"Messy, high risk, truly uncomfortable, chaotic work"

Building community through
Action for Neighbourhood Change
and
Neighbourhoods Alive!

by
Reuben Koole

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
The University of Manitoba
in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

Master of City Planning

Department of City Planning
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
*****
COPYRIGHT PERMISSION

"Messy, high risk, truly uncomfortable, chaotic work"
Building community through *Action for Neighbourhood Change* and
Neighbourhoods Alive!

BY

Reuben Koole

A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University of

Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirement of the degree

MASTER OF CITY PLANNING

Reuben Koole © 2009

Acknowledgements

First, I must thank Heidi for putting up with hours of reading, transcribing, writing, editing, and occasional expressions of frustration. You provided a stable environment for me to complete my studies and this thesis, and made numerous cups of coffee, tea, or hot chocolate when I was glued to my desk. I will always remember your words of encouragement – "get it done!" Thank you so much for your unending support.

To my Winnipeg housemates, Cameron and Tanya, living in Winnipeg was exceptionally enjoyable because of you. When I was busy studying, Heidi used you as her social outlet, and when I needed a break, there was always a party, or symphony concert, or play to attend. I had a fantastic time and enjoyed getting to know Winnipeg with you. Thank you for sharing your home with us – it meant more than words can express.

To my parents, what can I say. It was a long and winding journey to get to this point, and your patience and encouragement led me in directions I never thought possible, thank you. To Heidi's parents, thank you for your support. Your visits to Manitoba were highlights for us both.

To Ian, thank you for being patient as I plugged away at writing little bits and pieces here an there, extending my deadlines, and being flexible with my personal circumstances and timing. Your encouragement and edits made this a better paper.

To my committee, thank you for your input and comments to improve the scope of this thesis. I appreciated your insight and expertise.

Finally, I would like to thank the G. Clarence Elliott Fellowship committee for selecting me as one of three recipients for the Fellowship award. The financial support enabled me to complete my classes and this research.

SUMMARY

Community development occurs in various forms in cities across Canada, often with

the goal of alleviating neighbourhood and community decline. This project assesses the

current state of community development in Canada using two recent initiatives: Action for

Neighbourhood Change and Neighbourhoods Alive! Through a scan of program material

and twelve key informant interviews, the research analyzes current community development

practice and its likely evolution. Five themes emerge from the key informant interviews:

diversity (multicultural awareness), definition, place-based, political influence and power,

and sustainability. Combining these interview themes with the literature review leads to six

supporting principles for community development practice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

1 | Introduction

Community development is a wide-ranging topic and includes numerous programs and initiatives being implemented across Canada to address community and neighbourhood decline. Recently, many of these programs and initiatives have become focused on grassroots support and local solutions to effect positive change, evolving from master plans of renewal that failed to meet their goals.

As community development continues to change, developing new approaches and retaining or shedding old practices, there remain many questions and challenges in the field. How community development is funded continues to be a central feature in many initiatives, as well as what level the initiative focuses on ("top-down" or "bottom-up") and whether it is individual-based or place-based. In addition, there are new dynamics at play including how diversity and multiculturalism affect communities and how government policy facilitates or impedes organizations striving to have a positive impact on their communities. This research attempts to navigate this broad community development landscape in Canada, drawing on community development and neighbourhood change literature from both Canadian and American sources, and to assess current community development practice, where it's going, how to get there, and what improvements can be made.

The Literature Review guides the empirical work of the study, examining two community development initiatives in Canada. Action for Neighbourhood Change (ANC) was a

collaboration of Tamarack: An Institute for Community Engagement, Caledon Institute of Social Policy, United Way of Canada and the National Film Board of Canada that studied approaches to locally driven community development activities focused on enhancing the capacity of residents. Neighbourhoods Alive! (NA!) is the Province of Manitoba's long term neighbourhood revitalization and development strategy, providing support to local neighbourhood renewal corporations that carry out development activities in inner-city neighbourhoods. ANC was an 18-month learning initiative that has ended in some neighbourhoods (ongoing in others), while NA! is an eight-year-old program that continues to grow. Both represent very recent community development programming practices and are the focus of the research.

Set in a discussion of the evolution of community development activities and neighbourhood change theory, each program is studied in terms of underlying theories and related programs and support systems. This is done through a scan of each program's respective literature (Mason, 2002) and 12 key informant interviews (Berg, 2007; Zeisel, 2006; Krueger and Casey, 2000) with organizers from the programs. It illustrates how organizations are seeking to enhance the local capacity of neighbourhood residents through collaboration (ANC) and how government is actively involved in supporting community development activities (NA!). The two programs are representations of current community development theory in action and offer insights into past activities, current trends and new directions for the future.

Statement of Purpose

This project focuses on community development and revitalization strategies as a means

to actively rebuild and support depressed communities in urban neighbourhoods – one community-focused and another government-initiated.

It explores emerging ideas about community development and draws on a predominately North American experience for theoretical grounding. The goal is to examine existing community development knowledge and neighbourhood change theory, and situate an analysis of two emerging community development initiatives within it – ANC and NA! The objective of examining these two programs is to discover new knowledge about community development and principles that support positive outcomes.

This analysis is framed in the context of a review of community development and neighbourhood change literature. The development activities from each program are then situated within a brief scan of the background of each program including websites, documents, and program materials. Both the Literature Review and the program materials provide the base upon which the key informant interviews are used to build understand about how each program fits in the evolution of community development activities and neighbourhood change theory.

Key Questions

Key questions assist with framing the scope of the research and present the over-arching goal of the research. The three questions reveal the perspective of the paper and represent the "jumping off" point for exploring the topic of community development in this context.

- What is the experience of Action for Neighbourhood Change and Neighbourhoods Alive!

as community development programs?

- How can the relationships between organizations, funders and participants be strengthened and sustained?
- What lessons were learned and what supporting principles for community development practice can be drawn from them?

Significance of the Study

The topic broadens the scope of planning knowledge related to community development activities and the organizations involved. Planners have myriad roles including private consulting; municipal, provincial and federal policy planning; land use and real estate development; and community organizing. While planners often overlook working for community organizations with a professional degree, it is a field where more active planning may be useful. Planners are able to offer experience and knowledge not only through a community consultation process but also through working for community-based organizations. In the past, this was referred to as advocacy planning and took a more adversarial form, but can now be understood as a collaborative and empowering effort to revitalize neighbourhoods.

This research is intended to point in that direction. By exploring new programs occurring across Canada and within Manitoba, the knowledge of planning and its practice in the field of community development can be expanded. Rather than planning being an academic exercise, communities frequently plan for and by themselves. In this particular case, the focus is on improving the connection between planning as a professional arena and as a community activity.

This is important as a contribution to ongoing, evolving, community development activities

and discussions occurring within governments, local communities, and service providers. Faced with the pressures of underdeveloped neighbourhoods, governments, cities and communities across Canada seek solutions on how to best provide services and supports for community initiatives.

Limitations, Assumptions and Bias

The study was limited to these two examples for several logistical reasons. One was to enable a detailed examination of the two that allowed comparisons to be made between them. This involved an analysis of literature from each program including websites, documents, program materials, and key informant interviews. Another related to situation and circumstances. NA! is a local initiative (Winnipeg and Manitoba) and therefore presented good accessibility for conducting key informant interviews. ANC, on the other hand, contributes a national perspective as it dealt with communities across Canada including Surrey, Regina, Thunder Bay, Toronto and Halifax. This provided balance to the research by relating it to a broader community development perspective. Another limitation was that the research took a greater social perspective of community development. As such, it did not deal specifically with Community Economic Development (CED), which has a greater economic emphasis. However, overlap between the two does occur within many community development initiatives.

Assumptions in this research include the idea that community development is an important and valued aspect of how to provide support and resources to depressed urban neighbourhoods. Many initiatives have been tried in the past and some have failed. This research does not seek

to legitimize the current trends in community development and neighbourhood change, but explores aspects of current trends that appear to be working. It builds on experience and looks towards the direction neighbourhood revitalization is going. It also assumes there are aspects to community development that can be improved. As it responds to neighbourhood change and community dynamics, community development is an ever-evolving process. Improvement is assumed to be a part of this evolution since neighbourhoods do not remain the same and continuous change is necessary for community development to remain relevant when responding to neighbourhood issues.

An important bias in the research is my personal involvement with NA! as a part-time employee. I was involved in the work of NA! for several months and while this facilitated access to key people involved in the program, it also impacted the dynamic of the key informant interviews. I made every effort to remain an "outside observer" but acknowledged my personal and professional perspectives when necessary. In addition to NA! staff, key informant interviews were conducted with Neighbourhood Renewal Corporation (NRC) directors because the NRCs represent the main way NA! does community development. I had little contact with the directors through my work at NA! and outside of the context of the interviews.

2 | LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Community development and neighbourhood revitalization have risen out of the need to invest in inner city neighbourhoods and communities to counteract decline occurring in those same neighbourhoods.[1] In most inner cities across Canada and the United States, communities struggle with addressing high levels of poverty, crime, abandoned housing, and, until recently, the out migration of middle class residents. The results are often dilapidated housing stocks, conversion of single-family housing units to multi-family units, exit of retail businesses, establishment of marginal businesses, a decline in land values (relative or absolute) and mortgage redlining (CMHC, 2001). In addition to these market-oriented indicators of decline, social problems may also be present including decreased income levels, lower educational achievements and limited capacity to engage in political dialogue.

To counteract this disinvestment and decline in the inner city, communities have engaged in activities meant to address the lack of capital. In the introduction to *The Community Development Reader*, DeFilipps and Saegert (2008) describe this idea of "lack of capital" as follows:

> Community development occurs when the conditions of surviving and thriving in a place are not being supplied by capital. Thus community development emerges in the context of the current limitations of the capitalist political economy to fulfil the needs and desires of the community. (p. 5)

---

1 See "definition of community and neighbourhood" for a definition of community and community development and why it is used to encompass community, community development, neighbourhood and neighbourhood revitalization.

According to them, it is the failing of the capitalist market in not meeting the needs of community members that has led to the idea of community development. The resulting activity of community development strives to do the following for community members:

- Provide for the everyday needs of adults and children
- Create institutions that more fairly and democratically allocate goods and resources
- Cultivate relationships among people that promote human and cultural development, effective citizenship, and political will (p. 5)

While these areas of community development provide a conceptual understanding of what activities are involved, they do not address what communities are being developed. The location in which community development most often occurs is the inner city and as Leo and Shaw (2002) point out, "the most credible of [community development] efforts are ones that treat inner cities not as problem areas to be revitalized with programs disconnected from the wider urban area but as the heart of a metropolitan area that must be managed as a coherent whole" (pp. 121-2).

These three ideas – that the inner city is in decline, that community development activities address the resulting lack of capital, and that programs need to be contextualized within the greater urban environment – viewed together provide a holistic understanding of community development. They also illustrate the diversity within the field of community development. It is difficult to find an activity occurring in the inner city incompatible with these three ideas. This broad understanding is echoed by Pierson and Smith (2001) when they suggest "the field is also extending its range to embrace matters such as the relationship between school and community, the intricacies of effective local job training schemes, community safety and the

virtues of mixed income tenancies" (p. 1).

A broad understanding of community development can be viewed both positively and negatively. In one sense, the more broad community development understanding is, the more holistic and better equipped it is to deal with the multi-faceted issues that occur in the inner city. Conversely, the opportunity for confusion and disjointed activity increases as well. This presents a challenge for community development policy makers and practitioners who are engaging in development activities, and it is not without its problems.

> The search for area-based solutions to urban poverty has thus far produced more questions than answers. Important new concepts such as social capital and social networks have become the focus (and hope) of recent endeavour, both scholarly and in the field, and in turn the subject of intense debate. (Pierson and Smith, 2001, p. 1)

At the same time, many cities around the world have made great strides in seeking better approaches to community development – approaches that have moved beyond controlling people and activities, towards enabling people and activities. Throughout the "advanced economies of the world," Williams and Windebank (2001) suggest that "the traditional authoritarian approach that sought to socially engineer populations by doing things *to* them and 'disciplining' them is receding from view. In its place is emerging an approach founded upon an as yet ill-defined principle of 'self-discipline' in which people are being enabled to do things *for* themselves" (p. 1; emphasis original). The following research seeks to discover what these new "approaches" are and the different activities they may entail.

The research begins by setting a working definition of community and neighbourhood

development. A review of the knowledge about community development and neighbourhood change follows, dealing with each topic separately as much as possible but realizing there will be overlapping ideas. Literature from both streams of thought is used to provide a comprehensive understanding of community development that encompasses neighbourhood change theory as well as community development activities. With community development defined, the research discusses specific historical activities from both a Canadian and American policy perspective. Finally, the study proceeds to illustrate how community development corporations and comprehensive community initiatives evolved as the most recent programmatic responses in community development.

Definitions of community and neighbourhood

In order to address researching the topic of community development, it is necessary to identify and define what the term means to clarify the perspective the research takes. Community development involves two terms, "community" and "development" and each has its own meaning. The word community often "refers to places where people live and work, though not necessarily doing both in the same place. They are the people, places, and institutions we encounter in everyday life that provide opportunities and support for our activities, as well as barriers and constraints" (DeFilippis and Saegert, 2008, p. 1). Community is about linkages among people, places, and institutions, which interact together and support people's everyday activities. But DeFilippis and Saegert are careful to not suggest that all community interactions are positive. The interactions and interdependence of community can be limited for some and are "not always beneficial to everyone involved" (p. 1).

Another perspective on community is provided by Ferguson and Dickens (1999) when they write the word "community in community development comprises residents of a geographic neighbourhood or multi-neighbourhood area, no matter how they relate to one another" (p. 4). Compared to DeFilippis and Saegert, they stress the geographic area and physical location of community. The interactions and interdependence of community occur in specific locations and are shaped at many different scales, from a neighbourhood block to an entire city. Also introduced by Ferguson and Dickens is the incorporation of the word neighbourhood to describe community. Often when the word neighbourhood is used, a certain geographic location is implied, whereas when the word community is used, the focus is on the interactions and relationships within a geographic area.

In her study of urban community development corporations (CDCs), Vidal (1992) bridges this geographic-relationship gap with her concise definition of community. Community is "the geographical target area that a [CDC] defines as its territory of activity" and is "synonymous with neighbourhood" (p. 175). The context of this definition is Vidal's glossary of terms at the end of her study and is necessarily focused because of her specific study of CDC activity. Even so, it serves to illustrate that community and neighbourhood are interchangeable words and concepts at a certain level.

This introduces the idea of development, which is often used in conjunction with the word community. According to Usnick, Shove and Gissy (1997) the resulting combination of community development "lacks a universally accepted single definition" (p. 62). "In the broadest usage, community development encompasses a wide array of community

improvement activities that can range from informal neighborhood improvement meetings to vast, formal capital improvement schemes" (p. 62). Community development is "fostered through improved individual, organizational, and problem-solving skills" (Community Development Society, cited in Usnick, Shove and Gissy, p. 62). This relates to community being about interactions among people, places and institutions described earlier, and introduces the improvement of these interactions.

Another aspect of community development is asset building. In developing their definition of community, Ferguson and Dickens (1999) add that community development "produces assets that improve the quality of life for neighbourhood residents" (p. 4). Again, the word neighbourhood appears when describing community development. Not only is community development encompassed in a geographic area (i.e. neighbourhood) but it is about building the assets of the residents, extending it beyond any physical location. Their synthesis is that "community development is asset building that improves the quality of life among residents of...communities, where communities are defined as neighbourhoods or multi-neighbourhood areas" (p. 5).

From this brief overview, it is evident that neighbourhood and community can be synonymous in many different contexts. While neighbourhood often reflects a geographic area and community describes the relationships between people within the geographic area, it is the intricacies that are foundational to the research that follows. Both the physical area and the people within are included in this research. As community and neighbourhood are very interconnected and literature regarding both topics is used in the research, the word

community provides the focus to simplify the synthesis of the two. When dealing specifically with neighbourhood-related literature, the word neighbourhood is used with the understanding that community may also apply. Community is defined as the interaction of people, places and institutions at any geographic scale. It follows that community development is about working to strengthen those interactions through a myriad of activities (such as asset and capacity building, physical improvements, networking, or empowerment).

Community Development

Much of the community development literature originates in the United States, where it has been shaped by three key "common set[s] of experiences" (Pierson and Smith, 2001, p. 2) in recent history. Broadly speaking they are the social dislocation resulting from industrial economy restructuring; the dismantling of the public housing system; and the decentralization of political power from federal to more regional forms of government. What resulted from these three broad themes is that the environment in which community development now occurs is "characterized by post-industrial and global modes of production, flexible organizational networks and social polarization between areas, households and individuals" (p. 4). This new context is very different from the past and plays on the interactions and connections between people, places and institutions. This section will further explore the resulting activities of community development including the common themes found in community development activities: what is strived for in community development, how activities can be categorized, select criticisms of recent community development ideas, and what the future of community development may be. Following this, subsections will address one methodology of classifying community development organizations, the idea of social

capital and finally, asset and capacity building.[2]

In light of the commonalities that have shaped the context in which community development occurs, the programmatic response has also developed along three themes, as described by Pierson and Smith (2001, pp. 5-6):

1. The way programs respond to the interlinked nature of the problems of poor urban neighbourhoods including crime, housing deficits, labour issues and inadequate education. In the United States, this interlinked initiative is referred to as "comprehensive," while in Europe is "holistic."
2. The way programs respond to the pressure for public inclusion and participation in the development process. This can often confound the interests of other stakeholders such as funders and can create opportunities for creative forms of government.
3. The way programs respond to the demand for political activity at a local level. Citizens are looking for greater democratic control in light of the inequality and dominance of the global market.

These three themes can be found in most community development initiatives. What is evident in these themes is the complexity of community development. Programs that used to "do" development to or in a community must meet demands of public inclusion and control, political pressure, global market influences and many interlinked problems.

Within these themes, community development strives to achieve a wide variety of goals. In the introduction to their edited volume, *Urban Problems and Community Development*, Ferguson and Dickens (1999) provide a useful list illustrating "quality-of-life ideals" that "entail social justice, political efficacy and economic vitality" (p. 2) within community development:

- Residents should feel secure in their homes and neighbourhood
- Residents should have the capacity to address and solve problems when they arise

---

2 Community economic development (CED) is not explored within the context of this literature review. This omission is intentional to avoid the complexities of economic principles and literature, and focus the scope of this research on a more social perspective.

- Residents should be politically active and their neighbourhood should receive its fair share of public goods and services
- Residents should be able to acquire and maintain jobs within commuting distance to support their families
- Local businesses should be competitive and integrated into the regional economy
- Housing should be affordable and available through market financing and insurance
- Schools should be local and serve as places for the community to gather
- Local religious institutions should help maintain the moral foundations of the community

Again, the complexity and interconnections of community development are evident through the outcomes of community development activities. Many communities are not able to realize all of these ideals and when attaining one of them falls short, "its aspirations to realize others will suffer" (p. 2).

Given this complexity in the program activities and outcomes of community development, it is useful to be able to categorize initiatives. One example is put forward by Zielenbach (2000) who suggests,

> Efforts to revitalize neighbourhoods generally fall under one of... two categories. The first... focuses on improving conditions for the residents of a particular area. The second... contains those revitalization strategies that emphasize the development of a neighbourhood as a more economically viable entity. (p. 24)

He terms the first "individual-based" and the second "place-based" (p. 24). This simple classification (Table 1.) provides a starting point when assessing where various community development activities fit and understanding their mechanics. But it is not able to address more complex questions about community development like the connections between different initiatives. Initiatives based on low-income residents (individuals) of a community largely ignore initiatives based on physical amenities and property values (places) and vice versa.

Individual-based approaches

1. Social development	Enhanced schools, job training centres, day cares, health clinics and improve community's sense of liveability.
2. Program-driven economic development	Generation and circulation of additional money in a community through increased business activity and job creation.
3. Trickle-down economic growth	Improving the macro-economic situation results in improved local conditions.

Place-based approaches

1. Gentrification	Physical restoration of inner-city neighbourhoods by middle to high-income residents, often displacing existing residents.
2. Incumbent upgrading	Physical restoration of inner-city neighbourhoods by existing residents.
3. Adaptive re-use	Using vacant/derelict land in a new way, such as converting old industrial land to residential use.

Table 1.   Classification of community development approaches (Adapted from Zielenbach, 2000, p. 24-30).

The goals of community development are often touted as admirable, but rarely come under criticism. Fraser et al. (2003) put forward an argument about why current community development activities need to be re-evaluated in the context of who is actually carrying out the projects.

> Community-building initiatives occur in an increasingly globalized context, providing opportunities for stakeholders other than residents to promote certain productions of space and place and that urban restructuring and the development of inner-city neighborhoods may be viewed as arenas where developers, realtors, lending institutions, and a host of other private ventures extract profit and instigate a particular vision of the city. (p. 418)

Their arguement is that current community development activity is initiated by "nonresident stakeholders and carried out largely by professional community builders" and does not allow for local residents to actually determine how their community develops. The problem with this is that regardless of the benefits from community development activities, a more "complex set

of effects" (p. 418) is produced that have not been studied.

They also address the understanding that community development initiatives are treated with a simple cause-effect relationship – do this activity, and this will happen. While this type of relationship may be adequate when the initiative occurs in a unique location such as one isolated neighbourhood, that situation that rarely occurs. "Community building, as is true for any form of spatial practice, has a large number of contingencies and spreads way beyond the constructed boundaries of immediate efforts" (p. 438). According to them this means, "all community interventions must be understood as social and spatial, and the potential outcomes, both beneficial and detrimental, must be conceptualized as such" (p. 438). Limiting community development to a cause-effect relationship is inadequate and the outcomes of any activity need to be related to its entire context, including social elements and physical boundaries.

Finally, community development also maintains a paradox; while "it localizes impoverished neighbourhood residents" it also "globalizes" the impoverished neighbourhood (p. 439). The nature of community development to improve local residents' lives necessarily relates to the global scale as the context in which the city functions as a whole. The city's "ability to maintain participation in a global political economy" is dependent upon the neighbourhood's health and the localized way in which community development is undertaken. These criticisms discussed by Fraser et al. shed light on another aspect of the complexity of community development. The direction community development needs to take involves addressing these complexities and bringing forward in the discussion how to address decline in communities appropriately.

As community development practice evolves, it is faced with addressing the relationship between individual and place-based initiatives, as well as the complexity of how community development initiatives fit within the context of the city at regional, national and global scales. Zielenbach's (2000) "two-pronged" definition of community development suggests guiding its progress through "the improvement of economic conditions for existing residents and the re-integration of the neighbourhood into the market system" (p. 31). Pierson (2001) also suggests the importance of the market in community development when he describes several themes for guiding it in the "new millennium" including harnessing the power of the market, the inclusion of public participation and strengthening local politics and the "public sphere" (p. 206). In order for community development programs to be successful, these elements need to be in place as prerequisites.

Addressing the future of CDCs, Vidal (1997) concludes community development needs to shift away from housing issues and into more complex issues (she uses CDCs as a specific example within the broader idea of community development and her conclusions can be extended from CDCs). These include "macro-economic and social forces," which work against communities living in the inner city (pp. 433-4). She goes on to illustrate several push and pull factors leading CDCs and community development away from housing provision (which had been their primary mandate) to the more complex issues. Push factors include: 1) CDCs have always had a broader, "community oriented" mission, 2) older CDCs started in housing but have diversified, leading new CDCs on the same path, 3) CDCs are lacking new development projects, 4) CDC responsibilities for housing lead them to other issues affecting the residents, and 5) welfare reform will cause CDCs to be involved in helping people find employment (p.

434). Likewise, pull factors are also causing CDCs to diversify because their community-based focus results in them being considered strong community partners in new initiatives. Several pull factors include: 1) the growing importance and emphasis on community policing, 2) the devolution of responsibilities to states and local communities to provide services, 3) school reform encouraging schools to regain connections with local communities, and 4) the positive signs that community-based organizations are useful for providing access to special training and placement facilities for local residents (p. 435).

Yet Vidal also cautions against any extensive diversification of community development activities by a single organization. A growing scarcity of resources means not all CDCs can "become diversified direct service providers... The 'system' cannot attract enough resources to support a comprehensive CDC in every dis-invested neighbourhood that would benefit from one" (p. 436). This leads her to conclude that, "large, multi-serviced 'mature' CDCs... are not a model for the future" even though they may be highly accomplished (p. 436). But a contradiction exists – this is the very model of community development that CDCs have evolved towards. Even though community development has a wide variety of issues and concerns to meet in the inner city context, Vidal cautions against pressing all organizations into becoming diversified, "multi-serviced" agencies.

Levels of community development

The complexity of the community development field presents a challenge in being able to categorize and compare different initiatives in terms of who is carrying out the activities. Ferguson and Stoutland (1999) developed a classification they use to illustrate the various

types of organizations involved in community development that they term the "community development system" (p. 36). This section describes the essence of what they outline and presents it as a tool useful in clarifying roles and responsibilities among organizations involved in community development.

They begin by defining four levels of community development organizations (Table 2. presents a summary). Level zero[3] organizations have no paid staff, are characterized as grassroots, and are comprised mostly of networks and social connections between individuals and households. Level one organizations are termed "frontline" and include non-profits, for-profits and the public sector. These would include CDCs and community-based organizations (CBOs) that are involved in "directly providing goods and services to residents" (p. 38). One of the major distinctions between level zero and level one is the element of paid staff. Also, once a CBO is large enough to become diversified and achieve nominal economies of scale, they become part of level one.

------

3 The authors note the words "levels" and "zero" imply a hierarchy. They suggest while this may not be what is desired in community development, it is often a reality that communities in level zero are power-less and on the bottom tier of the system.

Level zero	Entities without paid staff	Tenant associations, neighbourhood watch, community newsletters, garden clubs and recreation clubs
Level one	Frontline organizations	CDCs, CCIs, recreation centres, churches, local businesses, homeless shelters and day care centres
Level two	Support organizations	Public facilities department, public housing authority, banks, contractors, technical assistance programs and training institutes
Level three	Regional, state and national support entities	Legislative committees, community development finance agencies, foundations, research organizations and national media

Table 2.   Summary of levels zero through three
                (Adapted from Ferguson and Stoutland, 1999, pp. 37-41)

Level two and three organizations are similar and include "policy makers, funders, and providers of technical assistance who... make up the authorizing and support environment of level one organizations" (p. 38). Level two is comprised of local organizations while level three is the regional, state (provincial) or national organizations. Both level two and three are important because they "make the laws and regulations within which the system operates and they assemble and control resources that fund projects" (p. 38). In this classification, it is important to note that the distinctions between levels are not based on individual people. Ferguson and Stoutland describe how a single person could be a part of multiple levels, thereby becoming a bridge between levels and aiding in the success of multi-level and multi-sector alliances (p. 38). These people are what they term "network members" and are key actors in creating alliances in community development.

This classification system provides a useful tool for conceptualizing how community development organizations are involved in different aspects of work. Applying this method of classification to an analysis of community development initiatives would provide insight into the relationships between all parties involved in the interrelated activities. It would also clarify the connections between the organizations and enable one to identify links to be strengthened and gaps to be bridged.

Social Capital

Social capital is a recent and popular idea in community development, warranting an exploration in terms of its origins and meanings and how this relates to knowledge about community development. Putnam (2000) brought social capital to the mainstream with his

book *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, which is relied upon as the most prevalent understanding of social capital in community development. In a critique of Putnam's conceptualization of social capital, DeFilippis (2001) draws on several other ideas of social capital, arguing the popular understanding Putnam espouses is not in line with historical understandings and is not in the best interest of community development. This brief documentation of social capital uses both authors to illustrate its complexity and role in community development.

Social capital, according to Putnam, "refers to connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them" (p. 19). It also "calls attention to the fact that civic virtue is most powerful when embedded in a dense network of reciprocal social relations" (p. 19). These networks and relationships, in turn, result in increased economic prosperity, better education, safer neighbourhoods, healthier people and a more democratic and civil society (Putnam, 2000). The popularity of Putnam's work has led to the adoption of his concept of social capital into all areas of community development as a "win-win relationship based on mutual interest and a promoter of economic prosperity and development" (DeFilippis, 2001, p. 788).

In a well-argued article *The Myth of Social Capital in Community Development*, DeFilippis (2001) presents a critique of Putnam's concept of social capital. Although the critique is lengthy, several key points are drawn here to illustrate the problems with conceptualizing the idea of social capital and its role in community development. In general, DeFilippis argues that Putnam's definition and concept of social capital have been accepted cart blanche, "largely

ignor[ing] an enormous volume of research and literature by academics, people in the popular press, and activists who have criticized almost every component" of Putnam's arguments (pp. 787-8). He suggests the definition of social capital lacks several elements according to the earliest understanding of social capital, developed by Loury (1977) and Bourdieu (1985).[4] One is the idea that social capital cannot be separated from the idea of "capital" itself, even though it is "constituted by social networks and relationships" (DeFilippis, 2001, p. 783). Also lacking is the understanding from Bourdieu's perspective that capital is about power and the distinction between the social networks a person exists in and the outcomes of those relationships. "Social networks should not simply be equated to the products of those social relationships, for doing so would render invisible social networks that might be very dense but nonetheless unable to generate resources because of lack of access" (pp. 783-4).

One particular problem DeFilippis identifies is that Putnam defines social capital "as something that is possessed, or not possessed, by individuals, communities, cities and nations" (p. 789). This is problematic in two ways. One is regarding the semantics that communities cannot actually possess anything – individuals in communities can, but communities cannot. The other is, "no place is solely a function of the internal attributes of the people living and working there" (p. 789). Communities are a culmination of multiple relationships and characteristics, both internally and externally related. Putnam (2000) addresses this problem by identifying "bridging" and "bonding" capital. Bonding capital is internally focused and "tend[s] to reinforce exclusive identities and homogenous groups, while bridging capital is externally focused and "encompass[es] people across diverse social cleavages" (p. 22). As he quotes Xavier

---

4 Due to the limits of this study and the context of DeFilippis' critique of Putnam, his work is used as the source for both Loury (1977) and Bourdieu (1985). See "Additional Sources" for their citations.

de Souza Briggs, "bonding social capital is... good for 'getting by,' but bridging social capital is crucial for 'getting ahead'" (p. 22).

Yet DeFilippis (2001) still argues this is inadequate in addressing the power relationships that exist in communities by using the example of gated communities. These communities exclude others from the surrounding city and region and it is precisely because of this exclusion that they can maintain their wealth. Contrary to Putnam's assertion that bridging social capital provides a way to get ahead, it is the opposite that is true, it is "isolation" (p. 790).

> The important question is, who controls the terms of any relationships or connections (or lack of connections)? 'Bridging capital' is really needed only if a community's residents are poor and therefore on the losing end of a set of power relations. What needs to change are those power relations, not the level of connections. (p. 790)

This distinction is important as it relates to community development. Providing an individual or group of people with greater reach and connections to other individuals or groups of people serves little benefit when the first is powerless to change the situation they are in.

Social capital is currently playing a central role in the understanding of community development. Yet issues of power, the lack of economic meaning in the term "capital" and the assumption that social networks benefit everyone, serve to illustrate its complexity (DeFilippis, 2001). Putnam's illustration of how social capital, as he defines it, is declining in communities is important for community development activities to realize, but it also needs to be understood that building social networks should take into consideration issues of power and capital in a broad sense.

Asset and capacity building

Asset and capacity building are also prevalent in community development literature. This section will briefly illustrate the current understanding of assets and capacity and then move into illustrating a particular case for each. Assets can be understood on both an individual and a collective, community level. They represent a move away from assessing a neighbourhood or community's "needs" towards understanding their strengths. "With [needs'] unrelenting focus on deficiency, [it] has managed to obscure [the idea] that communities can only be built by focusing on the strengths and capacities of the citizens who call that community home" (Kretzmann, 1995, para. 5). This focus on deficiencies can be removed, according to Kretzmann, and replaced with "asset maps." Only once a community has discovered all its assets and mobilized together to solve their problems can "a community previously regarded as empty and deficient... appear on the large civic stage as capable and powerful" (Kretzmann, 1995, para. 9).[5]

Since Kretzmann (1995) outlined these ideas, assets have been further defined and include many different aspects of community development. According to Ferguson and Dickens (1999) assets,

> Take five basic forms: physical capital in the form of buildings, tools and so forth; intellectual and human capital in the form of skills, knowledge and confidence; social capital – norms, shared understandings, trust and other factors that make relationships feasible and productive; financial capital; and political capital, which provides the capacity to exert political influence. (pp. 4-5)

These five types of assets – physical, human, social, financial and political – form the basis

---

5 It is interesting to note the ideas of "power" and "civic engagement" in Kretzmann's presentation of community assets. This is similar to ideas put forward by Putnam (2000) in his discussion of social capital. While space and scope limit the discussion of this relationship, it is worth mentioning in order to illustrate the interconnectedness of many community development ideas.

for much of what community development strives to improve, but the debate regarding how best to do so is ongoing. One type of asset which has become a focus of recent community development activities is individual assets, defined as a "stock of wealth – savings, equity held in homes, businesses or financial securities, and human capital – that have the potential to produce additional income" (Weber and Smith, 2003, p. 196).

Weber and Smith's (2003) study of individual asset[6] building programs in community development provides insight into where they originated, a model for how asset building impacts community development and potential new directions for asset building. Historically, asset building programs have been justified on the basis of three processes including; "1) the devolution of federal welfare policy, 2) the legacy of housing and employment discrimination against people of colour, and 3) the continued subsidization of asset accumulation for those who are not poor" (p. 174). They argue that each of these processes led to the understanding that assets enable individuals to cope through difficult times by drawing on their new "stock of wealth" (p. 174). Another reason for the rapid growth in asset building is these programs stretch beyond political boundaries. Politically conservative policy makers identify assets as a way to move the government out of providing "social safety nets" and "getting low-income families more invested in the system" while liberal policy makers see assets as a way to "increase the economic power of the poor and marginalized" (pp. 175-6).

In their review of how individual assets impact community development, Weber and Smith (2003) illustrate how literature "suggests that there is a positive, unidirectional and causal

---

6 While their study focuses specifically on individual asset building strategies, they recognize CBOs usually think of asset building more broadly and in terms of collective activities.

relationship between individual assets and neighbourhood benefits" (p. 182). But they also suggest this relationship may not always be true, pointing out the effect may function in a reciprocal way and in reverse. This leads them to add new dimensions including one-way positive and negative causation and two-way positive and negative causation.

The revised model attempts to identify links between "1) asset-building strategies and the production of actual assets, 2) assets and individual benefits derived from those assets, and 3) individual benefits and neighbourhood spillover effects" (p. 185). It is useful in conceptualizing the ideas related to how individual asset building programs can impact the way communities develop, but also how changes in the community in turn impact the asset building programs. In developing this model, Weber and Smith (2003) draw several conclusions. Understanding the organizational impact asset building programs have on community based organizations (CBOs) is important because they often require specialized staff members and a high level of direct involvement in the program. Also, programs should also be carried out at an appropriate scale so as to optimize the positive impact on the neighbourhood as a whole. Both of these aspects can cause CBOs to be stretched beyond their capacity. But there are also ways to address a community organization's ability to conduct asset building programs and other community development activities – through increasing their capacity.

Capacity building of community organizations is about supporting their work and increasing their ability to conduct community development activities more proficiently and efficiently. Nye and Glickman (2000) conducted an extensive study in the United States of CDCs and the community development partnerships (CDPs) that support their work. Throughout the article,

they describe "CDCs' efforts to increase their capacity, with the focus on those CDCs that have the help of community development partnerships (CDPs)" (p. 164). In their discussion, they frame the definition of a CDP using "partnerships" and "collaboratives" to describe their characteristics. Many CDPs in the United States are comprised of groups of foundations or other funders who argue that "by becoming more skilled, CDCs should be better able to produce benefits for their neighbourhoods" (p. 165). Working with a broad understanding of CDPs as supportive networks and organizations is useful for the discussion here as it relates to the diverse field of community development. Nye and Glickman's study is used to illustrate this relationship between CDCs and support organizations related to increasing CDCs' capacities.

According to surveys conducted by Nye and Glickman (2000), CDCs strive to be more innovative, work at adapting best practices at a local level, seek more flexibility in using funds, try addressing larger and more complex problems and face problems that occur beyond their control (the complex economies and structures of cities). They want to develop a wider range of neighbourhood revitalization strategies, which in turn has caused CDPs to broaden their understanding of what support CDCs need and begun to,

> Include economic development, commercial development, and community-building goals in their mandates. In exchange for their assistance, [CDPs] require increased oversight and accountability for CDC performance… seek to improve performance by promoting 'best practices' [and] help them be more strategic in setting priorities for their neighbourhoods. (p. 168)

But diversifying community development activities from both the CDC and CDP perspective results in administrative and logistic problems. According to Nye and Glickman, several CDCs identified that quantifying outcomes and constructing performance measures increases the

administrative burden of a community development organization. They have "begun to count everything" and this "has led to the need for more assistance in data management and analysis" (pp. 192-3). This means as CDPs increased the "capacity" of CDCs, it has also resulted in the need for more support from CDPs related to how best assess the effectiveness of community development activities.

Another problem that emerges is how CDC activities relate to the larger context of city and regional development. As Nye and Glickman state, "CDC capacity cannot be totally separated from the capacity of the city's entire community development system… CDCs operate in the context of resources, regulations, policies and priorities determined by other public and private actors" (p. 193). This is an important point. Regardless of how well supported and high-functioning (i.e. possessing a high level of capacity) a community development organization is, its activity is dependent upon the larger policy and regulatory environment. What a CDP may be doing to support a CDC in a certain way can be undermined by broader, counter-active forces.

Nye and Glickman also provide a summary of different capacities, categorizing them into five topics and identifying how CDCs and CDPs relate to each other in providing and receiving capacity-building support (Table 3. presents a summary). This is useful in determining how community development organizations can be supported by funding and administrative organizations under the idea of increasing capacities.

This discussion of community development is wide ranging and addresses the current

Capacity	What CDCs Need	What CDPs Provide
Resource	• stable, long-term operating support • new funding sources • fees from projects • better fundraising skills	• multi-year operating support • fundraising assistance • help attracting new donors • assistance with banking and loans
Organizational	• managerial support and training • ability to attract and retain skilled staff • well-developed personnel policy • competitive compensation and benefits • staff and board training • leadership development • financial and internal management systems	• organizational benchmarks to promote best practices • organizational assessment and strategic planning • staff and board training • performance-based funding • financial management systems and training
Networking	• networks with other CDCs and non-profits • networks with training organizations • joint development projects with for-profits • expansion of board networks	• networking help among CDCs and between CDCs, non-profits and for-profits • community development education
Programmatic	• housing development and management • economic development and retail trade • workforce development and job skills training • community organizing	• support for housing and other asset management • support for community organizing • support for economic and workforce development projects
Political	• greater recognition and support for community development • more responsive public agencies and programs • better public relations and communications strategies	• liaison with downtown interests • negotiations with government and private sector interests • increase public awareness of neighbourhood-based development

Table 3.   The relationship between CDCs and CDPs
(Adapted from Nye and Glickman, 2000, p. 167)

knowledge of community development in addition to classifying different community development activities and initiatives. These classifications include levels of community development, social capital and asset and capacity building initiatives. The purpose is to frame an understanding of what constitutes community development and outline recent trends in the field of community development. In conducting the analysis of Action for Neighbourhood Change and Neighbourhoods Alive!, this literature is used to explore the various facets of community development that each initiative addresses.

Neighbourhood Change

Neighbourhood change is another stream of literature that explores how neighbourhoods develop and evolve over time. In this section, two topics of neighbourhood change will be addressed. One is the theory of neighbourhood change, following the work of Temkin and Rohe (1996; 1998) and Pitkin (2001). The other is neighbourhood life-cycle theory, described by Metzger (2000) as contributing to neighbourhood decline. Each of these discussions adds to earlier descriptions of community development and, in many cases, provides the theoretical underpinnings of community development activities.

Neighbourhood change theory

The theory of neighbourhood change has undergone significant developments over the last century and understanding this evolution is important to the discussion of community development. Many of the theories developed over time had significant implications for urban planning and have influenced how current community development activities are understood (Pitkin, 2001). This section will discuss this evolution using Pitkin (2001) and Temkin and Rohe (1996) as the main sources to do so. Each identifies three major theoretical understandings of how neighbourhoods change – ecological, subcultural and political economy. A brief discussion of each is followed by a summary outlining Temkin and Rohe's (1996; 1998) synthesis of each to build a new theory of neighbourhood change and a description of several recommendations made by Pitkin (2001).

Ecological Model

The major source for the ecological model of neighbourhood change comes from the

University of Chicago School of Sociology and "tend[s] to present neighbourhood change as part of a natural, deterministic process based on rational, economic choice" (Pitkin, 2001, p. 3). One of the earliest and most well known theorists with this view was Burgess, who identified an "invasion/succession" model. Commonly known as the 'concentric ring' model, neighbourhoods change over time as a result of inevitable competition for space and as the city grows, inner areas of the city place pressure on outer areas to expand. The result is that "neighbourhoods deteriorate as lower-income residents move into them and push the growth of the city outward" (p. 4).

In 1933, Hoyt expanded the idea of invasion and succession with what is now called "filtering." The outward expansion of the city is "due to the attraction of new neighbourhoods on the periphery, not as the result of a push mechanism from the inner circles" (p. 4). In many cases, filtering has been used as a justification for supply-side housing initiatives, which result in "improving the housing consumption of all residents" in a city (Temkin and Rohe, 1996, p. 161). As new houses are built, wealthier residents move into them, vacating more affordable homes for lower income residents. This results in "upward" movement in the housing market and contributes to neighbourhood change.

The final idea in the ecological school is the bid-rent or tipping model. The bid-rent aspect expands on the two earlier ones by suggesting that residents choose between two competing characteristics – living close to the city centre with higher housing costs or living in a more affordable area farther from the centre (Pitkin, 2001). The emphasis is on demand-side housing initiatives. Residents will choose where they want to live based on their income and the city

will become spatially distributed based on these clusters of income (Temkin and Rohe, 1996, p. 161). The tipping aspect introduces the factor of social characteristics, such as race, that may contribute to a resident locating in one place compared to another. When a predominantly homogenous neighbourhood – historically white and middle-class – experiences an influx of a social minority, and the minority group reaches a certain level, the neighbourhood "tips" and the majority leave (Temkin and Rohe, 1996). This illustrates it is not only the housing costs that affect where residents choose to live.

Within the ecological theory of neighbourhood change, Temkin and Rohe argue that neighbourhood stabilization initiatives are problematic for two reasons; "1) these models assume that neighbourhood change has a positive impact on both in-movers and out-movers, and 2) they also assume that a neighbourhood's fate is not within its own hands" (p. 161). Residents who move into a neighbourhood are "improving" their situation, as are residents who move out of the neighbourhood. In reality, this situation is often not the case. Similarly, the theory is not very applicable to local neighbourhoods. Improvement activities done at a local neighbourhood level do not have much benefit based on this theory because neighbourhood change is guided by larger scale, natural forces.

Subcultural Model

The subcultural model of neighbourhood change evolved as a reaction to the ecological model, and critiqued three of its assumptions: 1) its economic determinism, 2) its almost exclusive focus on exogenous forces, and 3) its presupposition that neighbourhoods are homogenous (Pitkin, 2001). Subcultural proponents contend that the spatial arrangements

of neighbourhoods in cities is based on value and meaning, neighbourhood stability can be determined by the residents themselves and neighbourhoods are comprised of diverse groups of people. As Pitkin states, "whereas in many ecological models resident mobility and neighbourhood decline are seen as inevitable, natural processes, subculturalists contend that neighbourhoods can remain stable or even improve if the social structure is strong" (p. 7). Temkin and Rohe (1996) add that the simple premise of subculturalists is that "all neighbourhoods within a city do not follow the same trajectory over time" (p. 162).

This subcultural view of neighbourhood change that decline is not inevitable, and some neighbourhoods decline while others do not, "encourages neighbourhood organizers to mobilize residents to assert their interests" (Pitkin, 2001, p. 7). There is an emphasis on studying residents' social networks, their sense of commitment to a neighbourhood and the overall image of the neighbourhood. These "non-economic factors... influence a neighbourhood's stability over time" (Temkin and Rohe, 1996, p. 162) in addition to the external forces identified by the ecological model. Focusing on social networks, resident connections and their ability to counter neighbourhood change are a few of the foundational aspects of recent community development initiatives such as asset and capacity building strategies.

However, Temkin and Rohe (1996) contend there are problems with the subculturalist model. Focusing on "enhancing a sense of place while neglecting the neighbourhood's visibility and power in the local political economy" (p. 163) may result in a narrow understanding of neighbourhood revitalization and many strategies may fail if based on this way of thinking.

The urban context a neighbourhood exists within including the political, economic and power structures need to be addressed as well. It is the third model in ecological neighbourhood change theory that attempts to deal with this context.

Political Economy

The political economy model of neighbourhood change built upon both the ecological and subcultural models. They "retain the ecologists' interest in neighbourhood change driven by economic relations and forces from outside the neighbourhoods" (Pitkin, 2001, p. 9) but add the dimension of examining social relations within the economic production and accumulation of goods and services. Their critique of the ecologists is more complete than that of the subculturalists by "recognizing changes in the urban structure and economy" (p. 9). Within political economy, there are the ideas of the growth machine and urban restructuring.

Logan and Molotch (1987) formulated the growth machine model and it "holds that coalitions of urban elites seek to capture and retain economic power primarily by promoting real estate and population growth" (Pitkin, 2001, p. 9). The major idea in the growth machine model is the contrast between use and exchange values. Place is conceived as a commodity and there is a conflict between those who value the commodity for economic reasons and those who value it for non-economic reasons. The economic value is understood as the "rent" one could gain from its use (exchange value) versus the non-economic value, which is one's attachment to a place (use value) (Pitkin, 2001). The result, according to Temkin and Rohe (1996), is that "neighbourhood stability is most likely where use and exchange value are congruent" (p. 163).

The other is urban restructuring, or globalization. Pitkin (2001) understands urban restructuring being characterized by "two interrelated developments" (p. 11). One has been the restructuring of capital through global processes and the concentration of corporate activities. The other is the restructuring of labour markets by becoming more decentralized and flexible. The restructuring of capital has resulted in new global urban powers that no longer operate on a local or national scale. Concurrently, labour is now characterized by subcontracting and self-employment, which has shifted the "spatial patterns of production" (p. 12), thereby affecting urban areas. Communities and neighbourhoods are now faced with not only local or national pressures when enacting development activities, but are increasingly dealing with global economic competition and population shifts.

These three models – ecological, subcultural and political economy – each influenced community development activities. Pitkin (2001) asserts that the "subculturalist self-help doctrine still holds sway in much of community development practice... [and it is] political economy's emphasis on the external forces that shape how neighbourhoods decline or improve [that] is assumed by many policy makers and urban scholars" (p. 15). He also suggests a "balanced approach" is necessary to build a contemporary theory of neighbourhood change, which can be done by,

> Retain[ing] the ecologists' interest in analytical consistency, the subculturalists' pleas
> for human agency and concern for the 'micro,' and the political economists' disposition
> toward analyzing the political, economic and social forces from various scales that impact
> neighbourhoods. (p 3)

Temkin and Rohe (1996) also arrive at a similar conclusion, arguing elements from each of

the three previous models can be used in developing a synthesized model. The ecological model illustrates that "neighbourhood stability is affected by larger structural changes to a metropolitan area's economic and social characteristics," the subcultural model "recognizes the importance that social characteristics play in neighbourhood change," and the political economy model illustrates "neighbourhood residents must be able to influence larger political, financial and other institutional actors whose decisions affect neighbourhood stability or change" (p. 166). Bringing all of these elements together, they use the metaphor of cheesecloth to describe how they understand neighbourhood change theory. In this metaphor, the density of a neighbourhood's social fabric is variable, like the thickness of cheesecloth. Tight-knit communities are able to resist neighbourhood change, thereby maintaining stability, in the same way thicker cheesecloth is better able to retain its contents. In this model, there is less emphasis on the physical infrastructure than on the social fabric and network in a neighbourhood.

Yet there are also several factors necessary for this theory to hold true. There need to be "institutional actors [involved] who allocate municipal and financial resources across a metropolitan area" (p. 167) in order for the strong social fabric to reach beyond the neighbourhood's boundaries and enable the neighbourhood to remain stable. In addition, various neighbourhood stability programs need to be congruent with each other – conflicts between two programs, one place-based, the other people-based, may counteract one another (Temkin and Rohe, 1996). Using a place-based approach may encourage residents to stay by improving physical conditions while an individual-based approach may encourage the social upgrading, movement and relocation of people. This can be taken to a broader level as well.

Overarching, citywide policies can negatively affect neighbourhood development initiatives by counteracting the local improvements being initiated by residents of a local neighbourhood. Temkin and Rohe (1996) suggest, "neighbourhood change [is] a dialogical process whereby larger citywide change is distributed across neighbourhoods as residents of neighbourhoods interact with larger social forces impinging on the community" (p. 168). In order to address the issue of how citywide policies affect local neighbourhood initiatives, policy makers need to be aware of the social fabric of neighbourhoods "in order to design stabilization or improvement efforts" (p. 168). This can be done by augmenting census data with social data about a neighbourhood, similar to the way asset maps or social capital is measured as discussed in the community development literature.

Building on their earlier work, Temkin and Rohe (1998) more formally incorporate ideas of social capital into their theory. "Neighbourhoods with strong sociocultural milieus [are] more likely to begin defensive measures in the face of potential threats. Residents in such neighbourhoods will be more likely to view their neighbourhoods as unique spatial communities" (p. 69). The sociocultural milieu is comprised of identity (a neighbourhood has an identifiable spatial and symbolic environment within the city), interaction (how much neighbours visit with one another) and linkages (ability residents have to form social ties outside their neighbourhood). In addition to sociocultural milieu, institutional infrastructure is also important and "measures the level and quality of formal organizations in the neighbourhood" (p. 69). This measurement assesses both the level of presence neighbourhood organizations have and how well they are able to represent the needs of neighbourhood residents. These key ideas of sociocultural milieu and institutional infrastructure relate well to

the understanding Putnam (2000) has regarding community development. Social capital as he

understands it fits into Temkin and Rohe's (1998) theory of neighbourhood change well.

Temkin and Rohe conclude saying,

> A successful neighbourhood defence... requires an effective pre-existing neighbourhood
> group or a number of residents who can come together and form a group in the face of a
> potential threat. In either case, the neighbourhood must be able to leverage a strong sense
> of place into a collective movement that is able to form alliances with actors outside the
> community and influence decisions that affect the neighbourhood's character over time.
> (p 70)

While this understanding of neighbourhood stability is a good starting point, there are aspects

missing. It depends to a great degree on the internal ability of residents to resist change but not

how residents can facilitate change brought about by external forces – the positive aspects of

external impacts are missing. Neighbourhoods do not always need to be defended against a bad

change, but can also be improved by facilitating a good change.

Pitkin (2001) concludes by suggesting three elements to guide new developments of

neighbourhood change theories. New theories need to "acknowledge the complexity of urban

life, economic conditions and social relations... recognize forces from both within and outside

of neighbourhoods... [and] analyze change at multiple geographic scales, taking into account

both micro and macro dynamics, and recognize how conception of community is changing" (p.

20). His idea that neighbourhood change theories need to address multiple geographic scales is

important. Many theories continually focus on the neighbourhood level, but are not tested at

different scales and lack adaptability. New theories of how neighbourhoods change and develop

will need to address Pitkin's guidelines in order to be relevant in the increasingly globalized and

restructured world.

Historical Responses

In the context of community development and neighbourhood change knowledge, there have

been diverse policy and programmatic responses to inner-city community needs throughout

history. In order to bring this knowledge into practice, this section examines several topics. It

begins with a comparison of urban policy in Canada and the United States (U.S.), largely from

the vantage point of affordable housing. A discussion about the evolution of CDCs follows,

relying significantly on the U.S. experience to illustrate the roots of their formation and the

role they play in community development. Finally, Comprehensive Community Initiatives

(CCIs) are presented as the next step in community development work, building on the long

history of CDCs and new urban policy trends of holistic and comprehensive development.

Urban policy in Canada and the United States

Canadian and American urban policies share many similarities in their responses to urban

and community poverty issues, yet more recently have begun to diverge. In broad terms

there were similar policy practices in both countries up until the 1970s related to housing

policies. Though both countries cut funding for affordable housing, the American experience

was characterized by the privatization of housing while the Canadian experience emphasized

non-profit sector housing (Dreier and Hulchanski, 1993). The result is that Canada has a very

large "non profit sector that has been nurtured for two decades by the federal government and

some provincial and municipal governments" (p. 43; Chisholm, 2003) while in the United

States (U.S.), there was a heavy reliance on the private sector to provide affordable housing and

this "created a highly unstable low-rent housing stock" (Dreier and Hulchanski, 1993, p. 50).

The impetus for the change in Canadian policy was the National Housing Act amendments in 1973, which pointed Canada in the direction of non-profit social housing – characterized by "locally based not-for-profit organizations, including municipal non profit housing corporations, assum[ing] the roles of owners and managers" while the federal government removed itself to a large extent (p. 51). This change has been referred to as the development of "third sector" housing and resulted in many affordable units that are removed from the real estate market. In the U.S., large numbers of subsidized units are owned and managed by private, for-profit landlords – and some of those units have no long-term affordability requirements in place. There was also no support system for non-profit developers, nor a major federal housing production program in the U.S., which resulted in "nonprofit entrepreneurs [having] to patch together resources from local and state governments, private foundations, businesses and charities" (Dreier and Hulchanski, 1993, p. 62). The result of the decreased overall funding in both countries (third sector housing in Canada and the non-profit housing in the U.S.) was a decrease in housing production through the late 1980s and early 90s in Canada (Chisholm, 2003) and the emergence of intermediaries[7] in the U.S. (Dreier and Hulchanski, 1993).

Overall, Canada's affordable housing had been considered to be in better condition than that in the U.S. and Dreier and Hulchanski (1993) suggested it was time for Canada to build the capacity of the non profit sector while the U.S. has a significant, untapped resource in

---

7 These intermediaries are the same as the CDPs discussed in the section Assets and capacity building.

community-based initiatives that could provide adequate affordable housing if sufficient funding is made available. However, the federal budget in 1993 indicated there would be no increase in social housing funding for new production beyond current support for existing subsidies (Chisholm, 2003). In addition, many of the subsidy agreements will expire in the next 30 years (with a high proportion around 2020), causing many affordable housing providers in Canada to begin engaging in discussions about how the housing will stay in the non-profit sector, removed from the real estate market (Chisholm, 2003).

After the 1993 federal budget that indicated no new money was going to be spent on new affordable housing, the federal government did re-enter the affordable housing field through other programs focused on the renovation of existing buildings. In particular, this occurred through the Affordable Housing Initiative (AHI) of 2001 (CMHC, 2009), although this did not represent the federal government building and owning any additional social housing units. The federal government provided the funding for new construction, but usually did not support the ongoing operating expenses of the new units. The most recent federal budget, 2009's Economic Action Plan, also supported the construction and renovation of affordable housing (Canada Department of Finance, 2009). However, the budget did not provide any additional money to support the ongoing operation of any affordable housing projects.

This brief comparison of housing strategies in both Canada and the U.S. can be widened with a discussion of overall urban and community development policies in each country. Canada, despite what has been illustrated as a somewhat healthy third sector affordable housing supply compared to the U.S., has lacked initiative in terms of developing diverse and innovative

community development policies compared to the U.S. (Bradford, 2005). Overall, there has been a shift from nation-state economics to more urban-centred regional economics (Leo and August, 2006) and this has been compounded by the federal and provincial government offloading responsibilities related to urban community development – including housing as discussed previously (Bradford, 2005). In response to this, according to Leo and August (2006), Canada recognized that "national resources are needed to solve local problems" and "very different economic and social conditions in different cities call for differentiated policies" (p. 4). The National Homelessness Initiative (NHI) in 1999 was the response to this regional diversity, specifically the Supporting Communities Partnership Initiative (SCPI) component. SCPI set "broad objective[s] of reducing and alleviating homelessness... allowing individual communities the latitude to determine how those objectives may best be met [through a] community planning process... guided by community stakeholders [who were] recognized as being in the best position to decide what will really work to alleviate homelessness in their particular community" (Leo and August, 2006, p 6; Chisholm, 2003). However, Leo and August (2006) found that the SCPI initiative did not live up to its expectations as the federal government did not want to relinquish too much control in the community planning process and came into communities with preconceived ideas about how to best deal with poverty and homelessness (p. 15-6).

Bradford (2005) argues Canada should enter a "concerted round of policy learning and practical experimentation" related to urban and community development and move forward borrowing ideas and experiences from other jurisdictions including Britain, the U.S. and Europe. The "protracted problems of American cities have triggered successive waves of intense

policy experimentation" (p. 21) that began with physical regeneration initiatives in the 1960s, moved to people relocation strategies in the 1970s and 80s and finally evolved to 1990s efforts to bridge the two. He contends that Canada needs to engage in diverse policy discussions between all levels of government, municipalities included. This could also be expanded to include, as Chisholm (2003) suggest, non-governmental and community-based organizations that have experience in meeting diverse community needs.

Canada requires a different kind of policy formation and delivery structure to address not only housing issues, but other community needs as well. There is a need for "increased cooperation across government departments and between governments and the community sector" and "the involvement of local communities will be essential if cities are to build healthy, vibrant, inclusive communities" (Chisholm, 2003, p. 50). The changing federal, provincial and municipal relationships – with a greater emphasis being placed on municipalities to meet community needs – have been illustrated (Leo and August, 2006; Bradford, 2005), but national community development policy has not yet followed. This broad policy discussion should recognize "all three levels of government are presently active in cities and communities, spending, regulating, taxing and owning property" (Bradford, 2005, p. 32) and work towards greater coordination between all levels of government and community service providers.

As Bradford (2005) suggests, there has been a diverse evolution in U.S. urban and community development policy, and it has been well documented (Halpern, 1995; Keating and Smith, 1996b; O'Connor, 1999; Zielenbach, 2000; von Hoffman, 2003). In 1932 the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration introduced the New Deal and it was the "first time in U.S. history

that city mayors had access to federal aid and hopes of federal assistance" to aid in rebuilding inner-city communities" (Keating and Smith, 1996b, p. 50). It also marked the beginning of a long "struggle between political and ideological positions regarding the federal government's involvement in improving urban conditions associated with poverty" (ibid.). As part of the New Deal, the Housing Act of 1937 (and later amended in 1949) created the basis for public housing that continued for decades and also led to the clearance of inner-city poor neighbourhoods. The purpose of the Housing Act "was to acquire and demolish slum buildings and construct something better in their place" (von Hoffman, 2003, p. 8). It "authorized the federal government to lend cities money to buy slum land" and "allocated a hundred million dollars to help pay public agencies or private companies to redevelop the land" (ibid.), activities that are now recognized as being significantly detrimental to the low-income communities it displaced (Keating and Smith, 1996; O'Connor, 1999).

But the activities initiated by the Housing Act, known as urban renewal, also enabled the broad "War on Poverty" legislation to have greater effect by empowering local planning and grant distribution, according to O'Connor (1999). Begun by the John F. Kennedy administration and implemented by Lyndon B. Johnson, the War on Poverty was a "dramatic expansion of national urban policy that moved beyond the physical improvement of cities to focus on their poor residents [and] was an attempt to eliminate poverty by empowering the poor and placing more control in the neighbourhoods" (Keating and Smith, 1996, p. 51). Several of the policy and legislative activities included the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 with a focus on providing poor urban residents with job and educational opportunities (Zielenbach, 2000) and the establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (O'Connor,

1999). Although the War on Poverty represented a significant step in involvement for the federal government in urban development issues, it was under-funded to a large extent and its impacts were limited (Keating and Smith, 1996).

In 1968, the Richard Nixon administration consolidated many grant programs into a single one called the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG). The CDBG "provided funds to cities and urban counties... to benefit low and moderate income residents... housing rehabilitation, public works and infrastructure improvements and social services" (Keating and Smith, 1996, p. 53). Nixon's philosophy "sought to give states greater power and responsibility and to lighten federal restrictions in determining how public funding would be spent" (O'Connor, 1999, p. 109) and it represented the "beginning of the end to large scale, top-down intervention" (Keating and Smith, 1996, p. 53). The resulting emphasis on increased local control also "pushed community based organizations to strengthen institutional capacity, while the vacuum created by federal withdrawal from housing construction opened up a niche market for CDCs" (O'Connor, 1999, p. 109).

The Ronald Reagan administration represented the "beginning of extensive cutbacks in urban programs" (Keating and Smith, 1996, p. 54). HUD suffered significant cuts, CDBG funding was reduced, the Urban Development Action Grants (UDAG) were eliminated, waiting lists grew, public housing deteriorated and CDCs sought alternative funding sources (Keating and Smith, 1996; O'Connor, 1999; Zielenbach, 2000). Following in Reagan's footsteps, George H. W. Bush continued the same policy agenda and the Affordable Housing Act of 1990 could not make up for a previous decade of disinvestment in urban communities (Keating and Smith,

1996). The extensive cutbacks and program cancellations lead to the strengthening of CDCs as they improved efficiency and their ability to access other sources of funding from local and private supports including foundations and funding intermediaries (O'Connor, 1999).

Bill Clinton's administration in 1992 attempted to reverse the urban policy trend by increasing HUD's budget and introducing new initiatives including the Enterprise Communities/ Empowerment Zones (EC/EZ) program (Keating and Smith, 1996). The EC/EZ program has been referred to as a hybrid program (O'Connor, 1999; Bradford, 2005) as it combined lessons learned from previous programs into one. Its four principles include providing,

> Economic opportunity in private sector jobs and training, sustainable community development characterized by a comprehensive coordinated approach, community based partnerships that engage representatives from all parts of the community and strategic vision for change based on cooperative planning and community consultation. (O'Connor, 1999, p. 116)

Keating and Smith (1996) assert there was no clear indication that federal policy was moving towards a single approach to urban development and O'Connor (1999) is critical of its effectiveness in the "face of an overarching policy agenda that encourage[d] footloose capital, low labour costs, reduced social spending and persistent wage inequity" (p. 117). However, Bradford (2005) highlights evaluations of the program that suggest citizen engagement and participation was significantly higher than previous federal initiatives and the program was successful when partnered with an existing community organization that was in turn linked to broader, metropolitan development activities (p. 23).

In the future, O'Connor (1999, pp. 117-9) suggests there are five main challenges facing urban

and community development policy. It needs to:

- Make a case for investing in communities as part of an antipoverty policy that focuses on income inequality, job opportunities and racial exclusion as well
- Reassert the importance of the federal government's participation
- Reconstitute and strengthen the political coalition behind community development policy
- Acknowledge not only how race has contributed to the problems in poor communities, but to explore how it may be part of the solution
- Reverse the policy contradictions that keep community development swimming against the tide, [which] requires focusing not only on community interventions but creating the economic and political conditions within which community development can actually work

Along similar lines, McNeely (1999) adds there need to be attention paid to how other federal departments outside of HUD relate to community organizations. Many other departments provide direct funding to community organizations and these multi-departmental efforts should be coordinated. These are relevant issues "as the U.S. moves toward an era of community building, of comprehensive strategies to address poverty that combine place-based with individual and family-oriented programs and amalgamate top-down with bottom-up perspectives" (pp. 127-8). Bradford (2005) illustrates the U.S. federal government has learned from its past initiatives and these more recent programs have aided in a significant reduction in urban poverty.

This broad exploration of Canadian and American urban policy has revealed both similar and divergent trends. While both Canada and the U.S. have reduced funding for affordable housing, Canada has encouraged non-profit organizations to take on the role of housing provision while the U.S. has relied on the private sector for housing provision. In addition, the U.S. has been through a diverse community development policy path characterized by periods of intense investment, significant cutbacks and status-quo program maintenance while Canada

has lacked the same intensity in policy development and experimentation.

Community development corporations

Community development corporations (CDCs) have largely been formed in two successive

periods of time in the U.S. (Vidal, 1996; Stoecker, 1997; McNeely, 1999; Stoutland, 1999).

The first was during the late 1960s when funding was made available through the Special

Impact Program (SIP) of the War on Poverty. The second was during the 1970s and resulted

from the removal of federal funding from community development, as well as in response to

mortgage redlining and urban renewal activities affecting poorer, inner city neighbourhoods.

The first period of CDC formation focused on antipoverty and economic issues, mostly

through community activism while the second focused on physical redevelopment and market

based initiatives – specifically housing – and was not as multi-faceted.

The SIP of 1965 was modelled on the early CDCs and after it was created funded two specific

ones – Bedford-Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation (BSRC) in Brooklyn and Hough Area

Development Corporation in Cleveland (Stoutland, 1999). Senator Robert Kennedy visited the

BSRC and witnessed the poor conditions there, which led to the creation of the SIP O'Connor

(1999) suggested the early CDCs originated in the early movements for "black economic

self determination" and were "linked to indigenous efforts to establish an alternative to white

capitalist control" (p. 106). The second period of CDC formation resulted from federal

funding cuts for urban development that pushed CDCs to "do more with less" and access

"local and private sources of development support" (O'Connor, 1999, pp. 114-5). They were

largely focused on housing production (Goetz, 1996; Stoutland, 1999) and according to Vidal's

(1992) survey of 130 CDCs, 87% of them were involved in housing development – the highest of any CDC activity.

According to Stoecker (1997a, p. 4), CDCs operate with three underlying principles. First they are to accomplish "bottom-up comprehensive redevelopment" with a focus on being operated by community members. Second, they are to "empower whole communities through comprehensive treatment of social and physical conditions" and not focus on individual issues. Finally, they accept a "supply-side economic model and free market philosophy" that strives to correct three market failings:

- The inability of potential investors to see opportunities in the neighbourhood
- Profit maximization that prevent[s] socially conscious investing
- Social and legal restrictions on investment such as zoning laws

The result is that CDCs occupy an "insecure and unpredictable" middle ground between working with a bottom-up community focus yet depending on capital investment for development. They strive to improve local community conditions through managing capital investments like capitalists, but they do not do it for profit, and they often manage their projects through the constraints imposed by funders, rather than local community members.

Stoecker (1997) concludes that CDCs have a limited comprehensiveness, operate with a myth of community control and conduct disorganized development (p. 6). The solution is to form two separate entities, "a community controlled organizing/planning process and the high capacity multilocal CDC" (p. 13; Stoecker, 1997b). This would enable the community controlled organizing process to focus on being community based and work on mobilizing community members to address neighbourhood issues. The high capacity CDC would then be

able to facilitate greater, more efficient affordable housing productions through economies of scale and impact numerous neighbourhoods.

In a response to Stoecker's (1997) suggestion, Bratt (1997) takes exception to his idea that community organizing should be separated from the development activities of a CDC. Bratt believes Stoecker understands community as a "monolithic" one and says CDCs are often the best avenue for competing community interests to engage in debates and dialogue – an inevitable aspect of community organizing. She also points out that CDCs do not lack funding merely because of their small size, which Stoecker suggests can be alleviated through creating higher production CDCs. They lack funding because of general, low level interest among the public for supporting "poor people and inner city areas" (p. 25). On the other hand, Keating (1997) concludes that Stoecker's idea of splitting CDC activities into two has already occurred to a certain extent. But the problem with this split is that community-organizing groups often struggle and disappear due to funding limitations. "Without government or foundation financial support, sustaining such organizations has proven extremely difficult" (pp. 31-2). This point is also stated by Bratt (1997) who says that these new community organizing groups "would continue to struggle as mediating institutions" (p. 27). CDCs are often caught between directing development locally while maintaining a level of community based control. They also struggle to be as comprehensive as possible, but frequently fall back onto housing development as the most feasible community development activity.

In more recent years, practitioners and scholars have begun to identify a shift back towards being as comprehensive and holistic as possible among many CDCs (Traynor, 1995; Stoutland,

1999). This transition is based on the understanding that increasing opportunities among low income, inner city neighbourhoods involves improving the social fabric of communities and includes diverse activities such as assistance networks, public safety issues and education (Traynor, 1995). Stoutland (1999) says that many CDCs "have a sense of a comprehensive mission" and strive towards "meet[ing] multiple local needs" (p. 232). This new trend transitions the understanding of these organizations from being understood as CDCs to CCIs, which are discussed in more detail next. CDCs are currently most often understood as housing-based initiatives, while CCIs are organizations that tend towards being more multifaceted in nature.[8]

Comprehensive community initiatives

Comprehensive community initiatives (CCIs) represent the newest direction in community development's long evolution. Their roots can be found in many historical responses to community needs, yet they are characterized by several new guiding principles that add to the historical responses. They started in the late 1980s and were loosely grouped as initiatives with a focus on building 'community' in poor urban neighbourhoods (Kubisch, 1996; Kubisch and Stone, 2001) and according to Kubisch and Stone (2001), estimates indicated there were close to 100 CCIs in the United States in 2001. The roots of CCIs can be found in three trends from past community development activities (ibid.). One is research into how various community problems are interrelated (including physical health, infrastructure, business activity, racism, weak social and cultural institutions) and the importance of building social capital – the relationships between individuals and institutions. A second is the experience of program

---

8 A well-documented example of a comprehensive CDC is the Dudley Street Neighbourhood Initiative in Boston (Medoff and Sklar, 1994).

coordination (CDCs for example) that showed how focused, individual based strategies are limited in "achieving sustained improvements in individual and community well-being" (p. 20). Finally, the development of policy related to individual and context based activities stimulated the concern for both and CCIs emerged in response to integrate the two.

CCIs are primarily funded by foundations in the U.S. and are guided by the concepts of "comprehensiveness, coordination, collaboration and community participation" (Kubisch and Stone, 2001, p. 13; Kubisch, 1996). They work to synthesise many dichotomies – people vs. place, public vs. private, top-down vs. bottom-up, deficit vs. asset, categorical vs. comprehensive – and work at both the neighbourhood and individual level (Kubisch and Stone, 2001, pp. 15-6). Kubisch et al. (2002) identify eight loosely common characteristics of various CCIs including:

- An initiative focus, rather than being project based (longer term funding)
- Goal-setting initiated by funders
- Possessing explicitly comprehensive goals
- Promoting community based planning by residents
- Relying on partnerships within the community
- Using external organizations for support (research or technical)
- Building partnerships to external sources of power (economic or political)
- Continual learning

While observing CCI activities, a few researchers have identified lessons learned. A CCI can be established by creating a new organization or by using an existing organization such as a CDC (Kubisch, 1996). This choice raises issues community members need to be aware of, namely that existing organizations may have interests they desire to protect, and they already have an established structure and way of operating that may constrain their ability to take on CCI

activities. At the same time, establishing a CCI through a new organization is a cumbersome process and effecting change may be limited for a significant period of time. Pitcoff (1997) also identifies lessons from early CCI activity including the need to 1) shift power relationships to residents, 2) clarify roles between funder expectations and community realities, 3) balance a give and take between the funder and community organization, 4) be aware of 'on-the-ground' political conditions, and 5) require technical assistance for supporting community work. While CCIs are recent initiatives, these lessons indicate a growing awareness about how to build on previous community development activities and continue to improve them.

One of the key issues facing CCIs is how to adequately evaluate their effect on communities. "Traditional evaluations rely a great deal on issues of causality – examining exactly what actions bring about what change – which usually [is not] applicable to CCIs" (Pitcoff, 1997, The role of reflection section, para. 5). They tend to focus on large-scale projects, including community participation and resident empowerment, and it is "difficult to measure the changes in broad indicators [such as these] in such a relatively short time" (para. 4). Funders are interested in how CCIs are improving their communities through focused, comprehensive methods and establishing a method to evaluate CCI activities is important in determining their long-term sustainability.

Overall, "CCIs reflect the belief that single-issue planning and development neglects the interconnectedness of all the threads that create the neighbourhood fabric" (Pitcoff, 1997, A new community development model section, para. 2). They work towards providing neighbourhoods with tools to solve their own problems, yet maintain that support through

partnerships with outside organizations is also necessary.

> The change they seek is comprehensive, that is, inclusive of all sectors of the neighbourhood – social, educational, economic, physical, and cultural – and focused on community building, that is, strengthening the capacity of neighbourhood residents, associations, and institutions. (Kubisch, 1996, para. 2)

They represent another step along the path of community development, one that is ever evolving, learning from experience, community residents' knowledge and academic research. CCIs, as the most recent iteration of community development activities, show how the process of community development can be just as important as the results of what activities are undertaken.

Conclusion

Community development has a long and diverse history, evidenced through this literature review. As Canadian urban centres are faced with the multi-faceted struggles of inner city neighbourhoods to meet the needs of residents, they have sought to address these issues through various programming activities. These programs, whether they are people- or place-based, seek to improve the interactions and interdependency among people, places and institutions. They do so using various techniques including asset and capacity building, physical improvements to amenities, social capital building, and networking and empowerment initiatives. Many of these techniques have been carried out by different organizations including CDCs, CCIs and through different policy initiatives at federal and provincial government levels.

Current community development programs fit into this history. Although it seems self-evident,

this history is important to understand before attempting to discern and identify current activities, who is carrying out the activities and why, and how the history has informed current practice. The exploration of current practice also illustrates how programs are organized and implemented, who supports the programs, and who uses the program experiences to build knowledge about community development practices. As urban communities strive to meet the many challenges they face, strengthening the iterative process of program organization, implementation, support and knowledge building is an essential part of community development.

The key questions of the research provide the frame for exploring how Action for Neighbourhood Change and Neighbourhoods Alive! fit within this discussion of community development and neighbourhood change literature. As the literature indicates, the diverse history and wide scope of community development activity requires a multifaceted look at the two initiatives. The first question assists in determining how they align with various types of theory and practice. The second question begins to assess important relationships within each initiative and attempts to uncover ways those relationships are affected. The final question brings together the first two and builds towards discerning supporting principles for community development.

3 | RESEARCH METHOD

Framework

Using an interpretative point of view, the research includes key informant interviews (Berg, 2007; Zeisel, 2006) with organizers from both ANC and NA! This method of including two types of initiatives – one a community collaboration enhancing local capacity and the other active government involvement in supporting community development – provides a more complete picture of current community development activities and frameworks. It also permits a closer examination of the strengths and weaknesses of the two programs, and may provide a basis for the emergence of lessons learned and supporting principles.

Key informant interviews

The original intent of the research was to conduct focus groups but for logistical reasons this was changed to key informant interviews. When comparing the two methods through the Literature Review, focus groups would have permitted diverse discussions on some questions such as community development definitions and neighbourhood change theories. However, key informant interviews present the opportunity for participants to be more candid and contributes to revealing perspectives on community development support and the dynamics between organizations and funders.

The participants of the 12 key informant interviews were selected based on their involvement organizing and implementing each program's community development activities. ANC was

initiated by Tamarack: An Institute for Community Engagement, Caledon Institute of Social Policy, United Way of Canada and the National Film Board of Canada. ANC was conducted in five cities across Canada – Surrey, Regina, Thunder Bay, Toronto, and Halifax. One participant from each city was selected through assistance provided by an early ANC interview using the snowball sampling method. In the end, only Toronto was not specifically represented in the interviews due to a lack of response from the individuals contacted. NA! is a program coordinated by the Province of Manitoba and the administrators of the program formed the core of the key informant interviews. NA! provides support to local NRCs and several directors (or appointed representatives) of the NRCs also participated in the interviews.

The key informant interviews lasted about an hour each and were conducted mostly over the phone, except when the interviewee was located within Winnipeg, in which case it was done in person. ANC interviewees were located across Canada and NA! interviewees were mostly from Winnipeg, but also outlying communities such as Brandon and Thompson. Written notes were taken during the interviews and were recorded with a digital recorder that was saved as an audio file. After each interview was complete, the audio file was transcribed word for word to facilitate more in-depth analysis of the data.

Analysis

Data gathered through the interviews was compiled and analyzed through the transcripts. The transcript of each interview was coded using the process described by Neuman (1997). In this process, "a researcher organizes the raw data into conceptual categories and creates themes or concepts, which he or she then uses to analyze the data" (p. 421). Identifying codes in the

data permits the researcher to "spot quickly, pull out, then cluster all the segments relating to a particular question... or theme" (Miles and Huberman, 1984). Once themes from each interview were identified, they could be compared to each other to reveal new relationships and insights into the research questions being explored.

Neuman (1997) establishes three stages of coding: open, axial and selective. Open coding is characterized by identifying broad themes in the data and assigning initial codes to those themes. This initial stage "brings themes to the surface from deep inside the data" (p. 422) and allows abstract themes to emerge related to the researcher's initial research questions and literature review. Next is axial coding, characterized by a focus on the codes identified in the initial coding process, rather than the data. The goal is to move "toward organizing ideas or themes and identif[ying] the axis of key concepts in [the] analysis" (p. 423). The researcher pays attention to "causes and consequences, conditions and interactions, strategies and processes, and looks for categories and concepts that cluster together" (p. 423). Finally, selective coding involves looking for selective cases "that illustrate themes and make comparisons and contrasts after most or all data collection is complete" (p. 424) by scanning both the data itself and the coded themes. The goal is to describe, elaborate on and build relationships between the themes identified in the previous coding stages.

The open coding process was accomplished through several steps. First, the transcript of each interview was printed and different colour highlighters were used to tag key phrases, sentences, and sections in the interviews. This was done for each interview using the same colours for similar key phrases. Next, the highlighted texts were copied into new documents based on the

same colour groupings together and broken down according to each interviewee in order to be able to identify who was quoted. Finally, these new documents containing the broad coloured themes were scanned to develop the axial codes through identifying relationship and concept clusters within the open codes.

After the coding process was complete for each interview, the themes and relationships between them were compared to the rest of the interview results. This permitted an examination of the strengths and weaknesses of each program in addition to what lessons have been learned and where those lessons may be applied to improve community development practice. It is a broad look at where community development practice exists in terms of the two initiatives studied, and attempts to derive more generalized observations about current and future community development activity.

Ethics

The University of Manitoba Joint Faculty Research Ethics Board (JFREB) granted ethics approval for the research on May 30, 2008. Interviews were conducted over the summer of 2008 and participants signed a consent form prior to being interviewed. Copies of the ethics approval form and consent form are included in Appendix A and B respectively.

4 | ANALYSIS

The Analysis begins with a description of Action for Neighbourhood Change and

Neighbourhoods Alive!, broadly outlining their approach to community development and the

key partners that were (or are) involved. Then the themes from the key informant interviews

are presented in order from least to most frequent. For confidentiality and privacy reasons, the

interviewees are only identified as "Participant X" when quoted, without noting the program

they work for and any other personal information such as race or gender.

Action for Neighbourhood Change

As indicated, Action for Neighbourhood Change (ANC) was a Canada-wide learning

initiative focusing on identifying locally-driven neighbourhood revitalization activites. It ran

from the spring of 2005 to the spring of 2007, focused on particular neighbourhoods in five

cities including Surrey, Regina, Thunder Bay, Toronto, and Halifax. In some communities,

the activities begun by ANC are still continuing, or have changed focus to different

neighbourhoods.

Approach

ANC based its activities on the goal of enhancing the capacity of community members to

build and sustain strong, healthy communities ("About ANC" <www.anccommunity.ca>).

It did this through engaging local residents, not-for-profits, private partners, and the public

sector, striving to develop local solutions to local problems and create sustainable community

development and neighbourhood revitalization. In additon, ANC worked from the perspective of action-based research to learn how to better facilitate community development, and create broad policy dialogue about how community development activity could be encouraged in a more productive way over the long-term.

At a local level, neighbourhoods were chosen through consultation with local residents and community leaders, in addition to government and organization stakeholders (ibid.). This process was based, in part, on the idea that some neighbourhoods are in more distress than others, and that a coordinated response is required from all people and organizations involved. It also enabled residents to articulate long-term neighbourhood aspirations in addition to specific project activities, creating a broad neighbourhood vision that encompassed multiple issues and more holistic neighbourhood policies.

Key partners

ANC was funded by several departments of the Canadian federal government including the National Secretariate on Homelessness (NSH), Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC), Health Canada (HC), and Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness (PSEP). Coordinating it at the national level were three organizations, United Way Canada - Centraide Canada (UWC), Caledon Institute of Social Policy (Caledon), and Tamarack: An Institute for Community Engagement (Tamarack). The National Film Board of Canada (NFB) was also involved for the first year, providing the use of film and media to engage and empower local youth. UWC provided the overall administration and financing, Tamarack focused on leadership development and action research, and Caledon lead the policy dialogue to improve

how governments and neighbourhoods share their experiences. At a local level, the UW
chapters in the Lower Mainland (Surrey), Regina, Thunder Bay, Toronto, and Halifax took on
the responsibility of coordinating and engaging local residents and organizations.

Neighbourhoods Alive!

Neighbourhoods Alive! (NA!) is a community development initiative organized by the Province
of Manitoba that started in 2000. Initially focused on select inner-city neighbourhoods of
Winnipeg and the cities of Brandon and Thompson, it has since expanded twice – first in 2005
into additional Winnipeg neighbourhoods and again in 2007 to five communities across the
province: Portage la Prairie, Selkirk, Dauphin, Flin Flon, and The Pas. Activities are continuing
in all the neighbourhoods and communities, and the government has continued to provide
additional resources to support the program as it expands.

Approach

NA! aims to provide planning and financial support to community organizations, assisting
them with rebuilding their neighbourhoods. NA! requires communities to do a 5-year
community plan through an engagement process, consulting with local residents and other
stakeholders. NA! also provides a bridge between community organizations and neighbourhood
priorities with other services and programs in place, either in government or other agencies
("Neighbourhoods Alive" and "Frequently Asked Questions" <www.gov.mb.ca/ia/programs/
neighbourhoods/>).

At the community level, the initiative encompasses social and economic development in

addition to hard infrastructure under the recognition that building community takes more than a traditional "bricks and mortar" approach. Key areas of activity include housing and physical improvements, employment and training, education and recreation, and safety and crime prevention. These activities are carried out through a variety of programs under the NA! umbrella, with an emphasis on the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) and Neighbourhood Development Assistance (NDA).

The NRF is allocated based on neighbourhood size and need, and is available to all community organizations who apply and show that their project is a part of the neighbourhood's 5-year plan. The NDA supports a local Neighbourhood Renewal Corporation (NRC) with core funding on a 5-year contract. This enables the NRC to focus on planning and coordinating projects and not have to re-apply for funding every year to carry out core administrative tasks ("Programs" <www.gov.mb.ca/ia/programs/neighbourhoods/>).

Key partners

NA! is an initiative coordinated and funded by the Province of Manitoba. Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs administers the program and other Ministries play a role in assisting community organizations with projects that meet their own mandates (e.g. Manitoba Justice). Locally, each community or group of neighbourhoods has an NRC in place to administer projects and help coordinate community development activities in accordance with the 5-year plan, which they are responsible for developing. NA! also works with and consults other organizations, such as the Winnipeg Foundation, when assisting community groups.

Key Informant Interviews

As described in Research Methods, the key informant interviews were analyzed using transcripts and three passes through the data (open, axial, and selective coding) to identify themes. While there were many lesser themes that emerged from the interviews, only the most significant will be presented here. In order from least to most apparent, based on frequency of occurrence, they are (1) diversity (multicultural awareness), (2) definition, (3) place-based, (4) political influence and power, and (5) sustainability. The following analysis presents the findings of the interviews and uses representative quotes to highlight important points under each theme.

Diversity (multicultural awareness)

Although this theme was not initially apparent, after several passes through the data there was a sense that most participants had an understanding of how diversity played an important role in affecting their work in most communities. This theme occurred with less frequency compared to others and it is important to acknowledge that the interview questions did not explicitly target diversity and multicultural issues. The research allowed themes to emerge in the data on their own accord and in this case many participants identified diversity and multiculturalism through answers to other questions. As described at the beginning of the Analysis, the small sample size increased concerns about confidentiality and privacy and it is not possible to identify participants by program, gender or race. When combined with lower frequency of occurrence, the result is a more limited analysis of this theme compared to the others.

Many interviewees discussed changes over the years and how the nature of cities – and

inner-cities in particular – had grown to encompass a more diverse community that included Aboriginal people and new immigrants. There was a sense that racism affected many programs despite efforts of the larger society to be more open to new communities. As Participant I bluntly put it, "we need racism awareness." Interviewees went on to elaborate that there needs to be a whole new way of thinking and interacting between people if neighbourhoods were indeed going to become more inclusive.

In addition, emphasis was placed on the changing demographics in Canada and the rapid population growth of Aboriginal people. Participant B said,

> the Aboriginal population is growing in huge leaps and bounds and unless some sort of mechanism to draw those people in to the larger sense of community is developed, and [there is] a shift in the philosophy of how these things get done... there is real trouble coming.

This growth in population is coupled with the degrading conditions on reserves. Despite the fact many inner-city locations also struggle with their own issues such as crime, poor job opportunities, and substandard housing, they continue to draw Aboriginal people from reserves, where conditions are frequently worse. This puts a strain on community organizations and municipal resources, and without adequate support from governments (the federal government in particular) their ability to respond in an adequate manner is reduced. It leaves community organizations, municipalities, and provinces to address the issues and federal government funding does not stream down to urban Aboriginals. Participant G said,

> if someone lives on the reserve, the federal government is acknowledging their responsibilities, but if that aboriginal person leaves the reserve, the government almost washes their hands of them.

However, this was contrasted by guarded optimism that things were not entirely without

hope. The sense of integration and acceptance of many different cultures continues to increase, including Aboriginal. As Participant L put it,

> I feel really strongly that there's far more value and more acceptance of aboriginal people being a neighbour, having a great contribution to make, having opportunities to be... part of the cultural fabric [and] the economic outlook.

Definition

This theme was one of the overall goals of the research and key informant interviews. It quickly became apparent that many participants thought there was a significant amount of confusion about how community development is defined. As the interviews continued, several sub-themes and common threads about community development began to emerge including asset and strength based, slow and messy, modest outcomes, and a return to its roots.

Confusion

The acknowledgement of confusion about how community development was defined quickly became apparent. Many participants stated that community development was a "multi-pronged" approach and took on "fairly broad and diverse strategies." This breadth of activity creates the confusion about what, exactly, community development is. Participant G put it this way,

> I think the problem with community development is it becomes a bastardized term in that it's a catch all phrase for everything you want to do... first of all there's no control of the term community development and I think that's the big problem. We can only identify how we define community development, and then establish some parameters to support that. And once we've defined it and we've established parameters to support that, then we can assess and promote a direction that we want. And if you ask me, I think it needs to be clear, this is our position on community development.

Participant B stated,

the definition of community economic development and community development work is so broad that you can drive a truck through it and almost anything fits. Which means that if you're working for a small organization it's very difficult to focus and be in any way effective...

In some cases, participants stated that they did not use the term community development to describe their work because of the confusion about how it is defined. Participant H said,

> we never used the words community development because nobody really understands what it means... it means whole different things to different people.

However, there was cautious acknowledgement that many communities, despite this confusion, often understand community development. As Participant B described,

> I think that a lot of communities implicitly understand the concepts behind community development.

Asset and strength based work

Many participants viewed the work they did as building on strengths or assets already found within the neighbourhood – it was a matter of mobilizing and engaging residents to use those strengths and assets. Participant C said,

> it's called asset-based or strength-based community development, but really the heart of it was trying to find ways to engage citizens in these neighbourhoods to help them find their own voice and determine their own strategies.

This is also referred to as capacity building and many participants stated it is where community development begins, and that activities and projects grow out of initial capacity building experiences. As Participant L described it,

> I think that capacity building activities as they're broadly defined are the starting point for community development, and things tend to grow out of that initial capacity building experience.

In addition, participants discussed the dynamic between community economic development

and community development. Several considered CED as the main method through which systematic change could occur, and that by building the local capacity of a neighbourhood in economic terms, the exclusion or poverty the neighbourhood experienced could be mitigated more than through community development alone. Again, Participant L said,

> the broader context in my work is the whole movement to total community revitalization and that is a complex integrated set of commitments on the part of a group of people and it also includes the notion of CED because as people become more knowledgable and sophisticated about identifying the factors or forces in their community, they begin to identify the lack of access to employment and to opportunities to improve their own personal economic situation.

Slow and messy

Almost every participant described community development as a long term process, and a few others as a messy one. The time it takes for many community development initiatives to produce visible and apparent change is often longer than what is expected and this creates tension within the initiatives, leading to the description of it being messy with modest outcomes. Participant B said,

> the importance of community development work is, one, it's a long term thing... So you have to be able to adapt... and you simply cannot do it on a short term basis, you have to do it on a longer term, you have to look at the broader picture.

Participant D, describing how an organization had hired community developers who became frustrated by the demands that change should occur quickly, provided a specific example of this.

> Two people have been hired by the health authority as community developers and are so frustrated. They've been in the job for 6 months and people have been saying ok, well what have you done... I don't see any change.

Participant J connected this idea of long-term change with a neighbourhood's capacity, stressing

that it was necessary to "work at the pace of the neighbourhood people who participated in the project."

The length of time it takes an initiative to effect change in a neighbourhood was also connected to how messy the work often is. When the work is messy, it is not a surprise that it may take a long time. As Participant H said,

> this is what we would call messy, high risk, truly uncomfortable, chaotic work. And you try and take an institution that has hierarchy and structure and power and risk management and a board of directors and funders who need to have answers on what's getting done, and those two models typically don't meet. You typically can't take an institutional model and plug it into community development because community development stuff is so radically emergent and high risk... Eventually we managed to work through it, but I didn't want you to leave the conversation thinking that it's pretty cut and dry.

Modest outcomes

A sub-theme related to how long community development takes was that initiatives are often characterized by modest outcomes. Many participants struggled balancing community development activities not achieving grand outcomes with the value of doing the work regardless. As Participant B said,

> there's a hell of a lot of work that goes into producing what seems to be relatively modest outcomes... conversely, if the work isn't done, nothing comes out of it, right?

Participant G echoed a similar thought stating,

> you could spin tires on social development projects when at the end of the day you still might not see any progress – it doesn't mean it's not worth doing, but you might not see change because those are issues beyond our control.

There was also a sense of exasperation from a few participants when describing how community development activities could not be forced on someone, and they may choose to ignore the

resources or programs being offered. Participant G trailed off by saying,

> all it does is provide opportunities and we should continue to provide opportunities but we cannot hold our breath and put all our eggs in one basket. We have to diversify and push forward and know... there are things available and we continue to offer them, but if people choose not to use them...

Finally, Participant B summed up how community development should not be held up on a

pedestal, and expected to solve all our problems.

> I think to couch it in some terms that make it sound like it's some sort of magical panacea is not really correct.

A return to its roots

Several participants who had been involved in community development work thought the

most recent developments in the field brought them back to where they started their work – in

place-based, resident-led work. Participant D recalled,

> I'm old enough now to have come the whole full circle to see it emerging again... this is where I started my career, doing place-based neighbourhood connections with people and having them decide what kind of community they want rather than having the institutions decide for them.

This movement back to activities that characterized community development in the past was

compared to traditional community development, which seemed to be what occurred between

the two time periods where the focus was on place-based, resident-led work. Participant C said,

> I think often in traditional community development, a group of citizens or people in a particular community...people go in with their own set of ideas about what's needed and they go in with their own ideas about what kind of programs should be in place, and often it hasn't really matched what it is that communities themselves think is important for their own communities.

Participant L expressed a lack of confidence in this traditional form of community

development, also suggesting it should be focused on the residents.

I guess I have less confidence in more institutional community development. I think it certainly can be an incredible resource when the magic is there, but I think, of community development in its purest form is definitely being related to a group of people identifying their own concerns. And that could be in any community.

Through all of these sub-themes, there were a few common ideas about what community development could be, and these could indicate an early formulation around a definition for community development. Many participants expressed how community development could be thought of in terms of "engaged," "collective," and "involved."

As Participant F put it, "I think of community development as when the community is directly involved." And Participant J defined community development as, "engaging the community and the people who live in that community."

Place-based

As described earlier under the theme *Defining community development*, one of the sub-themes was about community development being placed-based. This was pulled out and identified as larger theme and the sub-themes within it dealt with addressing a neighbourhood's context, and the importance of thinking regionally and working with municipalities.

Neighbourhood context

This sub-theme takes into account the fact that neighbourhoods and communities have specific and contextual histories, defined by their location, demographics and available resources. As Participant A described it, the importance of location and history,

[means] you can't just cut and paste and photocopy one good idea into another community.

Participant G described how the local history of individual neighbourhoods had been taken into account, acknowledging there had been a long history of evolution that contributed to the current conditions.

> The history of these communities has been acknowledged and the evolution that happened to bring these communities to where they are in this present condition.

In response to this complex history and neighbourhood context, many participants described how place-based community development was acknowledged in the context of their work.

Participant J summarized it with the term "contextual fluidity."

> Contextual fluidity… is understanding where this neighbourhood has come from and who the people are that live here and their histories.

Participant G stated they thought their organization, in acknowledging local histories, had,

> created… mandates broadly enough to address the separate and unique need that each area [had].

The other aspect of neighbourhood context that emerged was how the speed at which different neighbourhoods pick up on community development activities varied. Participant H said,

> community development is about working at the speed of what's already going on in each individual place so that you create systems or connections or networks or infrastructure that regardless of how long you do it, it creates some kind of stickiness in the community.

For Participant J, this means,

> you need the luxury of being able to just have an open timeframe because every community is different in respect to how quickly or how slowly things are going to evolve.

The result is that funders need to realize that neighbourhoods evolve at different speeds and

take this into account when they support community development. Participant J continued,

> the funders of this type of work, be it foundations, the government, anyone, need to understand that this process needs to have a lot of leeway in respect to how it evolves in communities so that each community can bring their unique place based values and visions forward and build on that rather than taking some sort of cookie cutter mold and say this is the way we do community development and this is how we'll do it across the country. So really looking at this place based collaborative way of doing things.

Think regionally and work with municipalities

This sub-theme emerged based on what participants described as having learned through their involvement in community development work. The idea of having a regional perspective connects into the importance of working with municipalities. Participant K said there certainly needed to be a,

> recognition that you cannot look at a neighbourhood in a bubble because a neighbourhood is a part of a much larger community.

Participant C paraphrased Xavier De Souza's work and said,

> [he] talks about the need to look at a neighbourhood in the context of the role that particular neighbourhood plays in the larger region… so it's important to look at the neighbourhood as a neighbourhood but also in the terms of the region or the city in which it sits.

This regional perspective illustrates how interconnected neighbourhoods are. Participant B described how this can often lead to under-resourced community development activities because instead of supporting organizations from a larger, regional perspective, they are supported only for local populations.

> It would be like saying in [this] neighbourhood… we'll do this and this and this and we'll measure our outcomes in this manner and we'll try and change these perceptions but in actual fact the people you are dealing with all come in [from outside the neighbourhood] so that the population goes from 15000 to 70000 and they all disappear again. Can you affect the perceptions and actions of those 70? When you're really working in an area that's defined as 15? And you've got resources based on 15? I would say it's difficult.

74

Participant L stressed it is important to look at initiatives from a regional perspective because the impact of the work could be increased if partnerships were made with surrounding neighbourhoods.

> You need to look at some initiatives as regional initiatives and you need to see what the impact would be in partnering with other [neighbourhoods].

In addition, Participants A and C described learning that building connections with municipalities was more important than with the federal government. Participant A said,

> certainly a lot of community work is going on across the country… but it's not at the federal level but the municipal – municipalities get it because they're the ones who… see the problems first hand.

Participant C said,

> that's I think an aha with respect of working with municipal government [and] an important one. If the federal government devolves so much more responsibility to municipalities, that becomes the key to get a lot of things moving ahead.

Political influence and power

The fourth theme that was identified emerged around ideas of political influence and power at the community, organization, and government levels. Within this theme, several sub-themes were identified including resident mistrust, roadblocks and obstacles, and tension between funders and organizations.

Resident mistrust

The first sub-theme, resident mistrust, seemed to be the easiest to articulate for many intervewees and could be summed up simply as neighbourhood residents being tired of over-studying, over-programming, and being told what activities will happen in their

neighbourhood. Participant C rhetorically asked,

> how do you actually work to engage people who often in these kind of neighbourhoods have been over-studied, over-examined, lots of programs tried and people quite often become cynical of somebody else trying to tell them how to live their lives?

Participant A described this idea as a general lack of trust between residents and the organizations doing the work.

> When we first started work in the neighbourhood there was a definite lack of trust and well, mistrust of us coming in and doing work.

One way this lack of trust was addressed was described as establishing key leaders within the community who could work with residents and involve them in the neighbourhood activities and build a healthy relationship with them. It took a great deal of effort and energy to build these relationships, but in the end the process was necessary to help community projects to proceed. Participant K said,

> it did take us quite a bit to work through that and a lot of energy, and these are key leaders in the community that we absolutely had to maintain a relationship with, and so [we tried] to find ground where we could still agree.

Roadblocks and obstacles

This sub-theme emerged in the context of dealing both with people who may impede community development, or policies that may restrict community development. Even though some community members were seen as enablers, there were also instances where some individuals prevented certain activities from taking place. Participant A described it saying,

> I think there's often specific people who can be roadblocks be it someone who is key to moving forward in some shape or form they sometimes put up roadblocks and we've hit many of them just in the small scale things that we were doing in the neighbourhood be it the director of an organization, or someone from the municipality who says no you can't use the centre because we don't have staff after whatever.

Participant D reflected on a lesson-learned about people who are potential roadblocks in the community and said it is important to "be able to assess the level of strength and power that some individuals wield." However, the majority of the participants described the process of dealing with municipal and local policy barriers at a broader level, rather than just particular individuals. Participant A said, .

> we did run into many situations where there was a roadblock in our way and it could have been as simple as usage of a community centre, policies around that... Policies in respect to even getting through the door and speaking to municipal staff people at a level that some sort of change could happen took a long time to happen.

In order to address these policy barriers, several participants shared about committees their organizations had participated in to mitigate, or even change, policy barriers. Participant K described establishing an inner city community partnership.

> The intent of that group was to identify and try and remedy some of the policy barriers to the recommendations that had been identified.

Participant H called their's a resource advisory committee and said,

> their sole responsibility was to hear what the residents have to say and find ways to reduce barriers so that residents can get what they want done.

The most significant thing participants described as being important in addressing the roadblocks and policy barriers to community development was building partnerships with municipalities. Participant H, referring to community development in general, said,

> I think in a lot of community development issues, the broader context is looked to the municipal government to give you that. What else is going on in the community, you go ask a 'power that be' that lives and works and breaths as an entity in the community and say 'how does this fit.'

Many participants talked about trying to re-establish connections between neighbourhoods

and municipal governments as a way to build local capacity. One way this was done was through a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between a community organization and the municipality, described by Participant B.

> So that's one of the ways of dealing with [barriers] is because you know you're going to hit your head against it in almost every initiative that you take, so perhaps the easier way to do that is to ...sign an MOU to focus on areas where we agreed to work together and it's worked, actually.

Participant C echoed this idea when sharing one of their learnings about how closely community development connects with municipal level government.

> What we were trying to do originally was to get the voices of the residents reflected in federal policy that affects people at the community level... the big "aha" was we should actually be building much closer relationships with municipal governments because that policy is a lot closer to home.

Tension between funders and organizations

This sub-theme was the most frequent within the topic of political influence and community power. It can be summarized as being about the constant tension between, as Participant A put it, the hand up and the hand down. In other words, the "top-heavy, bureaucratic" traditional government control approach and the "grassroots, upward" community engagement and capacity building approach.

From the government control perspective, participants described how governments have the ability and power to chose certain neighbourhoods over others. Participant G said in many cases there was "an assessment to determine whether these neighbourhoods were selected or not." In other cases, it was a matter of governments dictating to communities about what they should be doing or what concerns they should have. Participant B said,

they are being asked to produce homegrown ideas and concepts where they didn't really have them before. They're being asked to have concerns… And if they can't identify them to go out and identify them… [the process] was designed to work in the opposite direction.

Another government control idea was the power they have over not-for-profits. Participant C said,

> by law, not-for-profits are forbidden from doing much advocacy work, so how do you start and advocate for the policy changes you need when you are forbidden to do so – put your charitable status at risk – that's a great big [problem] in terms of creating long-term, sustainable, [and] resilient change.

Participant C then added to this idea of not-for-profit control by wondering about who was doing the work of community development and who it was benefitting from it.

> If you look at the economic impact of the not-for-profit sector, it's absolutely enormous. Often it's a way for government mandated services to be delivered very cheaply, and those not-for-profits have their hands tied in a whole bunch of ways. That begs the question of who's going to do this kind of work.

Participant B described it more cynically by saying that this was a way for government to accomplish its goals in an under-funded manner,

> and what my experience was when on the ground was that it was sort of an under funded way of the government accomplishing it's goals and objectives by having people in the community involved here to do these things… Ultimately it is based on things the government philosophically agrees with, otherwise it wouldn't give the funding.

But there was also a sense that it was possible to work within the structures established by government, as Participant E stated,

> we have tried to work through the existing government structures where decisions are made… you influence a lot more by being proactive than sometimes you do if you become an activist. We have tried to stay out of being an activist.

However, there were also participants who described how governments need to be able to justify their investment in a community because of their accountability to the broader public at the municipal, provincial, or federal level. Participant L was candid when describing the challenges that governments face.

> We need [funding] agreements ...part of it is to protect the future of the program in general, so [there are] some restrictions and some constraints, but they are for, in the long run, the protection and the good of everyone involved in the initiative. You're naïve if you think government can stand a certain level of criticism.

Participant G echoed this idea that accountability to the broader public is a significant challenge, one many community organizations who receive funding do not often consider.

> My concern is that depending on the government of the day, depending on the partners involved, things can get swayed right? In order to... demonstrate results... I think it needs to be a little bit more prescriptive I guess. And it's prescriptive not because it doesn't acknowledge but because it understands the extent of what we can and cannot do.

> It's a philosophical argument, it's not that it's not worth pursuing, but in the end when the program is winding down and a new government comes in, how do you justify the value to continue on what we're doing with someone with a different moral lens or a different perspective?

From the community capacity perspective, participants shared about the struggle to do large amounts of work on very little funding, and the importance of bringing funders into community development projects early. Participant B described this with a story about how difficult it was to get funding for a small feasibility study.

> The conniptions and the back and forth to get that done was insane for $15,000 for a feasibility study. And that's just a feasibility study to establish the need and to move on right? Anybody with eyes can see the need... But this is the process you have to go through ...it was months in order to get a pittance ...[the project] has been demonstrated over and over again but you still have to go through this big dance and that's the modest outcomes. A year of work for $15,000.

Participant I talked about how important it was to have funders on board with a project very

early, and how this was different than the way community development used to occur.

> As soon as an idea is percolating, it used to be you'd have to get the proposal all written up and finished and perfect and send it in. Well that's the wrong approach, immediately if you have a great idea happening, call the funders and say this is happening, this is interesting, I think this really has some potential, do you think you could fit that into your framework over there?

This was also described as the strengths that increased community capacity brings to the community development process, that higher capacity leads to expertise that government can tap into to accomplish community goals. Participant F said,

> I think the benefits to government of having us here are that we are in touch with what's happening, we are on the ground and we can be that link and I would love if the government would invite us in more, because I think we've got expertise that would help inform government programs.

Participant F also described the perspective of a community organization,

> I would like the different levels of government to acknowledge that we're here and that we need to be supported properly to do the work that we're expected to do. And that means financial and networking with us.

However, Participant E pointed out that there remains a disconnect between governments requiring partnerships at the local level, but neglecting the same principal of partnership within governments.

> At the local level, any government grant has to be in partnership with other organizations... The provinces have to work in partnership with the cities. So why can't the federal government work in partnership with each other at the political level, when we've all identified this as a problem?

Overall, participants stated that the balance between government control and community capacity involves many different elements, from funding to partnerships. Participant A said,

> you have to build those linkages between all these partners and everyone needs to come to the table at an even playing field, so that everyone is coming with the same level of authority, same level of knowledge, and the funders of this type of work, be it foundations, the government, anyone, needs to understand that this process needs to have a lot of leeway in respect to how it evolves in communities so that each community

can bring their unique place based values and visions forward and build on that rather than taking some sort of cookie cutter mold and say this is the way we do community development and this is how we'll do it across the country.

Sustainability

The fifth and final theme that was identified emerged around the idea of how community development activities can be sustained in local communities. Within this theme, three sub-themes were identified including collaboration, local engagement and leadership, and long-term funding.

Collaboration

Almost all participants described their work in community development as involving many collaborations, including between different levels of government, community organizations, neighbourhood residents and the business community. Participant A stated that there is a close link between working together and the sustainability of community development work.

> Unless you have people working in concert… at that community level and the government and the business people… its really difficult to sustain this kind of work.

Participant K echoed this idea, adding that working together in collaboration also takes a significant time investment.

> Relationships become very important and the time to build those relationships in a way that is trusting and respectful and collaborative is really important.

However, collaboration was also described as not something that a person or organization necessarily knows how to do before actually participating in collaborative processes. Participant K said,

there was a huge amount of learning about how to work collaboratively... you could only understand about how to build collaborations by doing them, and there's lots of theory about working collaboratively, but the collaborations are very hard to do... no one organization can do this work in isolation – you've got to build collaborations and you've got to figure out how to build collaborations with the business community and with government. We simply cannot just work in isolation – either as organizations or as a sector.

Local engagement and leadership

Many participants described the various processes they used to engage with and foster participation from community and neighbourhood residents. In turn, this engagement and participation was shifted to developing local leaders that could carry on the projects that were initiated. Several participants found the most fruitful engagement occurred when residents were met in places they already gathered or by going door to door. As Participants H shared, "you had to go to where the people were," and Participant K said, "we've tried a variety of different ways, but certainly I think the door to door was probably the most effective." In other cases, local offices were set up, enabling people to have conversations about their communities. Participant A said,

> They set up an office and they would just go and talk ... and strike up a conversation... and they spent the first few months just talking.

However, Participant J said that although going out to meet with people in local places and actively engaging them was what they wanted to do, it took a significant time investment or they did not have the resources to be able to do it.

> We started going to where people were meeting already... it took about... 7 months of continually going out and meeting people in their spaces to generate enough interest.

Participant F echoed this saying,

> I really want to get out and do more of that because there's the squeaky wheels we hear from all the time and there's other people who I'm sure have an opinion, but we don't have the time or ability to go and find out.

In addition, Participant D described trying to get local residents to become community facilitators, but not feeling that people in the neighbourhood had the capacity to do it.

> We'd hoped that there was capacity within the community to train the facilitators to train residents to be the facilitators – that didn't happen. They just didn't have the skills, the confidence, the feeling of safety to become the leader of a discussion group... we really learned that if you're going to do something like that that requires a fairly good skill level, you're going to have to find the right people who can come in and be accepted by the community to be able to do that.

Engaging local residents to participate in community development activities was then turned into developing leaders to carry the work forward in order to prevent the activity from dwindling in the future. As Participant A said,

> without local leadership coming forward to drive it, sustainability was always [an issue], it's always about how do we sustain this... You don't want to come in and be a flash in the pan and go away.

Participants A and J also shared two ways to do this, hiring locally and establishing an organized neighbourhood group. Participant A said,

> we had hired locally, which was a really smart decision to do.

Participant J said,

> we decided the best way to ensure that there's some sort of sustainability around the work was to help form a neighbourhood group.

Participant L described this process as building neighbourhood capacity, and said it was integral to community development sustainability.

> I believe that kind of capacity building project is fundamental to growing much stronger

and much more sustainable initiatives down the way. You cannot get there without starting with capacity building.

Long-term funding

This sub-theme was the one most often repeated by participants, although it was occasionally described in slightly different ways. This first way was from the perspective that community development takes longer to implement and effect change than many funders seem willing to acknowledge. Participant H connected the speed of community development activity to how fast things are already occurring in a particular neighbourhood.

> Community development is about working at the speed of what's already going on in each individual place so that you create systems or connections or networks or infrastructure… it creates some kind of stickiness in the community, that the work carries on under its own steam or in some other capacity in a greater way than when you started.

Related to this seemed to be the idea that not only is working at the speed of a local community important, but so is realizing that this may be longer than originally anticipated when a community development initiative is begun. This is different than many programs that typically just invite community groups to apply for money but do not worry about getting local residents involved. Participants C said,

> I think that far to often in community development we leap right to the activity stage when in fact I think really effective long term community development takes a long time to help figure out how to get people engaged, because if that doesn't happen, then some of the project work, everything goes back to the original status… That's far different from somebody going in with a program and saying… and narrowly defined program, and this is what we think… this is what the money's for – if you want to apply, apply.

Participant J said,

> we definitely learned that it's something that evolves very slowly. It's a change process that needs first of all time, it needs funding, it needs dedicated people to continue the work.

Three participants also connected this slower pace and community engagement with how funders typically neglect process, emphasize measurable outcomes, and view projects with short one-year timelines. Participant B said,

> the importance of community development work is, one, it's a long term thing. You can do one off projects and those can be done in a particular period of time with stated objectives and you accomplish those things and you have your goals and objectives and you do those and you're all done and you can measure outcomes and you're all done. But the development of a community is more complicated than that.

Participant D said,

> I think funders need to be understanding of it and accepting the pace and accepting process is important and helping people understand what the small steps look like.

Participant H said,

> you go slow, you take your time, its always resident led and neighbourhood focused and you sit on your hands and try not to do everything... which is terribly frustrating because most people want fast solutions and most community development projects have only one or two year horizons.

Participant H also described it as being a matter of how much risk a funder or institution wanted to take that determined whether a community development initiative occurs or not, and whether it survives.

The second way this sub-theme was described related to the willingness, or lack thereof, of funders in agreeing to be with projects over a longer time-frame than typical project-based, one-year initiatives. Three participants described how funders had to somehow be convinced into providing support over a longer time period, and for atypical tasks such as planning or processes. Participant I said,

> [funders say] we'll give you one year funding and then we'll give you two... we said this has to be a long term strategy... so in other words, longer term planning. This project funding year to year, that's not a vision. Communities don't become dis-invested

communities in one year or two years... has declined over 30 years, you know? So you need a 30-year plan then to get back into it.

Participant J said,

> it all comes back down to the way things are funded, the funding silos of how communities are funded in respect to programs and services, everything is issue based so when you look at something like this that's asset based and it doesn't have traditional outcomes like you do when you're providing a program or service... But because of the way this work is, you're basically funding a process, it's much more difficult to explain for one, and two to show tangible outcomes in a short period of time, like most recent funding.

Participant C said,

> so with government funding, it's a real push-pull in terms of what they require over the short term and how long we know this kind of community development in fact takes.

Participant F described a process of continually re-framing and re-naming projects so they could get longer funding commitments to continue the same project activities under a different project name.

> We're in the situation where if you want to get funding for a program you have to reframe it and rename it to make it enticing to the funder, turn it into a new program or phase 2 or something else and it's kind of this game that everybody knows people are playing.

However, there were some participants that described a process of receiving longer-term funding that enabled them to do community engagement and organizing, activities that are not typically well-funded. Participant E said,

> without their support, a lot of the base community stuff would not occur... that [long term] funding... has been there and that has allowed us to organize the community and bring the community together.

Participant H also described the idea of seed funding as being important in additional to long-term commitments. This enables community groups to tackle an issue rapidly and can show residents that activities are taking place and getting results. One key to seed funding is how fast

it needs to be able to get sent to the group that wants to do the project.

> Seed funding has to be in such a way that it's fast, it's reactive and it's very minimal administration, so if somebody wants to create a vegetable garden and they're here in your office in June and they want to get it going while the summer's still there, that you have the ability to turn around to them in 72 hours and say "yes, go do it." Like, it has to be fast. Governments are typically not fast.

Participants also suggested that contrary to what many believe, community development in it's various forms may need to occur indefinitely, which is likely not something funders believe to be true. Participant K said,

> There's this sense that if we go in and we fix the neighbourhood, that we don't have to do that work any more. The work might change, but always there needs to be some degree of community development, community engagement, community whatever at the neighbourhood level.

Participant H concluded,

> if you want to have lasting change, you better make lasting funding commitments.

5 | SYNTHESIS

This section builds upon the Literature Review's discussion of community development, neighbourhood change, and the historical responses. It also uses the Analysis of ANC and NA!'s programmatic responses, and the key informant interview findings. By bringing the Literature Review and Analysis together, the relationship between theory and practice can be explored, permitting new insight into community development practice.

Action for Neighbourhood Change and Neighbourhoods Alive!

When viewed through the Literature Review, ANC and NA! as community development initiatives fit with varying degrees into the different concepts. Pierson and Smith's (2001) three themes for describing programmatic responses to community decline illustrate general aspects of ANC and NA! well. They are both programs that attempt to address the interconnected nature of inner-city issues. They also both responded to public pressure for greater inclusion in decision making and development processes, and either sought extensive community engagement or more targeted community input. In addition to these themes from Pierson and Smith, the diverse goals of community development described by Ferguson and Dickens (1999) fit well with both initiatives. They are seeking to meet diverse needs – from resident security and capacity, to resident political and public engagement, to enhancing local business and economic development.

Zielenbach's (2000) classification of community development initiatives into individual-based

and place-based approaches is helpful for illustrating the broad approach of each initiative. ANC considered itself a place-based approach and using Zielenbach's categories, is best described as being incumbent upgrading. It uses existing residents to restore inner-city neighbourhoods. On the other hand, NA! seems to fit more within the individual-based approach and the categories of social development and program-driven economic development. These focus more on enhancing job training, day cares, and other individual programs to improve a neighbourhood's liveability, and use CED principles to increase local business and job development.

Vidal's (1997) description of CDCs becoming more diverse in their community development practices is also evident through both ANC and NA!'s approaches. Both are not only seeking to address traditional community development activities such as housing and infrastructure, but are engaged in building the social networks of neighbourhood residents as well. However, Vidal's caution against building all community organizations into multi-dimensional and "multi-serviced" agencies could be an important message to each initiative. Vidal is essentially arguing for a decentralized system of community development, saying that there are limited resources available and it is not possible to create many large community development organizations in individual neighbourhoods or communities. In particular, NA! tries to encourage one organization to coordinate most activities in one neighbourhood. However, although this is not necessarily the wrong approach, more diverse avenues for encouraging community may help strengthen the program.

Using the levels of community development set out by Ferguson and Stoutland (1999),

ANC and NA! can be categorized to determine their relationship with the communities in which they work. ANC as an initiative exhibits many characteristics of a level two initiative, using local United Way chapters to coordinate activities in each neighbourhood. In turn, the initiative fostered many locally-based groups of people with level zero characteristics to take up different activities. By the time the initiative had been going for a year or more, ANC established local organizations with greater capacity and paid staff - one of the distinctions between level zero and level one groups. In the background, the partners that initiated ANC were level three organizations that had research ability and national scope that spanned all five communities.

NA!, on the other hand, is organized primarily provincially and is therefore a level three program with policy staff, legislative power to regulate communities, and the ability to significantly affect funding. In turn, NA! establishes local NRCs in neighbourhoods to foster locally-based community development. The NRCs technically fall into the level one category, but some develop capabilities that are more representative of level two organizations. NA! also supports many organizations that may be at level zero, however one of their funding criteria is that the organization has to be incorporated in order to receive NA! funding - this could limit the number of level zero organizations NA! supports because an incorporated organization without a paid staff person (a key criteria of level zero, according to Ferguson and Stoutland) may be rare.

One other important point Ferguson and Stoutland add to their classification of levels is the idea that certain people with organizations may transcend the levels. Levels of community

development are intended to describe organizations, and one way that networking and key alliances are created between levels and organizations is by having people that are members of organizations at different levels. This increases the chance for collaboration when addressing the complex nature of community development, and is one way ANC and NA! could potentially encourage and strengthen their community development processes.

Using a social capital lens, ANC and NA! exhibit the understanding of social capital described by Putnam (2000). There is strong emphasis on increasing the connections between neighbourhood residents and this in turn benefits the economic, safety, and health of communities. However, one of the important factors in DeFilippis' (2001) critique of Putnam – that the power relationships are not part of his definition of social capital – is difficult for both ANC and NA! to address. The power of funders over community organizations is a delicate balance that significantly affects how community is encouraged and neighbourhood connections are fostered. This emerged significantly in the interviews and is addressed in the Interview section.

Both ANC and NA! also use the terms assets and capacity to describe the scope of their work. As Kretzmann (1995) describes, they attempt to focus on neighbourhood assets, rather than needs, when building programs and initiatives. This focus on neighbourhood assets can include different aspects such as physical, human, social, financial, and political (Ferguson and Dickens, 1999) and both ANC and NA! attempt to reach this diverse scope through their work. In addition, capacity building can be individually-based or organization-based. NA! provides planning, financial, and program development support to the NRCs as well as

other community organizations that apply for funding. ANC, as a collaboration of several organizations and funders, also provided assistance to community groups but with less direction from ANC itself and more guidance based on resident input.

NA! is an example of what Nye and Glickman (2000) call CDPs, summarized in Table 3 of the literature review. In some ways, NA! functions as as CDP in that it works on building the capacity of the local NRCs through resource, organizational, networking, programmatic, and political support. However, Nye and Glickman's study also reveals that increased capacity leads to greater demand on the part of CDPs. The result is an emphasis on quantifiable outcomes and performance measures that further increase the administrative burden on CDCs, a finding that emerged through the key informant interviews of this research. In addition, Nye and Glickman illustrate how CDCs work within a regulatory and public policy environment, which is similar to the situation of NRCs. In this case, the strength of NA! is that it has connections into that regulatory and policy environment, thereby present the possibility to overcome key barriers the NRCs may face.

In both ANC and NA! there is evidence to support Pitkin's (2001) assertion that community development and neighbourhood change theory is guided mostly by the "subculturalist self-help doctrine" (p 15). The focus is on neighbourhood residents and their interest in the neighbourhood, leading to a study of social networks, a sense of commitment, and the image of the neighbourhood. All of these elements are present in both initiatives to varying degrees. ANC and NA! policy makers could strengthen their understanding of neighbourhood change theory by using Pitkin's analysis as a starting point. This includes a blended model that

encompasses analytical consistency from ecological thinking, human agency subculturalist thought, and an understanding the political, economic and social forces on neighbourhoods from political economists.

ANC contained elements of what Chisholm (2003) identified as a need in community development - increased cooperation between government sectors and the community, and the involvement of local communities in this process. In many ways, ANC represented a potential new policy formation in community development because it built many partnerships between federal government departments and several prominent community organizations. It made a concerted effort to engage local residents and letting them decide how their communities developed. However, it was also a *potential* new policy formation. ANC did not evolve longer than the original two years at the federal level and this is indicative of a continued struggle to bring the federal government into the community development field, the way many policy makers and practitioners feel it should.

Finally, the NRCs (a key component of the work NA! does in community development) can be characterized as having many common characteristics with CCIs in the U.S. Using the outline of Kubisch et. al. (2002), the NRCs exhibit all eight characteristics of CCIs:

- An initiative focus, rather than being project based (longer term funding)
- Goal-setting initiated by funders
- Possessing explicitly comprehensive goals
- Promoting community based planning by residents
- Relying on partnerships within the community
- Using external organizations for support (research or technical)
- Building partnerships to external sources of power (economic or political)
- Continual learning

Although the history of NRCs is not as long as some CCIs in the U.S., they are an excellent example of what can be done with longer term funding, holistic (comprehensive) goals, a community focus, and broad partnerships. These organizations provide an important contribution to community development in their respective neighbourhoods.

Interviews

Bringing together the five themes that emerged from the interviews is very complex, as the nature of community development itself indicates (refer to the literature review). This section presents the most salient points of each theme and discusses the relationships among them.

The first theme, diversity, was described by multiple interviewees as being a key issue in their work. Racism and intolerance appeared to be prevalent in different communities, and many interviewees who were involved in community development encountered it. Particular groups of people that were mentioned included Aboriginal and new immigrants.

When viewed with other themes identified, diversity connects closely with the place-based, and political influence and community power themes. Place-based community development attempts to take into account neighbourhood context when understanding how initiatives may affect the neighbourhood. With issues related to Aboriginal and new immigrant communities, it is important to understand the processes of settlement in the city and that potential support programs may need to change over time. Being able to adapt to the changing conditions is a strength that would enable a community development initiative to evolve over time and meet the needs of the day for a particular neighbourhood.

Political influence and community power connect with diversity through policy issues and government controls identified by interviewees. To assist developing Aboriginal reserve and urban populations, governments control the conditions on reserves, which in turn lead to many Aboriginal people seeking better opportunities in urban centres. However, do not necessarily adjust the resources given to urban communities to meet the increased demand for services – there is a policy conflict between regulating reserve communities and funding for community organizations in urban centres.

Perhaps the most confusing theme, and maybe ironically so, was the definition of community development. There is such a wide variety of ways organizations and practitioners understand community development that it almost becomes impossible to determine what it is and who is doing it. A few characteristics emerged including building on neighbourhood assets and strengths, it is a very slow and messy process, it achieves modest outcomes of large amounts of work, and it has come full circle through "traditional" community development to emerge again as resident-led, community organizing work. There were also widely varying descriptions of what types of activities community development uses including community gardens, celebrations, crime prevention, building playgrounds, holding meetings, renovating housing, etc. However, a particular unifying activity or outcome did not emerge.

In fact, there is one point in the Analysis where a contradictory quote is used, describing that many communities seem to implicitly understand what community development is. This illustrates how even though there is little agreement on an exact definition (also described in the Literature Review), there are certain elements to community development that

neighbourhood residents can identify with. Perhaps the broad definition means community residents can attach personal experience to many different activities and gives community development it's broad appeal – to the frustration of many practitioners involved in the field.

In contrast to this apparent lack of unifying activity or outcome, there appears to be a certain amount of agreement about the process of community development, rather than the specific activities that are included in community development. Most interviewees used words such as "engaged," "collective," or "involved" to describe the desire to get residents to take ownership of the activities in their neighbourhoods and communities. This is similar to the definition of community development described in the Literature Review, although it is much simpler and easier to understand. Community development could be redefined as being about engaging residents to become involved in collective action. And borrowing from the Literature Review, it could be at any geographic scale – whether the block, neighbourhood, city, or region.

In the place-based theme of community development, the most significant thing to emerge from the interviews was the desire to build closer relationships with municipal governments. Many interviewees described how municipalities are often more connected with urban issues than other levels of government such as provincial or federal. This potentially results in them paying more attention to groups that are working in neighbourhoods to address those issues. When looking at this issue in other themes, it corresponds with the theme of political influence and community power. Interviewees talked about how they built partnerships with the municipal government, either through establishing MOUs, forming committees, or reconnecting neighbourhood residents with municipal services. This assisted with breaking

down people and policy barriers that slowed or prevented community development activity from taking place.

Another place-based theme was thinking more in terms of a region when promoting community development activity. With the movement of people across neighbourhood boundaries and many neighbourhoods serving populations greater than just their own, it becomes important to fund programs in different ways beyond being strictly neighbourhood focused. One way to do this is to provide funding to surrounding neighbourhoods in addition to those deemed most "in-need." Efforts to encourage and engage resident participation are not just for neighbourhoods that may be struggling, but are a way to continue to support neighbourhoods that may be more stable. An example is the Minneapolis Neighbourhood Revitalization Program (MNRP) where money is available for all neighbourhoods in Minneapolis. Some neighbourhoods have a higher allocation than others, but there is acknowledgement that community development in all neighbourhoods should be supported.

In political influence and community power, there was a tension between government control of community development, and the desire for developing community capacity. Governments regulate the not-for-profit sector and many interviewees saw this as a significant issue. It prevents organizations from advocating for the change that they are trying to achieve, and in turn the organizations are under-funded by government who then use the organizations as a way to carry out government work "on the cheap" This could be a cynical way of understanding government control, or perhaps it is illustrative of a significant issue within the community development field. Since many community organizations are not-for-profits, they

are limited through strict regulation combined with limited funding, and then expected to achieve significant impacts on their communities in the meantime. Conversely, government has to justify their spending to the public that elected them, and typically the chosen way to do that is through activities with measurable outcomes rather than activities around community engagement and development processes.

Finally, under the sustainability theme, the issue of adequate funding was most significant and this relates back to the issues identified under the political influence and community power theme. In many cases, interviewees lamented the fact that funding was not committed over a long enough period of time in order to see significant and lasting change occur in neighbourhoods. As one interviewee quipped, communities have been dis-invested in for so long, you cannot expect them to change over the course of a one year program with limited funding. NA! as a program does fund the NRCs with funding for five years based on a neighbourhood plan the NRC develops. However, other community organizations are left playing the game of re-framing and re-naming their programs in order to continue operating. Despite the fact this game is played, not much has been done to alleviate or address what may be the underlying cause. In addition to lasting funding commitments, the need to provide quick seed funding was identified. This funding would provide what are called "quick wins" that the community can rally around, and can be used to show that activities are taking place and having an impact.

6 | CONCLUSION

Many cities across Canada use community development to counteract community and neighbourhood decline, which occurs most often in the inner city. As this research shows, community development has a diverse history and contains a rich array of programs and initiatives that are used to carry out various activities. Action for Neighbourhood Change and Neighbourhoods Alive! represent two examples of recent initiatives, illustrating a desire to encourage and engage local residents and provide support services for community organizations.

The first key question related to the experience of Action for Neighbourhood Change and Neighbourhoods Alive! As the Literature Review, Analysis, and Synthesis reveal, ANC and NA! are similar yet distinct community development programs (summarized in Table 4.). Both identify with Pierson and Smith's (2001) three themes of community development, Putnam's (2000) social capital ideas, and Kretzmann's (1995) asset-based focus. However, differences emerge when using classification methods from Zielenbach (2000) and Ferguson and Stoutland (1999) where ANC was grassroots focused and NA! took a programmatic perspective.

The second key question asked how the relationship between funders, organizations, and participants could be strengthened and sustained. The answer emerged from the interviews, predominately through the two themes political influence and power and sustainability. Residents of neighbourhoods where community development initiatives were taking place

	Action for Neighbourhood Change	Neighbourhoods Alive!
Pierson and Smith's (2001) themes	Address interconnected nature of community issues, provide greater inclusion in decision-making processes, and seek community involvement.	Address interconnected nature of community issues, provide greater inclusion in decision-making processes, and seek community involvement.
Zielenbach's (2000) classification	Place-based, incumbent upgrading	Individual-based, program-driven social and economic development
Ferguson and Stoutland's (1999) level of community development	Level two supporting level zero/one	Level three supporting level one/two
Putnam's (2000) social capital	Emphasis on building connections between neighbourhood residents	Emphasis on building connections between neighbourhood residents
Kretzmann's (1995) asset focus	Asset-based, focus on individual capacity building	Asset-based, focus on organization capacity building
Nye and Glickman's (2000) community development partnerships	No CDP characteristics	Many CDP characteristics in the relationship with the NRCs

Table 4. Characteristic summary of ANC and NA!

describe themselves as being tired and mistrustful of new initiatives. There are also particular people or organizations that impede the progress of an initiative and there is a significant amount of tension between funders and organizations. This "top-down" and "bottom-up" tension relates to funding and government control of non-profit organizations, and how significant outcomes are required with limited funding. The most often repeated way for community development to sustain itself was through committed, long-term funding arrangements that involve multiple departments (a result of the multiple agendas and diversity of community development activity).

Finally, the third key question asked what supporting principles could be identified to strengthen community development practice. The following are six principles that can be drawn from the Literature Review, Analysis, and Synthesis of the research:

1. *Encourage stronger connections between neighbourhood change theory and community development practice*

Many interviewees, if not most, had extensive experience in the community development field. However, the connection between knowledge of neighbourhood change and its effect on community development practice was lacking. While ANC did have a theory of change developed during the process, it was not developed prior to the initiative being implemented. There are many neighbourhood change models in the literature and grounding a new community development initiative in a theoretical understanding of what effect programs may have on neighbourhoods, and vice versa, could strengthen and increase the resiliency of an initiative. In addition, by developing new models and theories of neighbourhood change, existing initiatives can carry their learning forward into new and innovative community development practice.

2. *Define community development as a process rather than an activity*

Community development is confusing, an experience shared by everyone involved in the field. Activities in different initiatives vary from things as simple as planting a community garden and painting the front steps to as complex as convening policy groups focused on overcoming systemic regulatory barriers. This research began to reveal that a common understanding about community development may be found around the process through which various activities take place – engaging residents to become involved in collective action.

In order to take this process-based definition another step further, the characteristics of process need value in the same way concrete outcomes have value. Evaluating a community

development initiative based on process indicators in addition to activity indicators would strengthen the practice. It would also provide balance between encouraging community organizing (historically an important factor in community development), or process outcomes, and traditional activity outcomes. Widening the scope of performance and outcome evaluation in this way prevents community development from becoming entirely about numbers of participants, or infrastructure constructed, or people trained. These traditional outcomes are valuable and have contributed to enabling the measurability of community development impact. However, what has been lost (when compared to historical community development) is the process of engaging communities in collaborative, collective action being as valuable as activity outcomes.

3. *Create new policy formations, using ANC as an example*

ANC represented a diverse partnership in the federal government including several different departments. This indicates at least a foundational understanding that community development cuts across ministry mandates and can meet multiple needs at one time. The integration of many services outside of traditional "silos" that are present in government bureaucracy is occurring in many jurisdictions across Canada. Community development should be no different and funders need to seize this opportunity and collaborate in more meaningful ways.

4. *Recognize the power of governments over community organizations*

Governments exert a significant amount of influence on many things when they decide to support or not support a particular initiative including purpose, scope, duration, activity,

staff levels, and outputs and outcomes among many others. Ultimately they decide whether a program goes ahead or is denied. In particular, governments regulate many community organizations through not-for-profit legislation, which can be onerous for many organizations and significantly affect their ability to advocate and lobby for systemic changes.

5. *Make long-term, stable, funding commitments in order to support long-term change*

Many community development activities are program-based, meaning they receive funding for a particular program that usually has a year-long time frame. NA! offers a different example through their NRCs, which receive 5-year funding commitments in return for 5-year neighbourhood plans. This enables the NRCs to meet their basic staff and administrative needs and achieve a small amount of independence to decide what activities are more important than others for their particular neighbourhood(s). Even ANC, initiated as a two year program, broke the norm of strictly project-based funding. The game of reshaping and renaming projects just to get another year of funding is a poor use of government and community organization resources. Funding a project for 2-3 years (minimum) up-front allows organizations to plan for long-term impacts and achieve long-term results.

6. *Actively target municipalities in community development*

While increased involvement of municipalities may be seen as a sign of downloading responsibilities from federal and provincial governments, it remains that municipalities are impacted in direct and significant ways by community decline. This means they should have a vested interest in what is occurring in their neighbourhoods and communities, and typically they can respond more rapidly to immediate needs than higher forms of government. They can

also be strong advocates for the policy and systemic changes that need to occur to assist creating lasting change for communities in decline.

As planners, this final finding could be considered the most relevant to our work. The traditional role of planners is at the municipal level, either regulating and facilitating development from the civic perspective, or working with consultants, architecture firms, and developers on putting forward development proposals. Branching out to include community organizations in the development process and building partnerships between these organizations and civic government can play an important role in improving local communities and neighbourhoods. In many cases, community groups represent a significant resource to be tapped by municipal governments, assisting them in improving the livability of cities. However, this research also shows that the community development process must be adequately supported in order to achieve results and make change in local neighbourhoods.

Planners also participate in many other fields besides municipal development. One avenue is to work closely with community organizations to help them achieve change at the local level, either through employment or offering services. Planners also work for provincial or federal policy groups that create policy and in turn facilitate or impede community organizations' ability to carry out the work of building community and neighbourhoods. Keeping these findings in mind when working at all levels will help encourage community organizations in their work, building their capacity to serve local residents and engaging them in taking collective action to improve their neighbourhoods.

However, this research also revealed additional questions that need ongoing study. One of the most significant is discovering new approaches to evaluating community-based development initiatives. As Pitcoff (1997) states, "traditional evaluations rely a great deal on issues of causality – examining exactly what actions bring about what change" (The role of reflection section, para. 5). The difficult part is that as many examples and stories from this research illustrate, the process of community development can be just as important as the outcomes. The act of bringing people together to take action and positively impact their community has benefits in and of itself. But what is not known is how to adequately assess the success of this collective action. Additional work needs to be done on describing an adequate process-based evaluation.

Another aspect that needs additional research is continuing to build on the new policy formations that initiated the work of ANC but failed to continue beyond two years. Breaking down the barriers between government sectors at all levels should continue to remain a theme in the community development field. Identifying how to do so effectively requires more research, discovering more examples of where it has worked and why. Community development crosses all sector boundaries and requires integration to achieve outcomes that effectively counteract the disinvestment many communities have experienced.

Finally, issues around gender roles and racism in community development should be the focus of further research. The program material of both ANC and NA! and the interviews did not specifically deal with marginalization in community development through either gender or race-based lenses. Elements of racism partially emerged in the interviews and it was highlighted

as an important theme, but the research was unable to go beyond this critical mention. In order to make explicit conclusions and recommendations about this topic, it needs to be targeted through additional research.

Are community development initiatives worth the effort? The answer is a resounding yes – despite the fact that it is "messy, high risk, truly uncomfortable, chaotic work." The work of Action for Neighbourhood Change and Neighbourhoods Alive! illustrates both the complexity of community development work, and the positive impact it can have on frequently marginalized communities and neighbourhoods in decline. Success stories abound about the positive change in people's lives through simple projects like community gardens, women's support groups with child-minding, new immigrant literacy projects, or neighbourhood resource groups. With additional, sustained support and encouragement, the impact could be even greater.

REFERENCES

Action for Neighbourhood Change. Accessed January 12, 2008. <www.anccommunity.ca>.

Berg, B. L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences.* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Bourdieu, P (1985). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.). *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education.* (pp. 241-58). New York: Greenwood.

Bradford, N. (2005). *Place-based public policy: Towards a new urban and community agenda for Canada.* Ottawa, ON: Canadian Policy Research Networks. Retrieved February 26, 2008. <www.cprn.org>.

Bratt, R. G. (1997). CDCs: Contributions outweigh contradictions, a reply to Randy Stoecker. *Journal of Urban Affairs,* 19, 23-28.

Burgess, E. (1925). The growth of the city. In R. Park, E. Burgess and R. McKenzie (Eds.). *The city.* (pp. 47-62). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Canada Department of Finance. (2009). *Canada's Economic Action Plan.* Retrieved June 15, 2009. <www.budget.gc.ca/2009>.

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC). (2001). *Disinvestment and the decline of urban neighbourhoods.* Research Highlights: Ottawa.

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC). (2009). *Affordable Housing Initiative.* Retrieved June 15, 2009. <www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca>.

Chisholm, S. (2003). *Affordable housing in Canada's urban communities: A literature review.* Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Retrieved February 26, 2008. <www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/en>.

DeFilippis, J. (2001). The Myth of Social Capital in Community Development. *Housing Policy Debate,* 12, 781–806. Retrieved January 30, 2008. <www.mi.vt.edu>.

DeFilippis, J. (2008). Community control and development: The long view. In J. DeFilippis and S. Saegert (Eds.). *The community development reader.* (pp. 28-35). New York: Routledge.

DeFilippis, J., and Saegert, S. (2008). Communities develop: The question is how? In J. DeFilippis and S. Saegert (Eds.). *The community development reader.* (pp. 1-6). New York: Routledge.

Dreier, P, and Hulchanski, J. D. (1993). The role of nonprofit housing in Canada and the United States: Some comparisons. *Housing Policy Debate,* 4, 43-80. Retrieved February 26, 2008. <www.mi.vt.edu>.

Fraser, J. C., Lepofsky, J., Kick, E. L., and Williams, P (2003). The construction of the local and the limits of contemporary community building in the United States. *Urban Affiars Review,* 38, 417-445.

Fulbright-Anderson, K., and Auspos, P (Eds.). (2006). *Community change: Theories, practice and evidence.* The Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change. Retrieved November 6, 2007. <www.aspeninstitute.org>.

Ferguson, R. F., and Dickens, W. (1999). Introduction. In R. F. Ferguson and W. Dickens (Eds.). *Urban problems and community development.* (pp. 1-31). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Ferguson, R. F., and Stoutland, S. E. (1999). Reconceiving the community development field. In R. F. Ferguson and W. Dickens (Eds.). *Urban problems and community development.* (pp. 33-75). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Goetz, E. G. (1996). The community-based housing movement and progressive local politics. In W. D. Keating, N. Krumholz and P Star (Eds.). *Revitalizing urban neighbourhoods.* (pp. 164-178). Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Halpern, R. (1995). *Rebuilding the inner city: A history of neighbourhood initiatives to address poverty in the United States.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Hoyt, H. (1933). *One hundred years of land values in Chicago.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hulchanski, J. D. (2002). *Housing policy for tomorrow's cities.* Ottawa, ON: Canadian Policy Research Networks. Retrieved February 26, 2008. <www.cprn.org>.

Innes, J. (1990). *Knowledge and public policy.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Keating, D. W. (1997). The CDC model of urban development, a reply to Randy Stoecker. *Journal of Urban Affairs,* 19, 29-33.

Keating, W. D., and Smith, J. (1996a). Neighbourhoods in transition. In W. D. Keating, N. Krumholz and P Star (Eds.). *Revitalizing urban neighbourhoods.* (pp. 24-38). Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Keating, W. D., and Smith, J. (1996b). Past federal policy for urban neighbourhoods. In W. D. Keating, N. Krumholz and P Star (Eds.). *Revitalizing urban neighbourhoods.* (pp. 50-57). Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Kretzmann, J. P (1995). Building communities from the inside out. *Shelterforce*, 83. Retrieved November 6, 2007. <www.nhi.org>.

Kubisch, A. C. (1996). Comprehensive community initiatives: Lessons in neighborhood transformation. *Shelterforce*, 95. Retrieved November 6, 2007. <www.nhi.org>.

Kubisch, A. C., Auspos, P, Brown, P, Chaskin, R., Fulbright-Anderson, K., and Hamilton, R. (2002). *Voices from the field II: Reflections on comprehensive community change.* The Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change. Retrieved January 12, 2008. <www.aspeninstitute.org>.

Kubisch, A. C., and Stone, R. (2001). Comprehensive community initiatives: The American experience. In J. Pierson and J. Smith (Eds.), *Rebuilding community: Policy and practice in urban regeneration.* (pp. 13-33). Chippenham, UK: Palgrave.

Lang, R. (2000). Did neighbourhood life-cycle theory cause urban decline? *Housing Policy Debate*, 11, 1-6. Retrieved November 6, 2007. <www.mi.vt.edu>.

Leo, C. and August, M. (2006). National policy and community initiative: Mismanaging homelessness in a slow growth city. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 15, 1-21.

Leo, C., and Shaw, L. (2002). What causes inner-city decay and what can be done about it?. In C. Andrew, K. A. Graham and S. D. Phillips (Eds.). *Urban affairs: Back on the policy agenda.* (pp. 119-48). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Logan, J, and Molotch, H. (1987). *Urban fortunes: The political economy of place.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Loury, G. (1977). A dynamic theory of racial income differences. In P Wallace and A. LaMond (Eds.). *Women, minorities, and employment discrimination.* (pp. 153-88). Lexington, MA: Heath.

Lowe, J. S. (2008). Limitations of community development partnerships: Cleveland, Ohio and Neighbourhood Progress Inc. *Cities*, 25, 37-44.

Marshall, C., and Rossman, G. (1999). *Designing qualitative research.* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching.* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

McNeely, J. (1999). Comment on A. O'Connor, "Swimming against the tide." In R. F. Ferguson and W. T. Dickens (Eds.), *Urban problems and community development.* (pp. 121-131). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution

Medoff, P, and Sklar, H. (1994). *Streets of hope: The fall and rise of an urban neighbourhood.* Boston: South End Press.

Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Neighbourhoods Alive! Accessed on January 12, 2008. <www.gov.mb.ca/ia/programs/ neighbourhoods>.

Neuman, W. L. (1997). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Nye, N., and Glickman, N. J. (2000). Working together: Building capacity for community development. *Housing Policy Debate,* 11, 163-198. Retrieved November 6, 2007. <www. mi.vt.edu>.

O'Connor, A. (1999). Swimming against the tide: A brief history of federal policy in poor communities. In R. F. Ferguson and W. T. Dickens (Eds.), *Urban problems and community development.* (pp. 77-138). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Pierson, J. (2001). Rebuilding communities: Common problems and approaches. In J. Pierson and J. Smith (Eds.). *Rebuilding community: Policy and practice in urban regeneration.* (pp. 206-222). New York: Palgrave.

Pierson, J., and Smith, J. (2001). Introduction. In J. Pierson and J. Smith (Eds.). *Rebuilding community: Policy and practice in urban regeneration.* (pp. 1-12). New York: Palgrave.

Pitcoff, W. (1997). Comprehensive community initiatives: Redefining community development, part I. *Shelterforce,* 96. Retrieved November 6, 2007. <www.nhi.org>.

Pitcoff, W. (1998). Comprehensive community initiatives: Redefining community development, part II. *Shelterforce,* 97. Retrieved November 6, 2007. <www.nhi.org>.

Pitkin, B. (2001). *Theories of neighbourhood change: Implications for community development policy and practice.* UCLA Advanced Policy Institute. Retrieved November 6, 2007. <www2.urban.org/nnip/loc_pubs.html>.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* Toronto: Simon and Schuster.

Rohe, W. M., and Stewart, L. (1996). Homeownership and neighbourhood stability. *Housing Policy Debate*, 7, 37-81. Retrieved November 6, 2007. <www.mi.vt.edu>.

Skelton, I. (2006). *Understanding housing and neighbourhood dynamics: An analysis of housing strategies in the Daniel McIntyre and St. Matthews neighbourhoods, Winnipeg.* Winnipeg: Winnipeg Inner City Research Alliance.

Stoecker, R. (1997a). The CDC model of urban redevelopment: A critique and an alternative. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 19, 1-22.

Stoecker, R. (1997b). Should we… could we… change the CDC model? A rejoiner. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 19, 35-44.

Temkin, K., and Rohe, W. M. (1996). Neighbourhood change and urban policy. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 15, 159-170.

Temkin, K., and Rohe, W. M. (1998). Social capital and neighbourhood stability: An empirical investigation. *Housing Policy Debate*, 9, 61-88. Retrieved November 6, 2007. <www.mi.vt.edu>.

Traynor, W. J. (1995). Community building: Hope and caution. *Shelterforce*, 83. Retrieved November 6, 2007. <www.nhi.org>.

Traynor, W. J., and Andors, J. (2005). Network organizing: A strategy for building community engagement. *Shelterforce*, 140. Retrieved November 6, 2007. <www.nhi.org>.

Usnick, R., Shove, C., and Gissy, F. (1997). Maximizing community development through collaboration. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 97, 62-73.

Vidal, A. C. (1992). *Rebuilding communities: A national study of urban community development corporations.* New York: Community Development Research Center, Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy, New School for Social Research.

Vidal, A. C. (1997). Can community development re-invent itself? The challenges of strengthening neighbourhoods in the 21st century. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63, 429-438.

von Hoffman, A. (2003). *House by house, block by block: The rebirth of America's urban neighbourhoods.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Weber, R., and Smith, J. (2003). Assets and neighbourhoods: The role of individual assets in neighbourhood revitalization. *Housing Policy Debate*, 14, 169-202. Retrieved November 6, 2007. <www.mi.vt.edu>.

Williams, C. C., and Windebank, J. (2001). *Revitalizing deprived urban neighbourhoods: An assisted self-help approach*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Zielenbach, S. (2000). *The art of revitalization: Improving conditions in distressed inner-city neighbourhoods*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Ziesel, J. (2006). *Inquiry by design: Environment/behavior/neuroscience in architecture, interiors, landscape and planning*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Ethics approval certificate

APPROVAL CERTIFICATE

30 May 2008

TO: **Reuben Koole**   (Advisor I. Skelton)
          Principal Investigator

FROM: **Wayne Taylor, Chair**
          Joint-Faculty Research Ethics Board (JFREB)

Re: **Protocol #J2008:064**
          "Community Development: An Analysis of Action for Neighbourhood
          Change and Neighbourhoods Alive!"

Please be advised that your above-referenced protocol has received human ethics approval by the **Joint-Faculty Research Ethics Board**, which is organized and operates according to the Tri-Council Policy Statement. This approval is valid for one year only.

Any significant changes of the protocol and/or informed consent form should be reported to the Human Ethics Secretariat in advance of implementation of such changes.

Please note:

- if you have funds pending human ethics approval, the auditor requires that you submit a copy of this Approval Certificate to Kathryn Bartmanovich, Research Grants & Contract Services (fax 261-0325), including the Sponsor name, before your account can be opened.

- if you have received multi-year funding for this research, responsibility lies with you to apply for and obtain Renewal Approval at the expiry of the initial one-year approval; otherwise the account will be locked.

The Research Ethics Board requests a final report for your study (available at: http://umanitoba.ca/research/ors/ethics/ors_ethics_human_REB_forms_guidelines.html) in order to be in compliance with Tri-Council Guidelines.

Appendix B - Key informant interview consent form

UNIVERSITY
OF MANITOBA

Informed Consent

Research Project Title: Community development: An analysis of Action for Neighbourhood Change and Neighbourhoods Alive!

Researcher(s): Reuben Koole, MCP Candidate   Ian Skelton, Advisor

Sponsor (if applicable): n/a

This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

Description of the research project:
This research explores emerging ideas about community development (CD) and draws on a predominately North American experience for theoretical grounding. The goal is to examine existing CD knowledge and neighbourhood change theory, and situate an analysis of two emerging community development initiatives within it – Action for Neighbourhood Change (ANC) and Neighbourhoods Alive! (NA!). The objective of examining these two programs is to discover new knowledge about CD and learn emerging best practices.

Set in a discussion of the evolution of CD activities and neighbourhood change theory, each program is studied in terms of underlying theories and related programs and support systems. This is done through a scan of each programs' respective literature and four focus groups in order to illustrate how community collaboration is seeking to enhance the local capacity of neighbourhood residents (ANC) and government is actively involved in supporting CD activities (NA!). The two programs are physical representations of current CD theory in action and offer insights into past activities, current trends and new directions for the future.

Description of procedures:
This research will include focus groups of key informants from both ANC and NA! including both program organizers and program participants from each initiative. The individual focus groups will occur on one evening for approximately 1 to 1 1/2 hours (it may be less or more time based on the dialogue generated). It will be conducted as a conference call over the internet using Skype phone service. This will require you to install Skype on your computer. If you require assistance with this procedure or additional computer hardware (i.e. a microphone), please contact the Principal Researcher. There will only be one focus group for each participant, therefore the time commitment is restricted to this unique occasion.

The Researcher will record the focus group conference calls with a digital recorder. These recordings will be transcribed to permit greater depth analysis. Both the audio and hard copy files will be kept secure in either a password-protected file on the Researcher's computer, or in a locked filing cabinet at the Researcher's home. Participants in the focus groups will introduce themselves to each other, but once the focus group is complete, only the Researcher will have access to participant information including identities and the information collected. Once the research is complete, all digital and hard copy files of collected information will be destroyed.

A participant may wish to have some of their comments not recorded – this will not waive any of their rights as a participant. If this occurs, the focus group discussion will continue with everyone participating until the dialogue is complete. Following the end of the collective focus group, the participant wishing to not have certain comments

recorded will continue the conversation with the researcher and address the issue and their comments will not be recorded.

Quotations of participants will be used to illustrate the key findings from the focus groups. Confidentiality with these quotations will be maintained by not referring to any participant by name. Instead, generic descriptors such as "organizer," "administrator," or "participant" will be used. It is possible that the dissemination of the findings may compromise this confidentiality because the focus groups are being targeted at two very specific CD initiatives. This means some readers may be indirectly aware of who is involved in the two initiatives despite the lack of names being used with quotations. The research findings will not use participants names, however, individuals' indirect knowledge about the two initiatives may enable inferences to be made.

Description of risks/benefits:
There is minimal risk involved with participation. As described above, some readers of the research may be indirectly aware of who is involved in the two initiatives. However, when using quotations to illustrate points and themes in the research, program names will not be used in order to further minimize this risk. Again, the study is intended to discover new knowledge about CD and emerging best practices.

Description of feedback:
The results of this research will be disseminated through the completed thesis. You may request a copy of the thesis when it is complete to access the research findings.

☐ I would like a copy of the thesis

Description of remuneration:
There is no remuneration for participating in this research. However, as stated earlier, if you require additional computer hardware in order to participate, please contact the Researcher to make the necessary arrangements for covering this nominal cost.

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and /or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

Principal Researcher: Reuben Koole, MCP Candidate
    204-285-7259 (h)
    reuben.koole@gmail.com

Supervisor: Ian Skelton, Advisor
    204-474-6417 (w)
    iskelton@umanitoba.ca

This research has been approved by the Joint Faculty Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact any of the above-named persons or the Human Ethics Secretariat at 474-7122, or e-mail margaret_bowman@umanitoba.ca. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

_____

Participant's Signature   Date

_____

Researcher and/or Delegate's Signature   Date

Appendix C - Key informant interview guide

Introduction

> This section begins the interview and allows participants to get comfortable through introductions (name, where they work, their role). It is also used to introduce the study and research topic.

> 1. Introduction of the study.
> 2. Briefly introduce yourself and share what capacity or role you have with your organization.

Context

> These questions get participants into a "community development" frame of mind and set the context for the rest of the interview.

> 3. How would you define "community development" in the context of your work?
> 4. Share literature review definition of community development.

Neighbourhood Change

> These questions attempt to uncover how programs understand neighbourhood change.

> 5. What are the effects that cause neighbourhoods to evolve and change?
> 6. What things have changed in the neighbourhoods that you work

Community development activities

> These questions focus on identifying specific community development activities that are underway.

> 7. What types of programs are supported or facilitated by (ANC or NA!)?
> 8. What are you trying to achieve with those activities?
> 9. How are communities engaged around those programs?
> 10. How do you define needs and assets within the community?
> 11. How do you take contextual issues into consideration when facilitating community development activities?

Community development support

> These questions explore how the programs support different community-based organizations or community groups engaging in community development activities.

> 12. How are community-based groups and organizations supported?
> 13. Are certain types of activities and program favoured over others?
> 14. How are community development activities planned or coordinated?

Community development learning

These questions seek to identify what has been learned about community development activities in recent years. Building on the context and discussion from earlier questions, it deals with how participants identify new knowledge and attempt to put it into action.

15. What have been or were some of the results of the programs?
16. What has been learned about different community development activities?
17. How are you building this knowledge into new community development activities?

Closing

These questions wrap up the interview with a few broad community development ideas. The goal is to discern where community development is going in the future, what needs to be done to get there and certain issues facing the community development movement.

18. What direction(s) are community development activities evolving?
19. What steps need or should be taken to get there?
20. Given this discussion of community development activities, supports, and learning, what are the key issues that need specific attention within the community development field?
21. Is there anything else you would like to share or discuss?