondary	40%	26%	33%
Trades certificate or diploma	2%	2%	2%
College certificate or diploma	5%	2%	4%
University degree, certificate or diploma	14%	6%	10%

Higher education levels were concentrated among homeowners, and renters were found to have earned lower levels of formal education. In particular, the most significant differences between the two groups were the higher proportion of renters without a High School diploma compared to homeowners, and the lower proportion of renters with a University degree or certificate.

Income and Employment

Forty-nine of 117 surveyed adults (42%) reported that they were employed full-time. Twenty-eight (24%) respondents said they were retired, while twenty-nine (25%) said they received government assistance (social assistance, unemployment, disability/worker's compensation). Seven (6%) respondents reported that they were employed either part-time or seasonally. For a further breakdown of the employment status of residents see Table 12.

Table 12: Employment Status of the three blocks

Employment status	Homeowners - 59 (% of total)	Renters - 58 (% of total)
Full-Time	44%	40%
Part-time/Seasonal	3%	9%
Government Assistance	19%	38%
Retired	34%	14%

This data shows the two most significant income categories for both groups. Homeowners were largely concentrated in full-time employment and retirement, while renters were primarily focused in full-time employment and receiving government

assistance as sources of income. This pattern illustrates the largely older homeowner population and the low-income nature of renters' households, as government assistance does not pay large sums of money.

Most of the employment held by surveyed residents was concentrated in transportation or menial and trade-assisted labour, support services in offices and health-related sites. These positions were filled relatively equally between renters and homeowners. Only 4% reported working in a professional career, all of whom were homeowners. However, there were slightly higher proportions of renters in positions of menial labour and a significantly larger proportion of renters in office-related employment. Table 13 lists the top five employment sectors of these workers. One homeowner's occupation was unknown and therefore omitted from the Table.

Table 13: Occupation breakdown

Occupations	Homeowners – 27 jobs (% of total)	Renters - 26 jobs (% of total)
Menial labour	33%	38%
Trades, transport and equipment operator and related	33%	27%
Business, finance and administration	18%	31%
Social science, education, government service and religion	7%	4%
Sales and Service		
Health	4%	0%

Residents and Housing Stock

Overall, approximately 39% of the respondents had lived at their then-current dwelling for less than five years, while 61% had been residents for more than five years (37% living in their dwelling for over eleven years). In addition, 14% of respondents

reported having moved once in the last five years, while 21% stated that they had moved two to four times, and 8% indicated that they had relocated five times or more within the last five years (see Table 14).

Table 14: Length of Tenure on the three blocks

Length of time in then-current dwelling (in years)	Homeowners - 30 (% of total)	Renters - 31 (% of total)
Less than one	3%	26%
1 - 4	7%	32%
5 - 10	33%	26%
More than 11	57%	16%

The trend of renters' mobility is very apparent in this data table. Well over half (58%) of the renter-respondents had moved at least once in the previous four years, while only 10% of homeowners had done the same. Inversely, well over half (57%) of the homeowner-respondents had lived in the same home for more than eleven consecutive years, while 16% of renters had done the same. What this pattern illustrates is that homeowners on the three blocks tended to remain at one address for longer periods of time than renters.

This research also examined where individuals lived immediately prior to moving to their then-current residence to get an indication of what level of familiarity they may have had with their new neighbourhood and neighbours. It found that 34% of all respondents had previously lived in William Whyte before their current residence, while 45% had lived in Winnipeg (20% in the north-end), and 20% were from either rural Manitoba or another province. Only two individuals had recently moved into the research area from an international destination in 2001. In fact, out of all the respondents, 46%

reported having lived in William Whyte for more than 25 years, 38% had lived in the neighbourhood between five and twenty-four years, and only 15% had lived in the area for less than five years (see Table 15).⁶

Table 15: Length of tenure in the William Whyte neighbourhood

Length of time living in WW (in years)	Homeowners – 31 (% of total)	Renters - 32 (% of total)
Less than one	3%	3%
1 – 4	0	19%
5 – 10	33%	16%
More than 11	64%	62%

The most striking comparison in Table 15 is the nearly equal proportion of homeowners and renters living in William Whyte for more than eleven years. Other than this comparison however, it is evident that renters were less likely to live in the neighbourhood for long periods of time with each move. Instead, renters had moved to different addresses within the same neighbourhood, which may have permitted them to retain and maintain personal ties to neighbours and access to local resources (i.e. voluntary associations, non-profit organizations, business or government offices, etc.).

Summary

The social indicator data shows that the research area was fairly typical of the William Whyte neighbourhood. The most significant difference between the three blocks and the wider neighbourhood was the mobility of residents. Most of the surveyed residents in the research area had lived in that location for five years or more, while less

than half claimed the same in William Whyte. Therefore, the research area was relatively more stable than William Whyte in terms of the length of tenure at the same address.

Residents of the research area, homeowners and renters alike, had lived at their then-current address for quite some time and were therefore very familiar with their neighbourhood surroundings. Renters and homeowners were nearly equal in the proportions of full-time jobs and in the same employment sectors. The overall level of block residents' formal education was low.

In contrast however, homeowners' trends tended to lean more towards stability as they were comprised of more married couples, had more than two times the proportion of University graduates than renters, were more likely to stay at the same address for longer periods of time, and were employed in the only professional careers listed by census/survey respondents. In addition to these leanings, homeowners were less likely to be unemployed and more likely to be over the age of 65 and retired.

Although homeowners were comprised of a significant proportion of people of First Nations descent, renters were twice as likely to claim that ethnic origin as homeowners. In general, renters had more and younger, dependent children on average, more common-law and lone parent families, higher proportions of young adults (20-44 years of age), and were much less likely to live at the same address for long periods of time. In addition, renters had lower levels of formal education and higher proportions of part-time and seasonal employment, as well as two and a half times the proportion of government assistance recipients.

Area Perceptions

Chickney, Ruperts and Kapusko avenues displayed a propensity of physical signs of urban decay such as vacant lots and abandoned or boarded-up houses, high proportions of low-income rental units and low-income families, visible and numerous criminal acts. As a result, the area has often been portrayed in the media as lacking a sense of community. This portrayal often highlights, or implies, a lack of social control among residents of these neighbourhoods.

As of October 16th 2000, 14 vacant lots and ten boarded-up houses were present on the three blocks that received houses in the summer of 2001 (WHFH Residential Survey 2000). However, by December 2001, after ESWP construction had finished, the count had changed to four empty lots and 11 abandoned houses (Kapusko, Ruperts and Chickney). This rise in abandoned houses was the result of a house fire, which forced residents out of one house and the demolition of another. Therefore it is clearly visible that WHFH was having an effect on the number of vacant lots in the research area.

Many residents commented on these abandoned houses. One resident thought these houses were “blights”, while another thought that Habitat houses were a good thing and that more should be built to replace abandoned/boarded-up houses, which the respondent considered “eyesores”. More than one resident had said that illegal activities such as prostitution and drugs took place at these properties.

Other residents saw the presence of abandoned properties, empty lots and the prevalence of low-income renters in the area as lowering local property values. One of these comments was from a local homeowner that had unsuccessfully attempted to sell

their house on three separate occasions over the previous six years. The homeowner felt the house could not be sold for what they thought it was worth.

Some residents made pointed comments about some of their fellow neighbours – low-income renters, notably of First Nations descent. While not all block residents made these types of comments, a significant proportion had. One particular respondent (a renter himself) who worked as a contractor preparing apartments and house-suites for new tenants felt that the area could not be fixed. Due to the damages he had seen in apartments that needed repairs, he felt that some local kids and renters (First Nations) had no respect for other people's property. This was a common theme among local homeowners who stated that neighbourhood renters did not share the same values as they did. Two of the values mentioned were a respect for other people's property and an interest in promoting and preserving a safe and friendly neighbourhood.

While most respondents stated that they felt safe on their street, many added caveats such as 'being used to it' or, as several women responded, 'not at night'. Some of the prominent problems in the area that respondents mentioned were prostitution, gangs, juvenile delinquency, substance abuse and a predominance of rental units. In fact, while conducting the census/survey for this research, a house on one of the Habitat blocks was condemned and, several months later, the interior was burned out. The day after the fire, residents of adjacent houses suggested the fire was lit by bored local children.

Several individuals indicated that their way of dealing with local residents was to limit contact to those they had known for a long time. Another common strategy was to 'not bother others and they won't bother you'. The result of this pervasive attitude among neighbours in the area was reflected in one individual's comment that the nature of his

block had changed considerably over time. Another respondent said that at one time everyone knew everyone else living on the block. At the time of the census/survey, he said nobody talked to anyone else because they did not want to be bothered.

CH. 5 - HABITAT FOR HUMANITY

There have been a number of attempts at revitalization over the past forty years to address the issues afflicting William Whyte and the wider City of Winnipeg. Large-scale projects have included the razing and reconstruction of the Lord Selkirk Park neighbourhood in the 1960's. There have been other programs that were funded by the private sector and various levels of government aimed at improving and conserving existing neighbourhoods. Some of these programs include the Neighbourhood Improvement Program (NIP), Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program (RRAP), Manitoba/Winnipeg Community Revitalization Program (M/WCRP), Community Improvement Program (CIP), Core Area Initiative (CAI) and Winnipeg Development Agreement (WDA) (Department of Environmental Planning 1990; Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation 1987; Douchant 1994; Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives - website #13, 2003; Canada Home and Mortgage Corporation - website #12, 2004).

More recent plans took a long-term approach and used financial and administrative assistance provided through municipal, provincial and federal government programs. These programs are directed by the objectives laid out in Plan Winnipeg 2020 through the Neighbourhood Housing Plans, the Building Communities Initiative and three specific municipal by-laws (City of Winnipeg website #7, 2004). The by-laws were passed to provide tax credits for rehabilitation efforts (8165/2002) and to target derelict residential and commercial properties for improvement or appropriation by the municipality (7893/2002 and 35/2004) (City of Winnipeg website #6, 2003; City of Winnipeg website #8, 2004; Annette Champion-Taylor - personal communication #8, 2004).

In December 2001 a Neighbourhood Housing Plan was written specifically for

William Whyte. The William Whyte Residents Association was attempting to implement the plan by working with the Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiative (WHHI) and various local non-profit organizations such as the North End Housing Project (NEHP) and the North End Community Renewal Corporation (NECRC) (Dave Dessins - personal communication #9, 2004)⁷. The William Whyte Housing Plan consisted of twenty-nine initiatives designed to preserve the neighbourhood character of housing by cracking down on substandard and dilapidated residential structures and by increasing homeownership opportunities (North End Community Renewal Corporation and William Whyte Residents Association 2001).

One of the Plan's initiatives (number ten) used municipal and provincial government funds administered by the WHHI to provide exterior fix-up grants to residents and landlords. A similar project took place in another inner city neighbourhood in 2001 funded by the Thomas Sill Foundation and the Province of Manitoba. These funds were administered by WHHI to residents of North Point Douglas to improve the outward appearance of houses and property, and to support projects aiming to retain the historical character of the neighbourhood (Barbour 2002; Annette Champion-Taylor - personal communication #8, 2004). The focus on exterior repairs to residents' homes and properties was very similar to the Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity Millennium Project's Community Fix-Up Project of 2001 (see Chapter five for more details).

Another of the Plan's initiative's (number seven) attempted to ensure the creation of new housing by "solidifying Habitat for Humanity's Role" in building new homes on targeted blocks and by linking their role to the Plan's initiatives and community development/stabilization strategy ((North End Community Renewal Corporation and

William Whyte Residents Association 2001). By May 2004 however, WHFH's role in William Whyte had dropped off significantly from its 2001 activities.

Habitat for Humanity

Habitat for Humanity (HFH) is a non-profit Christian-based organization dedicated to eliminating substandard housing and homelessness worldwide. Using the "Economics of Jesus" and the "Theology of the Hammer"⁸, Habitat has two primary goals - "to provide decent, affordable housing to low income families, and to improve and stabilize inner city neighbourhoods" (WHFH Homeowner Application Package 2000). It is important to note HFH's lack of a statement of faith, which means that it is not a church, and its determination to work as an equal partner with people of different faiths and non-believers (Stafford 2002). In my work with the Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity affiliate, this determination and welcoming of diverse people applied to both homeowners and volunteers. However, Millard Fuller indicated that members of the HFH International Board and all top leaders of Habitat are Christian (Stafford 2002), but this Christian orientation does not appear to affect WHFH's decisions in selecting potential Habitat partner-families or volunteers.

Founded in the southern United States in 1976, HFH was represented in 78 countries worldwide at the end of fiscal year 2002 (July 1, 2001 – June 30, 2002). By 2002, Canada's 58 affiliates had constructed a total of 631 houses, part of the organization's overall 2,285 affiliates which had constructed 133, 641 houses worldwide (HFH website #2, 2002). The organization operates on three levels: globally (HFH International), nationally (a national office for each represented country), and locally (affiliate offices).

HFH International (HFHI) organizes and promotes group activities on a global scale. Two examples of such projects are the Jimmy Carter Work Project and the World Leaders Build. Since 1984 former United States President Jimmy Carter and his wife Rosalyn Carter have volunteered one week a year to help raise awareness of the need for affordable housing by participating in an annual massive house construction blitz (HFH website #3, 2004). The project is carried out in a different country each year. The World Leaders Build is a global event where current and former heads of state build Habitat for Humanity houses simultaneously in their capital cities (HFH website #1, 2004). Much like the Jimmy Carter Work Project, its purpose is to raise awareness of the need for affordable housing.

National offices coordinate affiliate builds and facilitate communication between affiliates and with other national offices. An example of one such activity is the annual Ed Schreyer Work Project (ESWP), which HFH Canada moves from city to city. With the ESWP, a number of houses are constructed in a one-week blitz build, as organized by the host affiliate.

A local office/affiliate is created when a pre-existing society or organization that is concerned with, and actively working, on low-income housing issues applies to the HFH national office to become an affiliate. Through this process, the organization agrees to uphold HFH's mandates, codes of conduct, and operational procedures. A local affiliate acts as an independent corporation that organizes and conducts the actual house construction, fundraising, land appropriations, homeowner selections and placements. Stafford (2002: 29) characterizes this structuring "...more as a movement than a top-down organization..."

Local affiliates manage and organize the actual house construction efforts. To minimize the impacts of the in-fill construction on the host neighbourhoods, Habitat has typically organized 'Blitz Builds/Weeks'. The purpose was to lessen the long-term impacts of traffic, noise, and dirt created by the building of a house by squeezing several house constructions into one week.

In addition to managing the construction sites, affiliates also control the selection of prospective homeowners. Homeowner applicants are screened through a selection process consisting of interviews, background checks (with friends, neighbours, landlords, employers and creditors), home visits and financial statements. Applicants must be steadily employed, not in receipt of social assistance, and possess a good credit history.

Habitat for Humanity Canada uses the federal 'Low-income cutoff' figures (LICOS), also colloquially referred to as the poverty line, as criteria in selecting potential homeowners. A family must be earning an annual income at or below the poverty line to be eligible for a Habitat home. These people are colloquially known as the working poor. They have full time jobs but earn low wages (Lezubski, Silver et al., 2000; Crosnoe, 2001).

Upon selection, the applicant must then agree to the terms of the partnership itself. Some of the more important terms are the new homeowner/partner's willingness to make a long-term commitment to a mortgage, and as a result, to the particular community where the house is located. Selected partners can generally be described as hard working and responsible. Specifically, HFH searches for people who will interact positively with their new surroundings and neighbours. This includes being respectful of one's new neighbours, their property, and the upkeep of one's own property.

Once new partners are selected, they make a down payment of five hundred volunteer hours (Sweat Equity) in lieu of the financial down payment of traditional mortgages. A basic tenet of partnership agreements with HFH is the requirement of each new partner (and family) to be on-site participants during the construction of their new home. Habitat believes that taking a hands-on role in the physical construction of one's own house instils a sense of value and personal investment in the new partner (and family). In essence, the house becomes a home – something to be valued and cared for.

A Habitat affiliate uses the money received from mortgage payments to pay for future construction efforts in their area⁹. Using mortgage payments to finance new housing projects is very important in the development of the criteria used to screen applicants. There is strong incentive for the organization to select steadily employed, responsible, hard-working partners to ensure a reliable construction fund in the future.

Through its selection of financially responsible and socially respectful partners, HFH has demonstrated a consistent concern with being a socially responsible housing organization (Nozick 1992).

Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity

Affiliate organizations receive guideline manuals from Habitat for Humanity International that outlines basic mandates, policies and procedures. The basic structure of an affiliate is to have an Executive Director to guide the daily operations, a Board of Directors to make decisions as to the direction the organization will take, and several Committees in charge of different aspects of the affiliate to carry out these decisions. The Executive Director provides vision, leadership and day-to-day management of the affiliate's affairs. The Board generally consists of twelve or thirteen members,

predominantly professionals representing a variety of expertise and background, such as accountants, lawyers, human resources, etc. Committees consist of volunteers and staff handling issues such as Family Support, Family Selection, Special Events, etc. The Executive Directors of the Winnipeg affiliate who were involved in this thesis were Mary Williams (2000-2001) and her successor Ken Bishop (2001-present).

Unlike other affiliates, Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity began when three local people volunteered at the 1986 Jimmy Carter Work Project in Chicago. As part of the Winnipeg Mennonite community and being interested in social justice issues, the three volunteers started networking in their faith community on their return. Over the weeks and months to follow, the committee they had created continued to grow. This committee handled the issues involved in beginning a non-profit charity (Paul Hiebert - personal communication #7, 2004).

In 1987, Winnipeg received authorization to begin operating a local HFH affiliate. Since that time, WHFH has built 104 homes within Winnipeg. As the land needed for many of these houses were received at very low prices from the City of Winnipeg, most were located in inner-city neighbourhoods. With the exception of The Jimmy Carter Work Project (1993) and the Ed Schreyer Work Project in 2001, the affiliate had focused its efforts on smaller builds of one to four homes at a time. In 2002, four houses were built in William Whyte. The organization completed its first winter build of one house in 2003 and built nine more houses in July and August of the same year. One of these houses was constructed in William Whyte while the other nine were built in other areas of Winnipeg (HFH website #4, 2003). For 2004, WHFH planned to construct one more house in the William Whyte neighbourhood (Ken Bishop - personal

communication #5, 2004).

Before 2001, the Executive Director and committees formulated ideas and submitted them to the Board for approval in the Winnipeg affiliate. Staff members, while members of committees, were not in charge. They were encouraged to act as a support person to committee volunteers and its Chairperson. According to Mary Williams, former Executive Director of WHFH (1995-2001) the "...role of staff was to facilitate involvement of volunteers" (personal communication #3, 2003). However, since 2002 the organization of the affiliate had changed to a more business-like model. Maintaining a Governing Board, the affiliate's policy now came from this Board and not from the volunteer committees as once before. Policy was carried out by staff, which was now in charge of the committees, and the affiliate's structure was not as volunteer-focused as once before (Ken Bishop - personal communication #4, 2003).

In reviewing WHFH's Annual Reports between 1990 and 1993, it became clear that the organization had long had a portion of its attention and efforts focused on community building¹⁰. Relatively new at that time, WHFH's mandate referred to the inclusion of community building and the involvement of local residents from neighbourhoods where future builds were planned to take place. In practice however, the affiliate tended to announce its projects to residents of affected neighbourhoods when vehicles and volunteers arrived to lay the foundations of future houses. Very little or no consultation usually took place between neighbourhoods and the affiliate. As a result, several Habitat homeowners reported difficulties in trying to integrate into their new neighbourhood (Mary Williams - personal communication #1, 2000).

Through an examination of WHFH's Annual Meetings and Annual Reports, it

appeared as though WHFH's concept and definition of 'community building' has changed over time. Initially (late 1980's to 1990), the term 'community building' was applied largely to relationships between Habitat families who were going to be living in proximity to one another. By 1991, the concept had begun to shift slightly to include the participation of members living in neighbourhoods where future builds were being planned. This process of shifting concept definitions eventually led to the year 2001 when WHFH defined 'community building' as an activity that incorporated and informed local residents, as much as possible, of the organization's project plans.

The Winnipeg Habitat affiliate's approach to community building encompassed an implicit assumption that homeownership contributed to neighbourhood stability. The organization received a letter from the spokesperson for a Foot Patrol organization in the William Whyte neighbourhood asking WHFH for their help in addressing the local housing issue. Aware of the declining conditions of Winnipeg's inner city neighbourhoods, WHFH agreed and chose William Whyte as the target neighbourhood to receive the organization's efforts through the Millennium Project.

Millennium Project

The Millennium Project's aims were to concentrate WHFH's construction efforts in order to place 50 new homes and families in one Winnipeg neighbourhood over a five-year span (2000-2005). As part of these efforts, four new homes were built in the summer of 2000, three of which were in William Whyte. Under the umbrella of the Millennium Project, ten houses were built in July 2001 as part of the Ed Schreyer Work Project (ESWP) on three residential blocks in William Whyte.

As part of the Project approach, an attempt was made to recruit potential Habitat homeowners from among current neighbourhood residents fitting the organization's homeowner criteria. In this way local continuity was promoted. That is to say, local residents could stay more or less where they were and maintain their relationships and ties to the area and its residents. Only one of the 10 Habitat families that bought a house through the ESWP was living in William Whyte at the time the organization was recruiting prospective homeowners. However, 10 of the 15 individual homeowners for the Ed Schreyer Work Project had previously lived in either William Whyte or in adjacent neighbourhoods. The families were therefore quite familiar with William Whyte.

For the ESWP, surveys were administered and information provided to local residents by Habitat volunteers and staff going door-to-door. In addition, Project-information pamphlets were mailed out to residents of the neighbourhood blocks affected by the ESWP. The surveys helped gauge local reaction to the Project and collect suggestions of what needed the most attention in the neighbourhood.

"Beginning in the spring of 2000 WHFH will change its focus to some degree. We plan to begin in a revitalization of a number of neighbourhood streets. The project will focus on three main aspects: Repairs and Renovations in partnership with low income homeowners, Beautification in assisting homeowners with exterior painting, repairs to steps, planting, etc., and New Home Construction. In these ways we hope to make a positive difference within the inner city which is showing signs of pain and stress."¹¹

Winnipeg Habitat hoped their efforts to achieve these objectives would result in breaking down social barriers, thus resulting in a more positive social climate on the city blocks with WHFH housing. Some of these social barriers included local residents' perceptions and mistrust of Habitat homeowners as new neighbours. Misconceptions of Habitat homeowners as recipients of social assistance or being short-term residents in the

neighbourhood were also social barriers to be addressed. These perceptions and misconceptions fuelled the mistrust of new neighbours that Winnipeg Habitat assumed local residents already possessed. The organization confronted these barriers with the simple premise of creating an avenue where local residents could have an opportunity to dispel these fears. The method chosen was the Community-Fix-Up Project (more on this project later in this chapter).

The organization also attempted to procure vacant lots and houses set for demolition to meet its goals to provide sufficient, affordable family housing as part of the Millennium Project. WHFH has stated "This in turn will give a 'face lift' to the neighbourhood, a new sense of pride for the community and families" (HFH website #4, 2003). The goals of WHFH in 2000 complement Hay's (2002) argument that Habitat should become more active in organizing the neighbourhoods in which they build, involving local residents directly in the planning process.

Several of the Millennium Project's goals came largely as a result of WHFH's experiences with the Jimmy Carter Build in 1993¹². It became clear several months after the partnering families had moved into their new homes that friction with residents of the surrounding area had developed. Initially, new partners sent their children to schools in other areas of the city and did not participate in local associations. These first residents had previously lived in other neighbourhoods and many were not prepared for the prevalence of drugs, prostitution, and gangs from the nearby housing development. There was very little integration into the social scene of the surrounding area. During the first few years after construction, half had opted out of their financial commitments to WHFH, leaving those houses empty for a period of time. These cancellations of obligations led to

problems with maintaining the organization's building surplus. Eventually, new partners were found to occupy the vacated houses (Mary Williams - personal communication #1, 2000).

This experience appears to have influenced the design and planning of the Ed Schreyer Work Project (ESWP), as part of the Millennium Project. The goal of the ESWP was to build decent affordable housing with low-income partners while integrating these new partners into the local neighbourhoods in which their houses were being built. Integration of Habitat families into local neighbourhoods is critical to the success of WHFH housing projects (Mary Williams - personal communication #2, 2001). Preference was given to suitable partner-candidates residing in the William Whyte neighbourhood who wished to remain there and former residents of the area.

A major difference between the Millennium Project and other house construction projects in the past was that the Millennium Project had a more comprehensive emphasis on community building. According to McNeil (1992: 119), "Habitat's preference is to build several houses in a cluster, both for the advantages of construction efficiency and visual impact, and to provide the opportunity for generating a micro-community for mutual support". Clustering describes the building of several Habitat homes together on a cul-de-sac or on one particular residential block facing one another. Over the history of WHFH's operations they have used clustering (notably during the 1993 Jimmy Carter Build). More recently, the organization has preferred more spread-out in-fill housing for its work in William Whyte. However, while future plans (50 houses were planned for construction between 2003-2006 in Winnipeg's west and northwest ends) largely focused on constructing clusters of eight or more houses, in-fill housing would continue to be

carried out in inner city neighbourhoods other than William Whyte (Ken Bishop - personal communication #4, 2003).

In the context of the Millennium Project, community building has been used to describe WHFH's approach to confronting some of the social barriers in the neighbourhood. The organization had assumed that local residents were not working together to assert social control over their neighbourhood and this was the result of little social interaction among neighbours. If neighbours did not know one another, they could not work together to establish social cohesion within the neighbourhood. Social cohesion refers to the relationships between neighbours that allow for the creation and assertion of informal mechanisms that permits a modicum of social control in their neighbourhood. Therefore, Habitat attempted to create a situation where local homeowners personally benefited by having the organization's help with renovations to their home, while simultaneously having the opportunity to meet their new neighbours. It was WHFH's hope that meeting the Habitat homeowners face-to-face would put a human face on the 'unknown' quantity of new neighbours. At the same time, meeting the new homeowners would help dispel local homeowners' fears about the type of people the organization was moving into the area. Local homeowners would have the chance to understand the values and sense of responsibility that Habitat families brought with them to their new homes and neighbourhood.

Habitat stated that the Millennium Project's lasting benefits to the community may include fewer people moving away and the attraction of new residents to the area; an increase in property values; and an overall safer environment. The organization believed that by concentrating their efforts and resources in a target area (William Whyte), they

could help create an increase in involvement at the neighbourhood level. This, in turn, would lead to "...improvements in social dynamics, neighbour-to-neighbour relations, etc." (Millennium Project Proposal, 2000: 18). Specifically, the Project's overall goals were aimed at securing the active participation of William Whyte residents with Habitat construction and renovation efforts. WHFH thought that neighbours helping neighbours with improvements to, and the construction of, each others' homes would create a mutual investment in the neighbourhood. This investment would act not only as a way for neighbours to get to know one another better, but also as a stepping stone for creating stronger personal attachments to one's neighbours and neighbourhood. It was hoped that participation would lead not only to improved neighbour-to-neighbour relations but also to improved general social conditions (Millennium Project Proposal, 2000: 2). Some of these social conditions included a renewed sense of neighbourliness and community between residents and the reassertion of social control by residents over their neighbourhood. A renewed sense of community would manifest itself through the relationships between neighbours – such as enhanced social activity (visiting one another's homes, more frequent contact, lending and borrowing personal property, etc.). Social control would be exerted by neighbours through the creation of, or increased membership in, local voluntary associations or informal groups to tackle local social problems.

The Millennium Project was to be a series of annual blitz weeks in which several houses were constructed in seven days. It began with the construction of four new homes on one street in William Whyte during the summer of 2000. In its second year, it took the form of the ESWP building ten new houses in July of 2001 over three blocks on

Chickney, Ruperts and Kapusko avenues. However, the project was discontinued due to a shift in the Board of Directors placing more value on building more homes, rather than investing in more community building activities like the Millennium Project (Brent Gillon – personal communication #6, 2001; Mary Williams – personal communication #3, 2003).

Ed Schreyer Work Project (ESWP)

Founded in 1993, the ESWP was named after former Manitoba Premiere and Governor General of Canada, the Right Honourable Ed Schreyer. As part of the annual project, which constructs several homes simultaneously in one week, Ed and Lily Schreyer focus their abilities on one of these Habitat homes. Coordinated by HFH Canada, it is an effort to help raise awareness of the national need for affordable housing. To date, the Project has built houses in St. John's (1997), Dartmouth (1999), Windsor (2000), Winnipeg (2001), and Ottawa (2002), to name but a few cities.

Several meetings took place between March and July to ensure all of the Project details and Habitat homeowners' concerns were addressed. These meetings led to the official Ground Breaking ceremony that took place on May 15th, 2001. From then until the ESWP Blitz Week (July 6 – 13th), pre-construction activities occurred every weekend (8am - 4pm) and on Tuesday and Thursday evenings (6pm - 9pm). These activities included digging a hole, laying the foundation, and building a basement floor and a roof to cover it (which would later become the house's main floor). Habitat homeowners received Sweat Equity for pre-construction activities on both their and others' homes.

One incident that occurred in June prompted the organization to seek volunteers

to guard the house sites until eleven o'clock at night. Local children had snuck into the basement after pre-construction crews had left for the night. They had started a fire that caused some minor damage before a local neighbour saw what was happening and called the Fire Department. Habitat homeowners took what shifts they could to ensure that such an occurrence did not happen again.

Through the ESWP, WHFH made a concerted effort to connect with community groups in the William Whyte neighbourhood, such as churches and cultural associations. During the week-long Blitz Build, child-care workers and church youth groups held a children's festival to help Habitat homeowners' children in the transition to their new neighbourhood. The different cultural groups represented in the ethnic make-up of William Whyte and Winnipeg's north-end staged each evening's entertainment and served regional cuisine to volunteers. WHFH attempted to provide for homeowners' family needs, embrace the neighbourhood's cultural diversity and bring the local residents together in welcoming their new neighbours to the area, while simultaneously providing volunteers with a memorable week of experiences. Part of these experiences, as it turned out, was the presence of television camera crews and reporters from various news media on a daily basis.

Efforts to reach out to the neighbourhood did not stop at the level of community groups. Local residents were approached through pre-construction canvassing and surveys in an effort to introduce the organization to the area and gauge local residents' reactions and opinions to the then-pending project. A specific aspect of the ESWP was the newly developed Community Fix-Up Project (CFP).

Community Fix-Up Project (CFP)

Three of the CFP's goals were: 1) to go beyond the building of new homes and make an impact on the wider community; 2) to provide opportunities for new Habitat homeowners to work with their new neighbours; and 3) to provide opportunities for volunteers to get involved and make an impact in Winnipeg's inner city. Its purpose was to initiate beautification efforts, such as grass cutting and park clean-ups while talking to local homeowners about conducting minor repairs and renovations to their homes. The aim was to not only build new homes on a block but to help improve the state of the neighbourhood and its residents' property (Community Fix-Up Project Report, 2001).

The CFP Coordinator's position, filled by Brent Gillon, was funded by a grant from the Winnipeg Foundation for a four-month period (April 16 to August 17, 2001). The position was extended through to October 19th as a result of a donation from Eastview Community Church (Community Fix-Up Project Report, 2001). The Coordinator's responsibilities included soliciting local residents as participants in Project activities, publicizing the CFP and its activities to residents of William Whyte, and organizing Habitat volunteers to carry out these activities.

The idea was to generate local interest in the CFP through canvassing the neighbourhood's residences with information pamphlets, followed by door-to-door visits to these same residences and local businesses (during the month of May 2001). Once this was accomplished, Brent Gillon began undertaking plans to improve visible areas of the neighbourhood such as boulevards and playgrounds. The purpose was to demonstrate to local residents that Habitat was sincere in its offer to help, to be followed by repairs and minor renovations to local homes.

As mentioned in the Literature Review, renovation to private properties can be referred to as incumbent upgrading. Carter and Douchant (1999) stated that William Whyte did not fit the criteria of a high proportion of homeowners to be a candidate for incumbent upgrading. However, the Winnipeg Habitat affiliate's approach was to meet homeowners half-way – homeowners provided the materials needed for the job and Habitat provided the people power (volunteers) and expertise (crew leader). In this way, both parties were equally invested in the process.

Initially, these renovations and repair activities were to be the opportunity for local and new Habitat homeowners to work alongside one another. The original Habitat plan called for the new Habitat homeowners to gain sweat equity hours by volunteering on the crews working on renovation and beautification efforts. New homeowners would help local homeowners with the hope that local residents would then help new homeowners during the Blitz build. This would provide the opportunity for investing in one another's homes, the neighbourhood at large, and their neighbourly relationships.

Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity experienced a few setbacks with its CFP. Local residents were skeptical at first, which WHFH had anticipated, but the change in attitude the organization had hoped for came towards the end of the project period, rather than two or three weeks after its start. Secondly, the William Whyte Residents Association received a large grant for its own Community Fix-Up Project from the Winnipeg Foundation in 2001 (Ken Bishop - personal communication #4, 2003). According to Mary Williams (Mary Williams - personal communication #3, 2003), the Residents Association did not fully understand the grant's administration process and therefore there was some overlap between the two efforts resulting in some confusion and extra

caution among residents. This is a point that one of the two Co-Chairpersons for the William Whyte Residents Association concurs with (Annette Champion-Taylor – personal communication #8, 2004). Thirdly, the post-Blitz clean-up extended through the end of August. This involved yard preparation for laying down sod, digging holes for posts and constructing fences among other jobs. The CFP's volunteers were routed to these tasks, rather than to the fix-up projects (Brent Gillon - personal communication #6, 2001). Fourthly, there were communication problems with the new Habitat homeowners in organizing volunteer times. Brent Gillon characterized these problems as the homeowners working long hours at their jobs, lacking phones, and as pre-construction on the ten houses began homeowners became more focused on their own home. Habitat homeowners indicated that volunteer dates were cancelled and not rescheduled or they just never heard from Brent. One homeowner summed it up as follows: "I've got no idea what Brent did over the summer. We were just focused on getting out of one house and into another."

The end-result of the CFP's efforts in William Whyte was sixteen separate projects that encompassed local residences, parks and public spaces, and other projects (local buildings and community relations). Half of the projects took place on Kapusko, Ruperts or Chickney avenues, while four of the sixteen projects were pending at the end of the CFP in October 2001 (Community Fix-Up Project Report 2001). Only two of the ten Habitat homeowners had participated in the CFP and only one of those had worked on a local resident's home. Therefore, the number of participating local and Habitat homeowners was well below WHFH expectations and hopes.

From an organizational perspective, the ESWP was a success in that no debt was incurred, the Right Honourable Ed Schreyer was satisfied, HFH International and HFH Canada were pleased with the project's organization and outcome and there was a significant amount of media coverage during the Blitz week (Mary Williams - personal communication #3, 2003).

Despite the small numbers of participating Habitat and local homeowners, the CFP did still have lasting effects – on its Coordinator, volunteers and local community. Brent Gillon reported that the project had received several letters of appreciation from William Whyte residents and a Community Service Award (received November 13th, 2001). This award was received as a result of the local business community submitting a nomination. As well, he went on to explain how volunteers from the suburbs came to change their perspective on the inner city at the individual level. Volunteers commented on how well local residents knew their neighbours and what was going on in the area. Some of the volunteers came to think of area residents as very warm toward one another. This type of behaviour was not what they had come to expect based on stories and media reports about the neighbourhood.

As an example of the type of support extended to the CFP and Habitat activities in the area, two teachers from a local William Whyte school got the addresses and names of the new Habitat homeowners and went door-to-door after school hours to introduce themselves and welcome the new Habitat homeowners to the neighbourhood (Brent Gillon - personal communication #6, 2001).

For Brent, he kept in touch with the residents he met during the course of the project, making a conscious effort to visit the area from time to time. What struck him

most about the residents was that “they take phenomenal pride in the neighbourhood” and they “love to tell stories about the neighbourhood. Let us know about the history.” (Brent Gillon - personal communication #6, 2001). Living in one of Winnipeg’s suburbs, this was not what he expected to find in an inner city neighbourhood known for crime and deteriorating conditions. Perhaps a difference between the CFP and other revitalization projects was its focus on the people as individuals.

Observations

Between February and June 2001 I attended six of Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity’s meetings. Most, but not all, of these meetings were held with the ten prospective Habitat homeowners present. In addition to these meetings, there were others aimed specifically at the ten families that did not apply to this research and therefore that I did not attend.

Pre-construction activities were held between the end May and the end of June 2001. I worked four days on three different weekends helping to carry out the activities on the ten Habitat house sites. This work prepared the sites for the Blitz Build in July when I further participated in the production of the houses.

The meetings, pre-construction and Blitz activities provided the opportunity to observe the changing nature of the relationships between the prospective Habitat homeowners. When I first attended a meeting and met the Habitat families (February 2001), the homeowners did not know one another very well, if at all. However, over the course of six months, several meetings and Habitat activities (fundraising, pre-

construction and the Blitz Week) the families became familiar and, in some cases, friendly.

By June 2001, friendships and acquaintances had developed among the families. These individuals would sit close to each other during meetings and meet during pre-construction breaks. They shared comments, joked and discussed issues pertaining to their houses, families and WHFH.

In fact, the familiarity between homeowners grew to the point that some of them offered others their extra Sweat Equity hours in July 2001. While not unprecedented in the history of Habitat for Humanity, it was still a generous gift as some homeowners still owed hundreds of hours on their down payment

During the Blitz Week, Habitat families often sat together during lunch and breaks times to compare notes on the progression of their houses and to joke around. As the houses were being constructed on different residential blocks, only the families whose houses were on the same block had the opportunity to mingle. Lunches and breaks were scheduled at varying times for the different blocks. However, I did see and talk to some Habitat homeowners who left their block during the course of the workday to see how things were going for other homeowners regarding the houses and the media coverage. Therefore, the Habitat families were managing to stay in contact with one another and keep apprised of the work done to each other's houses throughout the Blitz Week.

Throughout all of these activities, very few instances were observed when local block residents were talking or mingling with Habitat families. Instead, while apparently keen to observe Habitat pre-construction and Blitz Week activities, the few local residents who actually approached the sites talked with Habitat staff or volunteers. One

resident in particular helped clean up the wood scraps at the end of a day at one of the sites. The Coordinator for the day's activities gave the resident the wood, which he gladly took home with him.

Conclusions

The Millennium Project, while discontinued, did have some success in its umbrella Ed Schreyer Work Project and Community Fix-Up Project. Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity was successful in garnering publicity for its activities and the issues of decent affordable housing. As well, the organization managed to achieve success in the positive public relations it was able to create with William Whyte residents and businesses.

The Projects however, were not as successful in creating lasting friendships between Habitat families and people living on the same residential block. This is not to say that the organization did not affect the Habitat families' relationships. In fact, a number of long-lasting relationships between Habitat homeowners were fostered through Habitat activities. These relationships took their place in the families' intimate and place-based networks discussed in detail in the following three chapters (6-8).

CH. 6 – ESTABLISHED HOMEOWNER

INTERVIEWS

This set of interviews was conducted in late 2002 and early 2003 with residents of Chickney, Ruperts and Kapusko avenues. Ten potential interview participants were chosen using data provided by the census/survey. This information helped identify the people who were homeowners, long-term residents, had children living at home, and were between 20 and 65 years of age. These criteria aimed to identify local residents who were very familiar with the neighbourhood and faced many of the same familial issues as the Habitat homeowners. None of the local homeowners interviewed, or fitting the criteria to be interviewed, were lone parents – because no lone parent who completed the census/survey in the research area owned their home.

Four of the ten potential homeowner families were interviewed. Of the six non-participating homeowners, one family had moved away before being approached, three families refused, and two families were unable to be contacted despite numerous attempts. Only the adult heads of the homeowner families were interviewed, not their children or any other dependents regardless of age.

Though a small sample at four local homeowners/families, these interviews still provided valuable information for understanding a snapshot of local neighbourhood life through the use of intimate networks (the people interview participants deemed closest to them).

Relationships accounted for through the interviews were organized into a typology of categories. This research did not account for cross-categorization/overlap in the categories, such as with kin, co-workers or 'other friends' who were also neighbours. Kin were kin, co-workers were co-workers and 'other friends' were 'other friends', as

these were the primary roles the network member played in the interviewed families' lives. The following is a typology of social relations used here:

- **Kin** refers to people related by blood or through legal means (e.g. siblings, parents, cousins, in-laws, etc.), excluding spouses and dependent children living with their parents.
- **Co-workers** share the same workplace as the Habitat adult respondent.
- **Neighbours** share the same localized living area.
- **Other Friends** are those people who were met through family members or friends, known from childhood or met through other circumstances by the Habitat family.

Co-workers and neighbours are in close physical proximity to the interview participants. This proximity permits more opportunities for interaction than for 'other friends' who do not share the same workplace or neighbourhood.

Two basic types of communication have been used to divide the frequency of contact between respondent families and members of their personal networks: indirect and in-person. Indirect contact refers to conversations that take place between people while not in the same place (i.e. via telephone, e-mail, and letters). In-person communications are conversations that take place between people while in the same place.

Limitations have been employed to better measure this frequency of contact. Co-workers were expected to be seen in-person frequently. However, this research was interested in the nature of the personal relationship and therefore did not count the in-

person communications as indirect contact for co-workers. If the family did not contact their co-worker outside of work, then the frequency of indirect contact was zero even if the homeowner saw their colleague every day at work. The intent is to measure, in part, the effort invested in the relationship. Seeing a person everyday at work does not necessarily equal the emotional investment made through specific efforts to maintain contact with someone who is not seen at a designated place and/or activity daily.

For the section on 'Neighbours and Neighbourhood', visiting for social purposes or visits of a social nature included talking, parties, playing cards, watching television together, etc. Many of these visitors were direct neighbours to the homeowners. Any resident living adjacent to, or directly across the street and/or back alley from, an interviewed family were referred to as 'direct neighbours'. Wherever a back alley existed, homeowners had anywhere from three to eight direct neighbours, not including structures consisting of more than one rental unit.

Scheduled child-care refers to babysitting families' children that took place at regular and specific times, such as daily after school, lunch times or for planned parental outings, etc. Also, exchanging child-care between parents on the same block is part of this type of support. However, property and services in the form of favours could also be exchanged. Therefore, trading or reciprocal relationships refers to the mutual exchange of property or services, i.e. child-care, cigarettes, help with house maintenance, tools, etc.

Demographic information collected by the census/survey is presented in a section below in terms of eight individual adult respondents in the four participating families. The interviews are presented in terms of the four participant households/families' responses.

Demographic Characteristics

The demographic data in this section is tabulated according to individuals' responses for levels of education, sources of income and employment. Using the same social indicators as in chapter four of this thesis, the remainder of the data is presented in terms of the family unit for family structure, ethnic origins and length of tenure living on Kapusko, Chickney and Ruperts avenues.

In total, there were sixteen members of the four families, half of whom were parents and over the age of 25. Three of these families consisted of married couples and one was comprised of a common-law couple. Slightly less than one-third of the family members were between the ages of five and fourteen (31%) and slightly more than one third were between twenty-five and forty-four years old (37%). The remaining third was divided among fifteen to nineteen (12%), forty-five to sixty-four year olds (12%) and children under four years old (6%) (see Table 16).

Table 16: Family Age Characteristics

Family	Age of Female Family Head (in years)	Age of Male Family Head (in years)	# of Kids and Age Range (in years)
J	31	33	1 (10)
K	44	44	2 (16 and 18)
U	48	50	2 (8 and 10)
V	33	27	3 (3 to 11)
Average Age	39 years	38 years	10 years

Two of the four families were Filipino, one was First Nations and one family identified themselves as Ukrainian.

All eight participant adults had earned a High School diploma, with half earning a University degree/certificate as well. All eight individuals were engaged in full time employment, although one of these people was self-employed and depended on contracts for income. Slightly fewer than half of these people worked in the Trades and Transport employment sector while the other half of respondents were evenly distributed between the Manufacturing and Processing, and Business, Finance and Administration sectors.

All four families had lived on their residential block, or in their home, for nine years or more. Three of the homeowners had lived in their home for more than ten years while one had lived on the same block for nine consecutive years.

To summarize, the four homeowner-families were ethnically diverse and 50% of the families' members were dependent children, 37% of which were under the age of 14. It is difficult to accurately assess the annual income for these families, but all of the respondents were working at full-time jobs. These jobs were largely concentrated in menial labour or less skilled areas of occupation. All of the families had lived in the William Whyte neighbourhood, notably on Chickney, Ruperts or Kapusko avenues for more than nine consecutive years and were therefore quite familiar with the area.

Interviews

Intimate Networks

To ensure clarity, the information presented in this section is based on family responses (family heads – lone parents, common-law or married couples). The answers of both individuals in a married couple were counted as responses for one unit – the family – not individually. Therefore, mention of families or homeowners refers not to

individuals, but rather to family units. All of the following responses come from the four homeowner-families.

When asked to name the people considered closest to them (intimate network members), the four homeowners listed a total of thirty names. Kin represented two-thirds of these intimate network members, while friends composed one-third (see Table 17). One out of every five people listed as network members did not live in Manitoba, half of whom were 'other friends' and the other half was kin. One quarter of all of the named network members lived in William Whyte at the time of the interview, but were not neighbours on the same residential block as the four families.

Table 17: Intimate Network Characteristics

Typology of Relationships	Number	Percent of Total
Kin	19	63%
Neighbours	0	0%
Co-workers	1	3%
'Other Friends'	10	33%
Total	30	99%

Slightly more than two-thirds of all network members were indirectly communicated with (via telephone or e-mail) between once a week and everyday. Slightly more than two-thirds of these people were kin and slightly less than one-third were 'other friends'. Seventy percent of 'other friends' were included in this category. The remainder was either not indirectly contacted at all or between once a month and once every several months. The one co-worker mentioned as a member of the intimate networks was spoken to once a week and seen once a month.

For in-person communication, slightly more than half of the network members were seen between once a week and daily. Two-thirds of these instances took place with kin and one-third was with friends. Eighty percent of 'other friends' were included in this category. Less frequent in-person contact (i.e. more than once a month and less than once a week) was maintained with one-fifth of all intimate network members. Proportionally, more frequent indirect and in-person contact was maintained with kin.

These responses permit one to conclude that homeowners maintained more numerous and more frequent ties to kin rather than friends. However, the proportion of 'other friends' with which frequent communication occurred was very high.

Types of Support

Homeowners chose to spend recreational time away from the home with kin slightly over half of the time and 'other friends' slightly less than half of the time.

Kin provided two-thirds of the on-going and day-to-day emotional support for the four families while one-third was supplied by co-workers (one-fifth) and 'other friends' (one-seventh). Secondary networks are evidently at work in this situation as the majority of co-workers listed as providing this support were not named as members of the families' intimate networks. This type of support took the form of listening and talking about life experiences.

Table 18: Support received from intimate network members

Support Types	Kin	Neighbours	Co-workers	Other Friends
Recreation	55%	0	0	45%
Emotional	67%	0	20%	13%
Watch home	67%	33%	0	0
Emergency child-care	45%	55%	0	0
Help with house chores	100%	0	0	0

Homeowners would ask a total of seven people for help if someone were needed to watch their home. Kin were asked two-thirds of the time, with neighbours being asked slightly less than one-third of the time. However, all seven of these people lived in William Whyte and would be asked to watch the families' property, water the plants and check their mail. In the event of an emergency, families would ask neighbours to provide child-care until their return more than half of the time. While more than half of the homeowners received help for everyday chores and property maintenance, all of this help was received from kin.

Based on these responses, it is concluded that homeowners maintained stronger emotional ties to kin rather than friends. However, some neighbours were trusted enough to be turned to for help during a crisis, particularly for child-care.

Neighbours and Neighbourhood

When asked to name their neighbours, all four families listed an approximate total of forty block residents. From the information provided it was not possible to ascertain where on the block these neighbours lived. Two of the four homeowners knew fewer than five of the neighbours living on their block, while the other two homeowners knew more

than ten block residents. One family knew neighbours only of the same ethnic group as themselves. In total, the four families recognized over sixty block residents by sight.

Eleven neighbours were spoken to regularly (three or more times a week). Only two of these people lived adjacent (direct neighbours) to homeowners, as the majority lived elsewhere on the block.

Neighbours were met in four main ways: as passersby on the street, through children or a spouse, by growing up on the block, or by neighbours making the effort to introduce themselves.

One of the interviewed families had not received any invitations to visit the homes of their neighbours. Three out of the four families had been invited into seven of their neighbours' homes on nine different occasions. Three quarters of these visits were of a social nature (playing cards, talking, parties, etc.), while the remainder were either for soliciting help or unspecified. Only one out of these seven residents was a direct neighbour, as the other six neighbours lived elsewhere on the block.

Homeowners had invited a total of five neighbours into their homes on seven different occasions. Half of these invitations were extended to direct neighbours and the other half to residents living elsewhere on the block. Three quarters of these visits were of a social nature, while one quarter was reported by a homeowner who only allowed neighbourhood children (not adults) into their home.

Table 19: Place-based networks

Categories (average per family)	Established Homeowners
Neighbours known by name	10
Neighbours recognized by sight	15
Neighbours spoken to regularly	3
Visits to neighbours' homes	2
Visits by neighbours	1

Half of the families had lent something to their neighbours and half had not. In return, half borrowed from neighbours and half did not. Most items exchanged were food and tools, to either a direct neighbour or one living elsewhere on the block. A relationship involving the trade of personal property between one homeowner and a direct neighbour appears to have developed.

In conclusion, interviewed families had a limited involvement with their neighbours that was not confined to adjacent dwellings. Over time, homeowners had chosen specific block residents with whom to maintain regular contact through visits to one another's homes and conversations. However, these activities were the extent of the emotional depth of these relationships as no neighbours were listed as members of the families' intimate networks or as suppliers of emotional or on-going support. These specific block residents would be turned to for help during emergencies only.

People with Children

One family felt this section did not apply to their situation, as their children were older than fifteen years of age. This family was the only one of the four homeowners with children over the age of fourteen. All of the children accounted for in this section stayed

in the local area surrounding their home, with the exception of one child whose parents drove her to see friends living elsewhere in William Whyte.

When asked to list their children's friends, families stated knowing a total of more than thirty children. Two-thirds of these children lived on the same residential block. Three quarters of the total children known by homeowners lived in William Whyte. All three families knew some or all of their children's friends' parents.

Two-thirds of homeowners invited their children's friends on family outings and all of the families stated that their children had been invited on outings by their friends' parents. There appears to be reciprocal child-inviting relationships with all of the homeowners and some of their neighbours. Kin were asked to provide scheduled child-care in all responses.

From these responses, it is concluded that children younger than fourteen years old helped connect block residents to one another as parents. These connections extended beyond merely knowing one another to helping each other with child-care, although only kin were relied upon for scheduled child-care. All of the parents were aware of, and at the time involved in, their younger children's social circles.

Local Social Participation

Despite the various connections between neighbours, participants reported not being involved in locally organized groups (i.e. Block Parents, Residents Association or Neighbourhood Watch), while one parent did volunteer at their children's school.

Three of the interviewed families did attend a local Church, St. Joseph's (denomination unspecified), regularly once a week, but did not know each other from

attendance. One family knew some of their fellow parishioners, speaking to them only on Sundays or at Church functions.

Therefore, volunteer activities and the Church had little impact on the intimate networks of these four homeowners.

Area Perceptions

When asked to describe their neighbourhood, there was an undertone in the families' answers regarding the area's public image. Although the basic description of the area was generally good, there was concern with the increasing number of low-income renters and the decreasing number of homeowners in the area. An example of this sentiment came from one of the homeowners who said: "Lot of positive changes since we came here..." as there was a big difference in their first two years of living in the area with gangs and prostitution being eliminated from their block.

Generally speaking, families said they got along rather well with their neighbours. However there was one exception. A homeowner reported having taken out a peace bond against one of their then-current low-income First Nations renter neighbours. This action was taken stemming from incidents of threatening and swearing at the homeowners and their children. They went on to comment that renters had "very different values, attitudes and perspectives on life." This comment was taken to mean that the homeowner felt that, by and large, low-income renters did not value their own or other people's property or have the same type of respect for other people as did the homeowner. It may have also alluded to the nature of the low-income situation some renters found themselves in, notably a high unemployment rate and a large proportion of social assistance recipients.

Part of the comment may have been a general description of First Nations low-income renters overall or been referring to a different value placed on work ethic. More than one homeowner had made comments about the nature of low-income and First Nations tenants.

When other homeowners were asked if they had disagreements with neighbours, one family said: "Thank goodness no. We try to keep to ourselves." This homeowner's spouse stated that any problems on their block tended to come from people passing through, not block residents.

Regarding the transition of the ten Habitat homeowners into the neighbourhood, one family chose to attend the house dedication for each Habitat homeowner with a home on their block. The homeowner perceived their new neighbours as very nice and fine people who were apparently proud of where they lived. As a summary, the family said, "They [Habitat homeowners] certainly give hope."

While some families confidently said that they felt safe living in William Whyte, others were not as sure. This feeling of safety in the neighbourhood extended only to the daylight hours, as most families did not feel the same way about the area at night. In fact, one homeowner said that she ran from the bus stop until reaching home at night because she did not feel safe. In particular, women were more likely to fear the area at night and be concerned about their children and local dangers. One homeowner gave the following example of block residents' perceptions of fear: "Older block residents sit in the dark on Halloween. Because they're afraid of the kids."

Pertaining to this issue of feeling safe in the neighbourhood, families were asked about crime in the area – notably on their own block. Only one family stated that they

were aware of no incidents or victims of crime, other than items stolen from their child by an older child. However, while saying that this area was safe, the homeowner also stated that their child always had friends over to their house to play because "They're safe here. I have to protect him."

The other three homeowners observed that a wealth of crime had occurred on their block. Some of these crimes included: vandalism, gangs, drugs, prostitution, break-ins, muggings, an attempted murder and stolen cars being dumped there by thieves. One family said that two murders had taken place three or four blocks away within the previous few months (2003). Another homeowner, referring to the visible presence of violence on their block said: "Sometimes we see yellow tape [police tape] around a house." They went on to say that they were worried how events like this might affect their children.

Three of the four families had personally experienced some of these criminal acts which took the form of garages and tool sheds being broken into and a vandalized car. Some of their fellow block residents too, had experienced crime first-hand. Three of these neighbourhood experiences involved two senior citizens being mugged and a group of people assaulting a neighbour while getting out of their car late at night.

Therefore, while families knew some of their neighbours, and thus felt able to get help if needed, there exists the knowledge of an almost constant but unpredictable danger in the area.

Conclusions

The intimate networks of the four interviewed homeowners predominantly consisted of kin and 'other friends', not including any neighbours and only one co-worker. However, interviewees did have connections to other block residents.

A significant influence on these connections was the fact that half of the four families' household members were children under the age of 14. Parents were involved in the children's lives and watched out for their protection and safety. In general, these children stayed and played with other children on their own residential block. In effect, what these two actions accomplished was to provide an avenue for parents to talk with one another regarding a common concern. As well, homeowners tended to have only a few connections to other block residents. The activities of their children may have also served to provide information on new block residents, such as whether or not they were tenants, their ethnic identity, how often they were liable to move, etc.

Perceptions of danger and the unpredictability of neighbours, as proportions of renters continued to increase in the area, led families to adopt two main social strategies. The first strategy was to isolate oneself from other block residents and the second was to maintain relationships only with neighbours who had been known for a long time. As a result, families focused their intimate networks away from neighbours, relying more on kin and friends.

Kin was relied upon more for emotional and practical support and was seen in-person and indirectly contacted more frequently than any other type of relationship.

'Other friends' were kept in very frequent contact with but did not appear to provide much in the way of emotional or on-going support to homeowners. Instead, 'other friends' provided opportunities for socializing.

Co-workers, though a relatively insignificant proportion of the families' intimate networks did play a significant role in providing emotional support. However, individuals who were not mentioned as intimate network members supplied much of this support.

Although no neighbours were mentioned as intimate network members, some would be turned to for help during a crisis. One important favour that would be requested by homeowners of neighbours in a crisis situation would be child-care. Only specific neighbours were contacted regularly or trusted with the provision of support during a crisis. The relationships with these specific individuals were based on long-term knowledge and acquaintance as neighbours.

Over the course of at least nine years living on the same residential block, none of the four families had gotten involved in local voluntary associations or organizations. In relation to this, while three of the four homeowners attended the same local Church on the same day, none of them knew each other and only one claimed to talk to other parishioners while in attendance. Therefore, involvement in local organizations and Church activities had little impact on the families' intimate or place-based networks. The important link here is to the reduced levels of social capital in the neighbourhood. Little or no involvement in local groups decreases the number and variety of connections between neighbours. There are fewer resources available to local residents to deal with neighbourhood problems and no social platform in which to get involved.

Accompanying this lack of involvement in local voluntary organizations was little involvement with the neighbourhood or its residents. Homeowners only interacted with specific neighbours. Based on their own personal experiences and those of fellow long-term neighbours, families adopted this strategy of social isolation.

It is natural for people to maintain ties to other individuals they can relate to and whom they like. In this situation however, no or few new neighbours were being included in the connections between block homeowners due to apprehensions and perceptions of potential danger. The result was a group of homeowners who had known each other a long time and isolated themselves from block residents outside of this group, particularly renters. Therefore, there were pockets of connections between homeowners on Chickney, Kapusko and Ruperts avenues who largely perceived renters to be a neighbourhood problem.

CH. 7 – PROSPECTIVE (HABITAT)

HOMEOWNER INTERVIEWS

This round of interviews was conducted with prospective Habitat homeowners during the months of May and June in 2001 before their new homes were built and therefore before moving into their new neighbourhood of William Whyte. All of the interview participants lived in different neighbourhoods at the time of these interviews, but all were within Winnipeg's inner city. Nine of the ten homeowner-families chose to participate and were interviewed. Only the adult prospective homeowners were interviewed, not their children or any other dependents regardless of age. Interview responses have been presented based on the homeowner-family's (one or both adults, depending on the family) answers, not individual responses. Therefore, if two individuals from the same family listed the same person as part of their intimate networks, the person was only counted once. We are interested in the family's intimate network, as a single unit.

It should be noted that there were two families with unique characteristics significantly different from the other seven families. One family had many more children than the others, and the second had nearly twenty people (mostly kin) listed as their intimate network, much more than the other families. Both of these anomalous details inflate the age characteristics and intimate network data revealed through the interviews. No adjustment has been made for the data. However, to compensate for the potential skew in the interview data, information is presented in terms of family units and not individuals, thereby merging repetitive responses into one single answer.

The same definitions articulated in chapter six pertaining to typology of relationships, social purposes (for visits with neighbours), and scheduled child-care and trading/reciprocal relationships are employed here as well.

The nine families also answered the same demographic data questions as the residents of Chickney, Kapusko and Ruperts avenues. The families consisted of fifteen individual adult respondents to the census/survey that is presented in its own section, apart from the information collected through the interviews. Individual responses were used to determine the families' age characteristics, formal education levels, sources of income and employment and length of tenure at a specific address. Family unit responses were used to compile information on family structure and ethnic origins. This will allow a correlation of the interview results to possible demographic influences.

Demographic Characteristics

There were a total of 43 individuals living in the nine families' homes at the time of the census/survey. Five of these families consisted of a married couple and four included lone-parents. One of these lone-parent families was extended, including three generations – a mother, her adult son and his two dependent children.

Almost half (46%) of the individuals accounted for by the census/survey were between the ages of five and fourteen, while slightly more than one quarter (26%) were between the ages of 25 and 44. Twelve percent of the individuals accounted for were between 15 and 19 years old and nine percent were between the ages of 45 and 64 (see Table 18).

Table 20: Family Age Characteristics

Family	Age of Female Family Head (in years)	Age of Male Family Head (in years)	# of Kids and Age Range (in years)
L	53	38	2 (14 and 16)
M	31	36	6 (5 to 14)
N	40	Not applicable	2 (15 and 20)
O	33	Not applicable	3 (10 to 13)
P	40	Not applicable	2 (15 and 17)
Q	27	27	3 (3 to 8)
R	41	49	3 (6 to 13)
S	35	45	3 (9 to 14)
T	32	48	3 (5 to 18)
Average Age	37 years	40 years	11 years

Three of the nine prospective homeowners were of First Nations descent, followed by two families claiming no ethnic identity, one Filipino family, one of Mennonite descent, one African Canadian, and one of multiple ethnic origins.

Formal education levels were almost entirely below grade 12, but several respondents had completed various courses via Continuing Education and Community Colleges. Only three out of the fifteen interviewed adults had received their High School diploma. In relation to the level of education attained, respondents were largely employed in unskilled and menial labour positions. This employment was based primarily in the Health sector, as Aides or Support Workers, and in the Manufacturing, Processing and Labour sector. Ten of the fifteen respondents were employed full time, while four earned incomes either as a paid student, through disability benefits, or with part-time work. Two respondents were homemakers, one of who worked at a part-time job. Based on these jobs and sources of income, all of the respondents earned annual incomes below the LICO for Winnipeg.

All of the respondents were renters at the time of this research and had been for several years previous. Of the fifteen respondents, four had occupied their then-current residence for more than five years. Eleven had lived at their then-current residence for five years or less. Of these eleven respondents, three had moved only once in the past five years, while eight had moved two to four times in the same time period. These frequent moves were due, in part, to increasing rental prices that respondents could not afford to pay. Also, some of the respondent couples had not been together for five years at the time of the census/survey and therefore the data on residential mobility reflects the patterns of more respondents than Habitat families.

At the time of this interview, ten of the respondents had never lived in William Whyte before, while five had. Of these ten people, almost half had lived in neighbourhoods adjacent to William Whyte previous to their then-current residence. This demonstrates that two-thirds of the respondents had previously lived either directly in the neighbourhood or in close physical proximity and were therefore familiar with the William Whyte area before moving into their new homes.

To summarize, the families were ethnically diverse. A small majority of the nine families were married couples, the rest of which were lone-parents. The majority of respondents had not graduated from High School and, in accordance with Habitat for Humanity's homeowner selection requirements, all were earning below the Low Income Cutoff for Winnipeg. Employment consisted almost entirely of labour-oriented jobs. As renters, this group of respondents was somewhat mobile, half of whom had moved in the past year and slightly over half of all respondents having moved multiple times in the past five years.

Interviews

Intimate Networks

To ensure clarity, the information presented in this section is based on family responses (family heads – lone parents, common-law or married couples). The answers of both individuals in a married couple are counted as responses for one unit – the family – not individually. Therefore, mention of prospective homeowners or families refers not to individuals, as in the previous demographic characteristics section, but rather to family units. All of the following responses come from only nine Habitat families.

Families, in general, were found to maintain more frequent ties with their kin than with their friends. During the interviews, Habitat families were asked to name those people whom they considered closest to them (i.e., their intimate network members). A total of fifty-seven individuals were named. Of this total, two-thirds were kin and the remainder was friends. Of those named as friends, one third was also co-workers. Only four of the fifty-seven people listed lived in the same neighbourhood as the interview participant at the time of the interview (see Table 21).

Table 21: Intimate Network Characteristics

Typology of Relationships	Number	Percent of Total
Kin	36	63%
Neighbours	0	0%
Co-workers	7	12%
'Other Friends'	14	25%
Total	57	100%

Close contact in relation to the frequency of indirect (telephone, e-mail) or in-person communication was maintained more with kin. Three quarters of all intimate

network members were indirectly contacted between once a week and daily. In this regard three quarters of family members were mentioned, more than half of 'other friends' were stated and no co-workers qualified. For less frequent indirect contact (i.e. more than once a month but less than once a week) friends were mentioned five times more often than kin. Only one co-worker was contacted outside of work, while slightly less than one third of 'other friends' were contacted less than once a week but more than once a month.

In-person communication between once a week and daily was twice as common among kin as opposed to friends. All seven co-workers were seen at work either daily or several times a week, while slightly less than half (43%) of 'other friends' was seen with the same frequency. One-fifth of 'other friends' were seen less frequently (i.e. more than once a month but less than once a week) while one-third of them were seen less than once a month or with unknown frequency. More than one-third of kin were seen less than once a month or with unknown frequency.

Types of Support

The interview data showed that outings for recreational purposes were typically carried out with kin. In addition to this social function, kin were also predominantly trusted with and depended upon for ongoing and day-to-day emotional support. 'Other friends' were also found to provide significant emotional support. Families were three times more likely to turn to 'other friends' for this type of support than co-workers. Emotional support took the form of listening to and talking with prospective homeowners about both personal and individual life experiences.

Table 22: Support received from intimate network members

Support Types	Kin	Neighbours	Co-workers	Other Friends
Recreation	53%	0	13%	33%
Emotional	60%	1%	10%	29%
Watch home	40%	33%	0	27%
Emergency child-care	40%	40%	0	20%
Help with house chores	-	-	-	-

For emergencies, the practical support sought after by families included the watching of their home and subsequent mail collection, plant watering and other similar functions while they were away. Habitat families named a total of fifteen people who they would ask for this type of support, divided between kin, 'other friends', and neighbours. In addition, families turned equally to kin and neighbours to provide child-care during an emergency.

With respect to more frequent forms of practical support (e.g. help with chores and property maintenance) a strong majority of the prospective homeowners said they received no help from non-household members.

From this, it was concluded that families had stronger emotional ties to kin, but 'other friends' were still considered important. Neighbours were turned to for help during a crisis.

Neighbours and Neighbourhood

When asked to list the number of local residents known by name, all nine families named a total of thirty-four people. Most of these people were either direct neighbours or lived elsewhere on the same residential block (28/34). Four families knew more than ten

of their neighbours by name, while an equivalent number knew fewer than three. Six prospective homeowners recognized more than ten neighbourhood residents by sight.

All nine families listed a total of thirty neighbours with whom they were in regular contact (three or more times a week). Two-thirds of these regular contacts took place with their direct neighbours, while the remaining third took place with people living elsewhere on the same residential block. Three families stated having no regular contact with anyone living in their neighbourhood. Known neighbours were largely met through their children, by talking to passersby, through friends and family or exchanges (of goods or information).

Only one family had neither been invited into their neighbours' homes or had invited neighbours into their home. This person lived in the same dwelling for over a decade and characterized the area as dangerous and getting worse at the time of this interview. The other eight families reported that they had received, in total, twenty-nine invitations to visit the homes of twenty-nine local residents. Direct neighbours and neighbours from elsewhere on the block had both equally extended slightly fewer than half of these invitations. Half of these invitations were for social purposes while the other half were for lending help or for unspecified reasons.

Table 23: Place-based networks

Categories (average per family)	Prospective Homeowners
Neighbours known by name	4
Neighbours recognized by sight	14
Neighbours spoken to regularly	3
Visits to neighbours' homes	4
Visits by neighbours	Unspecified (numerous)

Eight families had extended a large (but unspecified) number of invitations to numerous neighbours to visit their homes over their various years in residence. Slightly over half of these invitations were of a social nature. However, who the neighbours were that received these invitations and where they lived on the block could not be ascertained.

Five prospective homeowners had borrowed items from their neighbours in the past. Three families had lent items to neighbours. Most of the items that were borrowed were tools, and most exchanges were between direct neighbours.

From these responses, it appears that families largely focused on their own residential block and its residents as their neighbourhood. Only three families had significant neighbourhood-based connections with neighbours, but largely on a superficial level. Sharing of personal problems or lending emotional support did not appear to be part of these relationships. However, small talk, the exchange of small favours and social invitations were part of these connections. Most of the neighbours known by name were listed by the three families with significant connections to neighbours. With the exception of one of these three families, who had the advantage of a number of kin as neighbours, the other two families were longer-term residents (4 or more years) in their dwelling and neighbourhood.

Six of the nine families did not maintain a large number of relationships with their neighbours. This was predominantly due to two main factors: family mobility and perceptions of danger in their neighbourhood. Four of these six families cited concerns with personal safety and mistrust as reasons for not getting involved in relationships with neighbours. Two of the six families had only lived in their dwelling for a short period of time (less than a year and a half) and had a pattern of frequently changing addresses over a five-year time span.

People with Children

This section deals with the prospective homeowners' knowledge of and interaction with their children's social circles. As some of the children were teenagers or older, families chose not to answer some questions or merely remarked that the question did not apply to their situation or to some of their children. Two of these questions concerned babysitters for their children. As an example, two teenagers lived in the same household and the parent/family decided that this section did not apply. Therefore, the family did not contribute their responses to this section. Instead, this section compiles the responses of the remaining eight Habitat families.

Nearly all (90%) of the families' children that were younger than fourteen years of age tended to stay in the area very close to their home. When asked to list their children's friends, the eight families provided a total of fourteen names. Nine of these friends were direct neighbours or lived on the same block. Six of the eight prospective homeowners/parents knew at least some of the parents of their children's friends.

Children fifteen years or older had friends primarily from school or different neighbourhoods. Of these friends, most parents knew only a few of their parents.

Scheduled child-care was provided by a spouse or the oldest child living at home in the vast majority of cases. Five parents did not bring their children's friends along on family outings; however five families' children were invited on outings by their friends' parents.

Based on these responses, it appears that children under the age of fourteen contribute to neighbourhood ties between parents and neighbours as they tend to stay in the local area and of their connections to their neighbourhood friends. Most parents were either directly involved, or at least aware of, their younger children's social lives. It is a safe assumption that part of this involvement was in order for parents to ensure their children's safety and security.

Local Social Participation

Three prospective homeowners said they were involved in their neighbourhood through schools, an informal neighbourhood watch or local activities designed to keep kids off the street. Six families reported no involvement in local area voluntary organizations or associations.

Six families did not attend Church, nor did they volunteer with any organization. However, three of these families who did not volunteer stated that they used to at one time. At the time of this interview, three prospective homeowners volunteered at schools, hospitals, churches, or sports teams. For volunteers, time commitments ranged from weekly to once every two or three months. One out of these three volunteer-families

reported having met at least one person they considered emotionally close through volunteering (although this person was not listed as a member of the individual's intimate network).

One Habitat family reported meeting some of the people on their intimate network list through religious activities, though not formally through a Church. These activities included prayer meetings and informal social functions.

Based on these responses, it appears that volunteering and the Church did not produce a strong impact on intimate networks for the majority of families.

Area Perceptions

It is important to note that all nine of the interviewed families lived in different neighbourhoods at the time of this interview. Therefore, they were describing different areas of Winnipeg. As well, prospective homeowners gave numerous answers to the same question, which resulted in some overlap and seemingly contradictory comments.

Despite some families' reporting fairly high levels of contact with neighbours and being aware of whom the local residents were, six of them described their then-current neighbourhood as dangerous, and three described it as a place where crime occurred. At the same time, four Habitat families described their neighbourhood as quiet while three described their neighbourhood as noisy. Three families said their neighbourhood was safe while three others said or implied that good people lived there.

When asked about leaving their neighbourhood to live in William Whyte, six of the nine families commented that it would be an 'okay' place to live, while the remaining three families reserved judgment. This translated into four prospective homeowners

looking forward to moving, while three families were either 'okay' or resigned to the fact. Most families were moving to William Whyte because that is what Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity had available at the time.

Conclusions

Due to low-incomes, all nine families lived in rental dwellings at the time of the interview. Although three of the families were long-term residents in their dwelling, most were not and had moved frequently in the five years previous to 2001. There was no overall positive correlation between longer lengths of tenure and higher levels of interaction with neighbours and the neighbourhood. However, there were correlations between lower levels of neighbourhood and neighbourly interaction with perceptions of danger in the local area and shorter-terms of residence. Habitat families were less likely to create or maintain relationships with neighbours in areas where concern for personal safety and property was in question, or in cases when the families had the expectation of moving to a new neighbourhood within a short period of time. The perceptions of potential danger appear to have affected the patterns of neighbourly interaction with those Habitat families that had longer lengths of tenure at their rental address. These families chose to limit their interaction with neighbours and involvement in the neighbourhood.

Overall, although prospective homeowners did maintain a semblance of connection with neighbours, their intimate networks focused on kin and friends who did not live in the same neighbourhood. Of these intimate network members, kin was the most important as they provided the most on-going and emotional support requested by Habitat families.

Generally speaking, co-workers, though seen very frequently, were not involved in the nine families' lives in a very personal way. Only a small handful (3/7 co-workers, 3/57 total network members) was entrusted with providing emotional or on-going support to prospective homeowners.

'Other friends' provided some of the overall emotional and day-to-day support received by the nine families. However, some of the families relied solely on 'other friends' for these types of support, not depending on kin at all.

Habitat parents demonstrated a pervasive concern for their children's well-being and safety in their interview answers. Stemming from this concern, parents were acquainted with their children's friends and other parents largely as a result of children under the age of 14 staying and playing close to home. Younger children added an important part to the puzzle of neighbourhood connections. Several connections with neighbours were created through their children and may have been maintained even after the children had grown up and left home.

Neighbours, as members of place-based and secondary networks, provided frequent contact and an associated sense of security in the neighbourhood. In essence, allowing prospective homeowners to feel comfortable with their children playing in the neighbourhood or feeling secure in the knowledge that neighbours would provide help if needed. This sense of security however, only existed for three of the nine Habitat families, who had multiple connections with numerous neighbours. Relationships with neighbours were largely superficial. That is to say, these relationships generally did not have the levels of intimacy associated with providing emotional or day-to-day support.

Habitat families did not participate in local volunteer-based organizations in their neighbourhoods. Nor did most of the families attend Church or know any of their fellow parishioners through this attendance. What this all adds up to is a reduction in the resources available to each family and therefore a reduction in the social capital each family possessed to help better their situation.

Prospective Habitat Homeowners and Established Homeowners Comparisons

The interviews and census/surveys completed by prospective Habitat homeowners were compared to those completed by established homeowners (Chapter 6). The purpose was to track the differences between renters and established homeowners who have lived in a specific home or on a specific block for several years. As previously mentioned in Chapter Two, several authors have shown that homeowners tend to be better acquainted with their neighbourhood and its residents as do renters. Identifying the main differences in local social patterns and intimate networks allowed for a better understanding of whether or not established homeowners had stronger neighbourhood ties and place-based networks than low-income renters (prospective Habitat homeowners).

Comparing intimate networks permitted insight into where interviewed families drew their most frequent and strongest sources of support and resources. Some of the support supplied by network members was child-care, house maintenance, listening and talking, and social activities to name but a few. The information stemming from these comparisons allowed insight into the role of place-based networks in an individual's personal life.

Examining the interview section pertaining to 'Neighbours and Neighbourhood' provided insights into the patterns of social interaction between residents of the three residential blocks. This section determines the types of social interaction (observation of neighbours but limited interaction; trading or reciprocal relationships; supportive relationships, etc.) and frequency with which they took place between neighbours.

Demographic Characteristics

The demographic data provided information regarding the social indicators discussed in Chapters Two and Four. Here, the demographic profile of the Habitat families (renters) and local/established residents/homeowners were compared to establish differences and similarities in the demographic influences affecting the two sample groups. In particular, education levels, types of occupation and income levels, and ethnic origins to determine potential social implications such as class differences, ethnic conflicts, etc.

Both sample groups consisted of a majority of married couples, but almost half (4/9) of Habitat families were headed by lone-parents. As well, Habitat and established families were ethnically diverse primarily claiming First Nations and Filipino identities.

As was previously mentioned in this chapter, over half (58%) of Habitat family members were younger than twenty years of age while one third (35%) were older than twenty-five years old. Established homeowners however, were more evenly proportioned as fewer than half (43%) of their members were younger than twenty years old and half (49%) were older than twenty-five years of age.

More than three quarters (80%) of Habitat respondents had not graduated from High School while one-fifth (20%) had. All of the local residents who were interviewed possessed a High School diploma and half had gone on to achieve a University degree or certificate as well. Perhaps consequently, Habitat families were engaged in primarily menial labour employment offering low wages. Local residents were employed as skilled labour, in office work, or in menial labour. However, both Habitat respondents and established homeowners were predominantly engaged in full-time employment.

On the other hand, established homeowners had higher levels of formal education, which translated into more skilled employment and presumably higher annual incomes. As well, Habitat families (as low-income renters) were much more prone to residential mobility and had more children living at home than parents – the opposite in both respects to established homeowners. As renters for several years, half of the Habitat respondents had moved more than once in the previous five years. However, local residents exhibited more stability by living in the same home or on the same residential block for nine or more years.

As has been mentioned previously in Chapter Four (Area Residents' Perceptions), some of the three blocks' homeowners have expressed issues they had with low-income renters. A significant proportion of this area's low-income renters have been of First Nations descent. Therefore, these issues may come to bear on how Habitat families were welcomed and integrated into the neighbourhood. Also, the issues of education and types of employment play a role in neighbours finding things in common to talk about and share, such as values and attitudes.

Interviews

Habitat families tended to maintain more frequent indirect and in-person contact with members of their intimate network than established homeowners. Frequent contact was maintained more with kin than friends for both interviewed groups too. However, both interview groups had more ties to kin than 'other friends', co-workers and neighbours in their intimate networks.

Table 24: Intimate Network Comparisons

Typology of Relationships	Established Homeowners (Number and Percent of Total)	Prospective Habitat Homeowners (Number and Percent of Total)
Kin	19 (63%)	36 (63%)
Neighbours	0	0
Co-workers	1 (3%)	7 (12%)
'Other Friends'	10 (33%)	14 (25%)
Total	30 (99%)	57 (100%)

In terms of resources accessed through intimate networks, both groups primarily depended on kin for on-going emotional support. Overall, they maintained stronger emotional and supportive ties to kin rather than friends. Two differences between Habitat and established families exist in the 'Types of Support' questioning however: help sought during crisis and people with whom families turned to for emotional support. In terms of emotional support, prospective homeowners relied much more on 'other friends' while co-workers played a larger role for local homeowners.

Table 25: Comparison of support received from intimate network members

Support Types	Kin		Neighbours		Co-workers		Other Friends	
	EH	PH	EH	PH	EH	PH	EH	PH
Recreation	55%	53%	0	0	0	13%	45%	33%
Emotional	67%	60%	0	1%	20%	10%	13%	29%
Watch home	67%	40%	33%	33%	0	0	0	27%
Emergency child-care	45%	40%	55%	40%	0	0	0	20%
Help with house chores	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Established Homeowners (EH) and Prospective Homeowners (PH).

During an emergency, Habitat families sought a significant proportion of help from kin, friends and neighbours to watch their homes. Local homeowners turned primarily to kin, but also to specific neighbours to watch their homes and provide child-care during an emergency. However, while prospective homeowners were also primarily dependent on kin and neighbours, they also enlisted the help of 'other friends' for emergency child-care.

For those prospective and established homeowners with children there was an important similarity and one main difference. Both groups were partially connected to their neighbours through their children younger than fourteen years of age. Parents knew each other as result of knowing their children's friends as most of these friends lived on the same residential block. The main difference emerged with the existence of relationships between parents of their children's friends. Habitat families had only one or two relationships in total with fellow parents in their neighbourhood in which they exchanged child-care responsibilities with each other, such as taking the children on outings. However, two of the three established homeowners with dependent children

requiring supervision had reciprocal child-care relationships with more than one neighbour.

Regarding the local neighbourhood in which the families lived, established homeowners were engaged with residents on the same block. Of this engagement, they consciously limited their involvement with neighbours to those that had been known over a long period of time. The average number of neighbours known by name was 10 and all of the established homeowners recognized more than 10 neighbours by sight. Among these relationships, regular contact (three or more times a week) was maintained but only rarely through visits to one another's homes. The average number of regular contacts was three. These neighbours lived directly adjacent to the established homeowners and elsewhere on the block. There was one example of a reciprocal trading relationship of personal property between a neighbour and an established homeowner.

Table 26: Comparison of place-based networks

Categories (average per family)	Established Homeowners	Prospective Homeowners
Neighbours known by name	10	4
Neighbours recognized by sight	15	14
Neighbours spoken to regularly	3	3
Visits to neighbours' homes	2	4
Visits by neighbours	1	Unspecified (numerous)

Overall, Habitat families treated their own residential block and its residents as their neighbourhood. Three of these families were actively involved in their neighbourhood's social circles, while three other families engaged with neighbourhood

residents sparingly or not at all as a result of their perception of local danger. Three of the nine Habitat families had no regular contacts and the average number overall for the nine Habitat families was three. The average number of neighbours known by name was four and two-thirds of Habitat families recognized more than 10 neighbours by sight. None of the prospective homeowners had reciprocal trading relationships with their neighbours.

One Habitat family was very involved with an informal prayer group and its members. However, overall, Church and local volunteering activities had little impact on the intimate networks of either sample group.

While some prospective homeowners reported living in dangerous neighbourhoods, they also acknowledged the areas to be quiet, safe and consisting of good people as residents. In contrast to these comments, some of the Habitat families stated that their neighbourhoods experienced crime and was noisy instead. When asked about moving to William Whyte, most Habitat families stated they were going there because WHFH was not offering homes anywhere else for that year. Despite this implied reluctance, most families thought the neighbourhood would be okay as a place to live. Half of the Habitat families were looking forward to the move while one third was merely resigned to it.

Local homeowners thought that their block was generally a good area where they got along relatively well with their neighbours. In contrast however, they went on to indicate that while they felt safe in the neighbourhood during the day, this feeling did not apply to nights. Most families said that crimes had occurred on their block and some had been perpetrated on them.

Overall, renters and established homeowners shared the following network traits:

- Stronger ties to, and more dependence on kin;
- Connections to neighbours through their children younger than 14 years of age;
- Basic awareness of local residents by sight;
- Equal average number of regular contacts with neighbours;
- Volunteering with local organizations and involvement in Church activities had little impact on intimate networks;
- Both groups of interviewees reported relatively social neighbours (by meetings on the street or through self-introductions).

The major difference between the Habitat families and established homeowners pertained to the nature and number of their relationships with neighbours. On average, established homeowners knew more neighbours by name and more of these homeowners recognized 10 or more neighbours by sight than the prospective homeowners. Habitat families' relationships were largely localized to direct neighbours and were limited to a superficial level – small talk and small favours only. On the other hand, while established homeowners appeared to consciously limit their contact with most block residents, the relationships that they did pursue with specific neighbours were multi-layered. While not emotionally intimate, these connections to neighbours involved lending support during crisis, exchanging child-care, socializing and trading personal property. As well, these relationships were dispersed among block residents and were not focused primarily with direct neighbours.

CH. 8 – NEW (HABITAT) HOMEOWNER
INTERVIEWS

Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity finished initial construction of the ten houses involved in the Ed Shreyer Work Project on July 13th, 2001. The ten Habitat homeowners moved into their new homes between August and September of that same year.

This set of interviews continues on from the first set conducted in May and June (2001) with the same nine Habitat families, who later moved into the newly constructed homes. Part of this chapter focuses on the Community Fix-Up Project's (CFP) role in neighbourly introductions between the months of May and August, 2001. The Winnipeg affiliate of Habitat for Humanity (WHFH) attempted to ease the families' transition and integration process into the neighbourhood by creating a reason for local residents and prospective Habitat homeowners to interact and build connections with one another. As has been previously explained in more detail in Chapter Five, the affiliate employed the Community Fix-Up Project (CFP) to achieve this goal.

Only two of the nine interviewed Habitat families participated in CFP activities. One of these two families actually worked on a local resident's home renovations, while the other worked on activities aiming to improve the aesthetics of local public areas such as mowing the grass on local blocks. As a result, only one Habitat family met an individual they had not known previous to the renovation. None of the other seven Habitat homeowners met anyone through the Project. In this regard, the CFP did not appear to achieve its goal of easing the transition and integration of Habitat families into their new neighbourhoods. However, this is not to say that WHFH had no positive effects. In fact, all of the nine new homeowners reported meeting several of their fellow block residents as a direct result of pre-Blitz and Blitz week construction activities.

Transition to Chickney, Kapusko and Ruperts Avenues

Every new homeowner reported meeting local residents or fellow Habitat homeowners through WHFH and its Pre-build and/or Blitz construction activities. Nearly all of the families (8/9) reported that none of their new neighbours visited or offered to help during the move into their new homes. Most of the visits with neighbours were either during Pre-Blitz Week activities or after the families had moved.

Two-thirds of the thirty people that helped the Habitat families during this move were members of the nine families' intimate networks and one-third was not. Three of these helpers (10%) were co-workers, 13 were 'other friends' (43%), and 14 were kin (47%).

Most of the known block residents were met during house construction activities or because they were fellow Habitat homeowners. One homeowner in particular knew several neighbours from previously living on the block. In general however, Habitat families had met an unspecified number of residents while walking on local streets. This information indicates that a lively and active street life exists in the area during the warmer months of the year, as many homeowners have reported talking to passersby in the summer and early autumn.

When they first moved into their new homes in August and September 2001, four of the families reported their children being excited and happy with the change. Three of the new homeowners reported their children liking it in their new neighbourhood, while one child in particular did not like it there. At the time of the follow-up interview only one Habitat family reported their children being happy with the area. Two families reported their children feeling safer in their new setting as opposed to their old

neighbourhood and two new homeowners said that their children were still adjusting to the new area.

So, why is it that some children felt safer and liked their new neighbourhood while others did not? Two reasons may be part of the answer. The first reason has to do with the families' previous neighbourhood. The children who were reported having problems with living on their new blocks were also reported, by their parents, as having numerous strong ties to people in their previous neighbourhood – child and adult resident alike. The loss of this sense of familiarity may, in part explain the dissatisfaction and feelings of not being safe.

The second part of the answer to this may be in how well the transition into their new social setting occurred. Parents reported two-thirds of their children's friends living either on their new block or within William Whyte and one quarter were classmates. Four families chose to keep their children in their previous schools while five families enrolled their children in local facilities. Some of the children with friends in schools from other neighbourhoods were also the children who were having more problems adjusting to William Whyte. Children who attended other schools from the neighbourhood children appear to have fewer connections to them.

Overall, participants' children were having problems adjusting to their new surroundings and neighbourhood children. Three of the parents reported problems with their children adjusting to their new surroundings as a result of fights with local (block) children, run-ins with gang members, and assault by "school thugs". In general however, the children were happy to be in a home the family owned.

Social Implications of the Move

Overall, the following intimate network traits did not change over seven months for the Habitat families:

- Reliance on kin for emotional support but a dependence on various sources for crisis support;
- Connections to neighbours through their children younger than 14 years of age, minor child-care exchanges;
- Relatively same levels of interaction with, and knowledge of, neighbours;
- Volunteering with local organizations and Church involvement had little impact on intimate networks.

Generally speaking, the new homeowners had moved to more place-based intimate networks than when they were prospective Habitat homeowners. This shift may have been due to an expectation of continuity in the neighbourhood and therefore greater willingness to make personal investments in relationships with neighbours. The more place-based networks may also have been the result of the initial move and the attempt by new homeowners and local residents to establish links to one another for neighbourhood security reasons. Another explanation for this shift may simply be the result of the new relationships between Habitat families that were then-new neighbours.

As new homeowners, Habitat families did not focus as much on direct neighbours, as they had met more neighbours who were dispersed on the same residential block and not all fellow Habitat families were direct neighbours. An initial spike in interest stemming from and toward neighbours after Habitat families moved onto Ruperts, Kapusko and Chickney avenues may explain this pattern.

An initial spate of interest in Habitat activities was most likely the result of local residents trying to get a feel for who their new neighbours were, motivated out of a sense of mitigating a fear of the unknown. Local residents may have tried to dispel their fears by being able to identify the Habitat families on their block by sight and, preferably, by name. By meeting the new homeowners, block residents gained the opportunity to assess their new neighbours, based on their own values and attitudes, to decide if these people were positive additions to the neighbourhood. Part of this assessment was the extension and accepting of invitations into each other's home. The home visits permitted a more in-depth assessment of an individual by revealing clues about income level and aspects of that person's attitudes, beliefs and values regarding upkeep of property, religion and ethnic background.

Secondly, meeting one's new neighbours provided knowledge of them, which may have been used to compare to information gathered by other known local residents. The potential for comparing notes may have provided locals with a means to further strengthen their own bonds, and an avenue for gauging local public opinion on the new situation and neighbours.

Habitat families chose not to maintain most of these new relationships with block residents. New homeowners displayed a reluctance to get too involved with their new

neighbours, most likely as a result of the need to more fully assess the new neighbourhood situation – who is reliable, who is safe and who is not, etc.

New homeowners displayed a decrease in the proportion of kin named as intimate network members and an increase in neighbours, ‘other friends’ and co-workers. The proportional decrease in kin was the result of a larger total number of intimate network members listed, not a significant drop off of kin names mentioned.

Table 27: Intimate network comparisons

Typology of Relationships	Prospective Habitat Homeowners (Number and Percent of Total)	New Habitat Homeowners (Number and Percent of Total)
Kin	36 (63%)	30 (43%)
Neighbours	0	3 (4%)
Co-workers	7 (12%)	14 (20%)
‘Other Friends’	14 (25%)	20 (33%)
Total	57 (100%)	70 (100%)

There was less focus on kin in the frequency of indirect contact and more on ‘other friends’, co-workers and neighbours as well. However, in-person contact with kin had increased in frequency, along with the provision of practical support by kin and crisis support by neighbours.

An increase in the frequency of in-person communication and practical support provided by kin was a direct result of the new house. Kin provided nearly all of the support requested by new homeowners with regards to house and property maintenance and household chores. In addition to these reasons for being at the house, kin were also making more social visits. Some of these visits were merely drop-ins while on their way to other destinations.

Analysis of the Move

Some of the social processes involved in these network changes were the loss and replacement of neighbourhood-based networks and the associated benefits for parents and children. Two of these benefits were a sense of personal security and social interaction in the neighbourhood. For the Habitat families that had previously formed these networks, they had to leave behind neighbours who had provided support during emergencies, exchanged child-care and personal property, and served a socializing role in the neighbourhood.

Children also had to deal with the loss of neighbourhood and school friends. However, four of the nine new homeowners kept their children enrolled in their previous neighbourhood's school. Three children younger than 14 years old and five children older than 15 years of age attended schools outside of William Whyte's borders. All of the older children used public transportation to attend school, while the younger children received a ride from their parents. This decision allowed some of the Habitat children to maintain their relationships with classmates and old neighbourhood friends. Some of the older Habitat children traveled to their old neighbourhoods on their own to see friends on weekends or after school.

Both parents and children had begun the process of replacing their place-based networks in their new neighbourhood of William Whyte at the time of the families' second interview. Children under the age of 14 helped integrate the families into the new area by serving as a connection between Habitat parents and those of neighbourhood children. As a result of the more independent nature of the children over the age of 15, their social circles were largely located outside of William Whyte and their residential

block and were relatively unknown to their parents. Therefore, these social circles appeared to have very little or no impact on the intimate or neighbourhood networks of their parents.

Relocating required the new homeowners to access resources that could provide the needed labour and transportation for a one-time event - the move. Secondary networks proved to play a significant role in this recruitment, along with the predominant role of intimate network members. However, while intimate network members (primarily kin and 'other friends') supplied most of the labour for the moves, resources of additional labour and transportation were accessed through intimate network connections. Some of the individuals who helped with the move were friends of kin, children, and 'other friends'. These were not individuals who were members of the Habitat families' intimate networks, but were willing to provide help for the one-time event.

Interviews

This section of the chapter displays the data collected from the administration of the second Habitat family interview. The interviews were conducted with the nine Habitat families seven months after they had moved into their new homes and neighbourhood (March 2002). Some of the new homeowners had previously lived in William Whyte and subsequently knew other residents on their block and the area quite well. This resulted in one homeowner, in particular, feeling quite comfortable with the local neighbours and neighbourhood immediately after relocating to their new Habitat home.

In the intervening seven months between interviews, one of the new homeowners' marriages had dissolved. However, the number of network members reported by the new lone-parent family increased, rather than decreased, in comparison to the previously married couple's total network members.

The same definitions articulated in chapter six pertaining to 'other friends', co-workers, neighbours, kin, direct neighbours, social purposes (for visits with neighbours), scheduled child-care and trading or reciprocal relationships were employed in this analysis.

This interview focused partially on the families' experiences and transition into their new neighbourhood. As a result, questions from the first interview pertaining to day-to-day emotional support were removed from the second interview. This interview sought to highlight changes in individual intimate and place-based networks and social patterns resulting from the transition from renter to new homeowner.

Of note, the onset of winter had changed social interaction patterns between neighbours. Most new homeowners reported rarely seeing or speaking to neighbours since winter began, but did expect this to change with spring and summer approaching.

Intimate Networks

When asked to name members of their intimate network, the nine Habitat families listed a total of seventy people. More than half were friends and less than half were kin. More than half of these friends were 'other friends', one-third were co-workers and less than one-tenth were neighbours (see Table 20). Of note here is that five of the seventy listed names belonged to fellow new Habitat homeowners, although not necessarily living

on the same residential block. One third of all network members also lived in William Whyte.

Table 28: Intimate Network Characteristics

Typology of Relationships	Number	Percent of Total
Kin	30	43%
Neighbours	3	4%
Co-workers	14	20%
'Other Friends'	23	33%
Total	70	100%

Thirty-eight intimate network members (54%) were indirectly contacted between once a week and daily (via telephone or e-mail). Friends and kin were split evenly in this regard, specifically more than half of 'other friends', one-third of co-workers and one-third of neighbours were included in this category. For less frequent indirect contact (i.e. more than once a month and less than once a week) friends and kin was mentioned equally once again. The most significant difference between friends and kin was found in the category of 'is not in communication'. This category accounted for all new homeowner answers that indicated no contact with certain network members via phone or e-mail. Friends were mentioned three times as often as kin in this category, which comprised slightly more than one-fifth of all network members. Two-thirds of neighbours and more than half of the co-workers named made up this category.

Forty-three network members (62%) were seen (i.e. in-person) between once a week and everyday. Slightly more than half of these in-person communications occurred with friends and the rest were with kin, specifically slightly less than two-thirds (61%) of 'other friends', nearly all (93%) co-workers and all neighbours were included in this category. Both friends and kin were equally represented in less frequent in-person visits

(i.e. more than once a month and less than once a week) accounting for one-fifth of all such communications. The most significant difference between kin and friends took place in the 'does not see' category, as kin were mentioned seven times as often as friends. These people accounted for slightly more than one-tenth of all network members.

Therefore, Habitat families maintained equally frequent contact with 'other friends' and kin. Friends were less likely to be contacted via phone or e-mail but more likely to be participants in in-person communications. This trend is most likely due to friends also being co-workers and due to some kin residing outside of Winnipeg and/or Manitoba, as they were less likely to be seen in-person.

Types of Support

New homeowners were typically accompanied on entertainment outings away from the home with kin and only occasionally with friends, almost exclusively 'other friends'.

During an emergency, seven families would rely on their oldest child still living at home to watch the rest of the children until their return. The remaining two homeowners would not ask anyone. All nine Habitat families named a total of ten people who they would ask to watch their house while away for an emergency. Half of these ten people were neighbours while the other half consisted of family (3) and 'other friends' (2). Some of the duties associated with this task included collecting the families' mail, watering the plants, keeping an eye on the place, etc. Who the new homeowners trusted with the keys to their house was a different matter however. Six of the keys were entrusted to kin, while three were given to neighbours and one to 'other friends'. This last statistic illustrates the

transition of the individual homeowners into the neighbourhood. Neighbours were known and some trusted.

Table 29: Support received from intimate network members

Support Types	Kin	Neighbours	Co-workers	Other Friends
Recreation	67%	0	5%	28%
Watch home	30%	50%	0	20%
Emergency child-care	-	-	-	-
Help with house chores	90%	5%	0	5%

Practical support was largely derived from kin. Five of the families received help from outside the household with tasks of property maintenance and household chores. Kin provided nearly all (90%) of this support.

From these responses, it was concluded that while new homeowners depended mainly on kin for social and practical support, neighbours were trusted enough to be turned to for help during a crisis.

Neighbours and Neighbourhood

When asked to list the names of their neighbours, all nine families mentioned a total of 58 people. One third of these people were direct neighbours while two-thirds of them lived elsewhere on the same residential block. Five new homeowners knew three or fewer of their neighbours by name, while four Habitat families knew the names of ten or more block residents. The vast majority of neighbours known by name were not direct residents but lived elsewhere on the block. In addition to knowing neighbours by name, new homeowners also recognized approximately sixty block residents by sight. Four

Habitat homeowners recognized ten or more block residents by sight and five families recognized fewer than ten block residents.

Fifteen block residents were named as neighbours with whom new homeowners maintained regular contact (three or more times a week). Nine of these residents were direct neighbours, as the remainder lived elsewhere on the block.

Table 30: Place-based networks

Categories (average per family)	Prospective Homeowners
Neighbours known by name	6
Neighbours recognized by sight	7
Neighbours spoken to regularly	2
Visits to neighbours' homes	2
Visits by neighbours	2

As a means to become better acquainted with one's neighbours, invitations of various sorts were often extended and accepted. Seven of the nine Habitat families had received twenty-one invitations to visit the homes of twenty of their neighbours. Direct neighbours extended two-thirds of these invitations and one-third were received from residents living elsewhere on the block. New homeowners accepted only ten of these invitations, as the rest were either rejected or not followed up on. Nearly all (90%) of the invitations were for social purposes and the rest were to request favours or unspecified reasons. Of the invitations extended to the nine families, most (62%) came from fellow new Habitat homeowners.

Of the nine Habitat families, eight had extended seventeen invitations to visit their homes to seventeen neighbours. Nearly all (90%) of these invitations were for social purposes and three quarters of them were accepted. Direct neighbours received three

quarters of these invitations and the rest were extended to neighbours living elsewhere on the block. More than one-third of these invitations were extended to fellow new Habitat homeowners.

Five families had neither lent nor borrowed anything from their neighbours. Those homeowners that did lend and borrow did so largely as one-time events or exchanged items only with certain individuals. Exchanged items included cigarettes, tools and small household appliances (teapot, toaster, etc.).

It can therefore be concluded that the families were actively maintaining their connections with fellow new Habitat homeowners. Most of these ties and those with other neighbours occurred as a direct result of Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity construction activities between May and August 2001. Since that time, neighbours and new homeowners were making efforts to get to know one another. Habitat families showed a reluctance to get too actively involved with neighbours before more fully assessing them and the neighbourhood.

People with Children

Only eight of the nine Habitat families deemed this section applicable to their situation. Therefore, responses that were given pertain only to eight families.

Nearly all (90%) of the new homeowners' children, who were fourteen years old or younger, tended to stay in the local area surrounding their home. Children fifteen years of age and over tended to have friends from school or different neighbourhoods.

When asked to list their children's friends, the eight families named a total of forty-eight children. All of the homeowner/parents, except one, could name their

children's friends. Slightly less than half of these friends lived on the same residential block as the new homeowners and one quarter of them were schoolmates. Five families did not know the parents of their children's friends, while four did know some of the parents.

Five new homeowners extended invitations to their children's companions, while three did not. In turn, the same proportion of Habitat families who had extended invitations had their children receive them from their friends' parents.

In half the cases, when parents were absent and childcare was needed, children were left with kin, a friend, or a trusted sitter. The other families' children were old enough to care for themselves and/or their younger siblings.

Based on these answers to the interview questions, children younger than fourteen years old were contributing to the family's integration into the new neighbourhood by connecting their parents to neighbours. Also significant, are the nature of the connections between new homeowners and other parents on the block through their children, which were largely reciprocal.

Local Social Participation

None of the nine Habitat families were volunteering or were members of any local association or organization at the time of this interview. However, one family did meet other parents through events at their children's school (e.g. Parent-Teachers Night, student concerts, etc.).

Only one of the new homeowners regularly attended a local Church, St. Joseph's (denomination unspecified), on a weekly basis. This homeowner did not know any of

their fellow parishioners at the time of this interview. However, one Habitat family reported maintaining relationships with some of the people named as members of their intimate network through informal religious activities outside of Church. These activities included hosting a weekly prayer meeting in the family's home.

Based on these responses it appears that local volunteer and Church activities have had little impact on the intimate networks of the majority of Habitat families.

Area Perceptions and William Whyte Transition

New homeowners reported several disturbing incidents had occurred over the previous seven months. Six of these incidents involved their personal property being broken into (car, house and shed) while seven other occurrences of crime happened to neighbours living on their block. Two families reported no problems whatsoever with neighbours or criminal activities on their blocks.

Five new homeowners said that their block was 'good' and 'quiet'. Seven families reported having good feelings about their relationships with neighbours and characterized these relationships as good or as liking their neighbours. Three Habitat families thought their neighbours were friendly. While five new homeowners spoke to local residents whenever they were spotted, four families felt that neighbours were distant toward them.

In conclusion, it appeared that Habitat families did not blame their neighbours for the crimes that had been committed on their blocks. Seven of the nine homeowners reported incidents of crime occurring on their block but also reported having good feelings about their neighbours. Families saw these incidents as a problem affecting the larger neighbourhood of William Whyte, not just confined to their own block.

Summary

All four types of relationships specified in Chapter six were part of the families' intimate networks: kin, co-workers, neighbours and 'other friends'. All of who played different roles in the lives of the new homeowners.

Kin were mentioned as intimate network members more often than any other type of relationship. Overall, Habitat families kept in frequent indirect contact with kin but saw them less frequently than other network members. Kin provided the most support ranging from socializing to practical (day-to-day and crisis). More than half of the people whom new homeowners would trust with the key to their house were kin.

'Other friends' comprised one-third of the overall intimate network members and were frequently seen and in indirect communication with. Although in relatively small proportions, 'other friends' did supply some support in the forms of socializing and practical help during a crisis.

Co-workers made up 20% of the total number of intimate network members and were frequently seen in-person but seldom spoken with outside of the workplace. These network members did not provide any types of support outside of work to Habitat families.

Only 4% of all the intimate network members were neighbours. These people were seen in-person frequently but most were not indirectly contacted outside of face-to-face meetings. Neighbours supplied much of the crisis support to the new homeowners and notably, most of these people and some of the 'other friends' were fellow new Habitat homeowners.

The nine Habitat families were not participating in local voluntary organizations at the time of the interview, nor was the majority attending Church regularly. Therefore, involvement in local volunteer-based associations/organizations and Church had negligible impact on the new homeowners' intimate networks.

To summarize, some Habitat families provided various types of support to each other as neighbours and residents of different blocks. In general however, given their personal experiences with criminal activities on their block, the nine families were hesitant to become too actively involved with neighbours. This reaction was despite having a good perception of their relationships with neighbours.

Conclusions

This section of the chapter examines if, and how, new homeowners' intimate networks and place-based social interaction patterns became similar to those of established homeowners.

Table 31: Intimate network comparisons

Typology of Relationships	New Habitat Homeowners (Number and Percent of Total)	Established Homeowners (Number and Percent of Total)
Kin	30 (43%)	19 (63%)
Neighbours	3 (4%)	0
Co-workers	14 (20%)	1 (3%)
'Other Friends'	20 (33%)	10 (33%)
Total	70 (100%)	30 (99%)

Overall, new and established homeowners shared the following intimate and place-based network characteristics:

- Significant proportion of 'other friends' and William Whyte residents as members of their intimate networks;
- Reliance on kin for practical support and scheduled child care;
- Concern about their children, involvement with other parents and an awareness of their children's social circles;
- Awareness of block residents by name;
- Average number of neighbours with regular contact;
- Mostly social visits between neighbours;
- Church activities and participation in local voluntary organizations had little impact on intimate networks;
- General concern with safety in the area after having personally experienced and witnessed crime on their residential blocks;
- Generally positive opinions of relationships with neighbours and the overall neighbourhood.

Table 32: Comparison of place-based networks

Categories (average per family)	Established Homeowners	New Homeowners
Neighbours known by name	10	6
Neighbours recognized by sight	15	7
Neighbours spoken to regularly	3	2
Visits to neighbours' homes	2	2
Visits by neighbours	1	2

There were only three main differences between the intimate and place-based networks of new and established homeowners: neighbourhood interaction, intimate network make-up, and the provision of support.

Established homeowners had a wider scope of interaction with their neighbours over more of their residential block than did new homeowners, who tended to focus on direct neighbours. Part of these interactions involved those with other parents living on the same block. Established homeowners were more active in this regard. This may simply be due to the fact that established homeowners have lived at the same address longer than the Habitat families and therefore were more familiar with block residents. Habitat families, in turn focused on the residents who lived in close physical proximity and were seen by the mere action of walking outside through one's front door, many of whom were fellow Habitat homeowners.

While new homeowners' intimate networks were comprised of co-workers and neighbours, established homeowners were predominantly kin. Habitat families had more frequent in-person contact with intimate network members while established homeowners had more frequent indirect contact and focused more of their contacts on kin.

Table 33: Comparison of support received from intimate networks members

Support Types	Kin		Neighbours		Co-workers		Other Friends	
	EH	NH	EH	NH	EH	NH	EH	NH
Recreation	55%	67%	0	0	0	13%	45%	33%
Emotional	67%	0	0	0	20%	0	13%	0
Watch home	67%	30%	33%	50%	0	0	0	20%
Emergency child-care	45%	0	55%	0	0	0	0	0
Help with house chores	100%	90%	5%	0	0	0	0	5%

Established Homeowners (EH), New Homeowners (NH). See Appendix D for a fuller comparison of all three interviews' intimate network members.

New homeowners relied more on neighbours for crisis support than did established homeowners. This difference may be related to the initial welcome that Habitat families received upon moving into the neighbourhood. As a result of block residents approaching the house sites during construction and pre-Blitz activities, new homeowners were exposed to an initial wave of friendly and interested neighbours. However, only a small number - one - of these initial contacts, with the help of a certain level of uncertainty and insecurity among Habitat families in owning their own home and living in William Whyte, turned into on-going relationships.

CH. 9 - CONCLUSIONS

The research presented here attempted to assess the level of integration and acceptance of the Habitat homeowners moving into new homes on Kapusko, Chickney and Ruperts avenues. Part of this research also assessed the notion that homeownership increases personal and neighbourhood stability. These assessments were provided by the analysis of social network data resulting from the three formal interviews with Habitat families and locally established homeowners.

Using the concept of social capital, the stability of neighbourhood life for Kapusko, Ruperts and Chickney avenues was evaluated. The notion of neighbourhood stability can easily be linked to the creation and maintenance of social capital (Sampson et al. 1997; National Crime Prevention Council of Canada 1997; Bolland and McCallum 2002). Social capital refers to the safety, security and accessible resources available through the protective networks of relationships between neighbours and local institutions. Relationships can be broken down or impaired with the addition of uncertainty in a neighbourhood. When this occurs, such as a result of urban decay's effects, the levels of social capital are decreased and residents seek new social strategies.

Urban decay and its effects on neighbourly interaction and social patterns within the research area figure prominently in this research. Specifically, four aspects of urban decay were particularly present in the research area - residential mobility, physical signs of social disorder, low levels of homeownership, and perceptions of urban danger/fear.

In general, the social indicators for both the neighbourhood of William Whyte and Ruperts, Kapusko and Chickney avenues illustrate the symptoms and effects of urban decay:

- High unemployment rate;
- Low levels of formal education;
- High proportion of menial labour and unskilled employment;
- High proportion of renters and low proportion of homeowners;
- Relatively high rates of residential mobility and short lengths of tenure at one address;
- Low annual income levels;
- High proportion of social assistance receipt;
- Significant proportion of common-law and lone parent families.

It was the general perception of local block residents and interviewed families that crimes were being committed in the research area. Some of these crimes were reported by block residents as taking place in the blocks' empty lots, abandoned and condemned houses and on local street corners. Other crimes were personally experienced by the block resident or by neighbours the resident was acquainted with.

These activities taking place in plain sight, along with the aging housing stock and unmaintained houses are symbols of the lack of social control in the area. They symbolized a latent threat to block residents' sense of security and safety. A high proportion of low-income renters living on Chickney, Ruperts and Kapusko avenues amplified the latent threat. This was largely due to two other properties: a propensity for

short-lengths of tenure and a significant proportion of tenants of First Nations descent.

Low-income renters tend to change addresses relatively frequently, in comparison to homeowners. As well, the blocks' First Nations renters were perceived by other local residents to be disruptive and problematic. This perception was not necessarily based on the behaviour of new residents so much as it was based on ethnic stereotypes.

All of these situations on the three blocks signify a split among local residents, notably renters and homeowners. The census/survey of the three affected residential blocks' residents showed definite demographic differences between renters and homeowners. Homeowners tended to have higher levels of formal education, longer lengths of tenure at the same address, had the only listed professional careers, were an older group, had more married couples, and consisted of more retirees. In addition, nearly all of the local residents of Filipino descent and a majority of individuals of European descent were homeowners, although some homeowners were also of First Nations descent.

On the other hand, renters were more likely to be of First Nations descent, have more and younger dependent children, more common-law and lone parent families, a higher proportion of younger adults, lower levels of formal education, more part-time and seasonal employment, much higher dependence on social assistance, and shorter lengths of tenure at one address.

In order to address the physical symptoms and social problems associated with urban decay in their inner city neighbourhood, local people, other than the interviewed homeowners, organized themselves into the William Whyte Residents Association in 2001. In cooperation with the Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiative, the North

End Housing Project and the North End Community Renewal Corporation, the Association had worked to formulate twenty-nine initiatives as part of the William Whyte Neighbourhood Housing Plan. Part of the Plan was to increase homeownership opportunities and crack down on dilapidated and substandard housing in the area. The approach was similar to that of Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity's ESWP and CFP, in that the Plan used incumbent upgrading and in-fill housing to address revitalization issues of neighbourhood stability. Both of these housing strategies maintains the character of the neighbourhood and does not necessarily significantly increase the local market prices of homes thereby forcing low-income renters to leave.

The CFP had little impact on creating social capital, as WHFH had originally intended. However, the organization's activities went a long way toward introducing local residents and Habitat families. While the ESWP and CFP did not appear to directly create relationships between neighbours and mutual investment in the neighbourhood, they did appear to facilitate the introduction and welcoming of Habitat families onto the three blocks. These projects and their activities also provided a venue and opportunity for Habitat families to create relationships with one another that went beyond the completion of their homes. Some of these families, at the time of the second interview, had maintained ties to other new homeowners as members of either their intimate or place-based networks.

Isolation was a very common social strategy mentioned by block homeowners to deal with the local situation, and appeared to be common among block renters as well. The interviews with the established homeowners showed that social capital was accumulated among local homeowners. These residents appeared to maintain contact

amongst themselves, largely excluding local renters. These renters tended to be low-income and/or short-term residents.

The interviewed families displayed a strong reliance on intimate networks for ongoing and daily support, and secondary networks for day-to-day social interaction and emergency or special event support. Parts of this secondary network were neighbours and therefore place-based.

The three sets of interviews did display certain similarities regarding intimate and place-based network structures. They were:

- Intimate networks were not neighbourhood-focused;
- Church and local voluntary organizations had little impact on either intimate or place-based networks;
- Children under the age of 14 helped connect parents on the same residential block;
- Social isolation or limited contact with neighbours were adopted social strategies;
- Security and the safety of one's family and self were important concerns;
- Pervasive perception of danger in their neighbourhood(s).

Homeownership appeared to have increased the new homeowners' stability. This stability was evident through the stronger influence of place-based networks in the new homeowners' lives, in comparison to the influence these networks had when they were prospective homeowners. Prior to acquiring homes, Habitat families had maintained weaker connections to neighbours in terms of knowledge of the neighbourhood and local

residents, and the number of links to specific neighbours. This difference can be explained by longer-terms of tenure at one address by established homeowners and also as a result of the associated place-based networks that provided an added sense of neighbourhood security.

The transition from prospective homeowner to new homeowner also displayed changes in intimate and place-based networks. More neighbours were included as the total number of people listed as members of their intimate networks had increased. All but one of these neighbours were Habitat families met during the course of the ESWP. These shifts were also reflected in a new focus on residents living elsewhere on the block, and not solely as direct neighbours. Neighbours, in turn, would be turned to a larger percentage of the time for help during an emergency. As well, while kin made up a smaller proportion of the intimate networks for new homeowners, kin had begun to provide more practical support and were seen in-person more often.

In comparison to established homeowners, new homeowners would turn to neighbours a larger proportion of the time for help during emergencies. However, established homeowners had more interaction with block residents, focusing less on direct neighbours. Pertaining to intimate network composition, both interview groups had a large proportion of kin listed as members. However, while established homeowners had a majority of kin as members, new homeowners' networks were more diversified. They listed more 'other friends', co-workers and neighbours than established homeowners.

Overall, new homeowners shared more intimate and place-based network characteristics with established homeowners compared to when they were prospective

homeowners. Notably, these characteristics included: a significant proportion of William Whyte residents as members of their intimate networks; a reliance on kin for practical support and scheduled child care; an equal awareness of the local residents by name and sight; conscious limited interaction with neighbours; general concern with safety in the area; personal experience with crime on their residential blocks; and a positive opinion of relationships with neighbours and the overall neighbourhood.

Homeownership appears to have increased the stability of the Habitat families through ties and attachments to their new neighbourhood. While the CFP did not function entirely as WHFH had hoped, the organization did find success in creating bonds between Habitat homeowners. Habitat families were interested in establishing themselves in a long-term arrangement as homeowners, and as residents of William Whyte. Essentially, the organization introduced families with an initial propensity for stability into a new neighbourhood where they continued moving towards more stability. The relationships that Habitat families developed amongst themselves greatly contributed towards this increase in place-based attachments and network members. Therefore, directly contributing to the each family's increased levels of social capital.

The CFP and other projects like it (William Whyte Housing Plan and North Point Douglas) contributed to social capital by directly addressing the issues of urban decay. By focusing on improvements to the physical and visible nature of neighbourhoods, through renovations and repairs to dwelling structures' exteriors, an area's character is seen to change. These improvements lead to the perception that people care about their neighbourhood and therefore the assumption that local social control is not far behind.

The perception of an improving area through visible cues signals a change in levels of personal safety and security. Improvements generate conversation and common experiences between neighbours. Residents take notice of improvements being made to a neighbour's home and have reason to talk to them. More than one neighbour who is involved in home improvements may talk to other residents for tips and to share experiences. As Riger (1993) pointed out, these types of informal conversations are very important forms of neighbourhood participation. They help to build trust among residents and a resulting sense that others will look out for them and the area.

Policy Recommendations

The evidence presented in this thesis demonstrates the potential for a sustained community-building effort such as the Millennium Project. In one ten-house build, Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity was able to replace ten vacant lots in a neighbourhood in distress with ten responsible families. This act impacted local residents by adding to their hope that local conditions could be changed and that their fortunes could be turned around for the better.

The Millennium Project, and its subsidiary Community Fix-Up, attempted to improve both the physical infrastructure and local social capital in the inner city neighbourhood of William Whyte. However, while the project's aims are a natural benefit to the new Habitat families moving into the area, the efforts went beyond this group of people to include local residents as well. By providing an avenue for new homeowners and local residents to become acquainted and dispel misperceptions, the organization promoted the creation of place-based and secondary networks. These types of social networks translated into a sense of security for Habitat and established

homeowners, as they knew that help from their surrounding neighbourhood was available if needed.

There were three main reasons directly influenced by Winnipeg Habitat that contributed to the Community Fix-Up Project not producing the hoped-for results. The first was the initial skepticism of local residents to the idea, which was anticipated and incorporated into the CFP's overall design. The idea was to overcome the skeptical attitude of residents by establishing precedence through each renovation project and beautification effort over the course of the five year Millennium Project. Secondly, post-Ed Schreyer Work Project clean-up activities siphoned volunteer-crews from CFP activities. This resulted in delaying specific projects due to a lack of labour. And thirdly, there were communication problems between the CFP Coordinator and Habitat homeowners which resulted in confusion and miscommunications regarding CFP activities. Part of these communication problems may stem from a lack of a means for contacting homeowners. When homeowners had more time available to donate their time to CFP activities (in May 2001), the Coordinator had limited resources in which to contact and organize them into volunteer crews. Essentially, as the CFP began to publicize and have its efforts recognized by local residents, it began to receive more requests. However, these requests came as homeowners were focused on home construction and moving-in thereby forcing the Coordinator to recruit volunteer crews from outside of the organization.

Recommendations to Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity for improving the outcome and impact of its community-building efforts are as follows:

- A) Increase efforts to recruit potential homeowners from targeted neighbourhoods.
- B) Continue pre-construction surveys and information campaign work (pamphlets and canvassing) in targeted neighbourhoods.
- C) If funding could be found, the Millennium Project's concept of larger-scale construction (50 homes over five years) and community-building should be revisited.
- D) Allow time for longer-term projects to reach their planned ends.

A) Specifically canvassing and talking to residents provides local people who fit Habitat's homeowner criteria, an awareness of the opportunities the organization offers. What this action provides to Habitat are individuals who are very familiar with a neighbourhood, know what to expect from the area and are willing to accept the situation. This acceptance helps make the otherwise normally stressful transition of adapting to the responsibilities of homeownership easier to handle. Another important beneficial product of this type of recruitment is that successful applicants are in the position to maintain local relationships and access to local resources. With these connections and resources intact, individuals are more likely to make an easier transition into their new responsibilities as homeowners and are therefore more likely to keep the financial commitment to Habitat for Humanity.

B) These activities appeared to have a definite impact on the aspects of community-building aimed at increasing the integration of Habitat homeowners into the

neighbourhood. Local residents were aware of the planned build and welcomed it, misperceptions about potential neighbours and the organization were addressed, and hope for local improvement in the form of ten stable, responsible families was introduced.

- C) Its basic principles of improving neighbourhood stability through interactions between new and local neighbours have wide-ranging applications in neighbourhoods other than William Whyte. Improving a neighbourhood through means other than constructing a house and placing a responsible, hard-working family in it has a positive influence on local residents. Mutual investment in each other's homes, and essentially each other's lives, creates a strong incentive for the smoother integration of new homeowners into an area.
- D) Longer-term projects provide three key advantages: an opportunity to build and maintain long-term contacts and public relation in-roads with neighbourhood residents; a longer evaluation period and time to work out issues and problems in the project's administration and delivery; and an opportunity to apply more quantitative measures on the social and physical impacts on local patterns and conditions.

Areas for Future Research

Areas of further research could include a fuller picture of neighbourhood interaction by examining the intimate and place-based networks of renters. Such research could permit a better understanding of how renters and homeowners interrelate in areas suffering from urban decay and its associated issues. As well, this type of research could

provide further insight into how residential and neighbourhood stability operates from the non-homeowners perspective.

Secondly, a more in-depth assessment of secondary networks could provide a better understanding of how an interview participant employs their entire social network. An examination of this sort would better place the use of intimate and place-based networks into a personal context.

Thirdly, research that did not, by necessity, limit its focus to intimate and neighbourhood residential blocks would provide a much richer description and texture of the place networks have in individuals' lives. This research could be particularly important to the understanding of social strategies in deteriorating inner city residential neighbourhoods.

Fourthly, as this research was limited in terms of time and resources, a further follow-up with the Habitat families (five years after their move into the new home) might be warranted. It has the potential to provide further insight into the process of integration and adaptation to block life. As well, an evaluation of the longer-term effects of homeownership on personal stability through their social networks would be available.

NOTES

¹ The particular signs of social disorder stem from research reported by Ross and Mirowsky (1999:413) and the effects of these signs on local residents stem from research conducted by Merry (1981).

² The names of these avenues are pseudonyms to protect the anonymity of those residents who participated in this research.

³ Although there were 10 Habitat homeowner families, one family was not interviewed (for more information see the section on Interviews later in this chapter). All 10 Habitat homeowners were given the designations L to T, while the local homeowners were given designations J, K, U and V. This was to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

⁴ The categories used here are those designated by Statistics Canada. "Ethnic origin pertains to the ancestral "roots" or background of the population, and should not be confused with citizenship or nationality" (Statistics Canada website 10b, 2004). Percentages are of the total number of responses – single and multiple. Accordingly, there were more responses than individual residents.

⁵ It is unclear whether the Statistics Canada category of 'husband-wife families' includes common-law couples, as there were no figures presented.

⁶ This statistic probed for the length of time that a respondent had lived in William Whyte over the course of their life. This often meant an estimation or approximation on the respondents' part, as they may have lived in the neighbourhood on more than one non-consecutive occasion.

⁷ The WHHI is an organization housing staff from all three levels of government to provide funding and administration of proposals.

⁸ Millard Fuller explains these concepts as follows: "we may disagree on all sorts of other things...but we can agree on the idea of building homes with God's people in need, and in doing so using biblical economics: no profit and no interest" (HFH website#1, 2004).

⁹ As well, each affiliate is asked to give 10% of its revenues to Habitat home construction in other countries (Stafford 2002).

¹⁰ The Annual Reports from 1990-1993 were all that were available at the Winnipeg affiliate's office in 2001.

¹¹ WHFH Information Manual (2000: 12).

¹² 18 new houses were built in 10 days in a north-Winnipeg inner city neighbourhood.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Census/Survey

1. Do you live at this residence? Yes No Other (Please Explain)
2. Do you rent or own this house? Rent Own Other (Please Explain)
3. What type of dwelling is this? (ask only if needed)
Apt. House (single-detached) Duplex (semi-detached) Rented Room (house)
Other (please specify) _____.
4. How long have you lived in this house? _____.
5. Where did you live previously? _____.
6. How long have you lived in this area (William Whyte)? _____.
7. How long have you lived in Winnipeg? _____.
8. How many times have you moved in the past: year ____; 3 years ____;
5 years ____.
9. How many people live in this house? _____. Are they related? Yes No Is Yes,
how? _____.
10. What are the ages of people who live in this house?
_____.
11. Number of Males _____ and Females _____ living here?
12. Marital Status: Single Married Common-Law Widowed
Divorced Separated Never Married
13. The adults in this house are currently: Employed Unemployed Retired
Student Part-time Full time Seasonal Other (please explain)
_____.
14. Is this household income: Single Dual Multiple?
15. Where do you work?
16. What is your occupation? _____.
Your spouse's? _____.

17. What is the highest level of education attained by you, your spouse and others living here? Grade Level _____; University (Degree or years completed) _____; Technical Training _____; Other _____.

18. Where were you born? _____.

19. Do you identify with an ethnic group? Please Specify.
_____.

APPENDIX B

Intimate Networks

1. Please name the people you consider closest to you.
2. How long have you known these people?
3. How did you first meet them?
4. Where do they live? (William Whyte, north end, Winnipeg, other)
5. How often do you see, visit, and/or speak with each of these people?

Neighbours and Neighbourhood

6. How many people in the neighbourhood do you know by name?
7. How many people living on this block do you recognize by sight?
8. How and when did you meet people you know who live on this block?
9. Is there anyone on this block that you speak to on a regular basis (three or more times a week)?

Types of Support

10. Who do you trust with private information about yourself or your family?
11. If you had a bad day, whom would you talk about it with?
12. Who would you talk to if you were having problems with neighbours, coworkers, friends or family members?
13. If you suffered a personal disaster (such as losing your job, a family member, or a close friend) whom would you talk about it with?

Neighbours and Neighbourhood

14. Have you ever been invited into anyone who lives on this block's home? Who? When? How often?
15. Have you ever invited anyone who lives on this block into your home? Who? When? How often? What was the occasion?
16. Have any of your neighbours ever borrowed anything from you? Who? What and when?

17. Have you ever borrowed anything from your neighbours? What and from whom? When?

Types of Support

18. If you had to leave the city for an emergency, whom would you ask to watch your house while you were gone? (Feed the cat, walk the dog, water the plants, pick up mail etc. Please specify responsibility given.)

19. Does anyone help you with household chores or property maintenance? Who?

20. When you decide to go eat at a restaurant, see a movie or play, or otherwise go out to be entertained, whom do you normally go with?

21. Do you have people over to your home on a regular basis? What for?

People with Children

22. Who do your children play with?

23. Do you know their parents?

24. When you take your kids out, do you invite your children's friends?

25. Do the parents of your children's friends invite your children along on outings?

26. When you go out for the evening, who usually baby sits for you?

27. If you had to rush out at a minute's notice, who would you ask to watch your children until your return?

Local Social Participation

28. Do you attend church? How often and which one?

29. Do you know any of your fellow parishioners? Who and for how long?

30. How often do you speak to and/or see these people?

31. Are you a member of any voluntary organizations (ex: charity, ethnic associations, etc.)? Please name them.

32. How often do you attend these organizations?

33. Have you met anyone you consider to be close to you through these organizations? Whom, when and in which organization?

34. Do you participate in locally organized groups such as Neighbourhood Watch, Block Parents, Neighbourhood Foot Patrol, Schools, etc.?

Area Perceptions

Local Homeowners

35. How would you describe living in this neighbourhood to a friend or relative who has never been here before?

36. Do you feel safe living here? Why or why not?

37. Do you feel safe walking in the neighbourhood? How about at night?

38. To your knowledge, have there been any crimes committed on this block? What kinds of crimes?

39. Do you know anyone on this block who has been a victim of crime? How about yourself?

40. Have you ever had any disagreements with anyone living on this block? With regards to what issue or situation? What happened?

Habitat Partners

41. What is your perception of the William Whyte neighbourhood as a place to live?

42. How do you feel about moving to William Whyte?

43. Why have you chosen to move to this neighbourhood?

44. How would you describe the neighbourhood in which you currently live?

APPENDIX C

Follow-up Interview

New (Habitat) homeowners - Transition

1. When did you finish moving into your new home?
2. Who helped you move in? How did they help?
3. Did any of your new neighbours come over during the move? Why?
4. How would you describe your experience in living on this block the past three months?
5. How would you characterize your relationship with your new neighbours?

Local Social Participation

6. Have you joined any local voluntary associations? Have you met anyone through them?
7. Are you attending a Church, or your children a school, in the local area? Have you met any of your fellow parishioners, or your children's friends' parents?

Local Homeowners

8. Did you help the new homeowners move in? How did you help?
9. Did you welcome them to the neighbourhood? How?
10. How did you feel when the new homeowners moved in?
11. Did you meet any of the new homeowners previous to their moving here? How?
12. How would you characterize your relationship with your new neighbours?

Intimate Networks – Both interview groups

13. Please name the people you consider closest to you.
14. How long have you known these people?
15. Where do they live? (William Whyte, north end, Winnipeg, other)
16. How often do you see, visit, and/or speak with each of these people?

Neighbours and Neighbourhood

17. How many people in the neighbourhood do you know by name?
18. How many people living on this block do you recognize by sight?
19. How and when did you meet people you know who live on this block?
20. Is there anyone on this block that you speak to on a regular basis (three or more times a week)?
21. Have you ever been invited into anyone who lives on this block's home? Who? When? What was the occasion?
22. Have you ever invited anyone who lives on this block into your home? Who? When? What was the occasion?
23. Have any of your neighbours ever borrowed anything from you? Who? What and when?
24. Have you ever borrowed anything from your neighbours? What and from whom? When?

Types of Support

25. If you had to leave the city for an emergency, whom would you ask to watch your house while you were gone? (Feed the cat, walk the dog, water the plants, pick up mail etc. Please specify responsibility given.)
26. Does anyone help you with household chores or property maintenance? Who?
27. When you decide to go eat at a restaurant, see a movie or play, or otherwise go out to be entertained, whom do you normally go with?
28. Do you have people over to your home on a regular basis? What for?

People with Children

29. Who do your children play with?
30. Do you know their parents?
31. How did your children react to living in a new area? Do they like this block?
32. When you take your kids out, do you invite your children's friends?

33. Do the parents of your children's friends invite your children along on outings?
34. When you go out for the evening, who usually baby sits for you?
35. If you had to rush out at a minute's notice, who would you ask to watch your children until your return?

APPENDIX D

Comparison of Intimate Network Characteristics

Typology of Relations	Established Homeowners		Prospective Homeowners (Habitat)		New Homeowners (Habitat)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Kin	19	63%	36	63%	30	43%
Neighbours	0	0%	0	0%	3	4%
Co-workers	1	3%	7	12%	14	20%
'Other Friends'	10	33%	14	25%	23	33%
Total	30	99%	57	100%	70	100%

REFERENCES

- Aaronson, Daniel.
2000. *A Note on the Benefits of Homeownership*. Journal of Urban Economics. 47(3): 356-369. (May).
- Accordino, John and Gary Johnson.
2000. *Addressing the Vacant and Abandoned Property Problem*. Journal of Urban Affairs. 22(3): 301-316.
- Barrett, A. Lee, R.S. Oropesa and James W. Kanan.
1994. *Neighborhood Context and Residential Mobility*. Demography. 31(2): 249-270.
- Barbour, Nancy.
2002. North Point Douglas Property Improvement Grant: Report. Winnipeg: North End Community Renewal Corporation. (October).
- Beggs, J.J., V.A. Haines, and J.S. Hulbert.
1996. *Situational Contingencies Surrounding the Receipt of Informal Support*. Social Forces. 75 (1): 201-222. (September).
- Blum, Terry C. and Paul William Kingston.
1984. *Homeownership and Social Attachment*. Sociological Perspectives. 27(2): 159-180.
- Bolland, John M. and Debra Moehla McCallum.
2002. *Neighboring and Community Mobilization in High-Poverty Inner-City Neighborhoods*. Urban Affairs Review. 38(1): 42-69. (September).
- Bott, Elizabeth.
1955. *Urban Families: Conjugal Roles and Social Networks*. Human Relations. 8: 345-384.
- Bradway Laska, Shirley, Jerrol M. Seaman and Dennis R. McSeveney.
1982. *Inner-City Reinvestment: Neighborhood Characteristic and Spatial Patterns Over Time*. Urban Studies. 19(2): 155-166.
- Brodsky, A.E.
1996. *Resilient single mothers with risky neighborhoods: Negative psychological sense of community*. Journal of Community Psychology. 24: 347-363.
- Brownlee, Joanne.
1995. In Search of a Good Neighbourhood. Winnipeg, MB: Institute of Urban Studies.

- Buendia, Hernando Gomez.
1989. Urban Crime: Global Trends and Policies. Tokyo: The United Nations University.
- Burgess, E. W.
1929. Urban Areas. IN Chicago: An Experiment in Social Science Research. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.
1987. A Consultation Paper on Housing Renovation. Ottawa, Canada.
- Carter, Tom and Christian Douchant.
1999. Homeowner Motivation and Revitalization of Older Residential Neighbourhoods: A Study of Incumbent Upgrading in Winnipeg, Final Report. Ottawa: External Research Program, CMHC. (December).
- Clay, Phillip L.
1979. Neighborhood Renewal: Middle-Class Resettlement and Incumbent Upgrading in American Neighborhoods. Toronto: Lexington Books. D.C. Heath and Company.
- Crane, Julia G. and Michael V. Angrosino.
1992. Field Projects in Anthropology: A Student Handbook. (Third Edition). Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Crosnoe, Robert.
2001. *Parental Involvement in Education: The Influence of School and Neighborhood*. Sociological Focus: Quarterly Journal of the North Central Sociological Association. 34(4): 417-435. (October/November).
- Department of Environmental Planning, City of Winnipeg.
1990. City of Winnipeg Neighbourhood Improvement and Housing Programs. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Dharsee, Salim S. and Betty Edel.
1994. A Background Study of the William Whyte Neighbourhood. Prepared for the North End Housing Project (NEHP). Winnipeg, MB. (September).
- DiPasquale, Denise and Edward L. Glaeser.
1999. *Incentives and Social Capital: Are Homeowners Better Citizens?* Journal of Urban Economics. 45: 354-384.
- Douchant, Christian E.
1994. Incumbent Upgrading. A Framework for Analysis: Towards a New Understanding of Residential Revitalization in Winnipeg. M.C.P. Thesis. Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba.

- Epstein, A.L.
1961. *The Network and Urban Social Organization*. *The Rhodes-Livingstone Institute Journal*. No. XXIX: 29-61.
- Fischer, C.S.
1982. *To Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks in Town and City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Flusty, S.
1997. *Building Paranoia*. IN *Architecture of Fear*. N. Ellin (Ed.) New York: Princeton Architectural Press. pp. 47-60.
- Fredrickson, Maggie.
1999. *The Process of Residential Decline: a Case Study of William Whyte and Lord Selkirk Park*. Winnipeg: Unpublished Honours Thesis, Department of Geography, University of Winnipeg.
- Fortes, Meyer.
1958. *Introduction*. IN *The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Groups*. Jack Goody (Ed.). Cambridge Papers in Social Anthropology No. 1. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. pp. 1-14.
- Gainsborough, Juliet F.
2002. *Slow Growth and Urban Sprawl: Support for a New Regional Agenda?* *Urban Affairs Review*. 37(5): 728-744. (May).
- Galster, George C.
1987. *Homeowners and Neighborhood Reinvestment*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Glassner, Barry.
1999. *The Culture of Fear*. New York: Basic Books.
- Granovetter, Mark.
1982. *The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited*. IN *Social Structure and Network Analysis*. Peter V. Marsden and Nan Lin (Eds.). London, U.K.: Sage Publications. pp. 105-130.
- Gunnarson, Lars.
1990. *The social networks interview*. IN *Extending Families: The Social Networks of Parents and their Children*. Moncrieff Cochran (Ed.). N.Y.: Cambridge University Press. pp. 48-57.

- Gutkind, Peter C.W.
 1965. *African Urbanism, Mobility and the Social Network*. IN Kinship and Geographical Mobility. Special No. of International Journal of Comparative Sociology (Leiden). 6(1): 48-66.
- Hall, Tim.
 2001. Urban Geography 2nd Edition. Routledge Contemporary Human Geography Series. London: Routledge.
- Hampton, Keith N. and Barry Wellman.
 1999. *Netville On-Line and Off-Line: Observing and Surveying a Wired Suburb*. American Behavioral Scientist. 43(3): 475-492. (November).
2000. *Examining Community in the Digital Neighborhood: Early Results from Canada's Wired Suburb*. IN Digital Cities: Technologies, Experience, and Future Perspectives. Toru Ishida and Katherine Isbister (Eds.) Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1765. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer-Verlag. pp. 194-208.
- Harkness, Joseph M. and Sandra J. Newman.
 2003. *Effects of Homeownership on Children: The Role of Neighborhood Characteristics and Family Income*. Economic Policy Review (Federal Reserve Bank of New York). Vol. 9 Issue 2 p.87. (June).
- Hay, R. Allen.
 2002. *Habitat for Humanity: Building Social Capital Through Faith Based Service*. Journal of Urban Affairs. 24(3): 247-269.
- Higgitt, Nancy C.
 1994. Factors influencing residential mobility among families with children living in a low-income area of Winnipeg, Manitoba. Winnipeg: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. (With the assistance of Marjorie Fraser and Adrienne Whiteley).
- Jorgensen, D.L.
 1989. Participant Observation: A Methodology for Human Studies. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kerr, Jeffrey.
 1992. Gentrification: Assessing the Causes and Effects. Winnipeg, MB: Institute of Urban Studies.
- Kohm, S.A.
 1997. The Geography of Winnipeg's Sex Trade: A Spatial and Temporal Analysis of the Business of Selling Sex. Winnipeg: Unpublished Honours Thesis, Department of Geography, University of Winnipeg.

- Larner, Mary.
1990. *Changes in network resources and relationships over time*. IN Extending Families: The Social Networks of Parents and their Children. Moncrieff Cochran (Ed.). N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.
- Leo, Christopher, Lisa Shaw, Kenneth Gibbons, and Colin Goff.
1998. Inner-City Decay in Winnipeg: Causes and Remedies. Winnipeg, MB: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. (October).
- Lezubski, Darren, Jim Silver and Errol Black.
2000. *High and Rising: The Growth of Poverty in Winnipeg*. IN Solutions that Work: Fighting Poverty in Winnipeg. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives
- Low, Setha M.
2001. *The Edge and the Center: Gated Communities and the Discourse of Urban Fear*. American Anthropologist. 103(1): 45-58.
- McIntyre, Gordon.
2000. The Role of Incremental Planning for Community Development: A Case Study of the North End Housing Project. M.C.P. Thesis. Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- McNeil, Paul Harris.
1992. The Feasibility of Private Market Single Family Detached Infill Housing in the City of Winnipeg. M.C.P. Thesis. Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Merry, Sally Engle.
1981. Urban Danger: Life in a Neighbourhood of Strangers. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- National Crime Prevention Council.
1997. Preventing Crimes By Investing in Families and Communities: Promoting Positive Outcomes in Youth Twelve to Eighteen Years Old. Ottawa, Canada.
- Nettler, G.
1974. Explaining Crime. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- North End Community Renewal Corporation (NECRC) and William Whyte Residents Association (WWRA).
2001. William Whyte Neighbourhood Housing Plan: ...An Evolving Document.... (revised December 21st).

- Nozick, Marcia.
1992. No Place Like Home: Building Sustainable Communities. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development. (Ch. 6 - Meeting Individual Needs) pp. 139-178.
- Ogaranko, Christine.
2001. A Community Plan for Homelessness and Housing in Winnipeg. Winnipeg: Social Planning Council. Prepared by: The Community Partnership of Homelessness and Housing and Aboriginal and Reference group on Homelessness and Housing. (September).
- Paquet, Bernard.
2002. Low Income Cutoffs from 1992 to 2001 and Low Income Measures from 1991 to 2000. Research Paper Catalogue No. 75F0002MIE – No. 005. Income Statistics Division. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Pérez, Gina M.
2002. *The Other "Real World": Gentrification and The Social Construction of Place In Chicago*. Urban Anthropology. 31(1): 37-68.
- Phillipson, Chris, Mirian Bernard, Judith Phillips and Jim Ogg.
1999. *Older people's experiences of community life: patterns of neighbouring in three urban areas*. The Sociological Review. 47(4): 715-743.
- Riger, S.
1993. *What's wrong with empowerment theory?* American Journal of Community Psychology. 21: 279-292.
- Rohe, W.M. and L.S. Stewart.
1996. *Homeownership and neighbourhood stability*. Housing Policy Debate. 7(1): 37-81.
- Ross, Catherine E., John R. Reynolds and Karlyn J. Geis.
2000. *The Contingent Meaning of Neighbourhood Stability for Residents' Psychological Well-Being*. American Sociological Review. 65: 581-597. (August).
- Ross, Catherine E. and John Mirowsky.
1999. *Disorder and Decay: The Concept and Measurement of Perceived Neighbourhood Disorder*. Urban Affairs Review. 34(3): 412-432. (January).
- Sampson, R.J., S.W. Raudenbush and F. Earls.
1997. *Neighbourhoods and violent crime: a multilevel study of collective efficacy*. Science. 277: 918-924.

- Social Planning Council of Winnipeg.
1996. William Whyte Census Profile from Statistics Canada National Census.
2001. William Whyte Census Profile from Statistics Canada National Census.
- Stafford, Tim.
2002. *How to Build Homes Without Putting Up Walls*. Christianity Today. 46(7): 28-36. (June 10).
- Steele, Marion.
1990. *Homeownership and Low-Income Housing Policy in Canada*. IN Housing Affordability in Canada: Are We Addressing the Problem? Tom Carter (Ed.) Winnipeg: Institute of Urban Studies.
- Suchman, Diane R.
2002. Developing Successful Infill Housing. Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute.
- Thomese, Fleur and Theo van Tilburg.
2000. *Neighbourhood networks and environmental dependency. Differential effects of neighbourhood characteristics on the relative size and composition of neighbouring networks of older adults in the Netherlands*. Ageing and Society. 20(1): 55-78. (January).
- Unger, D.G. and A. Wandersman.
1985. *The importance of neighbors: The social, cognitive, and affective components of neighboring*. American Journal of Community Psychology. 13: 139-169.
- von Hoffman, Alexander.
2003. House by House, Block by Block: The Rebirth of America's Urban Neighbourhoods. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wellman, Barry.
1982. *Studying Personal Communities*. IN Social Structure and Network Analysis. Peter V. Marsden and Nan Lin (Eds.). London, U.K.: Sage Publications. pp. 61-81.
- Wellman, Barry and Scot Wortley.
1990. *Different Strokes from Different Folks: Community Ties and Social Support*. American Journal of Sociology. 96(3): 558-588. (November).
- Winnipeg Core Area Initiative.
1992. Partnerships for Renewal: Winnipeg Core Area Initiative 1981-1992. Winnipeg: Public Information Program of Winnipeg Core Area Initiative.

Wireman, P.

1985. Urban Neighbourhoods, Networks, and Families: New Forms for Old Values. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity Documents

Annual Reports. 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993.

Homeowner Application Package. 2000.

Millennium Project Proposal. 2000.

Information Manual. 2000.

Annual Meeting Minutes. May 28, 1996.

Board Chair's Report - Annual General Meeting. May 25, 1998.

Residential Survey Reports in William Whyte. October and November 2000.

Community Fix-Up Project Report. October 19, 2001.

Personal Communications

Mary Williams, former Executive Director, Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity.

1 – October 16th, 2000. (in-person)

2 – April 10th, 2001. (in-person)

3 – March 21st, 2003 (in-person)

Ken Bishop, current Chief Executive Officer, Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity.

4 – March 14th, 2003. (phone)

5 – May 10th, 2004. (phone)

Brent Gillon, Coordinator, Community Fix-Up Project

6 – December 1st, 2001. (in-person)

Paul Hiebert, founding member of Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity

7 – April 29th, 2004. (phone)

Annette Champion-Taylor, Co-Chairperson, William Whyte Residents Association

8 – May 6th, 2004. (phone)

Dave Dessins, Winnipeg Housing Policy Coordinator, Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiative (WHHI)

9 – May 6th, 2004. (phone)

Dr. Raymond Wiest, Professor, Department of Anthropology, University of Manitoba

10 – April 30th, 2000. (e-mail)

Websites

Habitat for Humanity

1. www.habitat.org/intl/progress.html Building Houses, Building Hope Around the World (accessed April 15th, 2004).
2. www.habitat.org/giving/report/2002/default.html Strategy In Action: Annual Report FY 2002. (accessed April 15th, 2004).
3. www.habitat.org/local/affiliate_detail.asp?event=674 Jimmy Carter Work Project 2004. (accessed April 15th, 2004).
4. www.habitat.mb.ca Winnipeg Habitat for Humanity (accessed Mar. 21st, 2003 and April 15th, 2004).

City of Winnipeg

5. www.winnipeg.ca/interhom/ Police Services, Statistical Report - 2001 (accessed March 15th, 2003).
6. www.winnipeg.ca/ppd/programs_hrta.stm 2003 Home Renovation Tax Assistance Program (accessed March 15th, 2003).
7. http://winnipeg.ca/ppd/planning_crp.htm Winnipeg: Department of Planning, Property and Development (accessed April 30th, 2004).
8. www.winnipeg.ca/clkdmis/documents/c/2004/a3460/pd_02_03_no_10.pdf Winnipeg City Council: February 25th, 2004. Item #10 – Proposal to Regulate the Conditions and Maintenance of all Vacant Buildings. File EX (accessed May 12th, 2004).

Statistics Canada

9. www.statscan.ca The Daily – February 5th, 2003 (accessed Feb. 5th, 2003).
10. a) www.statcan.ca/english/Profil01/ Population Statistics for Winnipeg 2001 (accessed April 26th, 2004).
b) www.statcan.ca/english/Pgdb/demo43s.htm Population by selected ethnic origins, Winnipeg (accessed July 17th, 2004).
11. www.statscan.ca Statistics Canada – Report: Occupied private dwellings by period of construction and condition of dwelling, central metropolitan areas - (Winnipeg, 2001) (accessed April 30th, 2004).
12. www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/en/prfias/rerepr/index.cfm Canada Home and Mortgage Corporation - Programs and Financial Assistance (accessed April 25th, 2004).
13. www.policyalternatives.ca/manitoba/fastfactsdec15.html Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives (CCPA) – Manitoba. Fast Facts: Jim Silver. 2003. A ‘New’ Deal for Inner City Winnipeg (accessed May 2nd, 2004).
14. <http://envstudies.brown.edu/housing/background/abandonedcrime.htm> Brown University. Picturing Renewal: Using GIS to Evaluate Effectiveness of Housing Renovation (accessed June 8th, 2004).

15. www.thedesertsun.com/news/stories The Desert Sun. In-fill housing turning empty lots into homes. by Xochitl Pena. Coachella, California. May 16th, 2004 (accessed June 8th, 2004).
16. www.wd.gc.ca/rpts/audit/wepa/7d3_e.asp Western Economic Diversification Canada. 7.9 North End Renewal Project: SEED Winnipeg Inc – Manitoba. Western Economic Partnership Agreements: Final Program Evaluation. August 19th, 2003 (accessed June 13th, 2004).