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This is a case study of a project focused on organizing community economic development (CED) in the inner-city neighbourhood of Mount Pleasant, in Vancouver. Participant-observation research techniques, combining the roles of organizer and researcher, were used in this exploratory study.

The ethnic and cultural diversity of this inner-city neighbourhood, with its various "communities of interest," presents challenges to CED organization. This study examines these challenges in relation to the process of organizing CED and identifies the relevant factors for determining a community's readiness for CED. Key aspects of the organizing process are explored in depth (e.g., gaining legitimacy within the community, assessing the community's readiness for CED, determining a development approach, cultivating leadership and developing an organizational base).

This study proposes a framework for organizing CED which identifies the major stages, activities and critical factors in organizing CED. The research identifies and discusses the major roles of the organizer and the beliefs and values which guided the organizing process.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Community economic development (CED) is an increasingly important strategy for communities wishing to pursue economic development in harmony with social, cultural, and ecological values and objectives. This strategy, which emphasizes community control and self-reliance, is of particular relevance to communities characterized by economic dislocation, unemployment and poverty. However, communities which have high levels of structural unemployment and poverty frequently experience a lack of community identity, alienation, isolation, and disempowerment, all of which are potential obstacles to the organization of CED initiatives.

Lack of community identity, alienation, isolation and disempowerment are typical problems of inner-city communities. Combined with other common social and economic problems (such as high rates of unemployment, poverty, crime, transiency, safety issues, physical deterioration, and lack of adequate housing, parks, and recreational services), the potential obstacles to CED organization, in these types of communities, can seem insurmountable.
An important aspect of CED organization is its attempt to involve the community in a process of examining its problems and identifying potential strategies for achieving well-being. Critical to this process is the recognition of the existence of a "community culture." As Marcia Nozick suggests,

So long as culture is kept alive communities will persist, even under threat of extinction by war, economic depression, natural disasters and persecution. Ironically, often the struggle for survival itself helps to strengthen community as people bond together for mutual aid and come to realize their unity of purpose and common identity. (1992, 182)

This study explores the process of organizing CED within the inner-city community of Mount Pleasant in Vancouver. The impetus for this study was the researcher's interest in learning how community economic development, as a strategy that explicitly integrates social and economic development, could be applied in the context of an urban community. Through the documentation of the organizing process, community research is integrated with the community organizing process.

The author was both the principal community organizer and the researcher. This combination of research and action was undertaken as a combined research/practicum within the graduate studies program in the School of Social Work (the practicum contract is found in Appendix I). The research role involved participant-observation, which combines the
roles of active participant and researcher. Guidance was provided by an Advisory Committee drawn from the Mount Pleasant community.

Mount Pleasant, over the past one hundred years, has evolved from a relatively prosperous neighbourhood into an ethnically diverse community of people with various socio-economic backgrounds. While many of its residents have lived in the community for a long time, Mount Pleasant also houses a significant number of new immigrants to this country and has a large transient population. The community has a high rate of unemployment and many residents receive some form of government income assistance. With its rich blend of cultures, socio-economic backgrounds and income levels, Mount Pleasant is a microcosm of Canadian society.

Mount Pleasant's diversity presents challenges to the process of organizing CED. These challenges include the complexity of Mount Pleasant's social and economic issues, the rapid demographic changes the community is experiencing, the diversity of its ethnic groups, the influx of non-English speaking immigrants, its distinct "communities of interest" (e.g., ethnicity, arts, neighbourhood) and the complex infrastructure of agencies, services and community organizations within its boundaries.
This study examines these challenges in relation to the process of organizing CED and identifies the relevant factors for determining a community's readiness for CED. Key aspects of the organizing process are explored in depth (e.g., gaining legitimacy within the community, assessing the community's readiness for CED, determining a development approach, cultivating leadership and developing an organizational base) as well as the impact of the interventions on the process.

CED practice is concerned with the integration of social and economic planning and development. These are issues with which social work should be concerned. Poverty has been of long-standing concern to social work and as structural unemployment increases, poverty is increasing. Community economic development provides opportunities for community members to participate directly in issues that affect them and to work towards change that benefits both themselves and their communities. Community involvement in social change strategies is of direct interest to social workers, in particular to community practitioners. The linkage of social and economic planning and development also has implications for social policy, especially for the development of policy that encourages an integrated approach to community well-being.
Chapter Two provides the context for the key aspects of this study of organizing CED. It reviews the literature relating to the philosophy and evolution of community economic development and provides an overview of the literature dealing with community organizing. In order to give a geographical context for this study, a profile of Mount Pleasant is provided, containing relevant historical, physical, demographic, socio-economic and organizational information.

Chapter Three describes the research design and methodology, examines the limitations of the study and addresses the ethical issues posed by the research.

Chapter Four identifies, explores, and analyzes the research issues. The five stages of the organizing process are identified and discussed; the guiding values and beliefs of the organizer, the major roles and functions of the organizer and the roles of other key participants within each stage are examined. The major focus, activities and critical elements of each stage are discussed and a framework for organizing CED is proposed.

Chapter Five discusses the key findings of this study and the possible limitations of the research. A number of
questions for further research are identified and the major contributions of this study are discussed.

In sum, this research attempts to examine the process of organizing CED and attempts to identify and explore key issues related to the organizing process. In doing so, it suggests a framework which can be applied to organizing activities in both urban and non-urban settings.
CHAPTER TWO

A LITERATURE REVIEW:

THE CONTEXT FOR THE RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the context for the key aspects of organizing CED activity: the who, what, why, and where of this process. Three distinct bodies of knowledge are relevant to this study: literature relating to the philosophy, evolution and practice of community economic development; key issues pertaining to the process of community organizing; and, relevant historical, physical, demographic, socio-economic and organizational data pertaining to the community of Mount Pleasant.

The "why" and "what" questions are dealt with in the section on community economic development (CED). As the substantive context for this research, CED is discussed in relation to its philosophical basis and its emergence as an important strategy for addressing social and economic problems at a community level. "Community" and "new economics" are salient concepts within the CED literature. The underlying values and beliefs related to these concepts, as represented within the CED literature, are explored in order to understand the underpinning of the key principles of CED.
This leads to a discussion of the fundamental characteristics and principles of CED and the application of these principles to CED practice and to the important distinctions between CED and other approaches to local economic development. Lastly, this section outlines the emergence and growth of CED in Canada and considers the significance of current CED practice.

The "how" and "who" questions are addressed in a discussion of the process of organizing. An overview of the theoretical literature relating to community organizing is provided. Specifically, the major approaches to community organizing and development are outlined, discussed and the predominant roles of the community organizer are examined. A discussion of the process of community organizing is provided and the stages of initiated community action are highlighted.

The third and final section of this chapter addresses the "where" question. A profile of the community of Mount Pleasant is provided -- outlining the relevant historical, physical, demographic, and socio-economic characteristics of Mount Pleasant as well as describing its organizational infrastructure. This information provides a physical and social context for the research.
Many definitions have been proposed for community economic development (CED). The following definition, developed by the BC Working Group on Community Economic Development, is consistent with the approach to CED described in this paper.

CED is a community-based and community-directed process that explicitly combines social and economic development and is directed towards fostering the economic, social, ecological and cultural well-being of communities and regions. As such it recognizes, affirms and supports all the paid and unpaid activity that contributes to the realization of this well-being.

CED has emerged as an alternative to conventional approaches to economic development. It is founded on the belief that problems facing communities -- unemployment, poverty, job loss, economic instability, environmental degradation and loss of community control -- need to be addressed in a holistic and participatory way.

CED is an evolving, on-going process.

This definition makes explicit some of the values and beliefs about community as perceived within the CED literature.

Perceptions of Community

"Community" is an elusive concept.

... there remains something about ... [community] that is inherently mysterious, miraculous, unfathomable. Thus there is no adequate one-sentence definition of genuine community. (Peck 1988, 60)
It is within community that values are created which dignify living, suggests American philosopher, Baker Brownell. He maintains that a commitment to community is essential for a healthy society (Melnyk 1985, 135). Similar themes are echoed by others. "In and through community lies the salvation of the world," according to Scott Peck (1988, 17).

The word "community" has both a wide descriptive meaning and an evaluative dimension (Plant 1974, 13). The range of its descriptive meaning is very wide. "Community has been linked to locality, to identity of functional interests, to a sense of belonging, to shared cultural and ethnic ideas and values, to a way of life opposed to the organisation and bureaucracy of modern mass society, etc." (Plant 1974, 13). However, Plant maintains that "community" is "a word and concept fraught with normative import" (1974, 13) and thus, "the evaluative position of the theorist may well determine the aspects of the descriptive meaning to be emphasised" (1974, 37).

During the industrial revolution, the division of labour, combined with the processes of urbanization and bureaucratization, created social divisions within society and an estrangement from the social world. These social divisions, Plant maintains, are inimical to maintaining community (1974, 16-19). These factors, along with the
values of individuality and autonomy, have shaped the development of a liberal theory of community which claims that locality in itself is not a necessary nor sufficient condition for community. Plant asserts that the notion of functional or interest communities is more relevant to the liberal framework (1974, 47).

The notion of the functional community . . . is an attempt to make sense of the idea of community from some overall liberal view of man (sic), taking into account the values of autonomy and freedom realised as a result of the decline of the traditional community. In addition, it should be pointed out that this liberal view of the community is not some recent invention but goes to the very start of sociological thought on the nature of community . . . (1974, 47).

The functional community, which evolved from this liberal framework, is the basis for how community is viewed within the context of CED. "Communities of interest" are commonly referred to in CED literature and frequently are the initiators of CED activity. Although geography is relevant, it can be argued that it is not a sufficient determinant of community. The concept of "community" in CED is explicitly associated with particular values and beliefs. As Alexander Lockhart suggests:

The critical concept that distinguishes community-based from corporately-based development lies in an understanding of "community" as more than a bedroom and a service annex to alien commercial interests. Such a notion of community begins with the recognition of the crucial role that the building of shared commitments to the common well-being plays in the attainment of social health and individual satisfaction. (1987, 396)
Scott Peck (1987) proposes several characteristics of community, four of which have particular relevance to CED. First, he suggests that "community is and must be inclusive" (61). Inclusiveness means more than welcoming newcomers, it means accepting and welcoming the human differences that exist between people. "In community, instead of being ignored, denied, hidden, or changed, human differences are celebrated as gifts" (62).

Secondly, Peck suggests that community is consensual. It can never be totalitarian. In community, differences are resolved through means that go beyond democracy. "Decisions in genuine community are arrived at through consensus, in a process that is not unlike a community of jurors, for whom consensual decision making is mandated" (63).

A third characteristic noted by Peck is: "Commitment--the willingness to coexist is crucial" (62). This "requires that we hang in there when the going gets a little rough" (62).

Finally, Peck maintains that communities are self-aware. He claims that "self-examination is the key to insight, which is the key to wisdom" (66). Furthermore, "the community-building process requires self-examination from the beginning" (66).
These values, which are represented in community, are important not only because they "dignify living" as Baker Brownell suggests. These values represent the dimension of human relationships which must be acknowledged in the process of "community-building," a key objective and thrust of CED.

Perceptions of the "New Economics"

A "new economics" has emerged out of a critique of neo-classical economic theory. This new economic thinking, which underlies the philosophy of CED, represents a fundamental departure from classical economic theory in three major respects: its explicit focus on the satisfaction of human needs; its reconceptualization of the nature and value of work; and its emphasis on economic self-reliance (Ekins 1986, 97).

The word "economics" is derived from the Greek root "oikos," meaning "household." The suffix "nomos" means "to manage" (New Catalyst 1987, 2). Although economics originally meant the management of a household, this did not refer to the management of a nuclear family’s budget. Rather, it referred to a whole: the business of 'managing', or living sustainably within a specific, local niche in nature. ‘Economy’ was not just one’s exchange relations with others, but the whole, inter-dependent web of relations, social, cultural and ecological. (New Catalyst 1987, 2)
Economic thought has evolved over the centuries, reflecting changing ideas about the organization of political and social life. As the parameters of exchange broadened geographically, economics evolved to consider such matters as the production and pricing of goods, and the distribution of income through wages, interest and profit. Adam Smith was a major influence on classical economic theory. His influential book *Wealth of Nations*, published in 1776, postulated that economic growth is fostered by economic self-interest and competition in the market place. He proposed that the market place ought to be unencumbered by government intervention and advocated free trade (Galbraith 1987, 64).

Numerous writers, e.g., E.F. Schumacher (1973), James Robertson (1978), David Ross and Peter Usher ((1986), Paul Ekins (1986), Mark A. Lutz and Kenneth Lux (1988), Marilyn Waring (1988), Herman E. Daly and John B. Cobb (1989), and Hazel Henderson (1991), have contributed to a critique of neo-classical economics. Marilyn Waring argues that modern economic theory and practice, despite its claim to be free from moral judgments and values, is in fact predicated on a particular view of human nature. She notes that Adam Smith:

... established the logical foundation for his work by identifying what he thought was essential human nature. He developed an image of humans as materialistic, egoistic, selfish, and primarily motivated by pursuit of their own self-interest. This is also not a "scientific opinion" it seems
A focus on the satisfaction of human needs is a basic pillar of the "new economics." This contrasts with conventional economic approaches which emphasize economic growth without regard to its consequences on human and ecological systems. The conventional approach to economics is criticized for its lack of consideration of social, cultural and ecological factors and its compartmentalization of human behaviour. Economic decision-making is frequently done in isolation from decision-making about social, cultural, and environmental matters. A consequence of this is that economic development frequently occurs without due consideration of other relevant factors, and benefits are often assessed in narrow financial terms. Rarely are the broader impacts of development considered: the impact on the natural environment, on a community's culture and on the social dimension of people's lives.

The focus on economic growth, rather than development, has been widely criticized. There is "a mounting chorus of critics who point out how high the cost of growth of GNP has been in psychological, sociological, and ecological terms" (Daly and Cobb 1989, 64). Alderson and Conn maintain that: "The drive for productivity and profit dominates the agendas of government programs and policies, business practices and
procedures, which in turn affect the lives of everyone in the community" (1993, 4).

Others criticize the tools, such as the Gross National Product (GNP), that are used to measure economic growth. Daly and Cobb argue that the predominant use of these conventional measures of economic activity has insidious effects. They point to what they call "the fallacy of misplaced concreteness" because "the market activity that GNP measures has social costs that it ignores, and that it counts positively market activity devoted to countering these same social costs. Obviously GNP overstates welfare!" (1989, 64).

According to Ekins, the reconceptualization of the nature and value of work is the second pillar which comprises a major break with conventional economic thinking (1986, 97). Many critics contend that the GNP excludes much activity that is economically productive. Waring asserts that modern economics, which has a male perspective, contains underlying assumptions about what is, and is not, productive work. For example, it carries an assumption that unpaid household work is not productive. As those who have contributed most significantly to both the household and informal community sectors, women

... have long recognized that productive activity is not confined to the marketplace.
Unpaid work in the home and in the community, done primarily by women and often in addition to paid work, is an essential part of the economy. Without this work the formal or cash economy would not be able to operate. (Alderson and Conn 1993, 4).

Thus the relevance of the GNP as a valid measure of production has been called into question:

Again, the idea that wealth, or national product, is created by activity in the money-based, institutional sector of the economy and not by activity in the informal domestic and local community sector -- for example, that the economic production of the country actually goes down if people grow their own vegetables instead of buying them in the shops -- is also wearing thin. (Robertson 1978, 42)

Ross and Usher estimate that informal economic activity (represented by unrecorded community-based enterprise, voluntary activity, barter and skills exchange, mutual aid and household activity) is equal to at least one-half of the recorded Gross National Product (1986, 98; emphasis added).

A commitment to self-reliance, the third pillar of the new economics, implies a social, environmental and economic responsibility for the consequences of our decisions, according to Galtung (1986, 101). Conventional economics does not consider the negative effects or "externalities" (e.g., pollution, global warming, deforestation, loss of biodiversity) of economic decisions insofar as they have no direct impact on the enterprise. These are often seen as irrelevant. An emphasis on self-reliance would mean that
such externalities would be taken into consideration.

Galtung argues that:

[S]elf-reliance cuts both ways: it preserves the positive externalities by trading much less upwards, and protects against the negative externalities by trading much less downwards. It is a measure of economic defence as well as a pact of non-aggressiveness. In self-reliance there is both an element of enlightened egoism (don't give away the positive externalities) and enlightened altruism (don't damage others by exporting negative externalities). (1986, 101)

These criticisms have led to a fundamental rethinking of the role of economics in shaping public policy. This thinking has fuelled efforts at the community level to generate a new form of economic development. This type of economic development values all of the unpaid work in the household and the community which contributes to community well-being; it promotes community self-reliance and it deliberately incorporates humanistic and ecological values. The well-known economist, E. F. Schumacher, advocated developing a new economics which emphasizes the needs of people and a sensitivity to the environment:

If it (economics) cannot get beyond its vast abstractions, the national income, the rate of growth, capital/output ration, input-output analysis, labour mobility, capital accumulation; if it cannot get beyond all this and make contact with the human realities of poverty, frustration, alienation, despair, breakdown, crime, escapism, stress, congestion, ugliness and spiritual death, then let us scrap economics and start afresh. (1973, 62)
CED: Its Principles and Characteristics

Community economic development (CED) has emerged as a new approach to economic development, an approach which is explicitly rooted in a values framework. The CED literature addresses a number of important principles. These principles and characteristics are discussed with a particular focus on how they are applied in CED activity. The six principles referred to in this discussion are:

1) An integrated approach to development
2) A broader definition of economic productivity
3) Inclusive participation
4) The use of democratic processes and structures
5) A focus on building self-reliance and capacity
6) An emphasis on building community.

The first characteristic of CED is that it "recognizes that the healthy development of communities requires a holistic approach that addresses the social, economic, cultural and ecological dimensions of community well-being" (BC Working Group on CED). Similarly, CED recognizes the interrelatedness of social and economic problems. Unemployment is not just a social problem nor is it only an economic problem. Its effects are felt in terms of community economic well-being as well as impacting the personal lives of people in the community.
CED seeks to address socio-economic problems through methods which encourage both the social and economic development of the community. This integration of the social and economic dimension of problems and solutions is a key principle of CED. "The goals of community economic development projects are never solely economic: they are never limited just to creating jobs or increasing the flow of capital into the community. Nor are the goals solely social or cultural" (Wismer and Pell 1981, 3).

Taking an integrated approach to development, CED encompasses a wide range of activity. This includes activities which enhance community self-reliance such as housing development, loan guarantee funds, import substitution programs, community land trusts, individual and co-operative enterprises, and activities which emphasize training, education, and skill development (e.g., business training centres, employment training programs, literacy programs, personal empowerment skills, etc.). Other initiatives include strategies which empower workers such as promoting worker cooperatives and worker ownership of businesses.

Providing sustainable employment within the community is a major objective of CED. The primary strategy for achieving this objective is the development and encouragement of local
Local enterprise development frequently meets broader social, cultural, or environmental objectives as well as fulfilling an economic objective. This might be reflected in the nature of the enterprise, itself, or in the way it is structured (e.g., worker co-operatives). Job creation strategies are frequently implemented in concert with strategies for education, skill development and job training, all methods which enhance not only the economic, but also the social well-being of communities.

Discovering a community's cultural roots and characteristics is a further aspect of this integrated approach. Nozick claims that this can be done through keeping history alive in our physical surroundings. Heritage conservation can be a tool for community revitalization and community economic development by making

the past a living part of a community's identity, a source of community pride, and an economic tool to revitalize a neighbourhood at the same time. . . . Heritage can also mean maintaining and reviving the character of old neighbourhoods -- houses, streets, parks, flea markets, shops. (1992, 184)

The second principle is that "CED recognizes, affirms and supports all the paid and unpaid activity that contributes . . . to [community] well-being" (BC Working Group on CED). The previous section has related that conventional economics excludes much of the productive work that goes on in
communities and households. One way that women's CED projects consciously recognize and affirm this type of activity is by supporting women who have domestic and child care responsibilities. A non-profit housing society in Vancouver, Entre Nous Femmes, exemplifies this principle.

The society was started by single mothers who wanted secure housing for themselves and their children. In their training programs, family preparation time (for making lunches and for dropping off children at daycare or school) is incorporated into the work day. (Alderson, Conn, Donald and Kemp, 1993)

In addition, many CED organizations affirm the importance of this work by paying child care expenses of those attending meetings and conferences.

A third principle of CED is that:

CED encourages the active participation of all members of the community in the planning, decision-making, and benefits of CED initiatives, and works to remove the barriers that limit the participation of marginalized citizens. In particular, CED seeks to encourage the active participation of women, youth, seniors, differently-abled people, racial/ethnic groups, the poor, and First Nations' peoples in the public life of the community. (BC Working Group on CED)

While seeking to ensure that those who are most marginalized in community are included is a major principle and objective of CED, this represents a key challenge for CED organizers and organizations. The BC Working Group on CED, in planning a Provincial Consultation on CED in 1992 for CED practitioners, developed a grid which considered geographical regions of B.C. and "communities of interest"
(as represented by the community arts sector, aboriginal and First Nations' communities, women's centres, anti-poverty activists, housing groups, the credit union sector, the co-op sector, those engaged in community and regional economic development, the community business sector, those representing various ethnic and visible minority groups, as well as several others). This was a way of attempting to ensure that key representatives, from all sectors of CED activity, were included in this process.

CED is also characterized by the use of democratic processes and structures. "CED supports decentralized, non-hierarchial decision-making processes that strengthen the autonomy of the individual, the community and the region" (BC Working Group on CED). According to a 1985 report of the Social Planning and Review Council of B.C., CED organizations frequently engage in consensus decision-making (7). Structures such as worker cooperatives, collectives, community development corporations, community enterprise centres, business components of voluntary organizations, intentional communities, barter groups and organized skill-exchanges are some of the vehicles through which participatory democracy is reinforced (Ross 1986, 13). Some of these structures, such as worker co-ops and collectives, emphasize worker ownership of the enterprise and worker control over the decision-making process.
A fifth principle is a focus on building community capacity and self-reliance. CED develops capacity by building on "local strengths, creativity and resources, and actively seek[ing] to decrease dependency on, and vulnerability to, economic interests outside the community and region" (BC Working Group on CED). CED contributes to self-reliance "by encouraging the acquisition of relevant skills and the development of supportive structures and institutions" (BC Working Group on CED).

Implicit in CED is a belief in the capacity of communities to solve their own problems. CED encourages the use of resources within the local community whenever possible, limiting the community's reliance on external resources.

Greater self-reliance means different things. It means jobs, but it also means decreasing dependence on outside resources of goods and services, by finding ways to provide such things as food outlets and medical care locally. In addition, greater self-reliance for the project itself is important, so that it is not dependent on outside funding sources. When a community group begins to talk about that kind of self-reliance, it begins a process of community economic development. (Wismer and Pell 1981, 6)

Nozick describes a number of strategies used in communities in working toward the goal of self-reliance. They include recycling of resources (e.g., garbage, old buildings), encouraging community exchange (through barter networks, local lending, and local currencies), replacing imports with
local products, creating new products, and trading with equal partners (1992, 43-63).

Finally, community-building is a key objective of CED. "CED seeks to build a sense of community by fostering relationships of acceptance, understanding and mutual respect" (BC Working Group on CED). Building community is a complex process that can occur in many ways. Marcia Nozick, in her book *No Place Like Home*, discusses the importance of individual healing processes to the task of community healing and, therefore, to community-building. The biggest challenge of this, she maintains, is "healing the wounds of a broken society characterized by violence, abuse and disempowerment of increasing numbers of individuals" (1992, 149). A first step in this healing process is acknowledging the problems. The process of self-healing starts with individuals, yet affects their relationships with family, friends and associates, and extends ultimately to the community (Nozick 1992, 150). Nozick points to the Alkalai Lake Indian Band (in British Columbia), which was decimated by alcoholism and abuse, as an example of a community which has been "healed" in this way and has been able to effectively build a sense of community:

What happened at Alkali Lake was the linking of personal and social empowerment to revitalize an entire community -- spiritually, morally, culturally and economically. Personal empowerment had to come first, and, from that, community economic development followed. (1992, 103)
The Distinction between Local Economic Development and CED

CED represents a range of approaches and structures and is sometimes confused with other approaches to local economic development. A major distinction is between local economic development and community economic development. The degree and quality of community involvement in each of these approaches is a basic difference between these approaches. As the definition of CED used in this paper suggests, CED is a community-based and community directed strategy.

Community development corporations and other community-based organizations are the primary vehicles through which planning and implementing economic development strategies is carried out within CED. As Richard Schramm (1987, 158) notes, within traditional economic development strategies, the chief vehicles for planning and implementing economic development activities are industrial development authorities, set up by the local government or Chamber of Commerce. In British Columbia, the provincial government provides funding for local economic development commissions which are established on a regional or local basis.

Richard Schramm (1987) distinguishes between traditional economic development strategies and community-based economic development strategies. He notes that traditional local economic development stresses:
economic growth, usually measured in terms of the growth in jobs, total income, and property values and the local tax base. This approach relies heavily on the private sector, and uses public policy instruments to increase the profits of existing local businesses or businesses agreeing to move to the community. (1987, 157)

The local development approach accepts existing markets and market forces, and attempts to tie into these markets as much as possible through the link of "exported" goods. Its emphasis is on businesses that sell goods and services outside the locality. The traditional economic development approach to addressing social and economic problems is exemplified through the "rising tide lifts all boats" and "trickle down" philosophies which rely on economic growth and private sector employment and local purchases to create local income through a multiplier effect (Schramm 1987, 157).

In contrast, community-based economic development is concerned with the "stability and distribution of income and its production" (Schramm 1987, 158). Its strategies focus on development rather than growth and their focus is on broader goals such as economic empowerment, security, quality and equity issues, not just increases in jobs, total income and tax base (158).

Consequently, if a development project generates a certain number of jobs, a community-based approach focuses not just on the number of jobs but on what they produce, who gets them, how they fit with
existing industry and employment, what they pay in wages and benefits, what security and work conditions they offer, and other concerns that go beyond the number of jobs and the total income they bring. (Schramm 1987, 158).

Schramm notes a number of other differences in these approaches. He indicates (1987, 158) that community-based development, in contrast to traditional economic development:

* supports labour, consumer, and community interests directly, rather than using the support of private business interests as "trickle down" vehicles for local development;

* emphasizes social, rather than just private, costs and benefits from economic development projects;

* uses subsidies to labour or other community groups to create businesses and jobs, rather than relying on conventional subsidies to private capital to provide them indirectly;

* emphasizes the development of local resources, and the retention of local control over them rather than emphasizing the search for outside private and public resources to address local economic problems;
* supports many small projects rather than a few large ones from outside that promise to save the local economy;

* features ownership structures that are local and cooperatively or community owned rather than absent and privately owned.

While all of these distinguishing features are important, the salient distinguishing feature between these approaches is the involvement of the broader community, not just "experts" or local authorities, in determining the development strategies to be implemented.

**The Emergence and Growth of CED**

Although CED is considered to be a relatively recent movement, its philosophy has its roots in the co-operative movement of 150 years ago. Co-operatives were first developed in Canada in the late part of the 19th century (Melnyk 1985, 21). They have continued to develop and have experienced a resurgence of growth in recent years. Melnyk reports that a federal government study has shown that 43% of adult Canadians belong to at least one co-op (1985, 19). Co-operative activity remains an important element of the broader CED movement.
Community development is also an important underpinning for CED and the two terms are often used interchangeably. However, CED is distinguished from community development in its explicit focus on the economic as well as the social and cultural development of community.

The development of CED in Canada was also influenced by the American experience with community development corporations which were developed as a tool for urban renewal and local empowerment. Inner-city communities in the United States are characterized by unbearable conditions of racial inequality, urban decay, poverty, poor housing and lack of educational opportunities. In the 1960s, the disintegration of these communities prompted riots and fires which were further destroying them. This situation led to a mobilization of middle and working class African Americans who formed neighbourhood groups to reassess their situation. Out of this emerged a recognition that communities could develop the capacity to address many of these problems (Perry 1982, 8).

What happened spontaneously to each city began as neighbourhood after neighbourhood puzzled out the local scene, and the pieces of the answer fell into the same pattern: a community has to have its own institutions to deal with a comprehensive interlocking of economic activities as well as political, of new business as well as new voter registration, of housing development as well as integrated schools, of industrial parks as well as recreational facilities, of the sense of self-respect in a neighbourhood as well as the dignity of a national citizen. And they came to the same
general institutional innovation. Out of their recognition a new social and economic tool was invented -- the community development corporation. The CDC would represent and direct a community approach to comprehensive revitalization of a unified neighbourhood. (Perry 1982, 8)

The community development corporation has been successfully transplanted into the Canadian context. Cape Breton, an isolated region of Nova Scotia, had long been neglected by the provincial government and when it announced that the local coal mines would be allowed to close, a local group formed to address the problems of high unemployment and local economic underdevelopment. Out of these efforts grew the community development corporation of New Dawn, incorporated in 1976 (MacLeod 1986, 13-24).

In Canada, economic dislocation has occurred both at a regional level and in urban areas. Federal and provincial regional development policies, on the whole, have been unsuccessful at resolving the problems of chronically high unemployment, poverty, and underdeveloped local economies. The development of CED in eastern Quebec was an early example of attempts by an economically underdeveloped region to introduce new strategies for regional development which combined economic and social goals. Operation Dignity was formed in 1970 to protest governmental policies directed at closing down villages that were considered economically unviable (MacLeod 1986, 29).
Community economic development emerged elsewhere in Canada in response to the need to create an economic means to address social needs (e.g., housing, child care, etc.). For example, the CCEC Credit Union (formerly the Community Congress for Economic Change Society) was established to meet the capital financing needs of co-operative initiatives. In 1974, people involved in daycare, consumer and housing co-operatives met and discussed their concerns about their lack of access to capital within the community. They decided to pool their money and form a financial institution. Today, the CCEC Credit Union supports co-operative, democratic and self-help organizations and, describes its bottom line as "community economic development." Priority is given to loans which help people working cooperatively to provide services to credit union members or to the community as a whole (Strandberg 1985, 39).

Another Vancouver project, the CRS Workers’ Co-op, began in 1974 as a means to start food co-ops and food processing operations. Originally a consumer co-op, it later evolved into a worker co-op with full-time permanent staff. It is owned and run collectively by all the members who work in it. It also developed a food wholesale operation and began a bakery, called "Uprising Breads Bakery," which produces and sells a variety of breads and pastries. CRS Workers’
Co-op has identified a number of objectives including the operation of enterprises "according to the principles of worker ownership and control" and the support of "equality of women and men in the workplace" (Strandberg 1985, 11).

The early to mid-1980s saw CED emerge as a response to closures and high levels of unemployment in resource dependent communities. The communities of Nanaimo, Port Alberni, and Nelson have all examined CED in response to economic hardship within their communities.

While some government programs and community institutions have explicitly recognized and supported CED, government support for CED, until very recently, has been insignificant. As Lockhart claimed in 1987: "To be sure, an occasional government department has dabbled in the semantics, but only long enough for the forces of orthodoxy to reassert their hegemony" (411). The federal Community Futures Program, under Employment and Immigration Canada, began in 1986 to provide operational and capital funding in targeted regions of the country (with high unemployment rates) to diversify local economies and create local employment opportunities. Other short-term funding programs such as the federal Innovations Program were created to fund innovative solutions to employment. These programs have often acted as a catalyst for communities and regions to
examine alternative economic development strategies, and some of them have developed CED initiatives.

More recently, there is evidence of growing interest in CED. In the late 1980s, the Economic Council of Canada commissioned a number of case studies on local development and established a task force to examine the potential of CED (Lockhart 1991, 12). Health and Welfare Canada held a special competition for research on community economic development in 1991 and National Welfare Grants is now planning a five-year program of research on CED (National Welfare Grants).

Provincial and territorial governments are also becoming interested in CED and, in some cases, are supporting its development (e.g., Yukon, Northwest Territories, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Saskatchewan, British Columbia). Local governments, including Montreal, Ottawa and Edmonton, are also supporting CED projects in neighbourhoods that have been "hit hard by major corporate shut downs or curtailments" (Lockhart 1991, 11). However, as Lockhart notes, "notwithstanding these encouraging examples, it is the conventional development wisdom that still dominates Canada’s national economic development policy" (1991, 11).
Institutional support has also come from educational institutions (e.g., Simon Fraser University's Centre for CED) and to a limited degree from the credit union sector. Although many credit unions have taken conservative approaches to CED, Vancouver City Savings Credit Union, the largest credit union in British Columbia, has actively supported CED through the establishment of the "VanCity Community Foundation" whose mandate includes CED.

Community economic development is not just a North American phenomenon. All over the globe, CED strategies such as community enterprise centres, community-owned businesses, co-operatives, community land trusts, community forestry projects, micro-enterprises, credit circles and community financing alternatives are in various stages of experimentation and use. Lockhart notes the irony of the "recognition by Canada's own international development agencies that CED has proven to be far more successful, and hence worthy of foreign aid funding, than the once popular orthodox developmental projects" (1991, 11).

It is fair to conclude that the practice of CED is still relatively innovative and experimental. Further exploration and documentation of CED is required to facilitate broad understanding of CED principles and practices. Communities are beginning to share and learn from each others'
experience with CED. Recognizing the validity of this experience and sharing it with others is the essence of CED.

THE PROCESS OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZING

This section of the chapter highlights some of the key issues in the approaches to community organizing and development and the predominant roles of the community organizer.

Major Approaches to Community Organizing and Development

Community organization encapsulates a number of distinct practice areas. Various terms have been used to describe the activities carried out under the rubric of community organization. Included in these are community planning, community development, community work, and social action. Community organization practice is described by Rothman as "intervention at the community level oriented toward improving or changing community institutions and solving community problems" (1979a, 3). It is work which is performed by professionals such as social workers, public health nurses, adult educators, city planners and community mental health practitioners, as well as by citizen volunteers (Rothman 1979a, 3).
The diversity and scope of practice within the field of community organization has led to some confusion about what constitutes community organization practice. To help alleviate this confusion, Rothman (1979b) developed three models which delineate the major approaches to community organization practice: locality development, social planning, and social action. These models distinguish between each of the approaches in relation to such factors as its goals, assumptions, basic change strategies and practitioner roles. Although somewhat arbitrary, these models provide some useful distinctions between the major areas of practice.

The social planning approach, according to Rothman, emphasizes a technical process of problem-solving with regard to substantive social problems, such as delinquency, housing, and mental health. Rational, deliberately planned, and controlled change has a central place in this model. . . . By and large, the concern here is with establishing, arranging, and delivering goods and services to people who need them. Building community capacity or fostering radical or fundamental social change does not play a central part. (1979b, 27)

This model is practised at the municipal level, within national or provincial social agencies and at the provincial and federal levels of government.

In contrast with this technical, deliberate, top-down approach, social action:
presupposes a disadvantaged segment of the population that needs to be organized, perhaps in alliance with others, in order to make adequate demands on the larger community for increased resources or treatment more in accordance with social justice or democracy. It aims at making basic changes in major institutions or community practices. Social action as employed here seeks redistribution of power, resources or decision-making within the community and/or changing basic policies of formal organizations. (Rothman 1979b, 27)

Social action strategies are more likely to be carried out at the neighbourhood or community level. Social action efforts often take place within advocacy groups, such as anti-poverty, feminist and human rights organizations.

The locality development model is a somewhat more consensus-oriented approach to community change. It "presupposes that community change may be pursued optimally through broad participation of a wide spectrum of people at the local community level in goal determination and action" (Rothman 1979b, 26). This approach typically takes place in a neighbourhood setting or a distinct geographical location and is commonly referred to as "community development." In some cases, whole towns may be the target of community development efforts. Community development is a common strategy for combatting social and economic problems in developing countries.

Christenson (1989) developed a thematic categorization of community development based on a review of over 300 articles
that appeared in the Journal of the Community Development Society over twenty years. Three major themes emerged from this review, each of which represents distinct approaches to intervention: self-help, technical assistance, and conflict. The self-help theme can be compared with Rothman's locality development model, the technical assistance theme is similar to Rothman's social planning model and the conflict approach corresponds with his social action model. On the whole, this categorization does not appear to contribute significantly to a theory of community organization.

Fisher and Romanofsky (1981) distinguish between two dominant and distinct approaches to community organization, one based in the social work tradition, and the other, in the political activist tradition. In the social work tradition the community is viewed as a social organism and the focus is on building a sense of community (xiii). The political activist approach views the community as a political entity and the focus of this approach is on obtaining, maintaining, or restructuring power (xv).

The usefulness of such models is questioned by some. Perlman and Gurin (1972, 55) suggest that the development of models, or even a theory of community organization, is premature given the diversity and dynamic nature of community organization practice. They criticize Rothman's
models, pointing out that there are limitations to equating certain fields of practice to specific techniques. "At the present time statements as to what methodologies are appropriate under certain conditions frequently represent philosophical value positions or at most untested hypotheses" (54-5). One limitation is that this promotes a tendency to consider a particular field of activity as self-contained and therefore minimizes its interdependence with other areas of practice (54). Secondly, there is a tendency for practitioners to limit the options available for action.

Despite these limitations, as an organizer it is useful to be aware of one's view of the community and of the change strategies being employed. While how one views the community does not necessarily determine the change strategy and tactics to be employed, one important aspect of these models is that they reflect differing values and beliefs about the nature of community and about how social change occurs and is sustained. Within the community development model, the community is seen as eclipsed, static and lacking in democratic problem-solving capacities; this model implies that the community has common interests or reconcilable differences and a consensus approach is favoured for problem-solving. The social action approach sees the community as consisting of disadvantaged populations, social injustice and inequity; change is achieved through conflict
or confrontation, direct action or negotiation through the crystallization of issues and organization of people to take action against enemy targets. The social planning approach sees the community as having substantive social problems; its basic change strategies include fact-gathering about problems and making decisions on the basis of the most rational course of action by either consensus or conflict (Rothman 1979b, 30).

While these models highlight some basic differences in beliefs and approaches, the differences are not necessarily irreconcilable. All of the above views of community may be consistent with an organizer's perception of a given community. The change strategies employed may depend on the context and/or they may be determined on the basis of beliefs and values.

In the context of this study, a question might be posed as to which, if any, of these approaches, is consistent with CED values and principles. The short answer to this question is that all of them are consistent, depending on the context.

**Bringing in the Context: A Dialectical Framework**

The context or conditions of practice are a key ingredient, according to Burghardt (1982). He asserts that "good
organizers always ground their strategic stance in the "objective" condition before them" (27). Further, he suggests that a false dichotomy has developed in community organization practice between "technical" skills and "interactional" skills, in that particular models emphasize one or the other rather than drawing upon both. For instance, process or interactional skills are strongly emphasized in the community development approach while the social planning approach stresses technical skills. He also submits that the predominant Social Work frameworks help create a dichotomy between clinical and community practice by suggesting that caseworkers work with individuals (in the psycho-social sphere) and organizers with communities (in the socio-political sphere). The reality is often different. He argues that effective community organizing involves skill in interpersonal communication and an awareness of the emotional, as well as socio-political, context.

Burghardt's book, The Other Side of Organizing (1982), provides a new framework for community organizing practice which brings together both predominant aspects of organizing. The core of this "dialectical framework" is achieving a unity between the personal and social elements of practice. This is key to an engaged, dynamic practice. One way of realizing this is by learning to be comfortable
with both our intuitive and intellectual abilities (30). He suggests that the "joining of such abilities is fundamental to the mastery of what Paulo Freire calls "critical reflection" -- the ability to both act and reflect, simultaneously, on one's work" (30). Intuitive skills, he maintains, deepen practice experience by helping one understand intellectual content in actual application and vice versa (32).

Burghardt maintains that both the interpersonal and socio-political elements are at play all the time. In the dialectical framework, the organizer engages in a constant examination of both elements simultaneously (46). Several benefits are achieved by this type of practice, he suggests. One is what Freire calls the "constant development of consciousness" (47). "The way in which we act is as important as on what" (47). Secondly, this framework "materially roots one's work at all times" (48). The practice is developed and shaped by the larger social conditions. This keeps the practitioner involved and aware to as much change as possible within that context. The two-headed coin of false idealism and cynicism is replaced with a less inflated image of realistic activism. (48)

Further, Burghardt argues that heightened tactical self-awareness can increase one's organizing effectiveness (51). This helps organizers to realize that to be effective, they
do not have to do everything well. By becoming more aware of aspects of one's personality and of skills that are more developed than others, one can choose to emphasize those skills in which she has strength and to encourage others to play roles in which the organizer is less skilled. When this is not an option, the organizer can, at the very least, build in supports in personally difficult situations or adapt their own personal attributes to particular situations (52-55).

There are four important aspects of Burghardt's work. First, it places needed emphasis on the duality of roles of the practitioner. Instead of emphasizing one over the other, his framework allows both key aspects of the organizing work to be simultaneously considered. This is in contrast to other frameworks, such as Rothman's, which see the organizer in primarily one mode at any given time, within any given model. Secondly, it places the community organizing within a context, which is crucial in choosing among approaches, strategies, and tactics. It recognizes that the interpersonal, social, and political contexts all help to shape the development of approaches to intervention. Thirdly, this model encourages practitioners to be self-aware, an important aspect of effective practice. Fourthly, and perhaps most importantly, this framework facilitates the development of integrity in community practice by suggesting
that the means are the ends. It suggests that how an action is achieved is as important as what is achieved. As Burghardt notes, over time the content of community organizing is often remembered over the process. However, what may be the most important elements, and those which have the most lasting significance within the community, are the result of the processes -- the relationships that are created, the leadership that has been cultivated, the capacity that is developed, and the sense of community that remains.

Key Practitioner Roles and Functions
The role of the change agent or community organizer is a predominant theme in the community development literature of the 1960s and 1970s. Several theorists have attempted various categorizations of these roles, e.g., Ross (1967), Perlman and Gurin (1972), Grosser (1976), Morris (1979), and Rothman (1979).

Ross's categorization, often cited in the literature, most effectively brings together the combination of the interpersonal and socio-political dimensions of practice. Ross (1967) specifies four distinct roles: guide, enabler, expert, and a social therapy role (which he indicates is relevant only in limited situations). Additional role
categories, specified by other writers, include those of broker, advocate and activist (Grosser 1976, Rothman 1979).

The role of guide involves helping the community to establish and find a means of achieving its own goals (Ross 1967, 203-4). Ross indicates that the organizer does not impose her own views but encourages discussion by asking leading questions and focusing thought on problems she feels are important (207). Further, this role includes taking initiative by stirring consciousness of community problems and stirring discontent. The organizer's expertise is in bringing diverse groups of people together for collective decision-making (212).

The enabling role is one of the most widely recognized roles of the organizer and is discussed by several theorists (e.g., Ross, Rothman, Grosser). It involves facilitating the community organizing process by focusing discontent, encouraging organization, nourishing good interpersonal relations, and emphasizing common objectives. The worker focuses discontent by helping people see that their "personal" problems are "social" problems in many cases. According to Ross, this role of a "catalytic agent" involves helping people to:

look at themselves, to look below the surface and probe their deepest feelings about community life. [The worker] encourages verbalization of these feelings, he helps people see the commonality of
their feelings, he nourishes the hope that something can be done collectively about these. As feelings and consciousness of common problems begin to crystallize, the worker functions in a way that will support efforts to come together, to organize, to deal with these problems. (1967, 215)

Ross cautions the organizer against pushing the community, accelerating the pace of change or minimizing the difficulties of change, suggesting that it is best to move slowly in most situations (216-7). The enabling role means that the organizer does not lead, but facilitates, local efforts, does not provide answers but has questions which stimulate insight and does not carry the burden of responsibility for organizing and action but provides encouragement and support for those that do (Ross 1967, 221).

A non-directive approach to intervention is reinforced by other community practitioners, e.g., Lees (1975), Rothman (1979), Littrell and Hobb (1989). The characteristic role in Rothman's locality development model is that of "enabler" which includes facilitating a process of problem-solving, encouraging organization, nourishing good interpersonal relationships and emphasizing common objectives (Rothman, 33-5). In Littrell and Hobbs' (1989) self-help categorization, change agents help people to explore alternatives and organize for action. Their role is both educational and organizational, providing people with the skills and knowledge to facilitate their decision-making
process and to accomplish their specific objectives. The people, themselves, not the change agent, determine what is to be done (33-4).

The expert role involves providing data and direct advice in areas in which the organizer has knowledge. According to Ross, this role does not conflict with the role of enabler (1967, 221). In this role, the organizer provides research data, technical expertise, resource material, and advice on methods (221). While the organizer provides facts and resources, she should not make recommendations about what the community or its associations should do (222). Ross identifies several functions of the expert role: community diagnosis, research skill, information about other communities, advice on methods, technical information, and evaluation (222).

Rothman (1979b) also emphasizes the role of expert. In his social planning model, fact-finding and analytical skills are important. The expert role involves community diagnosis, research skill, information about other communities, advice on methods of organization and procedure, technical information, and evaluation (33-5). Fear, Gamm and Fisher (1989) indicate that the role of the technical expert or planner is to assess the situation based on technical information and to suggest the most
economically feasible and socially responsible approaches to improving the situation (35-6).

Grosser (1976) emphasizes the importance of the roles of broker, advocate and activist. The broker involves putting one's clients in touch with resources and in some cases, "action may also be necessary to ensure the exchange" (196). The role of advocate may need to be assumed in certain circumstances, where the organizer is unable to "effect a transaction between server and served" (197). "The worker in these circumstances is not an impartial enabler, broker, expert, consultant, guide, or social therapist: he is a partisan in a social conflict" (197). This might make it necessary for the organizer "to provide leadership and resources directed toward eliciting information, to challenge the stance of the institution, and to argue issues" (197). Finally, Grosser maintains that role of activist is "a legitimate one for the social worker, and especially for the community organizer" (200-1). This role involves focusing discontent and encouraging the organization of social action and protest strategies usually directed at a specific outcome.

In addition to the key roles of guide, enabler, expert, broker, advocate and activist, community workers perform a range of tasks and functions. They:
conduct needs assessments, encourage citizen participation, facilitate decision-making, identify resources, educate others, present alternatives, analyze information, develop leaders, formulate plans, stimulate organizational efforts, and assist in implementation of solutions. (Warner 1989, 120).

Some theorists emphasize the personal qualities needed to be an effective organizer. Kahn (1970) suggests that an effective organizer will "have a good deal in common with the people he (sic) is working among" (5). He stresses the importance of the organizer being liked and accepted in order to gain their confidence. He also suggests honesty is crucial. Ross suggests that the organizer should be "a warm, friendly person, sensitive to the deeper feelings of people and interested in the 'little things' that are important in the lives of individuals and communities" (1967, 218). Like Kahn, Ross also emphasizes the importance of the organizer being accepted, liked and trusted.

**Leadership Development**

Leadership involves "both the ability to organize and sustain task performance and the ability to arouse or stimulate others to join in the task" (Garkovich 1989, 203). The "situational-contingency" approach is a theory of leadership development which is most relevant to the social action model of community development. This approach proposes that leadership emerges from the interaction of
individuals traits or behaviours with the characteristics of other persons and within a particular situation (203). This approach emphasizes the flexible and adaptive nature of community leadership and suggests that leadership is activated in response to particular interests, is variable in its enactments, and is sensitive to the needs of its followers. Leaders may specialize in interest fields, or emerge to offer their skills and knowledge when appropriate situations develop (203). This theory suggests that communities contain many potential leaders and efforts must be made to both activate and nurture this leadership (203).

Kahn (1970, 39) suggests that developing leadership is a key function of the role of the organizer. He claims that training local people as organizers and transferring the organizer's skills and knowledge to community members is one of the organizer's most important responsibilities. Consistent with an empowering, non-hierarchal approach, leadership should be broadly based within a group rather than be concentrated in the hands of a few people (45). The process of developing leadership is "mostly one of involving others in the process of planning and decision-making" (45). Informal leadership roles should be stressed at first -- he suggests that rotating the chair from meeting to meeting is one method of developing leadership skills in group members (51). Further, Kahn suggests that the group structure
should be kept loose until people have had the time and experience to develop leadership abilities of their own (52).

However, the transference of skills and techniques is just one aspect of leadership development. Burghardt (1982) suggests that there are three dominant approaches used by community organizers to develop leaders. The first involves changing the situational problems to the exclusion of leadership development; this approach focuses on getting the job done but does not develop leaders (85). The second involves developing leaders who are grounded in organizational, and not critical consciousness, which he suggests is the most common form of leadership development in organizing (86). This "short-cut approach" to leadership development involves focusing on a set of techniques divorced from the social context and perpetuates "a model of leadership devoid of the critical reflection necessary to creatively act within the world" (87).

The development of critical consciousness is the third model of leadership development which Burghardt discusses. He suggests that this process of leadership development involves making the linkage between the "personal" and "political" in which the possibility of dialogue that can "transform the world" opens up. However, this process of
leadership development demands that the organizer recognize the necessary integration of the political context with the personal attributes of people that are integral to that action. In other words, the organizer needs to recognize the importance of both the task (action) and process (reflection) functions (91).

The development of critical consciousness as it relates to leadership development involves three phases. Phase one consists of the active work and the exposure of need or the sharing of self where the organizer presents herself as capable of completing the group’s tasks yet "open enough as a person to suggest a more mutual determination of the problem and how to end it" (102). The second phase involves the demand for sharing the work in which the organizer demands of clients that they assert their full selves by exposing their strength consistently. The organizer risks demanding success and will openly and honestly criticize failure, daring them "to be as fully human as you have attempted to be" (104-6).

In the third phase, the ability of the practitioner to organically move from intellectually to intuitively focused issues within the practice situation (a "critically reflective" skill), frees you both to present skills and to risk vulnerability in ways that begin restructuring the themes of how a problem situation is defined. . . . The application of these skills, shared with others
Community Action Theory

Of particular relevance to this study is the body of literature pertaining to community action theory. Community action is a broad concept, encompassing a range of activities and events within communities. Warren (1972) maintains that it is important to distinguish between community action episodes and other basic social processes, such as cooperation, competition and conflict. Community action episodes are change processes that, rather than being continuous, have a distinct beginning and end. They exist to achieve a specific purpose and they involve a process of organization and task performance in the direction of accomplishing the purpose, which in the process may be modified; then with the resolution of their effort the action subsides, and the episode is finished. (Warren 1972, 308)

Poplin categorizes community action as being either "spontaneous", "routinized" or "initiated." It is the latter type of community action that is of relevance to this study and is, according to Poplin, the area in which community action theorists have focused most of their attention (1979, 205).
Poplin describes initiated community action as those activities and events which have as their main purpose the initiation of change at the community level through the mechanism of orderly group processes. He indicates that "initiated community action can be viewed as an episode in the life of the community: a group comes into being, action is taken to bring about a desired change, and the group disbands or undertakes some other project" (1979, 205).

Poplin further identifies several distinguishing characteristics of initiated community action. The first is an emphasis on problem solving or achieving a concrete, well-defined goal (1979, 206). The second major characteristic of initiated community action is that most of the participants are members of the local community. Poplin states that "the one exception might be a professional person who is sent in by an outside sponsoring agency to help community members carry out a successful community action program" (206).

Poplin's third characteristic of initiated community action is more prescriptive than descriptive. He asserts that a fundamental characteristic of the ideal program is a democratic orientation in which all members, not only the leaders, are given an opportunity to participate in the establishment of goals, the planning for action and the
carrying out of the action program (1979, 207). He also specifies that these programs "should be free from control by vested interest groups, and the participation of all interested, conscientious citizens should be welcomed" (207).

Several community action theorists have identified and described the stages through which episodes of initiated community action pass as they move from initiation to completion. Poplin notes that each of these theorists "sheds light on slightly different aspects of the 'total action process'" which helps to account for the disparity in their categorization of these episodes (1979, 208).

Green and Mayo delineate the specific steps that are required to carry a project through to completion. They have identified four stages: initiation of action; goal definition and planning for achievement; implementation of plans; and goal achievement consequences (Poplin 1979, 209).

Warren describes a model that was developed over a number of years at Michigan State University by Holland and his associates as "perhaps the most sophisticated and the most useful model so far available for such analysis" (Poplin 1979, 209). This model, which focuses on the mechanics of community action episodes, was tested in two other studies.
It identifies five stages in the action process: the convergence of interest, the establishment of an initiating set, legitimation and sponsorship, the establishment of an execution set and finally the fulfilment of the "charter" or goals (Poplin 1979, 209).

Warren (1972) developed his own five stage model which he described as an attempt to accommodate the "various dynamic aspects of the development and change of community action systems". Its focus is on the emergence and operation of action systems. This model includes the following components: initial systemic environment; inception of the action system; expansion of the action system; operation of the expanded action system; and transformation of the action system.

Poplin suggests that there is enough similarity among these categorizations to attempt a rough comparison. He summarizes the major elements of the stages. Initiated community action begins "when at least a few people become aware of a problem and express interest in working toward its solution (stage 1)." Poplin suggests that this interest may arise "in conversations among neighbors or among the leaders of voluntary associations, and it may even be stimulated by an outside change agent, such as a community
While this first stage involves only a few people, "if a community action project is to move beyond the discussion stage, a temporary action system must emerge which can "get the ball rolling" (stage 2)." This stage involves the formation of an initiating set which usually involves many of the same people who originally became aware of the problem (210).

The persons who participate in the initiating set must "define the goals of the action episode and map out specific strategies by which these goals may be achieved." Next, the initiating set must "establish its right to take action, i.e., it must list the cooperation of persons who, by virtue of their position in the community, can make or break the project (stage 3)" (210).

The fourth stage involves the expansion of the action system to include "actors who have not previously been involved" (210). Fifth, is the achievement of the goals and purposes of the action episode. At that time, the action system may be disbanded or "in some cases the rewards of working together with other citizens to better the community are so
An understanding of community action episodes is important for a number of reasons. Warren suggests that understanding community action episodes helps to delineate the structure of the community and therefore, to promote understanding of the role and importance of the power structure in community action. Second, he maintains it increases our understanding of the community in its dynamic aspects, rather than as a "relatively static structure." Finally, it helps to increase understanding of the role of the change agent in the process of change (1972, 308-9).

Furthermore, the attempts to develop models around the concept of community action are important steps in theory generation, according to Warren. He quotes Homans:

> Any classification, no matter how crude, provided that it is used regularly, forces us to take up one thing at a time and consider systematically the relations of that thing to others. This is one of the roads that leads to generalization (1972, 308).

**Stages in the Community Economic Development Process**

While there are few theoretical models to guide CED activity, some practitioners have made efforts to document the process involved in implementing projects. These efforts are briefly summarized.
The Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia (SPARC of BC) has produced a number of papers describing community economic development and has summarized some of the efforts of CED organization within B.C. communities. In its 1985 report, *Community Economic Development in British Columbia: Nine Case Studies*, profiles were provided of nine CED initiatives. The stories detailed the history of the project, structure, membership, activities that were undertaken, and the integration of social and economic aspects of the development. Furthermore, the report outlined a common developmental process involved in establishing these projects (Strandberg 1985).

The stages were identified as follows: 1) unemployment "crisis"; 2) small group meets; 3) expands membership (entire community or special interest); 4) idea generation (brainstorm/think tank/workshop); 5) society formed (strategic plan/commitment); 6) apply for funds (usually LEAD/Canada Works); 7) feasibility study/market analysis; 8) select and develop project(s); 9) renew process/business expansion/business takeover/no further development.

In a 1983 report, Wismer and Pell describe three case studies of community economic development efforts in three different locations in Canada, detailing the process which
occurred in each of these situations. They identify five stages and a number of distinct steps within each.

The first stage involves the task of forming a working group. According to Wismer and Pell, most projects of this nature involve a small number of people who feel that some change in their community is desirable. Their task is to recruit similarly-minded people to form a working group. Wismer and Pell suggest that between six and ten people is a desirable group size (1983, 50).

The second stage is described by Wismer and Pell as problem identification. It involves five steps: 1) identifying the problem to be addressed; 2) creating a forum for community-wide discussion; 3) identifying goals for the process; 4) identifying opportunities (how the group will achieve its goals); and, 5) developing a base of community support and a participatory mechanism for community-based planning. This last step may be achieved through a number of means, including regular public meetings, elections, affiliating with an elected body and appointing representatives from already established community organizations (1983, 51-2).

The third stage, forming a strategy, involves two steps: 1) choosing an approach from the alternatives identified as
potential opportunities; and, 2) developing a plan of action. As a first step, market surveys, social and economic cost-benefit studies, and feasibility studies are conducted, and preliminary business or project plans are prepared. Based on the information that is collected, decisions can be made about the most feasible and desirable strategies for achieving the goals of the group. Once this decision is made, the group is in a position to develop a plan of action which identifies strategies and activities for implementing the project and the time frame in which they are to be accomplished (1983, 53-4).

The fourth stage of implementation, has three steps: 1) creating an organizational base for community action; 2) accessing resources; and, 3) implementing the selected strategies. The first of these steps involves formalizing the organizational structure and legally incorporating as a society. The group then accesses resources from the community as well as from the public and private sectors. Once this is achieved, the implementation of the plans can occur (1983, 54-5).

The fifth and final stage involves the steps of 1) future planning and, 2) training and skill development. Future planning involves reviewing the plan and making decisions about future steps. Training and skill development is
required on an ongoing basis to enhance the capacity of the people involved (1983, 55-6).

This documentation suggests that organizing a CED initiative requires a number of steps which do not necessarily occur in an orderly and systematic way. These steps may also overlap. The common ingredients of these categorizations include: 1) the formation of a group to initiate the process; 2) problem and opportunity identification and analysis; 3) the development of goals and strategies; 4) membership recruitment and development; 5) the development of an organizational base for community action; 6) the development of community support and participatory mechanisms for community-based planning; 7) project development (including obtaining the necessary sponsorship and resources for funding and sustaining the initiative); and, 8) future planning and development.

A COMMUNITY PROFILE OF MOUNT PLEASANT

The third and final section of this chapter addresses the "where" question by providing a context for the setting in which the research was conducted. This section highlights some of the relevant historical, physical, and demographic characteristics of Mount Pleasant. It also discusses the socio-economic issues facing the community and describes the
community’s organizational infrastructure, with particular emphasis on those organizations which support community development.

Mount Pleasant is home to approximately 21,000 people. The boundaries of this inter-city community are Cambie Street on the west, 16th Avenue and Kingsway on the south, Knight Street and Clark Drive on the east and Great Northern Way and 2nd Avenue on the north. Mount Pleasant’s geographical location within Vancouver is shown on the map on page 65 (figure 1).

Historical Development
As Vancouver’s first suburb, Mount Pleasant was once a prosperous community. Much of the early development in Mount Pleasant revolved around Brewery Creek, whose fresh waters contributed to industrial development (MPCPC 1987, 3). The first industry developed in Mount Pleasant was the Hastings Mill, in 1867 (MPCPC 1987, 4). The creek was named after the many breweries which it attracted to the community, from 1888 to 1912 (MPCPC 1987, 5). A local historian and member of the Brewery Creek Urban Committee, Claude Douglas, provides this account of the early development of Mount Pleasant:
Figure 1

Mount Pleasant in context of City of Vancouver

MAP OF MOUNT PLEASANT
Brewery Creek, so accurately named, in conjunction with the connecting routes of Main and Kingsway, became the centre of industry and commerce for the district of Mt. Pleasant. By 1897 there had been a fairly large conglomeration of residences to house workers, by shortly after the turn of the century there was a teeming population growth centered on Broadway and Main. The industries of Brewery Creek and False Creek provided the draw for many working families that densely populated the area below Broadway.

. . . . The commercial section filled up with merchants and service industries. Streetcar service was improved, a streetcar terminal was built at 14th and Main in 1917 (the same structure is now used by the I.G.A.), the main routes were paved with wooden blocks, the Broadway Theatre ran first-run films, and the first skyscraper, the Lee Building, was built in 1912. ‘Uptown Vancouver’ was well established as a prestigious suburb.

Brewery Creek and False Creek were eventually filled in. . . . Into the 1930s the Brewery Creek area changed drastically. The area below Broadway and west of Scotia began to develop into light manufacturing and dispensing warehouses. Of the many hundreds of homes there when it was residential, only a few dozen remain, as bulldozers razed the majority to make the area commercial and industrial.

. . . . The Brewery Creek watershed has changed drastically over the past few decades; however, it has a very rich history of great importance to Vancouver, and the "fabric" that it was helped shape the Mount Pleasant region. Although it is now a zone of transition, the area has a very rich mixture of buildings, people, land uses, industries and businesses, contributing to its unique character. The people of Mount Pleasant, and all Vancouverites, should pride themselves in the history of the Creek, and its identity should be better defined as the original centre of Mount Pleasant (MPCPC 1987, 5-6).
Physical Characteristics

Mount Pleasant encompasses a wide range of zoning areas and types of development. Residential buildings occupy 55% of the land base in Mount Pleasant. Civic and institutional uses, including the City Hall, schools, churches and parks, comprise more than 10% of the land area, while industrial and commercial uses occupy 30% of the available land (MPCPC 1987, 12).

Residential zoning ranges from single family to medium density residential; commercial zoning ranges from local to regional uses and industrial ranges from light to heavy (MPCPC 1987, 13).

Five distinct neighbourhoods, set apart by land use, building form, and major streets, have been identified by the community (MPCPC 1987, 19). The neighbourhood boundaries are shown on the map on page 68 (figure 2).

Of the housing in Mount Pleasant, the predominant types are multiple dwellings, with over 88% of residences belonging to this category. The predominant type of dwelling is apartments with less than five storeys (76.5%). Only 9.5% of the dwellings are single-detached houses, while 3.2% are apartment buildings with five or more storeys (1986 Canada Census).
Figure 2

Mount Pleasant's Neighbourhoods
More than 80% of the residential dwellings in Mount Pleasant are rented; this compares with the city average of 57.6% (1986 Canada Census). Only 29.2% of Mount Pleasant’s population has lived in the same dwelling as they did five years previous (1986 Canada Census). The comparable figure for the City of Vancouver as a whole is 48.5%. Together, these statistics suggest that residents of Mount Pleasant are relatively mobile.

Housing costs are lower in Mount Pleasant than the city average. In 1986, housing costs were an average of $454 per month (for renters) and $455 (owner’s average monthly payments), while the respective figures for the City as a whole were $545 and $518 (1986 Canada Census). A wide range of non-market housing is located in Mount Pleasant including housing co-operatives, senior citizen housing, housing for people with disabilities, and group homes.

Commercial developments include large offices such the Royal Bank Visa Centre, City Hall, the Canada Employment Centre, and the Ministry of Health. Retail outlets such as supermarkets, auto car sales lots, furniture stores and auto repair shops are found in Mount Pleasant. However, the predominant commercial developments are small, individually-owned businesses. There is one indoor shopping facility, Kingsgate Mall. A growing artistic community
features several art galleries, live theatres and dance studios. Industrial developments include wholesalers, warehouses, printing and light manufacturing (MPCPC 1987, 15).

Mount Pleasant has the second lowest ratio of park space per person of the communities in Vancouver. There are 1.1 acres per 1000 persons compared with the city average of 2.7 acres per 1000 persons (MPCPC 1987, 18).

Mount Pleasant is at the centre of several important transportation routes within the city. The primary and secondary arterial streets which dissect the community or run adjacent to it include the following: Kingsway, 16th Avenue, 12th Avenue, 7th Avenue, Broadway, Great Northern May/2nd Avenue, Cambie Street, Main Street, Fraser Street and Knight Street/Clark Drive (MPCPC 1987, 8-9).

**Demographic Characteristics**

Close to 40% of Mount Pleasant's population is between 20 and 34 years of age. Another significant age group is that between 35 and 44 years, comprising 14.8% of the population. Children up to 14 years of age comprise 12.5% of the population and 11.1% of the population are over 65 years of age (1986 Canada Census).
Over 35% of Mount Pleasant residents have a mother tongue other than English (mother tongue refers to the first language learned in childhood and still understood). The largest non-English group is Chinese, with 10.5% of the population having Chinese as their mother tongue. Close to 40% of Mount Pleasant residents were born outside of Canada, and half of these were born in Asia. This is remarkably similar with the figures for Vancouver as a whole. Of particular note is that 22.1% of Mount Pleasant’s immigrant population arrived between 1983-1986 and a further 20.9% arrived in the period between 1978-1982, revealing a relatively large population of recent immigrants (1986 Canada Census).

Income and Labour Force Data

The average family income in Mount Pleasant ($23,740) is less than 60% of that for the City as a whole ($39,908) (1986 Canada Census). Table 1, on page 72, compares the income data for families, households, and individuals (male and female), between Mount Pleasant and the City of Vancouver. The percentage of "low income economic families" in Mount Pleasant is 39.4% compared with 19.4% in Vancouver as a whole. More than half of Mount Pleasant’s unattached individuals (52.4%) are considered low income (1986 Canada Census).
Table 1
Average Income: Comparisons between Mount Pleasant and the City of Vancouver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mount Pleasant</th>
<th>City of Vancouver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Family Income</td>
<td>$23,740</td>
<td>$39,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Income</td>
<td>$20,050</td>
<td>$32,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Individual (Male)</td>
<td>$14,490</td>
<td>$22,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Individual (Female)</td>
<td>$12,392</td>
<td>$14,509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the 1986 Census, more than three quarters (76%) of the income earned in Mount Pleasant is through employment, 17.8% is from government transfer payments and 6.2% is from other sources. (The government transfer payment category includes all transfer payments from government programs excluding family allowances, Old Age Security pensions, Guaranteed Income Supplements, Canada Pension Plan benefits, U.I.C. benefits, and Federal child tax credits -- all of which are included in the "other" category. The latter category also includes income from retirement pensions, annuities, dividends, and interests payments.) The City's Social Planning Department estimated in 1987 that 37% of Mount Pleasant's population is dependent upon some form of public income or subsidy. An approximate breakdown of this figure by income source is: 4,300 people receiving
welfare; 2,600 people receiving unemployment insurance benefits; and 400 people receiving senior and disability pensions (MFCPC 1987, 22).

The data for labour force activity in Mount Pleasant (see Table 2 on page 74) shows that 76.4% of males and 65.1% of females (15 years and over) are in the labour force (this includes those of the working age population who, in the week prior to the Census, were employed or unemployed). Of these, 59.4% of males and 56.3% of females were employed and 17% of males and 8.7% of females were unemployed. The "unemployed" category, as defined by Statistics Canada, includes those actively looking and available for work in that week, those on lay-off with expectations of returning to work, and those who had arrangements to start a new job within four weeks of the Census. The remainder of the working age population, who were unwilling or unable to work in the reference week, is classified as not in the labour force. The total unemployment rate for Mount Pleasant is 18.3%; however, the unemployment rate for those in the 15-24 age group is 21.8%. This compares to a rate of 12.7% for Vancouver as a whole and a rate of 16.4% for those in Vancouver in the 15-24 age group (1986 Canada Census).
Table 2

Labour Force Activity in Mount Pleasant (by percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (15 years and over)</th>
<th>Females (15 years and over)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the Labour Force</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Labour Force</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socio-Economic Issues

This demographic information reveals some socio-economic characteristics of the community which can contribute to social and economic problems. Mount Pleasant's high mobility rate can lead to a lack of community identity and sense of community. Its relatively high immigrant population and the high numbers of people with a mother tongue other than English reveal the possibility of a significant population who does not speak English. Furthermore, a relatively high number of immigrants are recent arrivals and this may contribute to difficulties of integration into the community.

The data on labour force activity and income reveal that Mount Pleasant residents have relatively low incomes and are
more dependent on government income transfers than the City average.

In addition, a number of other social and economic issues have been identified by community members. The Community Development Plan (32) identifies six major problems areas in which strategies for community social development are required. These are: 1) Visible and direct impacts of street prostitution and its implications for the community at large; 2) General deterioration of the social fabric and physical environment of the community; 3) Escalating levels of transiency brought on by the community's poor image and lack of services; 4) High levels of unemployment and welfare; 5) Appearance and perception of high levels of crime and socially deviant behaviour; and, 6) Appearance of economically-depressed commercial areas.

The Plan notes the interrelatedness of these problems. While they can be seen as distinct, together these problems form part of a pattern, which, if not resolved, could lead to further deterioration of the community. Street prostitution, the Plan notes, is a prime example of how a vicious cycle is created through such problems. Neighbourhood neglect was a factor which "attracted" prostitutes initially; prostitution then contributed to a serious image problem for the community and created major
disruption to residents. This, in turn, prompted some long
time residents to move out of the community and established
Mount Pleasant as an undesirable location for families.

The problem of street prostitution is not likely to go away
on its own. The Community Development Plan recognizes the
need to develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing the
community’s social and economic problems, the basis of which
involves making the community a desirable one in which to
live.

Organizational Infrastructure
Despite these issues, residents of Mount Pleasant have much
to be hopeful about. Many of them are involved in
addressing the community’s problems and working to make the
future a brighter one for Mount Pleasant. Some of the key
government and community organizations and other
institutions involved in community development activities
are briefly described.

In April 1982, the City of Vancouver Planning Department
established a temporary store-front location on Broadway,
which housed the City Planning staff who assisted the Mount
Pleasant Citizens’ Planning Committee with the preparation
of the Community Development Plan for Mount Pleasant. This
collaboration, between City Planning staff and Mount
Pleasant residents, has focused much community attention on addressing the problems of the community and on improving the quality of life for Mount Pleasant residents. The Mount Pleasant Citizens' Planning Committee involved the work of approximately ninety community volunteers in the five years of its existence. This committee identified a number of community issues and concerns and developed a framework for addressing them. The Community Development Plan, which was adopted by City Council in May 1987, was a product of these efforts.

Several other community organizations have played important roles in addressing community issues. The Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood Association (MPNA) has shown leadership through advocating to City Council on behalf of the community's interests and working with various neighbourhood groups to address local concerns.

The Mount Pleasant Business Association (MPBA) was formed in 1985 to represent the interests of the business community and to promote the revitalization of the business sector. It sponsored a beautification project in the Main Street and Broadway area.

The Brewery Creek Urban Committee and the Mount Pleasant Heritage Conservation Society have actively promoted Mount
Pleasant's historical significance and the conservation of the community's many historical buildings.

The Mount Pleasant Police Liaison Committee was formed to work with the police in community crime prevention. The Traffic Planning Committee is working to address residents' concerns about the increased traffic flow through the community.

The Association for Mount Pleasant Economic Renewal (AMPER) is the community organization which was formed as a result of the organizing process described in this paper (Chapter Four details this process). Its mandate is "to assist Mount Pleasant economic renewal, through developing and assisting projects which provide sustainable local enterprise and local employment and encourage a sense of community" (Resource Directory, 1989).

The Community Development Plan (29) identifies a number of other organizations working on specific issues within the community including: the Allied Indian and Metis Society; the Mount Pleasant Mini-Team (an inter-agency committee of social services); the Royal Canadian Legion, Mount Pleasant Branch; and the Mount Pleasant Block Neighbours.
A range of community agencies and services provide important social and recreational services to residents of the community. The Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood House operates a range of community services and programs, including programs for newcomers and immigrants. The Mount Pleasant Family Centre, the Mount Pleasant library, the Kimount and Kivan Boys and Girls Clubs, and the Mount Pleasant Community Centre (which provides recreational and social programming) all provide important services to residents of the community. Although five day care centres are located in Mount Pleasant (MPCPC 1987, 16), a VCC staff member who was involved in the establishment of a Day Care Centre adjacent to the College claims there is a shortage of day care facilities in the community.

A variety of ethnic groups are represented in Mount Pleasant. Some of them do not have their own facilities but meet informally (e.g., the Latin American group holds meetings at the Neighbourhood House). Some of the groups with facilities include: the Australia-New Zealand Association Social Club, the Athens Social Club, and the Finlandia Club (MPCPC 1987, 16).

The growing arts community in Mount Pleasant has actively promoted the community as a venue for both the performing and the visual arts. Mount Pleasant has served as the host
of Vancouver’s Fringe Festival since the Festival’s beginning in 1985. This festival, which occurs every September, presents a diverse range of live theatre in 13 different venues throughout the community. The 1986 festival, the second one held, attracted over 8,000 people to the community and the Festival continues to grow. Other artistic and cultural groups based in Mount Pleasant include: Western Front (art gallery), Grunt Gallery, Vancouver Little Theatre, Theatre Space, Hot Jazz Society, Arcadian Dance Hall, Bruhanski Theatre, and the GOH Ballet (MPCPC 1987, 64).

A number of educational institutions are located in Mount Pleasant including five elementary schools, a secondary school, the Vancouver Community College (VCC) King Edward Campus, and the Native Education Centre (MPCPC 1987, 16). Operated by the Urban Native Indian Education Society, the Native Education Centre is the largest post-secondary education and training centre for Aboriginal people in B.C. (Mt. Pleasant Revue, Nov. 1/87, 9).

As was suggested in the City of Vancouver Planning Department’s 1985 report, Mount Pleasant: Overall Policy Plan, Mount Pleasant stands at a particularly significant crossroads.

It can continue to bear the burden of current trends and possibly slide into oblivion, a state
of being forgotten. This does not mean Mount Pleasant will cease to exist as a physical entity, but that it will cease to exist as a community with focus and aspirations for the future. The alternative is to meet change with positive direction, to shape Mount Pleasant’s future, building on the strength of the past and within the context of its present role within the city. The community has indicated through its efforts its desire to work with City staff to achieve this goal. (1)

As this discussion has suggested, many of Mount Pleasant’s residents and community organizations have demonstrated their own aspirations for this community. If nothing else, this bodes well for the future of Mount Pleasant.

SUMMARY

The three major sections of this chapter have attempted to provide a context for this study of the process of organizing CED within Mount Pleasant. This process will be discussed in some detail in Chapter Four. The next task, however, is to provide a description of the research design and methodology.
INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of the research design and includes the sampling design, methodological orientation and the theoretical basis of the research. The data collection methods are discussed and the framework for data analysis is presented. Lastly, this chapter addresses the limitations of the study and the ethical issues associated with the research.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The unit of analysis in this study is the inner-city community of Mount Pleasant. The research design limits the investigation and analysis to a single unit or case.

Qualitative methods, such as participant-observation, document analysis, and the administration of open-ended questionnaires, were chosen because of their suitability to this type of case study. Qualitative methods are appropriate because they allow in-depth thematic exploration of research issues and questions. This type of research method:
seeks to capture what people have to say in their own words. Qualitative measures describe the experiences of people in depth. The data are open-ended in order to find out what people's lives, experiences, and interactions mean to them in their own terms and in their natural settings. (Patton 1980, 22)

This research, a case study of organized CED activity, has an exploratory and mapping function of gaining a preliminary understanding of phenomena and of developing concepts and hypotheses. Although the beginning conceptual map was derived from theory relating to community economic development and community organizing, a specific conceptual framework was not used either to guide the actions of the organizer or to develop questions for the research.

RESEARCH METHODS

Data Collection Methods
The data collection proceeded simultaneous to the organizing activity. Data collection, to obtain relevant documentation of the meetings attended by the researcher, to document the interventions, and to record the organizer's observations, questions and analysis of the community and the processes that occurred, was undertaken from September 1986 to April 1987. In keeping with these goals, participant-observation was the primary method of data collection. Participant-observation involves a situation in which the researcher
becomes a participant in the process, as well as an observer. The participant role involved organizing CED within the community. The observer role involved observing and recording the dynamics and details of meetings and informal interviews, and documenting the interventions and activities related to the organizing process. Field notes were used to record the reflections about the meaning of the data.

The principal technique of participant-observation was augmented by document analysis. The main use of these documents (e.g., minutes of meetings, reports, news articles, and research surveys) was to supplement the data from participant-observation. Documents such as the minutes of the meetings of the initiating group (AMPER), served as an important part of the data in this study. The minutes of the AMPER meetings were recorded by the researcher and their accuracy was verified with the group. The researcher's recording of the meeting minutes was done both to assist the group to maintain records of the meetings as well as to meet the researcher's needs for accurate information.

Other documents used as data sources included: planning documents such as one prepared by the City of Vancouver Planning Department entitled Mount Pleasant Overall Policy Plan: A Framework for Community Development and the
Community Development Plan for Mount Pleasant prepared by the Mount Pleasant Citizens’ Advisory Committee; a report of a survey conducted by the Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood Association; field practice progress reports; 1986 Canada Census data; lists of community agencies; and, articles in the community newspapers. These sources of data provided relevant information about the community, additional perspectives, and corroborated the data gathered through the participant observation process.

The third method of data collection used in this study was the administration of an open-ended questionnaire to both advisory committee members and to group participants upon completion of the practicum (see appendices II and III). The questionnaires were designed to elicit the views of the community advisors and the group participants about the investment of their time in the project, the strengths and weaknesses of the project, the ways in which the social work practitioner/researcher influenced the process and outcome of the project and the prospects for future success. This information was sought to obtain additional perspectives, particularly those of other participants, about the role of the organizer and the process of community economic development organizing. This information was also used to augment the field notes of the participant-observer and to provide additional information and perspectives not
available through the technique of participant-observation.

Data Analysis Methods
The data were analyzed using the constant comparative method of qualitative analysis (Glaser 1978). The first step in the data analysis process was the coding of the data (i.e., field notes, meeting minutes and open ended questionnaires) on a line by line basis, to identity emerging themes and patterns. This substantive coding involves generating concepts about the empirical data base. A number of recurring themes were noted (e.g., sense of community, organizational capacity, receptivity to change, structural obstacles to CED, resources for CED, etc.). These became the basis upon which codes were developed.

The second level of coding is known as theoretical coding (Glaser 1978). In this research, the substantive codes of "sense of community," "organizational capacity," and "receptivity to change" represent indicators of "community readiness for CED." Next, the data were reviewed for their fit into these categories, a process of selective coding.

The selection of the core category was the next major step in the analysis. Of the major categories that emerged from the data, the determination of what was core demanded reflection and analysis; this was assisted by the writing of
"theoretical memos," a procedure highly recommended by Glaser. This step involved interrupting the coding to write down ideas about how the categories relate to one another. The researcher, in attempting to determine the core category, asked the question posed by Glaser: "what is this data a study of?" (1978, 57). The core category, "organizing", emerged from this analysis. Although one category was selected as the core variable, other categories related to the core variable, also emerged. Two such categories in this study are "community readiness" and "gaining legitimacy." Once the core category and the other categories were selected, the next step in the data analysis involved the development of concepts and their indicators. Glaser's concept indicator model illustrates the process involved in the comparing of indicators with each other and to the emerging concept (1978, 62). This model is illustrated on page 88, using one of the major concepts of this study and its indicators.

The final step of analysis was the development of a framework for organizing CED (see Table 3). This framework identifies the major stages of the process of organizing CED and identifies the key activities and critical elements of each stage. Table 4 identifies the roles and functions of the organizer and the guiding values and beliefs in each stage of the process. Tables 3 and 4 summarize the major
findings of the research which are fully discussed in Chapter Four.

---

**Figure 3**

Glaser's Concept Indicator Model

**Concept: Community Readiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1: Sense of Community</th>
<th>Indicator 2: Organizational Capacity</th>
<th>Indicator 3: Receptivity to Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- inclusiveness</td>
<td>- neighbourhood</td>
<td>- to addressing problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- commitment</td>
<td>- business</td>
<td>- to CED general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- consensus</td>
<td>- co-ops</td>
<td>- specific CED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- self-awareness</td>
<td>- education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The limitations of this research are related to its scope, feasibility and the data gathering techniques used.

This study is limited in scope to that of a single case. Although an advantage of such a study is that it allows a detailed description of a particular process, like all case studies, it suffers from a lack of comparison with similar cases.
Case studies have been criticized for providing little basis for scientific generalization. While Reid and Smith (1981) have noted this limitation of case studies, they believe it is offset by other factors, such as the richness of data that can be gained from a detailed study of one case. Furthermore, Yin argues that "case studies are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations and universes" (1984, 21). In this sense, the case study does not represent a "sample". The goal of the researcher is to "expand and generalize theories (analytic generalization) and not to enumerate frequencies (statistical generalization)" (Yin 1984, 21).

A second limitation is the feasibility of undertaking a study of this nature within the time frame that was used (i.e., the academic year of the University). The time frame for data collection was limited to a period of about eight months, a relatively short time frame for this type of study. While this timeline allowed for the collection of data on the beginning phases of organizing, it did not allow the long-term outcomes of the organizing process to be assessed.

Furthermore, the research has several limitations with respect to the data collection methods used. A weakness of participant-observation is that the observer may affect the
process in unknown ways (Patton 1980). In this study, the researcher played the key role of "organizer" in addition to the research role of observation. Therefore, it is more likely that her participant role of "organizer" affected the process than did the research role of "observer." The role of organizer is explicitly examined in the research.

To observe with accuracy while also participating can be a difficult task. "The challenge is to combine participation and observation so as to become capable of understanding the program as an insider while describing the program for outsiders" (Patton 1980, 128). One potential problem the researcher faces as a participant-observer is becoming so immersed in the program that she fails to observe meanings and patterns in what is occurring. Furthermore, while it is desirable to maintain a balance between the subjectivity of a participant and the pure objectivity of a researcher, Yin notes that the participant role may require too much attention relative to the observer role. Balancing these roles was a challenge in this research because of the sometimes conflicting demands of guiding the process while also attempting to document it. Furthermore, in addition to the roles of "observer," the role of "organizer" encompassed a number of distinct roles including that of guide, enabler, and information resource on community economic development.
A strength of this approach is the researcher's access to an insider's view of the process. This was essential. It would have been difficult, if not impossible, to gather this type of information if the researcher had not been a participant. The role of organizer, in fact, was essential to the process of organizing community economic development in Mount Pleasant. The organizing activity, as is described in Chapter Four, would not have occurred without the interventions of the organizer.

A further limitation of this study is its reliance on the observations of a single participant-observer. Although the researcher can endeavour to be objective in the recording of observations, complete objectivity is impossible. In addition, the investigator, at times, may have to assume positions or advocacy roles contrary to the interests of good scientific practices (Yin 1984). In this case, the roles of organizer and researcher were complementary in that both roles demanded an impartially with respect to advocating particular positions or taking "sides" on issues within the community. However, what was captured in the field notes was not always an "objective" account of the process, but the process as recorded and reflected upon by the participant-observer. To offset the subjectivity of these recordings and to help ensure their accuracy, meeting participants were asked to verify the minutes of meetings.
Furthermore, efforts were made to obtain additional sources of data. Using a variety of data sources results in a more reliable data base than would any of the methods individually. In this study, the views of both the participants (of the initiating group) and the advisory committee members were elicited through a questionnaire administered at the conclusion of the research. Seeking the opinions of the participants directly by means of a questionnaire had the advantage of introducing the perspectives of more than just the researcher and was a means of communicating the views of all key participants. This method of data collection helped to offset the subjectivity of the participant-observation method and added another major source of information from which the researcher could draw.

Documents were also used as a basis for comparing data. The documents refer to matters about which there can be objective agreement, such as the existence of certain resources and organizations in the community, the identification of particular community problems, and about meetings and events which occurred.
ETHICAL ISSUES IN THE RESEARCH

The ethical considerations in this study primarily centre around the dealings with the project participants. This involved communicating to the participants the objectives of the practicum and research project and the use which would be made of the data. From the outset, the participants were informed that the researcher would be recording information about what was occurring (in meetings, etc.). Upon termination of the project, participants were requested to complete a process evaluation which was structured as an open-ended questionnaire. A written description, indicating the use of the results of the evaluation and the voluntary nature of their participation in completing the evaluation form, accompanied this questionnaire (see Appendices II and III). In accordance with university procedures, a "Request for Ethical Review" form was completed and approval was granted (see Appendix VI).

SUMMARY

This chapter's discussion of the design, methodology and limitations of the research has attempted to provide an understanding of how the "framework for organizing CED" emerged from the empirical data. The framework and its concepts are explored in the next chapter.
INTRODUCTION

Organizing community economic development is a process consisting of five key stages. These five stages are: 1) Gaining Legitimacy; 2) Assessing Community Readiness; 3) Determining a Development Approach; 4) Cultivating Leadership; and, 5) Developing an Organizational Base. This postulate emerged from an analysis of the data from the Mount Pleasant experience of organizing CED. This chapter attempts to substantiate this postulate by showing evidence of these data.

Furthermore, this chapter identifies the key issues of each stage, describes the activities that occurred in each stage, discusses the guiding values and beliefs of the organizer and highlights the roles of the organizer and the other key participants. It also identifies those factors which were critical to the completion of each stage and describes why each stage is critical to the overall organizing process. A Framework for Organizing CED emerged from this analysis. This framework (see Table 3, on page 95) identifies each stage, its major activities and the factors that were
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>MAJOR ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>CRITICAL FACTORS/ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaining Legitimacy</td>
<td>Initial contact with Planning Department</td>
<td>Organizer’s Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formation of Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Support of Key Community Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of contract and terms of reference</td>
<td>Addressing issues perceived as important to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Community Readiness</td>
<td>Information Gathering about the community</td>
<td>Community Readiness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(strengths/resources &amp; issues/obstacles)</td>
<td>* sense of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing relevance of information to CED initiatives</td>
<td>* organizational capacity to respond to needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* receptivity to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining a Development</td>
<td>Contact with specific segments of community</td>
<td>Obstacles:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>General community outreach and education</td>
<td>* community alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formulating a plan of action</td>
<td>* community instability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* structural disincentives to CED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating Leadership</td>
<td>Recruiting participants</td>
<td>Identification of leadership potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing an initial meeting of interested residents</td>
<td>Recruitment of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging group leadership</td>
<td>Encouragement of leadership roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an Organizational</td>
<td>Discussion at group meetings of mission, goals, name,</td>
<td>Establishment of group identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>membership and organizational structure</td>
<td>Definition of mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Determination of an Organizational Structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
critical to the realization of the stage. Table 4, shown below, identifies the roles and functions of the organizer and the values and beliefs that guided the organizer within each stage.

Table 4
Major Roles, Beliefs and Values of Organizer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>ROLES &amp; FUNCTIONS OF ORGANIZER</th>
<th>GUIDING VALUES &amp; BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaining Legitimacy</td>
<td>Guide, enabler</td>
<td>Respect for community self-determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Community Readiness</td>
<td>Researcher, analyst, catalyst</td>
<td>Belief in human potential and community capacity for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining a Development Approach</td>
<td>Analyst, advocate, and planner</td>
<td>Recognition of socio-political context; belief in capacity to ameliorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating Leadership</td>
<td>Guide, planner, enabler</td>
<td>Belief in individual capacity; active self-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an Organizational Base</td>
<td>Guide, enabler, technical expert</td>
<td>Belief in group capacity and consensus processes; respect for group self-determination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAGE 1: GAINING LEGITIMACY

A favourable perception by community members is an essential foundation for organizing a community process. Obtaining community support and legitimation for the organizing activity is a key issue. This section describes the major activities of this stage, the role of the organizer and other key participants and identifies and discusses the critical factors in gaining legitimacy. It discusses the importance of this stage to the overall process of organizing CED.

Major Activities

The major activities of this stage involved making contact with the Planning Department to discuss practicum options, the formation of an Advisory Committee, and developing a contract and terms of reference.

In early September, 1986, the student contacted the City of Vancouver Planning Department’s Local Area Office in Mount Pleasant. This "store-front" operation was established to oversee the development of a Community Development Plan. Options for a potential practicum were discussed. The Department expressed interest in having social work practicum students assist with the social dimensions of this Plan. Potential research topics identified were: the
business community's effect on residents; the issue of unemployment; the impact of physical planning on social planning; how to involve the community of immigrants; and, the role of co-operatives in the community.

A follow-up meeting with the Planning Assistant and a faculty member of the Business Department of the Vancouver Community College (VCC), King Edward Campus, was held to determine a focus for the practicum. It was agreed the practicum would explore the linkages between social and economic development, with particular emphasis on co-operative development. It was also agreed that the establishment of an advisory committee would be beneficial. It was hoped that this Committee could provide guidance and support to the student and assist the student to access community resources.

The first meeting of the Advisory Committee took place in September. In addition to the VCC faculty member and the City planner, two other members comprised this committee: the President of the Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood Association (MPNA), and a Community Development Worker who was hired by the City of Vancouver to work with residents in addressing community issues. The meeting centred on the focus and scope of the practicum with some discussion on the
role of co-operatives and the potential for co-operative development in Mount Pleasant.

A contract was drafted (Appendix I), which described the scope and mandate of the practicum and the activities which were to be undertaken by the student. It describes the mandate of the practicum to be "the exploration of the concept of 'Community Economic Development' and its relationship with community development and cohesiveness." It further detailed that "the student will investigate, develop and organize community economic development projects such as community-based co-operatives. In addition to the above, the student will perform an assessment of the community support for such a project, and will undertake appropriate research within the overall context of the project." The contract identified the role of the Advisory Committee to "act as a resource to the student, providing advice, support and guidance." The contract was signed by the School of Social Work advisor, the Planning Assistant on behalf of the Mount Pleasant Committee and the student.

During this stage, the student met individually with each member of the Advisory Committee to develop a working relationship with each Advisor and to tap their knowledge of the community and obtain their perceptions about the key social and economic issues.
Guiding Values and Beliefs and Roles of the Organizer

During this stage the organizer guided the process by identifying specific areas of interest, exploring practicum possibilities with key community contacts, drafting the contract and taking the initiative in meeting with Advisors. The organizer played an enabling role in listening to the needs and perceptions of community members. In doing so, the organizer was guided by a respect for the community’s self-determination.

Roles of Other Key Participants

The Planning Assistant facilitated the development of the practicum and the formation of the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee acted as a support and resource to the organizer by providing initial direction and offering project ideas. The Committee members also provided referrals to community members with specific CED expertise or interest.

Critical Factors in Gaining Legitimacy

Wharf notes that, despite its practical importance in community work, relatively little attention has been given to the concept of ‘legitimacy’ in this literature (1979, 250). Despite the lack of theory pertaining to this concept, the Mount Pleasant experience points to a number of key factors in gaining legitimacy. They include:
establishing the organizer’s credibility; obtaining the support of key community members; and, addressing issues perceived as important by the community.

The organizer’s credibility initially stemmed from her association with the School of Social Work, University of British Columbia (UBC) which was seen by the Planning Department as a valuable resource for social planning. This association helped the organizer to gain legitimacy first with the Planning Department, and then with the Advisory Committee.

Credibility has to do with reliability and trustworthiness. Gaining the trust and respect of the Committee required the organizer to develop a good relationship with the Committee as a whole as well as with individual members of the Committee. The organizer’s credibility with the Committee was strengthened as the Advisors got to know the student and saw evidence of her reliability through her use of the Advisory Committee meetings and individual meetings with Advisors. Although the Committee indicated it felt the student "arrived in Mount Pleasant showing a very professional attitude and good social work skills," gaining their respect and trust was an evolving aspect of this relationship which grew over the course of the project. In its final evaluation, the Committee indicated that the
student "used her management committee for much more than a reporting panel. This resulted in a good feeling of trust between the management committee and the student."

The importance of building trust with key individuals in the community appears to have some support in the literature:

Legitimation demands that newcomers prove themselves and develop a reputation of being open, trustworthy, and fair. It requires identifying key individuals in organizations and/or communities and building and maintaining relationships with these individuals (Wharf 1979, 16).

Obtaining the support of key community members helped the organizer to gain legitimacy within the larger community. Among the most significant factors in gaining legitimacy was the project's connection to an advisory committee which represented key players in relation to neighbourhood issues, community development, community planning, and economic development. The composition of the Advisory Committee was key to this. The Planning Assistant was able to bring to the project the visible support of the City of Vancouver Planning Office. In addition, the institutional support of the community college was provided through the provision of a faculty member's time on this committee; this represented a commitment from the college to supporting the community's interest in CED. The representative from the Neighbourhood Association was able to bring a legitimacy from the community that association with a resident-based group could
The Community Worker also gave the project this type of legitimacy because of her strong connections with 'grassroots' neighbourhood activists. In addition to the organizations they were representing on the Committee, two of the Advisors were connected with other important community organizations which contributed to the legitimation of the project. The VCC representative was also involved with the Mount Pleasant Business Association which could be a potential player in CED. Likewise, the MPNA representative was a respected minister of a church that was involved in many community issues.

Addressing issues that are important to the community is also a key factor in gaining legitimacy, most likely because people tend to value opinions, ideas and interests that are consistent with their own. The Planning Department’s original interest in employment issues and co-operative development coincided with many of the student’s interests. The process of determining a focus for the practicum and drafting a contract was a collaborative one, ensuring that both the interests of the researcher/organizer and the interests and concerns of community members were addressed. The signed contract, not only reinforced the organizational support of the School of Social Work for the project, it contributed to legitimation by explicitly stating the
While gaining legitimacy is a key issue at the outset of a community process, to some extent it is an issue that is never fully resolved. As Barr notes in his discussion of a case study on Regent Park, "gaining legitimacy was not a one-shot, one-time process. It began before the unit opened its doors and to a lessor extent, has carried on ever since" (1979, 44).

The Importance of Gaining Legitimacy in Organizing CED

Gaining and maintaining legitimacy is critical to community support for the process of organizing CED. Without it, this project could not have proceeded. In the next stages, the Advisory Committee facilitated access to the meetings of important community organizations. These meetings provided the opportunity to recruit potential participants for a CED initiative. Without the generally perceived legitimacy of this project, it is doubtful that these recruitment efforts would have been successful.

STAGE 2: ASSESSING COMMUNITY READINESS FOR CED

Assessing a community’s readiness for CED is the second key stage of any organizing activity. The critical issues in
this stage are: 1) determining the key factors that contribute to community readiness for CED, and 2) determining the potential obstacles to CED. This section describes the process undertaken in assessing community readiness, identifies the factors that contribute to readiness for CED and identifies the potential obstacles to CED. It also examines the relevance of the concept of readiness to the process of organizing CED activity.

Major Activities
The major activity focus in this stage was gathering relevant information about the community and assessing its relevance to a potential CED initiative. The organizer, through her contact with community members, began a process of testing for community interest in CED.

Information gathering was done in a variety of ways. The most important method was talking to people in the community about their perceptions of Mount Pleasant (e.g., its strengths and resources and the potential barriers to CED). This procedure of information gathering started with Advisory Committee members and then extended to others referred by Advisory Committee members. Information was also obtained from relevant documents including community newspapers, Planning Department documents, a survey
undertaken by the MPNA, and a listing of community services and agencies.

The Advisory Committee was a rich source of information about the community and directed the organizer to potential resources. Committee meetings were a valuable forum for discussing project ideas and assessing potential obstacles to CED.

During this stage, the organizer was also testing the community for interest in CED. People were asked about their own interest in CED and about others who might have interest in CED. In addition, the organizer attended meetings of key community organizations (including the MPNA, the Mount Pleasant Business Association (MPBA), and the Mount Pleasant Citizens' Planning Committee). At these meetings, she generally gave a brief presentation about CED and expressed the hope of finding people interested in becoming involved in a CED initiative. At a meeting of the MPNA, she circulated a sign-up sheet for interested people which resulted in a list of four names.

Assessing the relevance of all the information gathered was a more complex process. Various community assessment approaches were reviewed and the organizer developed a list of dimensions that were important to consider (e.g.,
history, physical characteristics, demographic information, social/economic issues, organizational infrastructure, and peoples' perceptions of the community) in an assessment of the community.

This assessment was done in a number of ways. Gathering information from a range of sources allowed the organizer to compare and interpret the information. For example, several people referred to a previous attempt at organizing CED. About one year earlier, a workshop on CED was organized with about 12 to 15 people in attendance. The workshop was to be followed by a series of three films shown on subsequent evenings at the Neighbourhood House. While the workshop seemed to generate considerable interest and led to a number of project ideas, the attendance was low for the films and the third showing was cancelled. When this information was originally shared with the organizer by the Executive Director of the Neighbourhood House, it was presented as evidence of a lack of community interest in CED. However, after talking to other people, it emerged that people had not lost their excitement about the project ideas that came up at the workshop.

When all of the information related to history, physical characteristics, demographics, social and economic problems, organizational infrastructure, and peoples' perceptions of
the community was put together, a picture began to emerge of the factors that contribute to community readiness for CED as well as some potential obstacles to CED.

Guiding Values and Beliefs and Roles of the Organizer
The major role during this stage was that of researcher, (gathering, interpreting and analyzing information). The organizer also acted as a catalyst by encouraging people's interest and involvement in CED. The values that guided the organizer were a belief in human potential and in the community's capacity for change. The existing strengths and capacities of the community were recognized.

Roles of Other Key Participants
The Advisory Committee played a key resource role in this stage by contributing information about the community and giving the organizer referrals to other potential information resources. In addition, the Committee played an important role in contributing to the analysis of Mount Pleasant's readiness for CED through discussion focusing on the strengths and resources of the community and the potential obstacles to CED.
Factors Contributing to Community Readiness

The major factors contributing to readiness for CED are a sense of community, organizational capacity to respond to emerging community needs, and a receptivity to change.

A Sense of Community

A sense of community is important because without it, there is a lack of collective will to address problems and develop goals and strategies for change.

Chapter Two discusses the various connotations of community. While the geographical community of Mount Pleasant is the context for this research, the organizer hoped to determine to what extent "a sense of community" existed within Mount Pleasant’s geographical boundaries. In order to achieve a "sense of community" certain principles, such as inclusiveness, commitment, consensus, and self-awareness, need to be practised.

Inclusiveness is an important indicator of a sense of community, as was noted in Chapter Two. The organizer found evidence of efforts to include both newcomers in the community as well as a readiness to include ethnic communities in broader neighbourhood initiatives. Neighbourhood organizations such as the Neighbourhood House and the MPNA were making conscious efforts to include both
newcomers and people of diverse ethnic backgrounds in their membership and activities. English as a Second Language programs were offered by the Neighbourhood House along with programs which targeted specific ethnic communities (e.g., Spanish-speaking, Korean). The Neighbourhood House was a place of connection for many people new to both the community and to Canada. Although the MPNA did not have representation from many of the ethnic groups in the community, this was stated to be a concern on several occasions and was something the Association was working on.

A tangible expression of "a sense of community" is the extent to which people will become involved in community activities. A neighbourhood survey, undertaken by the MPNA in 1985, dealt with a number of issues of concern by Mount Pleasant residents. One section of the final report of the survey was entitled "sense of community" and had responses to a number of questions about how well people knew their neighbours and their sense of belonging or identity with the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood. One of the report's conclusions was that "the better residents knew their neighbours, the more likely they were to feel a sense of belonging or identity with Mount Pleasant." Of those who said they knew some of the people on their block or in their building "very well," nearly eighty per cent (80%) also indicated they felt a sense of belonging or identity with
the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood. However, those who answered "not too well" and "not at all" felt a sense of community only 38% and 19% of the time respectively. The report concludes that this:

demonstrates the essential importance in community organizing of building networks among the residents of the community. Only by pulling together and organizing around matters of concern can effective change be realized and can improvements be made to a community. What feeling a sense of community is about is residents coming to realize that they have common interests and concerns which revolve around the community and putting aside whatever other differences may exist to work together for these common goals.

Evidence of a community commitment to organizing around matters of concern was demonstrated by residents’ commitment of time to specific community issues and by the large number of community meetings being held. In virtually every meeting the organizer attended, there was a focus on addressing community problems or on planning activities to revitalize the community. The Citizens’ Planning Committee, which focused on the Community Development Plan, struck a number of task forces to deal with safety issues, traffic, etc. The level of citizen involvement in the process was growing.

The quality of the meetings also gave the impression of a dynamic and involved community. Residents showed energy and commitment to action and pride in their community. The favourable aspects of the community, such as its valuable
heritage and its vibrant artistic community, were often highlighted.

Commitment to community was also shown by the residents' interest in their own neighbourhoods. After several years of inactivity, the MPNA was undergoing a period of renewal and growth. In addition to involvement on the MPNA board, members were meeting on a neighbourhood basis to deal with specific neighbourhood issues. One long-time resident observed that "I have been a resident for 35 years and I've never seen Mount Pleasant as active as it is now."

Consensual methods of decision-making are also an important component of community as was indicated in Chapter Two. Many instances of consensual and inclusive methods of participation and decision-making were observed by the organizer. For example, at one meeting of the MPNA, the larger group broke into smaller neighbourhood sections to allow people who had not spoken in the larger group an opportunity to speak with their neighbours. This was an effective way of encouraging everyone to have input into the discussion. Many of the community meetings were informal, allowing people to feel welcome and comfortable in sharing their ideas and perspectives. While the organizer did not attend enough community meetings to determine whether consensus decision-making was the norm, at the few meetings
she did attend, she observed attempts to make decisions by consensus rather than by majority rule and to ensure people felt included in the decision-making process.

Another aspect of true community is its capacity to know itself.

Among the reasons that a community is humble and hence realistic is that it is contemplative. It examines itself. It is self-aware. It knows itself (Peck 1987, 65).

If Mount Pleasant was anything, it was a community looking at itself. It was looking at itself from many angles. It was looking at what it once was. There was strong awareness of Mount Pleasant’s history (a history of the community had been prepared by a local resident and an historical society had formed to protect and promote Mount Pleasant’s heritage).

Mount Pleasant was also looking at what it had become. Community members were very aware of Mount Pleasant’s social and economic problems and many were actively engaged in addressing these problems. In addition to the Community Development Plan, which was initiated out of residents’ concerns about the deterioration of the community, people were coming together through many different means to share their perceptions of problems and to work together for solutions. Just prior to the organizer’s involvement in Mount Pleasant, a community meeting was held with the Mayor
of Vancouver and the area’s MLA. The Mount Pleasant Action Group presented a report which identified an Action Plan for the community. It described Mount Pleasant as "exciting and vital as it is diverse. Within its boundaries one will find the best that city living has to offer as well as the very worst. It is neither homogenous nor boring."

Lastly, Mount Pleasant was looking at what it was becoming: a place for arts and a community which could acknowledge and celebrate the diversity of cultures contained within its boundaries. It was also becoming a home for many new immigrants to Canada and a community which valued its history. Organizations such as the Native Education Centre, the Fringe Festival, and the Mount Pleasant Heritage Conservation Society were examples of the new and emerging face of Mount Pleasant.

A sense of community is not an end point. It is something that a community continually struggles with and builds. Mount Pleasant strived to apply the principles of inclusiveness, commitment, consensus, and self-awareness discussed above.

Organizational Capacity

Organizational capacity represents a community’s ability to respond to issues and develop strategies for change.
Community organizations provide the infrastructure required for achieving goals. As Zald suggests, "organizations come into being to pursue collective ends" (1979, 240). The organizer's task was to determine which organizations had the potential to either play a leadership role in CED or to support a CED initiative.

While the evidence suggests a rich variety of community organizations, it was unclear whether these organizations had the capacity to deal with complex issues and to work cooperatively towards common objectives. Some organizations, such as the MPNA were undergoing a revitalization and new leadership was emerging. Other organizations were being formed to address particular needs and interests. The Fringe Festival had been recently organized to promote and celebrate the performing arts and the Mount Pleasant Heritage Conservation Society was developed to preserve the heritage of the community.

An unpublished report (author believed to be the Vancouver Planning Department) entitled "Mount Pleasant: A Social Action Plan" inventories community resources, trends, and social problems. It identifies a key problem as a lack of community organization or leadership in Mount Pleasant. Mount Pleasant lacks one central facility or staff responsible for co-ordination of services, it lacks any one identifiable political leader and lacks full co-operation between community organizations.
Nevertheless, the organizer identified several organizations which might be potential sources of leadership and support for CED. These included neighbourhood organizations (in particular the MPNA and perhaps the Neighbourhood House), the Mount Pleasant Business Association, key organizations in the co-operative sector (including housing co-ops and credit unions), and the community college. Although CED was not an explicit mandate of any one organization, there was evidence that these organizations supported CED.

Some of the residents of the community, who were part of MPNA, indicated interest in CED. In addition, the organization was concerned with both the social and economic development of the community. Furthermore, the President had expressed strong interest in CED.

The Neighbourhood House had agreed to sponsor the film series on CED which was cancelled after two evenings. The Executive Director had indicated he had "done a lot of research on CED and has attended meetings." He suggested there has been "too much discussion about CED by professionals" and not enough action. He believed that the people who need CED were not involved and expressed concern about targeting efforts at particular groups in the community because it might leave out other groups who could
benefit. However, he offered himself as a resource to any organizing activities.

The Mount Pleasant Business Association (MPBA) was strongly focused on 'Main Street' revitalization efforts and on supporting the existing business community. Some of its members expressed interest in CED after a presentation made by the organizer.

The co-operative sector in the community was represented by a number of housing co-operatives, several credit unions, and an arts co-operative. There was a perception by some residents that the housing co-ops were not "part of the community"; their interest and capacity to participate in broad community initiatives was not clear. Two credit unions in Mount Pleasant had expressed interest in CED. They were the Mount Pleasant Credit Union, which primarily served the residents and businesses of Mount Pleasant, and the CCEC Credit Union, which had a city-wide clientele and an explicit mandate to support CED. No investigation of the arts co-op was undertaken.

The Vancouver Community College was another potential resource for CED. One of the members of the Business Faculty (who was represented on the Advisory Committee) had
shown strong interest in CED and expressed a willingness to
offer relevant courses or training pertaining to CED.

Out of this assessment a number of organizations were
identified with the potential to play a role in a future CED
initiative.

Receptivity to Change
Receptivity to change was an important factor in determining
readiness for CED because CED represents a major change in
the power relationships in a community and is likely to be
resisted by those holding current economic power and also by
those who could potentially benefit from CED. Wharf notes
that "the more widespread, the more unsettling, the more
radical the change, the more intensely it will be resisted" (1979, 18). Furthermore, he suggests that because change
will likely to be resisted by some community members, "those
interested in change must, therefore, undertake a systematic
analysis in order to ascertain whether those affected by the
change will accept or resist it" (19).

Much of the evidence presented thus far suggests a
receptivity within the community to addressing current
social and economic problems, an important beginning for
CED. In addition, the interest in CED, itself, has been
discussed. Key organizations and individual members of the
community were strongly supportive of CED. Whether this receptivity to CED extended to those holding current economic power or to those most affected, was more difficult to ascertain. Because CED can be seen as marginal to the larger sphere of economic activity, it is not likely to be perceived as a major threat until it displaces other, more conventional strategies. In many respects, CED could benefit the conventional business community, which consists mainly of individually-owned businesses. For example, strategies such as the encouragement of residents to "buy locally" and support these businesses, would likely to be supported by the local business community.

Although there appeared to be general receptivity to CED, the receptivity of those most likely to benefit from CED merits some examination. In addition to the support of existing small businesses, CED strategies focus on the development of enterprises and employment for members of the community. The local unemployed population is obviously a target for CED initiatives. A potential lack of receptivity to CED of those who are currently unemployed was discussed by the Advisory Committee. At one meeting, a member of the Advisory Committee acknowledged that "the current system locks people into their present situation (e.g., it provides no motivation to get new skills, be innovative, start businesses, etc.). People who are in the welfare and
unemployment insurance systems lose their motivation to fight the injustices of the system and they lose the motivation to work." While it is unlikely that those who are unemployed would resist CED, existing structural disincentives need to be considered in examining the receptivity of the unemployed to becoming involved in CED initiatives. These structural disincentives are discussed further in the section dealing with obstacles to CED.

**Potential Obstacles to CED**

Potential obstacles to CED organization include: community alienation; community instability; and, structural disincentives to CED involvement.

*Community Alienation*

Alienation is characterized by indifference, estrangement, withdrawal and isolation. It can act as an obstacle to CED in two ways. First, the feeling of estrangement can contribute to apathy and hopelessness on the part of community members which can make it difficult to mobilize them for action. Second, CED requires resources, both from the community and from those outside of the community. Community members who are indifferent or who feel estranged from the community are not likely to perceive themselves as being resources for CED. Moreover, isolation from the dominant sources of power increases the difficulty in
obtaining needed outside resources. This is further compounded by competition within communities for scarce resources.

Strong feelings of alienation and isolation do exist in Mount Pleasant. They are a result of long years of perceived neglect by City Hall and a perception by many residents that Mount Pleasant has become a "dumping ground" for other communities' problems. These perceptions are not ungrounded. Until the Local Area Planning Office was established in Mount Pleasant, few city resources went to the community. Moreover, compared to other neighbourhoods, Mount Pleasant has fewer amenities such as parks and recreational facilities (next to Grandview-Woodlands, it has the lowest number of parks) and the community has been allowed to deteriorate physically.

The perception of Mount Pleasant as a dumping ground for problems in other parts of the City was fuelled by the emergence of street prostitution in Mount Pleasant. The report of the Mount Pleasant Action Group's presentation to Mayor Harcourt on September 3, 1986 stated that:

Up until 1984 street prostitution was not a problem in Mount Pleasant. The residential nature of the community made it an unnatural location for street prostitution and related activities to develop. The problem was moved to Mount Pleasant. Attorney-General Brian Smith obtained an injunction prohibiting street prostitution in the West End due to the intolerable impacts in that community. When the same intolerable
impacts manifested themselves in Mount Pleasant, Mr. Smith refused to apply for a similar injunction for fear of moving the problem to yet another residential community. Thus, the provincial government endorsed the use of Mount Pleasant for street prostitutes, pimps, johns and drug dealers. During this period of official encouragement, street prostitution became endemic in our community and a rapid deterioration in the quality of life ensued.

As a result of residents demanding that City Hall address this issue, much attention was finally focused on Mount Pleasant and residents began to get involved in addressing the problems Mount Pleasant was facing. Nevertheless, the continuing apathy of some residents, combined with a lack of community resources, still contributes to strong feelings of community alienation.

Community Instability
Community instability, caused by a transient population, is another potential obstacle to CED. First, a high degree of transience implies that a substantial portion of the population lacks a commitment to the community. Commitment has already been discussed as a contributor to a sense of community and ultimately, to community readiness for CED. Furthermore, it can be speculated that those most likely to benefit from CED (i.e., the unemployed and poor members of the community) may be the most transient. Another serious problem associated with a transient population is the
difficulty this poses in cultivating leadership within the community.

The profile of Mount Pleasant provided in Chapter Two identified the degree of transience within Mount Pleasant's population. Under 30% of Mount Pleasant's population has lived in the same location for five years or more. The March 1987 Draft Community Development Plan for Mount Pleasant (35-6) identifies two factors which account for Mount Pleasant's high level of transience. The first is that Mount Pleasant has some of the lowest priced rental accommodation in the City which "attracts individuals and families on unemployment and welfare as well as first time workers and young couples just starting out" as well as many immigrants and new arrivals to the City. The second important factor which contributes to transiency is the "physical image of the community." The report explains that as people become better acquainted with their neighbourhood and other communities in the City (and make a comparison of amenities, such as parks, shopping and recreational services) they may make the decision to move once they obtain work or are able to increase their income.

The Community Development Worker maintained that, until the population of Mount Pleasant became more stable, the chance of succeeding with a CED initiative was small. For CED to
become a strategy of significance within Mount Pleasant, a strong commitment by residents is needed to develop and implement strategies over a long-term. This demands a significant commitment of time and energy from more than a just a few keen community members. It needs strong community leadership and perseverance which necessitates a certain level of stability in the resident population.

**Structural Disincentives to CED Involvement**
As referred to in the discussion of receptivity, structural disincentives to CED are found in the existing income security systems of social assistance and unemployment insurance. As was noted earlier, these systems reinforce dependency by building in disincentives to participation in community development initiatives, certain training programs and self-employment and business development initiatives. For example, despite the relatively low income people receive through welfare benefits, such benefits often include health care coverage and other non-monetary benefits (e.g., prescription drugs). Working for low wages is a disincentive for many people because they may stand to lose the non-monetary benefits of the welfare system without gaining significantly (if at all) in monetary terms. Furthermore, recipients may fear that if they become involved in business development initiatives, they risk
losing benefits. This risk is not acceptable to many people, particularly those with families to support.

"Unemployment and low incomes are often cited as the underlying nemesis for the community" (MPCPC 1987, 39). The demographic information in Chapter Two pointed to the relatively high levels of dependency of Mount Pleasant residents on government transfer payments such as provincial social assistance and disability pensions. Furthermore, as discussed in the section on receptivity, the Advisory Committee was aware of these potential obstacles. At a meeting of the Committee, one of the Advisors warned the organizer of the importance of being "aware of the political and structural obstacles to CED. He said that 36% of Mount Pleasant’s population is receiving income assistance. These people are not likely to respond to CED... [it is] too costly for them and too risky."

At the Mayor’s Workshop referred to earlier, Mayor Harcourt suggested that economic development at a neighbourhood level would be a tough venture. The Mayor said that local economics are so interrelated to regional, provincial and federal patterns. He noted that the City of Vancouver Economic Development Office employs six people who spend most of their time assisting business and industry and, while over 44,000 jobs had been created in the region (not
including Expo), unemployment remained high in a community like Mount Pleasant (meeting minutes).

Although unemployment is frequently the catalyst for CED, the challenge of involving those affected by unemployment remains an important issue to be addressed. Although this issue was acknowledged, it was not resolved. However, a sensitivity to the structural disincentives to involvement in CED can influence the development of specific approaches to CED.

This discussion can be concluded with the observation that, while obstacles to CED do exist, the recognition of these obstacles needs to be weighed against the factors which contribute to readiness for CED. Given the information which was available to the organizer and the organizer’s assessment of this information, it was determined that, on the whole, Mount Pleasant was "ready" for CED. The next step was determining a development strategy which was appropriate for the community.

The Importance of Assessing Community Readiness in Organizing CED

Assessing community readiness is an important step in organizing CED. In addition to determining the strengths and resources of the community with respect to CED, an assessment of readiness will identify the factors which can
block CED initiatives. It is important to anticipate the potential obstacles to CED so that they might be addressed. Moreover, this assessment might conclude that CED is not likely to succeed and will help prevent fruitless efforts.

STAGE 3: DETERMINING A DEVELOPMENT APPROACH

A critical issue in determining a development approach for CED is in deciding whether to target particular aspects of the community or to consider the community as a whole as a focus for the development of CED initiatives. This decision circumscribes the subsequent choice of CED organizing strategies. This section briefly describes the major activities of this third stage of organizing CED, outlines the roles of both organizer and key participants and discusses the factors to be considered in choosing a development approach. Lastly, it discusses the importance of determining a development approach to the organizing process.

Major Activities
The major activity focus in this stage was the organizer’s contact with specific segments of the community (e.g., neighbourhood organizations, co-operatives, business, the arts community), general community outreach and education, and the formulation of a plan of action.
Contact with specific segments of the community was undertaken to determine their interest in CED (this was described in the previous section). This assessment, which occurred in the previous stage, led to a conclusion that interest in CED existed in many parts of the community. Yet, no apparent or specific development opportunities presented themselves (i.e., a group indicating interest in providing direct leadership for an initiative). Furthermore, in a conversation with the Executive Director of the Neigbbourhood House, a concern was expressed about employing a strategy which would target particular segments of the community.

Community outreach and education continued in this stage with community presentations and meetings. In addition, the organizer contacted the local media and arranged for an newspaper article on CED (see Appendix VI). An article was published in December 1986, inviting community participation in a CED process.

An Advisory Committee meeting focused on the question of whether to focus on a particular aspect of the community or to initiate a process involving interested residents. Consensus was that the approach should be focused around those who had most interest in CED.
The organizer agreed to develop a strategy for discussion with the Advisory Committee. This strategy was presented to the Committee in early January 1987. The strategy outlined a number of objectives, actions and a timeline. The four objectives were to: 1) Identify potential resource people for CED project; 2) Recruit and organize local CED Committee; 3) Facilitate committee’s identification of mandate, goals, and objectives; and 4) Facilitate committee movement toward plans and strategies for specific CED ‘projects.’ Essentially, this strategy focused on identifying interested people from the broader community and recruiting their involvement in an ongoing CED initiative.

Guiding Values and Beliefs and Roles of the Organizer
The major roles of the organizer were to identify and analyze the development options, to advocate CED, and to develop a specific plan of action. In undertaking these roles, the organizer was guided by a recognition of the socio-political context (i.e., where the readiness for CED originated) and a belief in the capacity to ameliorate conditions within the community.

Roles of Other Key Participants
The Director of the Neighbourhood House acted as a catalyst for raising the issue of appropriate development strategies. The Advisory Committee acted as a sounding board for the
organizer, helping to clarify and discuss the development options.

**Factors in Determining a Development Approach**

Community interest is a major factor in determining a development approach. The role of the organizer is to uncover this interest and to encourage it. The organizer cannot easily create interest that does not exist.

The difficulty with targeting a specific organization for CED is that organizations come into being to pursue their own purposes and are usually focused on activities which relate to these purposes. Targeting a specific group or even segment of the population could be seen as an imposition of the organizer’s agenda.

On the other hand, several individuals within the community had expressed interest in CED. In addition, the organizer had already identified potential leadership and resources from specific organizations and institutions. A strategy focused on bringing together residents and group representatives would not be imposing an agenda. It would be facilitating a process for which they had expressed interest.
In the discussion on initiated community action (in Chapter Two), Poplin maintains that broad community participation is desirable. Inclusive participation is a key principle and characteristic of CED; therefore, efforts should be made to choose an approach which is consistent with CED principles.

The Importance of Determining a Developmental Approach in Organizing CED

Developing a strategy or a plan of action is a critical stage in the process of organizing CED. This stage provides the link between analysis and action. It is critical because it forces careful consideration of the options for action and emphasizes a deliberate and planned strategy. This facilitates later assessment of the effectiveness of the strategy.

STAGE 4: CULTIVATING LEADERSHIP

Critical issues in cultivating leadership include finding community members who are interested in becoming involved, sustaining their involvement and assisting them to assume leadership roles and responsibilities. This section describes the major activities of this fourth stage of organizing CED, outlines the roles of both organizer and key participants and discusses the factors in cultivating leadership. Lastly, it discusses the importance of cultivating leadership to organizing CED.
Major Activities

The major activities related to cultivating leadership included the recruitment of participants for a CED initiative, the organizing of a meeting for interested residents, and, once an initiating group was established, to support and encourage leadership roles within the initiating group.

The recruitment process began by identifying people who might have interest in CED. This was facilitated by the referrals from Advisory Committee members. Another method of identifying people interested in CED was through the community meetings attended by the organizer. Noticing who asked questions or expressed interest and then pursuing individual conversations with these people was part of this strategy. Finally, as has already been noted, a sign-up sheet was used at one meeting to identify people with CED interest.

Recruiting participants for a CED initiative involved arranging a meeting for community members who had expressed interest in CED. Developing a list of potential invitees was part of the meeting strategy. The invitation list included those who had expressed interest or who had been referred by others. These people were phoned and personally invited to the meeting which was to be held the first week
of February, 1987. They were also encouraged to invite others they thought might be interested. A meeting date and location was established with a careful consideration of important factors (e.g., convenience, accessibility, etc.). A plan for the meeting was developed in consultation with Advisory Committee members. The meeting was carefully planned to encourage participation, facilitate the expression of interest and ideas and to obtain a commitment for a follow-up meeting.

At the first meeting of the group of interested residents, the organizer encouraged meeting participants to share information about themselves, their current involvement in the community and their interest and involvement (if any) in CED. This enabled the seven group participants to get to know each other and quickly established their common interest in CED involvement and facilitated a discussion of specific project ideas of interest to the participants. This led to a decision to meet within a week’s time to discuss the formation of an ongoing group to address CED.

At the second meeting, the organizer encouraged a group member to facilitate the meeting which allowed the organizer to concentrate on recording the minutes of the meeting. Thereafter, the group assumed responsibility for meeting facilitation, rotating the responsibility among a few
members. Group members also took responsibility for booking meeting rooms, contacting potential resource people and inviting other community members to attend meetings.

The organizer also tried to encourage the group to take responsibility for the overall direction of the process and meetings. However, suggestions were made by the organizer from time to time about key issues for discussion.

Guiding Values and Beliefs and Roles of the Organizer
The organizer guided the process by identifying and recruiting potential participants and planning and facilitating the initial meeting of interested residents. However, an enabling role was also critical; facilitating and encouraging group members to take responsibility for the direction of the group was an important part of the enabling role. These roles were guided by the organizer’s belief in the capacity of individuals and an active self-awareness of her role in relation to the emerging group.

Roles of Other Key Participants
The Advisory Committee acted as a resource by facilitating the organizer’s contact with potential participants. In addition, the Committee helped the organizer to develop an effective meeting strategy. Group members assumed
responsibility for meeting arrangements, facilitation, and resource people.

Factors in Cultivating Leadership
The major factors in cultivating leadership include: identifying leadership potential, recruiting participants, and encouraging leadership roles.

Cultivating leadership occurs from the outset of the organizing process. The organizer is always on the lookout for potential leaders and participants. A first step is identifying leadership potential. In this project, the organizer attempted to identify potential participants early in the process. Ross indicates that potential leaders can be found in both formal groupings within the community, and within informal groupings which he suggests are "far more difficult to identify" yet are as important (1967, 169). In this case, potential leaders were identified primarily from formal groupings although several people were identified informally by other residents.

Once potential leaders are identified, they need to be recruited. Generally, this involves finding community members who are interested in CED and encouraging their involvement in the organizing activity. The process of
recruitment used in this study was explained in the previous section.

The third factor in cultivating leadership has to do with encouraging leadership within the group of existing participants. As Ross notes, leadership "is a complex role with a multiplicity of functions . . . . [and] while there may be one central figure, there are actually many persons contributing to the leadership of the group" (1967, 193).

Given the principles and characteristics of CED (which encourage inclusive participation and empowerment), leadership roles can be, and should be, shared among group members. The organizer, especially when the group is getting established, can help to facilitate leadership behaviour and shared responsibility for the functioning of the group.

**Cultivating Leadership as a Key Step in Organizing CED**

Cultivating leadership is a key stage of the organizing process. As discussed, leadership refers to roles and responsibilities assumed by community members rather than as an inherent attribute of one or two people. Without people who can provide community leadership for an initiative, it cannot succeed. CED is not something that can be directed from outside of the community; the community, itself, must assume this responsibility.
The critical issues in developing an organizational base are developing group identity, mandate, and an organizational structure. Once indigenous leadership and an organizational base has been created, the involvement of an outsider organizer can cease. The formation of an organization is an important outcome of the organizing activity. This section briefly describes the major activities of this fifth and final stage of organizing CED, outlines the roles of both organizer and key participants and discusses the factors in developing an organizational base. Lastly, it addresses the importance of developing an organizational base to organizing CED.

Major Activities
The major activities in this stage of the process were meetings with the initiating group focusing on the development of a group mission and goals, the selection of a name, and the discussion of membership criteria and organizational structure.

In this final stage in the process of organizing CED, six additional meetings of the initiating group were held. During this period, from February to April 1987, the group moved from being a number of individuals interested in CED
to an organized group with an identity and mission. It
selected a name and agreed upon a mission statement. The
name chosen was the "Association for Mount Pleasant Economic
Renewal" (AMPER) and its mission was: "To Advance Mount
Pleasant’s Economic Renewal, through developing and
assisting projects which provide sustainable local
enterprise and employment, and encourage a sense of
community."

The meetings focused on identifying a mission and goals for
the organization, discussing specific project ideas,
identifying a long-range vision, and examining appropriate
organizational models for CED. While some additional
members joined the group over this period, the focus was on
developing an identity and focus for the group, not on
membership expansion.

In the course of the group’s deliberations about mission and
goals it referred to information about existing CED projects
and used some outside resources (e.g., representatives of
CED projects). In addition, the group invited two of these
resource people to meetings to assist with specific areas of
concern (i.e., goal development, project development, and
structural models).
Guiding Values and Beliefs and Roles of the Organizer

The organizer helped to guide the process of organization and enabled the group to find its own identity and mission. The organizer also acted as a technical expert, providing information and resources about CED. The organizer was guided by a belief in group capacity and consensus approaches to decision-making and a respect for the group’s self-determination.

Roles of Other Key Participants

The Advisory Committee acted as a sounding board to the organizer and a resource. The initiating group (AMPER) members facilitated meetings, sought out resources and generated project ideas and much discussion.

Key Factors in Developing an Organizational Base

The key factors in developing an organizational base include: establishing group identity, defining a mandate; and determining an organizational structure.

Establishing a group identity has both internal and external components. Internal components include: choosing a name, defining group rules and norms (e.g., decision-making methods) and agreeing on membership criteria. External components include resolving issues of autonomy vs.
affiliation and other matters concerning the group’s relations with the broader community.

One of the first issues that arose with respect to group identity was the issue of whether the core group should seek affiliation with an existing organization (e.g., the MPNA) or remain autonomous. This was discussed at the group’s second meeting; one participant expressed concern that this group may risk being "swallowed up" by another organization if it were to affiliate. It was agreed to maintain the autonomy of the group and not seek affiliation.

A second issue, which took several meetings to resolve, was that of a name. After several sessions of brainstorming alternative names one was finally chosen that met with most members’ approval. However, even after a decision was made to call the group AMPER (Association for Mount Pleasant Economic Renewal), one member at a later meeting asked to reconsider the name. After further consideration it was decided to adhere to the original decision.

Issues with respect to membership emerged. Expanding the group’s membership base was discussed. Seven people other than the organizer attended the first meeting. Of those, four attended the second meeting. One or two new people attended each subsequent meeting. Although almost every
meeting saw new people join, the major focus was not on expansion but on consolidation. Another issue that arose with respect to membership was whether agency representatives should be targeted for membership. Although there was interest in having a few representatives of other organizations as members, it was agreed that the membership of AMPER should be primarily resident-based as opposed to consisting of organizational representatives.

Defining a mandate has several components including determining the major problem being addressed, developing a long-term vision, specifying a mission and goals, and considering specific project activities.

At the group’s first meeting, one of the participants suggested that the group needs to define the problem that it hopes to address. After some discussion the following problems emerged: unemployment, high transiency, poor shopping, money leaving the community, infrastructural and transit problems.

The second meeting began to address goals for the group. These preliminary goals were identified: provision of local employment, being political neutral, identifying the appropriate resources, and using local resources whenever
possible. The idea of using the Brewery Creek site for potential CED activity was also discussed.

The third meeting addressed the issue of mission and goals somewhat more systematically. A number of elements important to CED in Mount Pleasant were identified. The group then decided which of these elements should have the most emphasis. These were then integrated into the draft mission statement which was eventually adopted with minor changes.

The goal development process undertaken helped the group to develop a long-range vision. A group visualization exercise which occurred at a workshop facilitated by an outside resource person also helped in developing a vision. The facilitator asked the group to visualize where it would be in two years time (group members were encouraged to picture its location, activities and who would be involved).

Project ideas emerged in the course of discussions. They ranged from small business development (e.g., hardware store) to ideas for integrated projects combining service provision and training (e.g., providing child care services, English as a Second Language training, and training of home care providers). Interest in the development of a local exchange trading system was also expressed.
Determining an organizational structure for CED involves determining an organizational structure which is congruent with the group’s mandate. The decision to develop a separate organization to explore and promote CED was the first step. Resource people were invited to group meetings on two occasions to discuss organizational structure and models. A representative of the Downtown Eastside Economic Development Society (DEEDS) attended two meetings. At one meeting he outlined DEEDS organizational structure and described the process that DEEDS had undergone in developing its organization. A workshop was facilitated by a representative of WomenSkills Development Society at which several organizational models for CED were discussed. Two models were described in detail: the community development corporation and the community enterprise model.

The issue of organizational structure was addressed but not resolved during the period of this study. One group member expressed his view that AMPER could function as a coordinating body to facilitate the development of projects and businesses. While this view was similar to the view of other members, the issue of organizational structure required further exploration and deliberation.
The Importance of Developing an Organizational Base in Organizing CED

As a community-controlled activity directed towards community self-reliance, CED needs an organizational base within the community. An organization provides the capacity for a community to explore CED and develop specific CED initiatives. Developing an organizational base is the outcome of a process of organizing and is, thus, a key element in the organizing process.

SUMMARY

The process of organizing CED is a complex process. Although presented here as a series of stages, the process is far from being linear. While each of the stages addresses particular issues, these issues are not always completely resolved before the next stage in the process occurs.

The role of the organizer varied according to the stage of the process and the changing context of the process. A multiplicity of roles (i.e., guide, enabler, researcher, advocate, analyst, planner, and technical expert) is needed to respond effectively to the evolving context and to affect change within the community. The specific roles of the organizer are guided by values and beliefs concerning individual, group, and community capacity, the importance of
change and a respect for group and community self-determination. Underpinning all of these values and beliefs are the values of human dignity, social justice and equity -- fundamental values of social work.

The fifth and final chapter discusses the key findings and implications of this study and suggests a number of questions for further research.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter reviews and discusses the chief findings of this study. It addresses the limitations and contributions of this research and identifies questions for further research.

KEY FINDINGS

This study proposes a framework for organizing CED. The framework identifies organizing as a process consisting of five stages and identifies, for each stage, the major activities and the critical factors for accomplishing its objectives. Each of these stages was found to be essential to the overall organizing process which culminated in the development of an organizational base for CED within Mount Pleasant.

Critical to the understanding of organizing that emerged from this research is that organizing is not just a technical process. Organizing is a process of relationship building. And relationships are the building blocks of community. Effective organizing consciously brings together both the process elements of relationship building and the
technical aspects of meeting organization and facilitation, planning, research and analysis, and public relations.

Furthermore, the values and beliefs of the organizer act as a lens through which the organizer both reflects and acts. The values and principles of CED can serve as a guide to CED organizers. The principles of CED (an integrated approach to development, a broader definition of economic productivity, inclusive participation, the use of democratic processes and structures, a focus on building community self-reliance and capacity, and an emphasis on building community), ideally, should be explicit in the organizing process.

This study attempted to understand how the values and beliefs of the organizer helped to shape the process of community organization. The values and beliefs which underlie the activities, roles and functions of the organizer at each stage of the process are identified (see Table 4, page 96). Values and beliefs were a critical part of the context that helped to shape the community organization process in this study. The organizer’s awareness of the values and beliefs which exemplified "the CED approach to development" as distinct from more conventional forms of both social and economic development influenced the organization process.
The intervention process was another research issue identified at the outset. This study delineated the role of the organizer in each stage of the process. It found that the role of organizer is critical to the process of organizing and further, that this role demands flexibility as the focus of the organizing effort changes over time. The role varies from that of guiding and enabling, to advocating and educating, to research and analysis, and serving as a catalyst and technical resource. In all of these roles, the fundamental principles of CED should be considered: the organizer’s role is an enabling and empowering one which seeks to encourage the involvement of community members in the process. Although the role of the organizer is important, even more essential is the active participation of the community from the outset. A key function of the organizer is to seek participation from the community and to cultivate leadership from within the community.

Secondly, the study attempted to assess the impact of the interventions on the process of organization. The study found that the organizer affected the process in several ways. The impetus for the project and its focus on community economic development came from the organizer’s own interest which meshed with the expressed needs of community members. The organizer, with advice and support from an
advisory committee, guided the overall process of exploring the conditions within the community, obtaining the perspectives of additional members of the community, and then functioning as an advocate and educator of CED. The organizer recruited and brought together a group of interested residents, and then provided facilitative and technical support, information and guidance to the group which enabled it to establish an identity and mission. The multiplicity of roles and functions performed by community organizers is noted in the literature.

The literature also points to the importance of the organizer's function of developing capacity and leadership within the group so that it can function without an outside organizer. Leadership in CED, as in any organizing process, is critical. CED principles of inclusive participation and consensus approaches to decision-making suggest an approach to leadership cultivation which focuses, not on the development of one or two leaders but, on fostering shared responsibility for the functioning and development of a group. Further, it recognizes the strengths of various members and empowers group members to take responsibility for various leadership functions of the organization. In this study, the organizer attempted to cultivate leadership by encouraging the group members to take responsibility for meeting facilitation, obtaining resource
people for meetings, inviting new people into the group and making contact with other organizations.

However, leadership development is a complex and not well understood process. The literature suggests that the transference of knowledge and skills between the organizer and potential leaders can be done through the organizer’s modelling and encouragement of leadership behaviour. Burghardt suggests that the development of critical consciousness is the ideal form of leadership development. At this stage of leadership development, community members develop, not only the capacity to perform organizing techniques, but have the capacity to engage in both critical reflection and action. The goal of this phase is to go beyond the ordinary definitions of leadership to reach "a collectively shared, mutually supported collective consciousness" (Burghardt 1982, 108).

The relationship between the organizer and the Advisory Committee exemplified the process of what Burghardt refers to as the development of collective consciousness where a mutual understanding of the problem and possible strategies for addressing the problem were developed over time through the sharing of personal perspectives and experiences. The project was an educational process for both the researcher and the Committee. In exploring issues together,
deeper understanding of the community and the complexity of its problems was achieved. The importance of this exploration was expressed by an Advisory Committee member in their evaluation of the project:

This has been a very significant contribution to Mount Pleasant even if it does not go any further, though I expect it will. It has helped to develop an awareness of local economic development both needed and possible both within the community and perhaps most important in relation to City Hall. It really has been an unexplored territory and this exploration has been both positive and enriching.

This notion of leadership is particularly relevant to CED. CED is much more than a technical process. The effective organization of CED requires what Burghardt calls "tactical self-awareness," where the organizer is simultaneously aware of both the psycho-social and socio-political contexts and can engage in simultaneous action and reflection. The development of critical consciousness goes hand in hand with the development of specific strategies. This process is obviously not a "cookie cutter" approach to organization. It demands that the organizer be fully engaged in the process and aware of the context.

Burghardt discusses the importance of both the psycho-social (interpersonal) and socio-political contexts in community organizing. He suggests that both dimensions of social work practice are relevant to community organization. Both the
The stages in the framework for community organizing explicitly recognize both the interpersonal and socio-political dimensions of the organizing process. The stages of "gaining legitimacy," "cultivating leadership," and "developing an organizational base," emphasize the interpersonal or process aspects of the organizing activity where the emphasis was on building relationships and developing individual and group capacity. The socio-political aspects are more apparent in the stages of "assessing community readiness," and "determining a development approach," where an awareness of socio-political factors such as the sense of community, the receptivity to change, the organizational capacity to respond to needs, the feelings of community alienation and the existence of structural disincentives to CED, were critical.

Both the process and task functions, and the interpersonal and socio-political contexts are woven together throughout the organizing process. An example of the use of both elements of context was in making a decision about whether to target a specific aspect of the community or to focus the organizing activity on the community as a whole. Both the analytical functions of the organizer (recognizing the
socio-political context) and the organizer's sensitivity to the interpersonal context were important considerations in making this decision. The analytical focus enabled the organizer to determine which aspects of the community were most "ready" for CED and the organizer's sensitivity to interpersonal dynamics helped her to see "who" was interested in becoming involved in this type of initiative.

LIMITATIONS

If a comparison can be made between the organizing framework developed in this study and the stages of initiated community action, the stages identified in this study may represent only the first two or three stages of Poplin's categorization of initiated community action (i.e., initial awareness of a community problem, the formation of an "initiating set" to begin action on the problem, and defining the goals and strategies of the action episode. The time constraints within this research did not permit the study of an entire "action episode" as defined in community action theory. Rather, the focus of this study was on the beginning stages of the organizing process.

However, the framework developed in this study does not fit neatly into Poplin's categorization of community action episodes. As discussed in Chapter Two, the focus of
initiated community action episodes is on achieving specific, concrete goals. This may account, in part, for the differences between the stages as identified in this research and the stages of initiated community action episodes. In community action episodes, once the goal is achieved, the "episode" comes to a conclusion. However, rather than focusing on the accomplishment of a concrete goal, the organizing process in this research was focused on organizing residents to develop strategies to enhance the social and economic well-being of their community. This is an ongoing process, rather than an episode.

The substantive context for this research may also help to account for the differences noted above. The stages described in this process focus on various activities and factors required in developing a strategy for CED (e.g., assessing community readiness, determining a development approach, cultivating leadership) in contrast to community action theory which attempts to increase understanding of the dynamics of change in a community. The organizing framework developed in this study attempts to integrate the substantive context (i.e., community economic development) into a general framework that could be applicable to varying contexts (e.g., the five stages as described could apply to other organizing activities such as the organizing of an election campaign or a labour union).
Another possible limitation of this research is its emphasis on values and beliefs without being able to objectively assess their applicability to the organizing process. The intangibility of values and beliefs means that they are open to potentially very different interpretation by different people. It is comparatively easier to assess the outcomes of activities. Assessing the values which underlie particular activities or approaches is much more difficult. Moreover, values and principles often do not lend themselves to an "either-or" situation. For example, if CED is a community building process, as is suggested, then the values of community that Scott Peck refers to (inclusiveness, consensus, commitment, and self-awareness) ought to be reflected in the process of organizing CED. Peck’s (1987, 62) definition of inclusiveness is not just about who is a part of the community; it is about accepting and welcoming the human differences that exist between people. While the composition of AMPER did not reflect the true diversity of the community in many respects (especially the ethnic and socio-economic composition), there was an attempt to listen to and appreciate the different perspectives that group members brought. Other values -- such as commitment, consensus and self-awareness -- are similar. The reality is that often there is a degree of inclusiveness, commitment, consensus or self-awareness; it is not an "either-or" situation.
The use of participant-observation as a key method of data collection is another possible limitation. The combined roles of researcher and organizer may contribute to an inherent bias in the research, particularly in those aspects of the research that are difficult to substantiate by outside sources (e.g., values and beliefs). However, this is offset to some degree by obtaining the perspectives of other participants (e.g., through the questionnaire administered to members of AMPER and to the Advisory Committee). In addition, key aspects of the process were documented in the minutes of meetings and practicum evaluation.

On the other hand, this method facilitated a conscious and self-aware approach to the process of organizing. As both participant and observer, or organizer and researcher -- a more reflective approach to organizing and a more practical approach to the research was undertaken.

QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study suggests a number of questions for further research. An important question is how applicable is this framework for organizing CED to other situations of CED organization and to other types of organizing? Key concepts
within this framework such as "gaining legitimacy" and "assessing readiness," which have not been explored in depth, should be examined for their applicability, to CED organizing, and other types of organizing. Are there other considerations needed to assess a community’s readiness for CED? And, if so, how can this assessment be made?

Further questions about the role of the organizer in developing leadership can be explored. For example, how broadly can the development of "critical consciousness" as a leadership development technique be applied? Is this approach to leadership development appropriate or possible in all communities? How can it be facilitated?

The relationship of CED principles to the process of organizing can also be explored further. How can CED organizing more consciously incorporate the principles of CED? What approaches can communities use in reaching consensus about the values that they will use in guiding CED activity?

CONTRIBUTION OF THIS RESEARCH

This research has attempted to examine a number of issues with respect to the organization of CED within an inner-city context. An important outcome of this study is the
development of a framework for organizing which can be applied in other contexts. This framework can be used as a tool for understanding the process of organizing, in relation to major stages of activity, key issues and critical factors within each stage, the role of organizer, and guiding beliefs and values. While the particular context will vary in other CED organization activities, this framework suggests a number of important themes and issues which have relevance for CED organization, and possibly for other types of organizing activity.

This research, in explicitly examining the values and beliefs which guided CED organization, has contributed to an awareness of the importance of values and beliefs in guiding CED activity. Values and beliefs are the lens through which we view the world and from which we act. Only by being conscious of our values and beliefs, can we be open to questioning them and to finding new ways of approaching the world. This has an implication for the education of CED practitioners and other community practitioners. In order to realize the overall objectives of CED, the principles of CED must be explicit. Education must emphasize values, not just techniques. The process of education for CED practitioners must encourage discussion of values and beliefs and encourage practitioners to be more consciously self-aware of their own values and beliefs.
So far, little research on CED has been conducted. What is missing from any of the research on CED is a discussion of the role of the organizer and the impact of the organizer on the process. This study has contributed to such a discussion, particularly with respect to the various roles and functions performed and the values and beliefs which guided the organizer.

Finally, understanding the process of change is critical. This is important to communities such as Mount Pleasant in which change is not only possible, it is necessary for their survival.

Active neighbourhoods are the living cells in society. If they fail to function, decay sets in. But when neighbourhoods come alive, society as a whole regains its nerve, and people dare to believe in their capacity to shape the future together" (Gibson 1992, 391-2).
EPILOGUE

The data collection portion of the research ended in April 1987. However, my involvement in AMPER continued at the invitation of the group.

The next several months were a busy period for AMPER. With the assistance of a doctoral student in social work, AMPER conducted a "goal identification exercise" in July 1987 which helped the group to define a set of goals and objectives. Specific strategies were identified in August 1987 and the group began to focus its attention on specific project ideas. In October 1987, AMPER conceived of a project idea to publish and broadly distribute a Community Resource Directory which would list key community services, agencies and local businesses. The group began to explore various funding possibilities and a proposal was developed and submitted in January 1988 to Employment and Immigration Canada (EIC) for a Section 38 grant.

AMPER also became involved in advocacy activities. In March 1987, it had written a letter of support to Vancouver City Council in support of a business incubator proposed by the Downtown Eastside Economic Development Society (DEEDS). In May 1987, it presented a brief on CED to the Mayor's Conference on Small Business.
During this period, AMPER also began to expand its contacts, both within Mount Pleasant, and within the broader "CED community." It liaised with community groups such as the Mount Pleasant Business Association, the Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood Association, the Fringe Festival, and other arts and heritage groups. It developed relationships with two local credit unions, both which sent representatives to AMPER meetings. It continued to liaise with the City of Vancouver Planning Office and Vancouver Community College. AMPER also made political contacts with the MLAs representing Mount Pleasant and with Carole Taylor, a member of City Council.

In November 1987, AMPER decided to become incorporated as a Society and began the process of developing by-laws and a constitution. This process continued throughout the spring and summer of 1988. AMPER eventually became incorporated as a Society in early 1989.

AMPER's application for a Section 38 grant was approved by EIC in the spring of 1988. This grant enabled AMPER to hire three workers and pay the expenses to undertake the research, design, compilation and distribution of a Community Resource Directory. AMPER rented an office near Main and 7th Avenue and the project commenced in May 1988. This project gave AMPER broad exposure within the community.
There was much support in the community for this project and many community members provided assistance. Likewise, AMPER attempted to involve many aspects of the community (e.g., arts, business, heritage) in this project. A decision was made to incorporate historical information and photographs of the early history of Mount Pleasant in the Directory and an art competition was held for the cover of the Directory. An awards jury, with representation from the local arts community, judged the many submissions received. AMPER decided to use a local printer for the Directory and other local businesses were also used in this project. AMPER explored the possibility of translating the Directory into other languages but was not able to find the necessary funding to do this.

The Directory was unique in highlighting both businesses and community services. 15,000 copies of the Community Resource Directory were printed and the Directory was distributed to every household and business in Mount Pleasant.

In January 1989, after this project was completed, the infrastructure (e.g., office, furniture, computer, etc.) could no longer be sustained. AMPER did not have an ongoing source of funding. Several project ideas and funding possibilities were explored; however no funding sources were found. Furthermore, AMPER began to lose steam after the
intense energy of its first project. The group agreed to take a break in the spring of 1989. I have not had any significant involvement in AMPER or in Mount Pleasant since March 1989.

While AMPER is no longer active in Mount Pleasant, the community has continued to be active in addressing important social and economic issues. A "healthy communities" project was initiated in 1989 and has made a substantial contribution to the community. The arts and heritage aspects of the community have also enhanced the vitality of Mount Pleasant. The Fringe Festival has become an important cultural event in the community. Still, despite the evidence of increased community vitality, many of the same social and economic issues (e.g., poverty, crime, prostitution, and alienation) exist. Such problems are not easily resolved. Mount Pleasant continues to evolve as a community. My sense is that it has become a stronger and more vital community.
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Appendix I

Agreement Between School of Social Work, Student, and Mount Pleasant Supervisory Committee
This agreement is between the School of Social Work, University of British Columbia; M.S.W. student Leslie Kemp; and her supervisory committee within the community of Mount Pleasant, represented by Leah Hartley, Planning Assistant, Planning Department, City of Vancouver. It defines the expectations and the respective roles of each of the aforementioned parties with regard to a field studies/thesis placement within the community of Mount Pleasant.

1. The M.S.W. student, Leslie Kemp agrees to engage in a piece of community social work practice in the community of Mount Pleasant. It is expected that accepted techniques of community practice will be carried out in a professional manner consistent with the Social Work Code of Ethics.

The particular area in which the student will be involved is in the exploration of the concept of "Community Economic Development" and its relationship with community development and cohesiveness. Contingent upon community support, the student will investigate, develop and organize community economic development projects such as community-based cooperatives.

In addition to the above, the student will perform an assessment of the community support for such a project, and will undertake appropriate research within the overall context of the project.

The student will be available approximately two days (16 hours) per week for work on this project, from now until April 3, 1987. Mondays and Tuesdays will normally be the days in which work on this project will take place.

2. The School of Social Work will provide support, advice and direction to the student in the course of her involvement in the project. Professor Roop Seebaran, as the student’s supervisor, will have periodic contact with the field supervisor, and will be available for consultation and problem-solving, if needed.

3. The Mount Pleasant Committee, which has agreed to act in an advisory capacity to the student, is comprised of Leah Hartley, Planning Assistant, Planning Department, City of Vancouver; Val Anderson, President, Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood Association; Howard Turpin, Vancouver Community College; and Judy Minchinton, Community Development Worker for Mount Pleasant.
This Committee will act as a resource to the student, providing advice, support and guidance. In addition, the Committee has agreed to provide the student with an office within the community, with a desk and telephone. It will provide feedback to the student and the university regarding the performance of the student and her work within the community. Leah Hartley has agreed to serve as the formal liaison between the Committee and the School of Social Work.
Appendix II

Advisory Committee Questionnaire
TO: Members of the Advisory Committee for M.S.W. student
   Leslie Kemp (Leah Hartley, Val Anderson, Judy Minchinton
   and Howard Turpin)

The intent of this questionnaire is to obtain your opinions about the following questions. The information you provide will greatly assist in obtaining a participant's perspective of the project that you have been involved in since September. The results of this questionnaire will be used in the research project being conducted by social work student Leslie Kemp. Your participation in completing this questionnaire is greatly appreciated. It is estimated that the questionnaire will take 20 minutes of your time.

Please keep in mind that your participation is entirely voluntary. You have the right to decline to complete the questionnaire and may leave blank any item you find unacceptable.

Thank you very much for your time and co-operation in filling out this questionnaire.
1. Do you feel the investment of your time and energies as an Advisory Committee member was worthwhile? (Please check the category which most closely reflects your feelings about this)

Not at all worthwhile ___ Somewhat worthwhile ___ Not sure ___ Very worthwhile ___

Please elaborate . . .

2. Please elaborate on the strengths and weaknesses of the project, both in terms of the process involved and in relation to the outcome.
3. a) What is your best bet as to the future success of this project?

b) What do you expect to be happening vis-a-vis this project one year from now?

c) What are the most important factors, in your view, to ensuring eventual success?
4. In your view, what roles did the Advisory Committee play in this project?

5. In what ways do you feel the social work student has influenced the process and/or the outcome of the project up to this point?

6. Any further comments you have about this project and/or your involvement are welcomed.

THIS Completes THE QUESTIONNAIRE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP.
Appendix III

Group Questionnaire
TO: Members of the Association for Mount Pleasant's Economic Renewal (AMPER)

The intent of this questionnaire is to obtain the opinions of the members of the Association for Mount Pleasant's Economic Renewal (AMPER) about the following questions. The information you provide will greatly assist in obtaining a participant's perspective of the project that you have been involved in since early February. The results of this questionnaire will be used in the research project being conducted by social work student Leslie Kemp. Your participation in completing this questionnaire is greatly appreciated. It is estimated that the questionnaire will take 20 minutes of your time.

Please keep in mind that your participation is entirely voluntary. You have the right to decline to complete the questionnaire and may leave blank any item you find unacceptable.

Thank you very much for your time and co-operation in filling out this questionnaire.
1. Do you feel the investment of your time and energies has been worthwhile up to this point? (Please check the category which most closely reflects your feelings about this)

   Not at all worthwhile ___  Somewhat worthwhile ___
   Not sure ___  Very worthwhile ___

   Please elaborate . . .

2. Please elaborate on the strengths and weaknesses of the project so far.
3. a) What is your best bet as to the future success of this project?

b) What do you expect to be happening vis-a-vis this project one year from now?

c) What are the most important factors, in your view, to ensuring eventual success?

d) What do you see as your role, if any, in relation to this project or in relation to AMPER, one year from now?
4. In what ways do you feel the social work student has influenced the process and/or the outcome of the project up to this point?

5. How many meetings (approximately) of AMPER have you attended?

6. Any further comments you have about this project and/or your involvement are welcomed.

THIS COMPLETES THE QUESTIONNAIRE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP.
Appendix IV

Advisory Committee Response
Do you feel the investment of your time and energies as an Advisory Committee member was worthwhile? (Please check the category which most closely reflects your feelings about this).

[Responses 4/4]

Not at all worthwhile ___ Somewhat worthwhile ___
Not sure 2 Very Worthwhile 2

Please elaborate . . .

A "I hope that the process was useful for you, Leslie. It was certainly useful for the community. The existence of an ongoing process in Mount Pleasant has the potential for lasting benefits and, therefore, is very worthwhile."

B "It was first of all enjoyable working with Leslie and then rewarding in working as part of her supervisory team for this helped me to also gain many new insights into the process of economic development and also through her eyes to have another view of this community."

C "Personally, I would rather be more directly involved that [sic] my available time allowed. The student says I was useful; I am interested in C.E.D. & learned a few things but remain feeling unsatisfied, sort of--I attended/contributed @ most meetings, but did I do any work?"

D "Not sure what results will come from the project. Will the project survive after withdrawal of student support? If not, I see limited value in the project and feel that the time & energy spent in the project was not worthwhile as it may have only raised false expectations."
Please elaborate on the strengths and weaknesses of the project, both in terms of the process involved and in relation to its outcome.

A "I suppose the weakness of the project could be related to the original goals of the project which now appear to have been unrealistic. The strength of the project is that this did not prevent success. Leslie's flexibility and professionalism enabled her to recognize and remedy [sic] the problems and develop a very positive outcome."

B "The strength of the project was first that it tackled a very much needed and practical aspect of this community. Leslie then brought to bear, first a study of the need, second a study of possible resources and resource people and third she initiated a process of practical response which is still continuing and appears it will continue after she leaves.

"The weakness is mostly in the shortage of time for such a large undertaking, though I must report she did accomplish her initial goal of setting a valid process in place which now can have a life of its own, I think a remarkable achievement."

C "I didn't find weaknesses that I can recall in the project--and it was revised to a 'community-realistic' placement: formation of a group vs product-project (employment) Process was good, student insight & assessment good. The outcome is a C.E.D. group with a life of its own."

D no response
What is your best bet as to the future success of this project?

A "My guess is that the group now established will produce projects and get results measurable in terms of economic development."

B "At this point the initiating committee appears to be very committed to working for success. Particularly they are inter-connected with a large network of supportive groups like King Edward Campus, DEEDS, the Neighbourhood Association, the Local Area Planning and City Economic Development."

C "I think it will not be able to get a project off the ground that produces a product or employs people."

D no response

What do you expect to be happening vis-a-vis this project one year from now?

A "How about one project actually happening!"

B "I trust that a year from now the committee will have tested out one or more specific economic development possibilities and may well have one or more of them on the way to permanence."

C "that participants will have explored C.E.D. & educated themselves on the subject concluding that Mt Pleasant area cannot support same. (They might do something like get a government grant and employ 'x' people doing something which will end when grant ends & that is not C.E.D.--even if one names it 'C.E.D.'"

D no response
What are the most important factors, in your view, to ensuring eventual success?

A "(1) Leslie's continued low-key involvement with the group. (2) Increased membership in the community and networking with other like-minded groups."

B "The first factor is the ongoing commitment of the present members and secondly their ability to tap the opportunities and resources available. They seem to have a good base to make one feel optimistic."

C "the biggest factor is a stable community."

D "Taking on small, distinct activities which are guaranteed to succeed and for which one person is clearly responsible."

In your view, what roles did the Advisory Committee play in this project?

A "(1) A sounding board--a place where ideas could be tested and concerns shared. (2) A source of resources--Leslie was able to draw out the help she needed."

B "First this committee helped to bring the project into existence and then acted as a sounding board, and input group for developing community contacts. It was a group to respond to process and ideas and help those to be clarified before presenting them to others. The supervisory group members were also able to help with community inter-connections."

C "Sounding board", student required minimal teaching supervision only normal supportive supervision. Helped student quickly get in touch with community residents & resources."

D "Bringing in the student and establishing initial liaison in the community."
In what ways do you feel the social work student has influenced the process and/or outcome of the project up to this point?

A "(1) research--provided the basis for action  
(2) organization--guided the structure for development  
(3) public relations--provided, in a variety of ways, the visibility such a project needed to get going."

B "Leslie has been key to the whole process. In the beginning she assessed the community and presented and refined a viable project and process. She then did the vast majority of the research on the community and on economic development process and brought together those who might be interested. She then was key to the process of organizing those who were interested into a viable working committee of which she gradually changed from organizer to resource person."

C "From the beginning ensured the group would control itself: started off with independence building thus enabling group to continue on its own without ever feeling 'leader-lost' because the student left."

D "Student had full direction of the project."
Any further comments you have about this project and/or your involvement are welcomed.

A "I think we all benefited from the project. It is useful to see the community in a new perspective and through someone else's eyes. Thanks for what you've accomplished."

B "This has been a very significant contribution to Mount Pleasant even if it does not go any further, though I expect it will. It has helped to develop an awareness of local economic development both needed and possible both within the community and perhaps most important in relation to City Hall. It really has been an unexplored territory and this exploration has been both positive and enriching.

"We owe a great deal to Leslie's persistance, patience, and vision."

C "It is too bad Mt. Pleasant area is too unstable to be able to take advantage of C.E.D. concept. I will happily be proven wrong. The project is useful as a discussion/education group and individuals will not lose the learning, and hopefully the community can repair itself to the point of being able to make use of C.E.D."

D no response
Appendix V

Group Responses
Do you feel the investment of your time and energies has been worthwhile up to this point? (Please check the category which most closely reflects your feelings about this).

[Responses 6/6]

Not at all worthwhile ___ Somewhat worthwhile ___
Not sure ___ Very worthwhile ___

Please elaborate . . .

A "Its a good process--have enjoyed the project, like the people we’re working with. Some very creative people are involved."

B No response

C "There is a real possibility of getting some CED launched in Mount Pleasant. If it happens that will be exhilarating. If not--well, we tried."

D "Relative newcomer to this group, although not to the CED initiative."

E "The forming of the group, and the process of goal setting & discussion has taken what seems to be a fairly long time. However, I feel that this is probably not unusual or abnormal, & that we are about where we should be at this point."

F "The amount of energy I have put in so far has been minimal. As I’m not a resident of the neighbourhood and instead am representing a local financial institution I see myself as a potential resource for the group. I think this role will be more valuable at a later stage in the group’s development."
Please **elaborate** on the strengths and weaknesses of the project so far.

A "**Strengths:**  
--a good core group, creative.  
--lots of community support--at least in principle  
--meetings have been quite business-like

**Weaknesses**  
--I’ve found that the goal development process has been quite slow  
--We’re short on ideas for projects & are being held back by procedural methods—a little bit anyway  
--we need to find some "do-ers" (I mean people not too busy to take on a project)"

B "The reason that I feel that my time is well spent in initial stage of the Association (AMPER). Because the idea of revitalize depressed aeria as Mount Pleasant is beneficial to all community and individuals, who lives in this aeria and are lacking support of other organization to give assistance in job finding or establishing self support businesses. AMPER--could eventually play big roll in supporting and advising those people who are interested to be self supporting and independent. [sic]"

C "**Strengths**
- commitment of the group  
- existence of DEEDS, with its problems, as an example of what can be done experienced in Vancouver.  
- Mount Pleasant has better resource potential than Downtown Eastside  
- Political interest potential in MP

**Weaknesses**  
-the usual problem that the do-ers in MP are spread too thin and there aren’t enough of them  
-we need an energetic co-ordinator when Leslie leaves to take us next step  
-we need a promising project on which all can focus  
-Not enough involvement yet of other resource people needed."
D. "Strengths - dedicated & diversified core group. Weaknesses - although mission statement is in place, not quite sure that the group has reached consensus on specifics, e.g. structure of projects & governing body."

E "Strengths: it has brought together people from various points & backgrounds in Mt. Pleasant to work for a positive goal: namely, economic development. Moreover, the participants have displayed a strong desire to "get it right". A good deal of discussion has focused on 'what kind of structure' & what kind of development do we want in Mt. Pleasant. I would only add that it has also been enjoyable working in the company of group members who display a high degree of competence & willingness to achieve goals."

F "As I haven't attended the last 3 meetings I'm out of touch with how much progress has been made. A weakness at an earlier stage was a coherent vision of what the group wanted to accomplish."
What is your best bet as to the future success of this project?

A "We need to get moving on something specific, or we'll lose interest. If we hit on a workable project, we'll be fine."

B "With energy and know how of the members of this group and support of local and Provincial governments success is possible."

C "50-50"

D "depends on what goals constitute 'success'--if the group stays together & keeps on trying, then this will be success enough."

E "I hesitate to 'bet', but the project has a good chance to succeed."

F "Sorry, out of touch."

What do you expect to be happening vis-a-vis this project one year from now?

A "Doing something! We'll have a project & will be working on it. Hard to say exactly what."

B "I expect that more interest will be shown by the business people and elected members of local government toward this group (AMPER), and more knowelagable people will joint the group to support it's cause [sic]."

C "Either--moribund/dead or--at least one project up and moving with more following in various stages of development"
D "registered as society--possible to have incubator in place as the City warms to CED."

E "I would expect that the project would have at least one business success to its credit. I would expect that if gov't funding assistance was not 'in place' that it would be resolved very soon. I would expect that the local credit union interest would have become more 'concrete' i.e) that they would actually be involved in a funding arrangement."

F "ditto" [previous question]

What are the most important factors, in your view, to ensuring eventual success?

A "1) Find a project 2) Find money to support action--a staff person, 3) Networking with other agencies--we may be able to ally ourselves with another group to make projects work."

B "To get more people involved in (AMPER) and contribute their knowledge."

C "Involvement of the resource elements: people with small business success allied to adequate funding (grants and loans) and the necessary skills and disciplines supporting."

D "education--politicking--determination--ability to follow through"

E "most important: 1) to reach out to the existing business community & include them in the process. 2) to choose business projects that have good (or v. good) chances of succeeding 3) to choose appropriate management structures for the business(es). 4) Selling the idea to the community at large."

F "willingness of participants to work outside the meetings --a decision to work on a specific project."
What do you see as your role, if any, in relation to this project or in relation to AMPER, one year from now?

A  "Depends— as long as I'm working at VCC, I would be part liaison, part "board" member (but active)."

B  "For myself I do not see that I will be playing an important role in this group."

C  "Providing specialist advice and helping to draw in the parts set out in (c)."

D  no response

E  "To assist in a coordinating role, vis a vis the other contacts I have in the community & city. --To assist by offering the benefit of the limited small business experience I have."

F  "-to provide information on how the organization can get financing from a financial organization (if appropriate). -to provide some publicity through the credit union newsletter"
In what ways do you feel the social work student has influenced the process and/or outcome of the project up to this point?

A "Greatly! Role as group convenor & organizer as been terrific. We needed for a) to get it going b) as a resource person c) to keep us on target. What will we do without you. Up till now you have been the "staff person" we're going to need later on."

B "The person who was asigned for this project is outstanding in her energy and effort to collect necessary data and organize people to be interested in idea of supports to revatelize the aeria [sic]."

C "By providing the initiative and the coordination AMPER is at least off the ground. Without this AMPER would not exist."

D "strong leadership--high degree of responsibility"

E "Leslie has been very effective at setting the tone for the project meetings to date. She has also been very efficient in the handling & dissemination of AMPER minutes & related literature. Her interaction skills are very good. She has not tried to dominate proceedings. She has assisted the members of the group to find their own way."

F "--by providing secretarial support--by soliciting the involvement of outside resources & community members.--by not taking too large a leadership role thereby encouraging the group to take role."
How many meetings (approximately) of AMPER have you attended?

A  "I think all of them. I may have missed one."

B  "Eight regular meetings."

C  "7"

D  "4"

E  "All (8)"

F  "3"

Any further comments you have about this project and/or your involvement are welcomed.

A  "I think I said it all."

B  "I hope the group will continue to work toward set goals."

C  "We have to get more real contributors involved."

D  "Good luck to us all!"

E  "I have enjoyed being part of the project & I expect to continue my participation. I look forward to being part of a successful future for AMPER & its goals."

F  No response.
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Leslie Kemp                                                N/A                      September 1986 -
                                                       June 1987

7 Title of Project
A Case Study of a Community Action Process in Addressing Economic and Social Problems

ALL INFORMATION REQUESTED IN THIS FORM MUST BE TYPEWRITTEN IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

*** NOTE: IF THE PROJECT IS LIMITED TO ONE OF THE FOLLOWING, PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX
AND COMPLETE AND SUBMIT ONLY PAGES 1 AND 2 OF THIS FORM:

☐ observation without intervention
☐ interviews of professional colleagues in the fields of law or business in which no invasion of
an individual's personal privacy or possible jeopardy of employment status is involved.
   (Summarize interview/questionnaire content in item #12 or attach a copy)
☐ course or programme evaluation
☐ modification of existing approved protocol #________: Indicate changes only and submit copies of
any revised attachments.

8 Summary of purpose and objectives of project

This is an exploratory descriptive study of the process undertaken within the neighbourhood of Mount Pleasant to address social and economic problems through the development of a community economic development strategy. The role of the research-practitioner is to organize and engage residents in a process of addressing community economic development. The purpose of the study is to document and analyze the process by which community economic development is addressed and to evaluate the impact of the research-practitioner on the process.

This study will provide a basis for examining how community economic development can be addressed in the context of an inner-city community. It will be of interest to current Community Economic Development practitioners wanting information about the dynamics of community economic development; it should also be of use to people in communities beginning to examine community economic development as a potential strategy for addressing social and economic problems.

SIGNATURES

9 Principal Investigator (or faculty advisor)

________________________
Date

10 Student or Co-Investigator(s) (if applicable)

________________________
Date

11 UBC Department Head or Dean

________________________
Date
Summary of methodology and procedures

The principle methods of data collection will be participant-observation, informal interviews and content analysis of minutes of meetings, newspaper articles and other relevant material. The study will be divided into three major stages:

1. Entry - This stage involves problem identification, goal-setting and formulation of specific objectives and action strategies in conjunction with the advisory committee. It involves familiarization with the community and meetings with community groups and individuals.

2. Basic Data-Gathering/Action - Research-practitioner organizes group of interested residents and business people and involves them in a series of meetings. During this stage, a group is formed and a planning process develops in which concrete plans and strategies are developed to address community economic development. The research practitioner collects data from group meetings and conversations with people in the community. A questionnaire designed to gather information on the participants' perception of the group developmental process and the impact of the research-practitioner is administered to group participants.

3. Closing - This stage involves data analysis. Field notes will be reviewed and a content analysis will be documented on minutes of meetings and other relevant documents. The data will be analyzed to elicit emerging themes and phases in the developmental process of the community. The results of the study will be written up.

DESCRIPTION OF POPULATION

13 How many subjects will be used? N/A
How many in the control group? N/A

14 Who is being recruited and what are the criteria for their selection? No one is being recruited. People have volunteered to participate in the process of addressing economic and social problems at the community level.
Appendix VII

Newspaper Articles
Mount Pleasant is a community in crisis, according to a group of community leaders who met with Mayor Mike Harcourt last month.

During the September 3 meeting, arranged by the Mayor with about 35 invited community leaders, concerns including street prostitution, traffic problems, lack of community services, and demoralized police were discussed.

"A growing lack of respect for the community is demoralizing to those police officers, civil servants, and area residents who are dedicated to saving and rebuilding the community," said Mount Pleasant Action Group spokesperson Michael Goldstein.

Individuals commented on the need for greater police presence, the need to amend the Criminal Code to control street prostitution, and the problems caused by absentee landlordship.

The Mayor responded by outlining some of the major projects the city has undertaken to control traffic flow. He said Skytrain, the Cassiar connector, and the Grandview Cut roadway are designed to alleviate commuter traffic pressure on communities such as Mount Pleasant.

He also suggested that a ward system would be more effective in the achievement of local area needs.

A number of task forces were formed which will study and report on social services, community facilities, employment and crime. Minutes of the meeting are available at the planning office, 325 E. Broadway, or the Neighbourhood House, 535 E. Broadway.
CED; a new approach for jobs

By LESLIE KEMP

Are residents and business people concerned about social and economic issues within Mount Pleasant? Is there a need for social and economic revitalization of the community? What sort of things can be done to improve the quality of life within Mount Pleasant?

Community Economic Development (CED) is a process of developing social, economic and cultural aspects of the community. It involves economic revitalization and the creation of local employment for local people. The goals of community economic development are not limited to economics, however; they usually encompass social and cultural dimensions, as well. CED implies an integrated approach to community development, taking into consideration the many components of community life.

CED involves people working together to plan goals and strategies for the development of the community. It involves people who are concerned and are willing to participate in creating new solutions to the problems which face us. Residents, business people, social agencies, cultural, ethnic and arts groups, schools, churches, the Neighbourhood Association, and others. Many communities have shown that they can tackle their social and economic difficulties and create a new type of community environment.

Are you interested in becoming involved?

In the next few weeks I will be contacting various community groups and organizations and asking for their contributions and assistance. I am compiling a list of people who are interested in becoming involved in the Community Economic Development process. If this type of involvement interests you - whether you are a member of a group in the community or are simply an interested resident or business person - we want and need to hear from you! I may be contacted at the Neighbourhood House (phone 879-8208) for information about this project.
Meeting to discuss Mt. Pleasant community and economic development

Leslie Kemp, a UBC student working on her master's degree in social work, is using her time and expertise to assist the community of Mount Pleasant.

Kemp is organizing a meeting in room 4043 of the King Edward campus of VCC, 1155 East Broadway, March 5th, 7:30 p.m. and has invited people in the neighbourhood to attend.

She is hoping to attract speakers from other neighbourhoods as well to come and share their ideas and experiences.

"As part of my thesis, I'm working with a group in Mount Pleasant that is interested in community and economic development," she says.

"I want it to be an educational opportunity for the community," says Kemp.

"and also for it to be a brainstorming session to come up with ideas to address the social and economic problems of the area."

But mainly it's a way to raise the level of participation in Mount Pleasant, to have people realize they can do something, she adds.