REPRESENTATION, INCLUSION AND COMMUNITY:

The Question of Social Equity

by

Christian Olivier Caron

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

August 28, 2003

Copyright 2003

Christian O. Caron

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 0-612-89032-5

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 0-612-89032-5

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this dissertation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de ce manuscrit.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the dissertation.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

ABSTRACT

This study examines the issues of representation and inclusion in a community-based initiative. It explores how these issues raised in the social equality debate between the proponents of the social inclusion model and the traditional egalitarian ideal model are played out at the community level. The data for this study were collected as part of a multi-site study of community-based initiatives. In depth interviews and focus groups were conducted with community members and representatives of various community organizations. The findings suggest that for community organizations, there is less emphasis on ideal theoretical models of equality than there is on more immediate community-based issues and concerns. Representation and inclusion, through a series of mechanisms, are mostly understood as processes. The potential for these processes to be the common ground at the community level between the two social equality models can be found through their promotion of participatory democracy. There, it offers an opportunity for potential dialogue between proponents of the social inclusion model and the traditional egalitarian ideals model.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The journey that led me here today has been one full of kind, helpful and inspiring individuals. I would like to thank Lucia Benaquisto who is greatly responsible for igniting this academic passion in me and for believing I could do it, long before any other. I would like to thank Dennis Forcese and the department of Sociology at Carleton University for giving me an opportunity to pursue my interests and offering me incredible support. I also want to acknowledge a deep gratitude to Katharine Kelly and especially Tullio Caputo for their patience, advice and for challenging me in taking the next step. Thank you.

On a more personal note, I would like to say thank you to the 499 crew, David, Paul and Chris for creating a wonderful, stimulating and pleasant environment around me over the last year. I would like to say thank you Peters for discussions, entertainment and editing. Thank you Banu for making me a better human being. Finally, I would like to offer a special thank you to Jennifer for the classic but incomparable love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1:	Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2:	Literature Review and Theoretical Framework.....	7
Chapter 3:	Context and Methodology.....	32
Chapter 4:	Findings and Discussion.....	47
Chapter 5:	Conclusion.....	81
Appendix A:	Information Handout.....	100
Appendix B:	Group Consent Form.....	103
Appendix C:	Interview Guide.....	104
	Bibliography.....	105

Chapter 1: Introduction

Inclusion begins with citizenship, which then serves as a value reiterated through democratic political activity in all the spheres of justice. The reiteration is qualified by the nature of the goods at stake: participation in the different spheres takes different forms. But what marks a democratic political community is the recognition that all those social transactions that drive citizens toward the margins, that produce a class of excluded men and women - uneducated, unemployed, unrecognized, and powerless - are everywhere and always in the life of the community unjust.

(Walzer 1993: 64)

Over the past two decades there has been a growing movement towards the community as a location for social action. Increasingly, communities are seen as focal points for intervention because they are key places where people, economic activity and the environment come together. The move toward community has generated a considerable amount of debate. Some observers believe the move towards community allows for flexibility in social interventions - some consideration can be given to issues of diversity, participation and local needs. For example, a focus on 'community' can lead to considerations of how to integrate community members into decision-making, planning, and the identification of local problems. This is seen as one way of promoting social cohesion in settings with diverse constituencies.

Supporters of the move towards the community point to a number of other critical features of the community-based approaches. Some authors (Glaser et al 1995; Cummings and Glaser 1985; Kelly 1977) mention the potential for increased autonomy and self-determination. Others point to the improvement (Abucar 1995) and greater efficiency (Morgan 1989) in the delivery of services. Still others (Savage 1984) claim that community-based approaches are more responsive to local needs and concerns. Finally, the move

toward community is sometimes interpreted as a partial transfer of power from service providers to services users (Morgan 1989).

While the move towards the community has many supporters, there are a growing number of observers who critique various aspects of this development (Cohen 1985; Rose 2000; Crawford 1995). Some are concerned that shifting towards a community-based approach will result in the downloading of responsibility from more senior levels of government onto local communities. This downloading is primarily related to funding cuts associated with the rise of neo-liberal governments. One consequence of the downloading is that problems such as crime can become identified as local and individual responsibilities rather than those of more senior levels of government.

There are other concerns raised in the literature, especially surrounding the consequences of the power differentials between the state agency workers and the local community members. Some authors see as problematic the agency workers' ultimate influence in defining the concerns of a particular community (Sampson 1988). Other concerns include the state agencies' role in determining the appropriate solutions to local problems (Ericson 1994; Fyfe 1989). Finally, other authors point to community-based approaches as likely to exacerbate intra-communal power differentials by giving a greater voice to special interests within the community (Taylor 1995).

While there are many questions emerging from this debate, this thesis examines two issues in particular. Representativeness and inclusiveness are two key issues debated within the context of the move towards the community. Some authors point to the potentially undemocratic nature of consultative forums at the community level and charge that the representatives tend to be drawn, by agency workers, including the police, from very specific and limited interests within a locality (Jefferson et al. 1988; Morgan 1989; Fyfe 1992; Taylor

1995). In this context, inclusion in community consultations and initiatives could have more to do with personal relations with key personnel, noted activism or previous 'good' service in other fields of 'voluntary' community work, than with broader notions of representativeness. Some critics suggest that such networks are largely self-perpetuating, self-justifying, and rarely challenged (Crawford 1997). This state of affairs may be frequently explained away by the need for people who 'understand' the administrative procedures, language, and practice of local agencies. A level of 'understanding', therefore, can become a filter for inclusion that allows some to participate while excluding other, more marginal groups and individuals (Scruton 1985; Scruton 1987; Sampson 1988).

This thesis examines the role of representation and inclusion in the move toward community. For this purpose, this thesis focuses on community-based crime prevention approaches. While questions surrounding inclusion and representation occur in many fields at the community level, including health and economic development, they are particularly prevalent in the field of criminal justice. As reviewed above, the debate between supporters and critics of the move towards community in the field of criminal justice is salient and thus offers us a good opportunity to address these issues.

The data for this thesis was collected as part of a larger, multi-site study on the sustainability of community-based crime prevention activities. The research design was sufficiently flexible to allow for the exploration of a number of issues related to the move towards the community including the issues of representation and inclusion.

The specific concern with representation and inclusion within the debate on the move toward community represents part of a larger debate on social equality. In fact, concerns about representation and inclusion resonate with another current debate regarding social stratification and inequality. In this debate, the idea of social inclusion is examined

against the backdrop of a traditional egalitarian ideals model. While a more thorough review of the nature of this debate will be undertaken in the next chapter, it is instructive to review some of its main features here.

The broader debate on social equality pits those who believe that a social inclusion model (Gray 1996; Glossop 2001; Lauziere 2001) offers a better vision and model for social activism against those who articulate a traditional egalitarian ideals model (Stewart 2000; Lister 1996; Levitas 1996). The social inclusion model has emerged recently as an alternative to the traditional egalitarian ideals model that is perceived by many to be antiquated.

The growing popularity of the social inclusion model can be partially explained by linking it to processes of globalization. Supporters of this approach argue that the global market has eroded the autonomy of national governments and made it increasingly difficult for them to maintain welfare state policies. This has placed considerable pressure on the maintenance of traditional social democratic values and models of equality. Furthermore, some analysts (Gray 1996) point to the current political unpopularity of such values in many countries as another reason to shift away from traditional egalitarian formulations toward a more narrow social inclusion model.

Fundamentally, the social inclusion model can be seen to foster a vision of inclusion that is based on individual empowerment, independence and peoples' capacity to enter into social contracts. It promotes equality of opportunity while putting primacy on social cohesion. In contrast, the traditional egalitarian ideals model fosters a vision of inclusion that is based on collective empowerment and the generation of power through communal action. This model promotes interdependence and mutuality based on a greater equality of outcomes. While quite complex, this debate has questions of inclusion and representation at its core. Clearly these models are incompatible with one another at the conceptual level.

The question is how these issues manifest themselves at the community level.

This thesis addresses the debate on social equality between the proponents of the social inclusion model and the traditional egalitarian ideals model. It explores these with data derived from a case study of a community-based crime prevention initiative. Chapter 2 begins with a brief consideration of the concept of community followed by a discussion of the concerns surrounding the issues of representation and inclusion within the context of the move towards community. The chapter then presents a detailed review of the conceptual frameworks underlying the competing social equality models, that is the social inclusion model and the traditional egalitarian ideals model. It traces the emergence of the current debate as well as the arguments that have been made in the literature that support the replacement of the traditional egalitarian model with a social inclusion model. Chapter 2 ends with a discussion of the potential drawbacks of embracing either of these competing models.

Chapter 3 is divided into two sections. The first offers an overview of the community in which the case study was completed. This includes a discussion of the origin and history of the community mobilization efforts in the community and provides important information about the social context within which the community-based activity has taken place. The second section in Chapter 3 outlines the research design and methodology used in this study. This includes a detailed description of each step taken in the research process from the scheduling of interviews, to the actual collection and analysis of the data.

Chapter 4 presents the findings garnered from this study. These are organized according to themes that emerged during the data analysis. Each theme represents a cluster of related ideas and interests. The following key themes are discussed: initiatives, factors of success, representation and inclusion. The initiatives theme presents a discussion of the

various activities organized or supported by the Evangeline Community Consultative Group (ECCG) the local committee directing the community mobilization efforts in the study site. The factors of success theme covers all of the various elements mentioned by the informants concerning the factors they believe have contributed to the ECCG's sustainability and success over time. The representation theme contains ideas related to the constitution of the ECCG. Finally, the inclusion theme explores the various efforts made by the CCG in reaching out to the community during all stages of their activities.

The conclusions are found in Chapter 5. As well, the findings of this research are considered in this concluding chapter in light of the broader conceptual debate on social equality. The implications of the findings are discussed at the end of Chapter 5 and some suggestions are made regarding future research in this area.

Chapter 2: Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Representation, Inclusion and Community: The Question of Social Equity

It is important to note at the outset of this literature review that the term 'community' is used in a variety of ways. For example, it can refer to geographic locations such as neighbourhoods or to a group of people who share some characteristics, values or beliefs - a 'community of interest'. Perhaps the most common use of the term 'community' is as a geographic region - city, town, village, or hamlet. Typically, these also serve as administrative centres with some form of centralized (group) decision-making responsibility. For the purpose of this study, 'community' was defined as a geographic location. This reflects the conception of community provided by the respondents: a recognition of and respect for diversity in their region. The detailed description of the geographic community studied in this thesis is provided in the following chapter.

It is also important to briefly define two other concepts that are the focus of this thesis: representation and inclusion. Representation and inclusion are treated as distinct but related concepts in this thesis. It is important to note that both these concepts are understood fluidly and that the conceptualization used through most of this thesis is the one offered by the community members themselves during group interviews. Representation is here defined as the representativeness of said community organization of its community. In the context of this thesis, this translates into examining the constitution of the community organization and its claims to represent its community. Inclusion is understood more broadly. In the context of this thesis, the concept emerges mainly as a process-oriented one through which the community organization reaches out to community members and

includes them in the mechanisms of information sharing and gathering, consultation, deliberation, decision-making, and generally encourages them to participate in activities designed to meet their local needs.

Representation and inclusion are distinct because theoretically, a community organization could be less representative and yet be very inclusive in certain ways, while another community organization could be more representative and yet be less inclusive. A group of elected community members that once elected, fails to reach out and involve the community in the development and formation of their initiatives and activities and is not responsive to their needs is an example of the former. A group of community members getting together in order to start a community organization that reaches out and involves the community at every opportunity may be an example of the latter.

With these three main concepts defined, we can now turn to the first important question related to the concept of community: who can claim membership and how is this decided? Additionally, the ability to actively participate as a member of a community is a key dimension of identification and affiliation. It is in this context that the issues of representation and inclusion emerge. How is representation in community-based activities determined and by extension, who is excluded or left out? As noted above, some authors have pointed out that community-based initiatives are not necessarily benign, especially when it comes to representation and inclusion. In fact, the potentially un-democratic nature of consultative forums at the community level has been identified as a serious concern. Critics have charged that the representatives on community committees tend to be drawn from very specific and limited interest groups within a locality by institutional representatives including agency workers and the police (Morgan 1989; Fyfe 1992; Taylor 1995).

In this context, inclusion in community consultations and initiatives may have more

to do with personal relations with key agency personnel, noted activism or previous 'good' service in other fields of 'voluntary' community work, than with broader notions of representativeness. Some critics suggest that such networks are largely self-perpetuating, self-justifying, and rarely challenged. (Crawford 1997) This state of affairs may be frequently explained away by the need for people who 'understand' the administrative procedures, language, and practice of local agencies. A level of 'understanding', therefore, can become a filter for inclusion that allows some to participate while excluding other, more marginal groups and individuals (Scruton 1985; Scruton 1987; Sampson 1988).

Morgan (1989), among others, discusses the emergence of a significant number of public consultation mechanisms. He lays out competing hypotheses, two of which will be discussed briefly here. These two hypotheses, which Morgan has labelled legitimisation and marginalisation, offer differing perspectives to what extent public consultation: makes for greater efficiency of services, consolidates the balance of power between service providers and users, and makes for more equitable distribution services.

The legitimisation hypothesis suggests that the introduction of formal consultative machinery in a community will involve the police, other governmental agencies and a variety of community representatives. Police officers will learn better about the manner in which police actions are viewed locally by politically powerful groups and will adjust policy if necessary to meet local needs and viewpoints (Savage 1984). The police will furnish community crime prevention forums with further accounts of their resources and operations. Through their involvement, community representatives will develop closer relationships with officers in management ranks, will learn more about policing, and will tend increasingly to share police viewpoints and definitions of what are the problems of policing (Hansard 1981). Finally, being better informed, community representatives will take

their duties more seriously, and, as they become more sympathetic to police problems and viewpoints, the police will more fully consult them as part of the police planning cycle.

The alternative, the marginalisation hypothesis, states that the move toward the community will serve to marginalise those persons and groups critical of the police (Scruton 1985; Scruton 1987). This is based on the following propositions: community crime prevention (CCP) participants will be drawn predominantly from the ranks of the socially and economically advantaged. Most CCP participants will have had little adverse experience with the police and will hold generally pro-police attitudes when they join committees. Most CCP participants will be largely dependent on the police for their information as to what the policing problems are in their area. As a result of their CCP involvement, most participants will become more sympathetic to police viewpoints and give less credence to criticisms of the police voiced by non-participants with whom they have little or no attachment. CCP participants' views will, to some extent, filter down to wider constituencies (Fyfe 1989). The fact that the police, through CCP deliberations, are widely understood to engage in community consultation about policy will, other things being equal, serve to legitimate policy in the eyes of many observers. As Morgan (1989: 225) notes, "a police force which asserts that it formally consults the community is more likely to be believed by neutral non-participants to be pursuing policies which are approved by the community at large."

Inclusion, according to Sampson (1988: 489) is also bound up with powerful agency definitions of the 'respected' and 'respectable'. 'Troublesome' groups are marginalized, ignored or overlooked. While agency personnel can be aware of the lack of genuine community representation, they occasionally blame the community for not having in place proper democratic structures through which representatives could be rendered accountable. Secondly, some agency personnel point to the 'impossibilism' of 'representation' to explain

the unrepresentative nature of community committees. According to this viewpoint, 'true representation' is impossible, so why waste the effort trying? These concerns are certainly worth investigation.

We cannot discuss participation without referring to the structural dimension of power and powerlessness. Pateman (1970) has distinguished between two types of participation with respect to power. Full participation where individuals have equal power, and partial participation where one party retains final power. In a situation characterized by full participation, it may be possible that rationality alone could be the basis for a just outcome in decision-making. However, in 'actually existing' situations of partial participation, effective power is based upon the resources particular individuals or groups can mobilize. This amount of power respective groups or individuals can harness is crucial to the outcome.

There can thus be clear structural power differentials between individuals, organizations and groups, which can have an impact on and influence policy outcomes. This occurs, first, through the processes of inclusion into, and by definition exclusion from, decision-making processes. Community consultation may favour established interests that are already powerful enough to be included and to participate in the processes of policy formation and implementation. Furthermore, the ongoing relationship between these established interests could lead to partnerships and result in what Marsh and Rhodes call 'privileged oligarchies' (1992).

Social Equality

The specific concern with representation and inclusion within the debate on the move towards the community represent part of a larger debate on social equality. In fact, these concepts resonate with another current debate regarding social stratification and

inequality. In this debate, the idea of social inclusion is examined against the backdrop of a traditional egalitarian ideals model. The debate is in part about whether the concept of social inclusion may “be too ‘soft’ on the need for structural change. Social inclusion may not adequately address the historic causes of social and economic exclusion” (Freiler 2001). The danger here, according to Bennett (1998), is that a focus on discrete problem groups could encourage the belief that these groups are themselves the problem. “It is therefore essential that the problem of social exclusion and strategies to promote social inclusion are located within a broader analysis of inequality and polarization both inside and outside the labour market” (Lister 2000: 42).

Social inclusion as a model has gained wide popularity in the last decade. Proponents of this model have a clear political agenda to promote. Goodin puts it well when he writes that “A new social evil has recently been discovered, ‘social exclusion’. Mainstream democratic theorists have come to see problems of inclusion and exclusion as absolutely central to their concerns” (Goodin 1996: 343). A number of questions concerning this concept help to focus this discussion. First, is social inclusion indeed a new approach in the realm of social advocacy? Second, how is social inclusion defined and being used in the political and academic discourse? Does social inclusion mark a departure from the classical promotion of equality? The argument in this case is that the promotion of social inclusion represents a new direction in social advocacy that is needed since the former model is no longer politically viable. What is the breadth of the current applications of this ‘new’ concept of social inclusion? Is it a unitary or a multi-dimensional idea? Finally, what are the possible drawbacks of adopting this ‘new’ concept?

On the Canadian landscape, we do not have to go very far to find the presentation of social inclusion as a new concept, a new way of thinking. The Canadian Council on Social

Development (CCSD) hosted a conference with the Laidlaw Foundation in 2001 on social inclusion, called 'A New Way of Thinking? Towards A Vision Of Social Inclusion'. A second conference entitled 'What Do We Do and Where Do We Go? Building a Social Inclusion Research Agenda' was held in 2003 (www.ccsd.ca/subsites/index.htm).

The goal of these conferences was to build a shared vision of social inclusion, a vision that "could transform Canadian society and the way governments make policy and deliver services. Social inclusion, a major reference point in the government's most recent Speech from the Throne, is already an established framework for policy in Europe. Participants hope that the conference can translate it into a forward-looking policy agenda for children and families in Canada" (<http://www.ccsd.ca/subsites/inclusion/pr.htm>).

The Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD) is a non-profit social policy and research organization focusing on issues such as poverty, social inclusion, disability, cultural diversity, child well-being, employment and housing (www.ccsd.ca). The Laidlaw Foundation is a public interest foundation that uses its capital and resources to promote civic engagement and social cohesion (www.laidlawfdn.org). The main question debated at the conference was whether social inclusion was indeed a new way of thinking. Lauziere, director of the Canadian Council for Social Development, in his opening remarks notes that we need to fundamentally rethink our social activism. He argued that the concept of social inclusion could be useful to combat what he says is a losing battle against poverty, exclusion, inequality, and most of all, the polarisation in our society. Lauziere outlined in his speech that social inclusion could be a concept around which all Canadians could unite (Lauziere 2001a).

In his opening remarks at the conference, Glossop (2001a) asked whether the terms social inclusion and social exclusion can provide Canadians "with some common ground

upon which we might choose to build a new foundation of wealth and opportunity, a common-wealth - as it were - to which all may contribute and from which all may benefit.” He further asked, “Does this new way of framing our thoughts around notions of exclusion and inclusion prepare us to better articulate and speak and listen to others? Do we have here a new way of thinking that is more compelling to us and others? Is there a vision of social inclusion that strengthens our commitment to our traditional notions of equity, justice, fairness, human rights?” (Glossop 2001a).

According to some social commentators, social inclusion has become a subject of national significance because there is growing apprehension that Canadian life is becoming permanently recast into moulds of privilege and disadvantage (Novick 2001). Freiler (2001) in a concept paper for the Laidlaw Foundation, states that “social inclusion was recognized as a powerful concept with significant strengths, most notably, social inclusion is grounded in the real life experiences of people. It has the advantage of being able to create a bond of association among people of varying identities and conditions. Social inclusion creates expectations for fundamental change at multiple levels of society, from public attitudes to policies to service delivery practices.” These quotations make it clear that some observers see social inclusion as a ‘new’ concept with a lot of promise!

However, social inclusion is not perceived as new by everyone. On the question of whether social inclusion is a new concept, Novick writes that, “if the primary focus of inclusion is on bringing marginalized populations into the prevailing mainstream, then the answer is no”. (Novick 2001). He continues that, “Social inclusion’s origins may be traced 30 years back in Europe”. Novick does concede that, “It has however gained considerable momentum in the last several years” (Novick 2001). Bach also writes that, “I do not consider social inclusion a new idea or agenda. There have been long struggles by many

groups to be included among those granted benefit and advantage by the state and major institutions of society” (Bach 2001).

Robinson (2000: 166) puts the discussion regarding inclusion into perspective when he asserts that, “There will always be individuals putting forward dramatic new paradigms which purport to offer an original way of understanding the evolution of society. Those involved in the political process are always searching for new ways of presenting their distinctiveness to the electorate. Often the latter feed off the former, but most new ways or third ways are either intellectually hollow or are merely a re-packaging of what has gone before”. This characterization may be somewhat harsh. Perhaps to offer a more definitive answer to whether social inclusion is a new way of thinking, we may benefit by exploring how it is defined and being used in the current literature.

The idea of social exclusion appears to have originated in France in the 1970's. Rene Lenoir, the French Social Action Secretary of State in the Chirac government coined the phrase, referring to people ‘with mental and physical disabilities, the suicidal, aged, abused children and youth drop-outs, adult offenders, as well as substance abusers’ (Ebersold, 1998). The European Observatory on National Policies for Combating Social Exclusion was established in 1989 with the goal of monitoring the ‘social rights of citizenship to a basic standard of living and to participation in major social and economic opportunities in society’ (Freiler, 2000). The definition of social exclusion adopted for the United Kingdom’s Poverty and Social Exclusion (National Strategy) Bill in 1999, specifies that, “any individuals who are excluded from participating fully in the economic, social, cultural or political life of the nation” (UK House of Commons, 1999) are socially excluded. Phipps (2001: 3) notes that, “those who are socially excluded are deprived of their civil rights and are therefore unable to make their proper contribution to society”.

Atkinson (1998) makes the point that while closely linked to both unemployment and poverty, social exclusion is not the same as either. In defining social exclusion, he emphasizes three dimensions: 1) relativity; 2) agency; and 3) dynamics. "While poverty debates have spent much time on the issue of the appropriateness of relative versus absolute measures, an 'absolute' measure of social exclusion has no meaning. An individual can only be excluded from a particular social group in a particular place and at a particular time -- social exclusion is fundamentally a relative concept" (Phipps 2001: 2).

Chisholm (2001), emphasize the presence of agency in the definition of social inclusion. He presents social inclusion as, "people's capacity and agency, their means and supports, to control their lives. It's about their ability to play an active role in influencing their circumstances and making autonomous decisions. So for us, there are three important components to consider: capacity, agency and autonomy" (Chisholm 2001).

Others suggest that social inclusion has a more human quality. It reflects ideas of "welcoming, respecting, valuing, and honouring" (Yelland 2001). "Social inclusion gets at the heart of what it means to be human: belonging, acceptance, and recognition. Inclusion makes the link between the well being of children, our common humanity, and the social, economic, political and cultural conditions that must exist in a just and compassionate society" (Freiler 2001).

Finally, some observers see the issue of inclusion and exclusion in terms of the denial of basic rights. According to Room (1995) social exclusion is a denial or non-realization of civil, political, and social rights of citizenship. Bach (2001) echoes similar thoughts while at the same time bridging this meaning of social inclusion with another one. "We can understand how the idea is sometimes used as a political claim for full citizenship, or as an ideal to which societal organizations and institutions should aspire, or to name the process of

reform of such arrangements” (Bach 2001). In this last statement, Bach points to the understanding of social inclusion as a process. Numerous authors have made similar observations, however, such a view of social inclusion is by no means the most common.

Robinson (2000: 154) defines social inclusion as “a situation where everyone is able to participate fully in society and no-one is blocked from doing so by lack of political and civil rights, by lack of employment or income, by ill-health or lack of education”. Freiler (2001) proposes that social inclusion is a normative concept rather than a descriptive term. “Social inclusion requires more than the removal of barriers. It requires investments and action to bring about the conditions of inclusion. We know that inclusion does not ‘just happen’ when barriers are removed” (Freiler 2001). Helgason pursues this idea when he states that, “Exclusion and inclusion need to be understood in the broadest sense. Marginalized groups need full participation in decision-making. Women being involved in the decision-making process’, etc” (Helgason 2001). I will come back again and again to this particular aspect of social inclusion: the focus on participation and the focus on process.

While some authors present social inclusion as embodying a fairly straight-forward set of characteristics, others prefer to use classification systems with a multi-dimensional presentation of the concept. I will briefly review four such classification systems that contribute to the present discussion. The first classification is by Clutterbuck that appears in his study entitled *Building Inclusive Communities: A Social Infrastructure for Canadian Municipalities* (2003). He asked various community participants to offer a description of an inclusive community. In their opinion, the following characteristics made up an inclusive community: integrative and cooperative, interactive, invested, diverse, equitable, accessible and sensitive, participatory, and safe (Clutterbuck 2003). To achieve such a community is a tall order! Of particular interest for this study is the participatory element to which I will

return shortly.

Based on her work with the Laidlaw Foundation, Freiler argued that social inclusion depends on the following: (1) Place, space and proximity; (2) Valued recognition and solidarity; (3) Human development; and (4) Voice, participation and empowerment. Again, there is a spatial dimension, an emotional dimension, a psychological dimension and a social dimension to the concept of social inclusion (Freiler 2001). This classification, much like the previous one, broadens the scope of the concept considerably. Again, particular attention should be paid to the social dimension of social inclusion.

Donnelly discusses another part of Freiler's classification. Freiler identified three intersecting dimensions of social inclusion: (1) Spatial: social inclusion as proximity, closing social and economic distances; social exclusion as 'unacceptable social and economic distance', 'being put and kept at a social distance'; (2) Relational: social inclusion defined as a sense of belonging and acceptance; reciprocity and positive interactions; being valued, having valued social roles; participation; and (3) Functional: social inclusion as the enhancement of capacities, capabilities, competencies. Donnelly adds to Freiler's classification by suggesting that, "Social inclusion might also be seen as the process through which the skills, talents, and capacities of children are developed and enhanced so that all are given the opportunity to realize their full potential, and to fully participate in the social and economic mainstream" (Donnelly 2000). Social inclusion in this formulation is clearly seen as a social process. More will be said shortly about this conceptualization of social inclusion.

Finally, there is the classification by Levitas (1998) about the particular forms social inclusion takes in discourse and their associated implications. This classification is worth reviewing at length because it is both comprehensive and comprehensible. She argues that there are three sets of discourses surrounding social inclusion projects. The first of these is a

redistributionist one (RED). The central preoccupation of this discourse is historically with the causes and characteristics of poverty. Stewart writes that the focus of this discourse has subsequently “been broadened out into a general analysis of the relationship between social exclusion and diverse, societally generated inequalities of power and resources” (Stewart 2000a: 4). This discourse is compatible with the rhetoric of the traditional left-leaning parties, like the Parti Quebecois in the Province of Quebec and New Democratic Party in Canada.

The RED discourse stands in stark contrast to a second one identified by Levitas that she calls a moral underclass discourse (MUD). The MUD places the causes of social exclusion with the moral and cultural characteristics of those who are excluded, the so-called underclass. According to Stewart, this discourse, “identifies welfare benefits as the principal source of moral corrosion and social breakdown” (2000a: 4). It is compatible with the rhetoric of the traditional right-leaning parties like the Canadian Alliance Party of Canada and the Republicans in the United States.

Both of these stand in contrast to a third discourse, the social integrationist discourse (SID). This discourse, “prioritizes economic efficiency and social cohesion and links the two by a consistent emphasis upon the integrative function of paid work. The associated political project valorizes labour market participation as the overwhelming key to social inclusion” (Stewart 2000a: 4). This discourse is compatible with the rhetoric of the left-centre leaning parties, namely the Liberals in Canada, the Democrats in the United States and more explicitly, the Labour Party in Britain.

In this context, social inclusion represents part of the conceptual frameworks of very different political projects. The multi-dimensional nature of the concept of social inclusion makes it popular and politically appealing. Levitas (1998) notes that current public debate

involves elements of all three of these discourses, although she argues that only SID and MUD are part of the current dominant political discourse. Stewart feels that a shift from RED to SID, in left leaning parties, represents an attempt to “resituate fundamentally the political spectrum by marginalizing or eliminating the issue of equality from the political agenda” (Stewart 2000a: 4). It is to this question that we now turn. Does the promotion of social inclusion as it is presently portrayed on the political landscape and in the academic literature represent a shift away from the goal of equality? Is there really a difference between social inclusion and equality? This question is important because of its possible answer. If there is indeed a difference between social inclusion and equality, then there could be associated consequences and repercussions of supporting the shift in political projects.

There is considerable disagreement as to whether the shift toward the ‘new’ concept of social inclusion is a good or a bad thing. Some argue that inclusion is a better suited than the traditional egalitarian ideals model to address current challenges. Social inclusion can “broaden the debate about poverty, vulnerability and the well being of children and families; Highlight that child and family poverty is not just about a lack of resources, but also about the inability to participate in society; link poverty and economic vulnerability with other sources of exclusion and vulnerability, such as racism, disability/rejection of difference” among other things (Freiler 2001).

Lister further points out that, “while some dismiss the notion of social exclusion as simply a euphemism for poverty, it does arguably have a value, for it captures something different. It is a more multidimensional concept than poverty, embracing a variety of ways in which people may be denied full participation in society and full effective rights of citizenship in the civil, political and social spheres” (Lister 2000: 38). These accounts offer part of the explanation behind the support for a shift toward advocating social inclusion

instead of the traditional egalitarian ideals (TEI) model.

Others mention the failings and limitations of the TEI model as the primary motivation for change. Coyle makes the point clearly. He states, “Is increased inequality inescapable? I believe that the nature of new technologies means that it is” (Coyle 2000: 148). Plant places this argument in a broader context. He notes that, “the social democratic approach of providing not only a welfare state, but also forms of welfare and taxation that secure a degree of social justice by redistributing the ‘natural’ and highly unequal outcome of the market is no longer compatible with global competitiveness because the social and labour costs of the social democratic state are too high. If the welfare state is to survive at all, it is argued, it will have to be as a limited safety net and linked to welfare-to-work strategies under which the welfare state will be used to equip people with the skills and qualifications without which it will not be possible for such individuals to secure for themselves a degree of economic security not conferred by the state but by the labour market for as long as these skills are in demand” (Plant 2000: 208).

The phenomenon known as globalization is also repeatedly mentioned as a factor in the shift in discourse from equality to social inclusion. Globalization is said to erode the autonomy of national governments. The high mobility of capital out of states whose governments are committed to a traditional social democratic agenda and high levels of taxation is also considered a main mechanism through which globalization has effect. The purported uncompetitive nature of traditional social democratic values in the global market is thus pointed out as a second logical reason for left-leaning parties to start advocating a social inclusion agenda rather than an egalitarian agenda. In this regard, Gray (2000: 21) states, “Plainly, the egalitarian objectives of classical social democracy are no longer politically realizable. Hence the appeal of a successor project: inclusion”.

Some see the shift toward a discourse of social inclusion as an attempt to conserve something of the classical egalitarian goals at a time when this is no longer politically viable. Gray (2000) actually goes as far as stating that the lack of electoral support for classical egalitarian goals has made its promotion a political liability thus making the shift to social inclusion a necessity. From this perspective, the shift toward advocating social inclusion is a natural progression that takes into account the realities and possibilities of the political landscape. Lack of electoral popularity is yet another explanation offered.

A shift may indeed have taken place at the level of discourse, however, are traditional social democratic goals in fact different than this new project of social inclusion? It will be argued that, indeed, they do adhere to distinct ideals. Gray states that, "In terms of British and Europeans traditions, one is social-democratic and the other social-liberal" (Gray 2000: 22). Equality and inclusion are distinct values. Often they may overlap, but sometimes they can be competitors. Gray tells us that, "Policies that promote social inclusion are commonly understood as somehow necessarily advancing an ideal of equality. This is a mistake. Sometimes they do, but that is an unintended consequence" (Gray 2000: 23). Supporters of social inclusion do not pursue an ideal of egalitarian justice, but an ideal of common life. This will surely condemn many inequalities. But not all. Inclusion is indifferent to some inequalities that egalitarians condemn. Policies promoting inclusion will sometimes generate inequalities that are seen by egalitarians as unfair but are viewed by advocates of inclusion as fair. In this latter case, equality and inclusion are not just different, they are rivals.

The intuitive core of the idea of inclusion looks simple enough. It is the idea that every member of society should have the opportunity to participate fully in it. The social ideal that inclusion expresses is an ideal of common membership: no one is denied access to activities and practices that are central in the life of society. "An inclusionary society is a

cohesive society” (Gray 2000: 23). In the theory of social inclusion, individual well-being is the bottom line and it is understood as being essentially social. In New Right thinking, individual choice is ascribed an overriding value and it is theorized as being entirely an attribute of individual human subjects. In contrast with this view, social liberals - along with other advocates of inclusion - think of personal autonomy as having both individual and social connotations and dimensions (Gray 2000: 26).

What the main egalitarian theories have in common that distinguishes them from ideals of social inclusion is the claim that purely relational properties can have fundamental ethical importance. From the standpoint of the ideal of social inclusion, only individual well-being has that significance. It is the impact of inequality on social cohesion and thereby on individual well-being that explains the moral importance we attach to it. Inclusion requires that every member of society have access to its central goods. This requirement incorporates at least two components - fair opportunities and the satisfaction of basic needs. While both are necessary for individual flourishing, they are not the same, and neither is sufficient. Both are distribution-sensitive in that some distributions will be condemned by them; but neither is essentially distributive. (Gray 2000: 28)

By contrast with theories of distributive justice, the ideal of inclusion accepts as its starting point the complex understandings of fairness that are to be found in society. (To that extent, inclusion is a relativistic notion.) Large economic inequalities are not condemned if they arise against a background of fair opportunity and basic human needs having been met. If we think of justice not as a matter of distributive principles applying throughout society but instead as a complex body of norms about local justice that vary from domain to domain and society to society, then justice will condemn economic inequalities only when they undermine an inclusive society. “The ideal of inclusion, then, is

distinct from any ideal of equality' (Gray 2000: 31).

Stewart (2000), among others, points to what he feels is an important loss when a shift occurs from TEI to an agenda of social inclusion. Fundamentally, the two conceptions can be identified respectively as social inclusion being based on the principle of the social contract, while TEI is based on the different principle of the social compact (Sklar, 1996: 156; Stewart 2000b: 58). Within the terms of the social contract model, the axis of social inclusion/exclusion and the index of social integration revolve, above all, around individual capacity to enter into social contracts. This capacity is understood in terms of the resources and transferable skills available for contractual relations. The more widespread such capacity, the greater the degree of individual empowerment, and the greater the degree of social inclusion. Conversely, the more limited such capacity, the more limited the degree of individual empowerment and the greater the degree of social exclusion (Stewart 2000b: 59). In contrast to the emphasis on the relationship between discrete individuals in the social contract model, the model of the social compact focuses upon communality and the generation of power through communal action. Compacts involve the recognition of social relationships of interdependence and mutuality, and prioritize solidarity and collective empowerment.

There are thus clear differences between the general agenda of social inclusion and the traditional egalitarian agenda. Whether the concept of social inclusion embodies a more progressive agenda or not, it has attained widespread prominence in the social advocacy literature. It has been used and re-used in numerous areas under more than one of its various manifestations. Let's explore then the breadth of its usage.

Social inclusion is used first and foremost in the context of paid work. Lister writes that, "A broad consensus has emerged in the UK around the central importance of good

quality jobs in tackling social exclusion” (Lister 2000: 41). The key to social inclusion is seen through a participation in the workforce. Hatfield reports that, “Recent research at the Applied Research Branch and at Statistics Canada sheds light on one of these barriers to social inclusion - persistent low income and its causes” (Hatfield 2001). A good point is presented by Lister that, “the more social inclusion is defined purely in terms of paid work, the more those not in paid work will come to feel excluded. This is particularly so, if politicians use exclusionary language such as that of the ‘dependency culture’ or the ‘underclass’ to describe them” (Lister, 1996). This approach can be problematic because in the context of a social strategy predicated on the work ethic, the result can be a devalorization of the hard work of caring for children and older people (Lister 2000: 41). Furthermore, “the elderly of course are not expected to have any current attachment to the labour market; for them ‘welfare to work’ is irrelevant” (Robinson 2000: 164).

Housing is another area of study where social inclusion is used as a primary concept. “Housing is a gateway through which we connect to our immediate environment and society at large. It reflects social status, belonging to community, a centre to gather with friends and family and it has a direct bearing on the extent to which we experience social inclusion or exclusion” (Chisholm 2001). Again, this use is not completely unproblematic. Chisholm does point out that one situation may give rise to both social inclusion and exclusion. “Social housing residents may have a sense of community within, while at the same time experiencing a sense of exclusion when they encounter prejudice from others because of their housing status” (Chisholm 2001). Chisholm offers us a reminder that inclusion and exclusion are not necessarily opposites. This issue will be revisited shortly.

After work and housing, education is another area where the concept of social inclusion is being actively used. Coyle writes that, “In the UK the path to privilege through

a separate and better education is one of the main channels of exclusion: it isolates children from understanding how others live and guarantees them, and their children in turn, far better life chances than their contemporaries in the state sector' (Coyle 2000: 150).

Wotherspoon (2001) has also written on this topic. He sees public school as a gateway for inclusion into citizenship, work, and other spheres of social participation (Wotherspoon 2001). Donnelly applies social inclusion to an even narrower area, physical recreation. He writes about the importance of having the opportunity for children to participate in physical recreation of various types. It is a crucial means through which children are socially included (Donnelly 2001).

This leads us to another area, the concern with the health, safety and well being of children. There is a growing advocacy for the rights of children and this area has made social inclusion one of its central concerns. The Laidlaw Foundation, a co-host of the social inclusion conferences, has a particular focus on the status of children. Jackson, among others, writes that the, "Social inclusion of children means that all children should have the opportunity to develop their talents and capacities to the full and to be active and valued participants in society" (Jackson 2001). Child inclusion is both linked with their parents' social inclusion in society and to other factors specific to children such as school and space.

Andrew (2001) discusses the importance of the role of space as an element in social inclusion. He includes, "Space in the sense of both social space and physical space" (Andrew 2001). "Having easy access to all parts of a community is one dimension of being included in that community" (Andrew 2001). Andrew goes on to make the link between social inclusion and public transportation explicit. He notes that, "Inadequate public transportation excludes a variety of groups within the population - it marginalizes the elderly, the young, the poor, women (as we know, more women use public transportation than men)

and all those who do not have ready access to private cars” (Andrew 2001).

Social inclusion as a concept is also used in relation to other marginalized groups. Social inclusion has been used to describe the situation of both the disabled and Aboriginal peoples. Frazee, writing from personal experience, states, “It is my belief that through the lens of disability, we can most clearly perceive the limitations of an exclusive focus upon rights and legal entitlement, and recognize the essential contribution of social inclusion to the challenge of promoting, respecting and protecting lives of dignity and equality for all citizens” (Frazee 2001). Ratcliffe, writing at the junction of minority identity theory and social inclusion, claims that, “The truly ‘inclusive society’ does not exist outside the realms of theory. Segments of all populations invariably lose out on ‘full citizenship rights’ on grounds of ‘race’, ethnicity, religion, class, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, and so on” (Ratcliffe 2000: 181). Ratcliffe goes on to explore the compatibility of identity politics with notions of inclusion.

Other theories have also been discussed in the context of inclusion. One of these is stakeholding theory. Thus, in the business realm, Slinger writes that, “We have also argued for laws that promote consultative arrangements between companies and their wider stakeholders. The aim of such reforms would be to allow inclusive solutions to be sought. This seems to us to be the best way of expressing, through a regulatory approach, the essentially cooperative and creative concept of stakeholding” (Slinger 2000: 274). Stakeholding theory and inclusion seem to have other affinities. Winstanley quotes Goodpaster’s distinction between, “stakeholder analysis, where stakeholder views are solicited to inform decision-making, and stakeholder synthesis, where stakeholders are more fully incorporated into decision-making processes, implying a more radical attempt at power sharing” (Winstanley 2000: 251).

Different emphases are placed on what a social inclusion model entails, but what remains is that it presents itself as an alternative to traditional egalitarian ideals. There is much disagreement about whether social inclusion is a new and better agenda than that based on TEI. There can be little disagreement, however, about the extensive use of the concept based on the varied arenas in which it appears.

Given its many uses, it is not surprising that some critics have charged that social inclusion is a nebulous concept. As Phipps (2001: 2) notes, social inclusion and social exclusion are not easily defined, there are many alternative definitions usually of a multi-dimensional nature “including social, cultural, environmental, physical and mental aspects.” Hatfield agrees noting that, “social inclusion and social exclusion are multifaceted concepts. No single factor separates those non-elderly adults and their families who earn adequate income from the labour market and are able to fully participate in their communities and those who do not” (Hatfield 2001). Novick reflects this tension well by pointing out that, “Social inclusion is a compelling, complex, and contested concept. What appears to have self-evident meaning to its advocates can conceal layers of differing assumptions and agendas. Inclusion holds out the promise of a more just set of relationships within society. But until we know what kind of inclusion is intended, and for whom, then the promise remains unclear” (Novick 2001).

Unclear? Drache agrees, “New ideas like social inclusion are always confusing at first because they are used in differing ways. This is nothing new. Noteworthy is the fact that much of our contemporary policy vocabulary is imprecise and many state-of-the-art concepts lack sharp clarity and precision” (Drache 2001). There is, thus, more nebulosity in contemporary policy vocabulary. So what? Ratcliffe states his position clearly when he asserts that, “What has been lacking in this process is a failure to undertake a serious critique

of the central concept: accordingly it has resulted, I would argue, in a form of ‘soundbite sociology’” (Ratcliffe 2000: 169). Why would this be a problem? Perhaps because too often, some of these questions are not attended to. “We need to examine what it is the marginalized group are being included in, what they are excluded from, and on whose terms the exclusion and/or inclusion is occurring” (Helgason 2001).

There are other drawbacks mentioned regarding social inclusion, even by some proponents of the model like Freiler. Participants at roundtable discussions organized by the Laidlaw Foundation judged social inclusion to be a promising concept that deserved further development and promotion. However, they expressed their cautions and concerns as well. Specifically, they were concerned that, “Social inclusion’s ‘political flexibility’ (i.e. that it can be seen as valuable by all sides of the political spectrum) and its ‘looseness’ as a concept (i.e. lack of precision and various usages as a goal, process, or outcome) may compromise its usefulness” (Freiler 2001). Also, “the language and concept of inclusion and exclusion, as currently articulated, may not be accessible to those are marginalized and excluded” (Freiler 2001).

Other concerns raised in the literature include social inclusion being interpreted “to mean homogenization of culture and lifestyle - or social control of vulnerable people” (Grey 2001). A related concern is with social inclusion being seen as an unopposed vision or goal. “Not everyone aspires to the same thing, as is implied in SI. Who will define what it is people are to be included in? Will SI become just another buzzword? Policy makers often fail to recognize the diversity among people and it can be a struggle to be identified as having unique needs and concerns” (Helgason 2001). Another way of putting it is that, “the interests, aspirations and demands of different sectors of the population may genuinely be in conflict with one another” (Ratcliffe 2000: 180). Social inclusion as a consensus vision to

achieve may render these legitimate conflicts impossible. In other words, there may be a conflict between the choice of 'self-exclusion' and the societal goal of inclusion. "Some groups may choose, for a variety of reasons, to remain outside of the mainstream culture (e.g. deaf culture)" (Freiler 2001).

Goodin (1996) raises another fundamental issue about inclusion and exclusion. "Built into the very logic of those concepts, I now want to argue, is a focus on precisely that marginality which those who politically invoke values of 'inclusion' hope to transcend" (Goodin 1996: 346). That argument holds little sway for me, since I equate it with those who claim we should not be using the concept of race or class because there is no such thing as race or class. Not using a concept will not make its lived reality by individuals and groups any less true or painful. You can disagree whether a status actually exist, but to claim that using the name of this status will focus undue attention on its object of study when usually that is precisely the point, is no argument at all.

Goodin does, however, make a good point when he writes that, "While fully acknowledging the genuine anxieties associated with various aspects of social exclusion, in the end, I think that that phrase mis-diagnoses the problem and mis-prescribes the cure for most of the social ills to which it refers" (Goodin 1996: 344). He thinks that subsuming the case for participation within arguments for inclusion gets at the relationship between those two propositions exactly the wrong way around. It is arguments for participation that should properly be seen to be subsuming arguments for inclusion. "That is to say, one of the things participatory theorists demand - and must demand, given the deeper logic of their arguments - certainly is the inclusion of the previously excluded among those eligible to participate in various forms of concern to them. But for participatory theorists, mere inclusion would never be enough" (Goodin 1996: 353). "What those arguments point to is a

case for 'full inclusion' (Parsons, 1965). The aim is to bring the disadvantaged ('the excluded') into the mainstream - into the very centre of the social life of the community. Goodin argues that most understanding of inclusion is, however, just about 'getting over the line'; there is nothing in that notion which implies, or is even compatible with, insisting on getting all the way to the centre" (Goodin 1996: 359). This 'center versus periphery' argument is of enormous importance. Before the end of this thesis, I hope to situate my own position on this crucial distinction.

The drawback is summarized clearly by Wotherspoon who writes, "Current emphases on concepts of inclusion and exclusion, and related discourses such as social cohesion, have emerged in a search for solutions to 'social problems' produced in the course of significant ongoing economic, social and political transformations. While this quest is important, there are dangers when fundamental social divisions like those of class, gender, and race, are obscured within language and policy interventions that ignore deeper structural forces and transformations" (Wotherspoon 2001).

The social inclusion proponents point to many problems associated with the traditional egalitarian ideals model. On the other hand, there are also some concerns regarding the concept social inclusion. Clearly, there are difficulties at the theoretical level with both models. They both offer ideal visions and while the conceptual debate between the social inclusion model and the traditional egalitarian ideals model is quite complex, the debate has questions of representation and inclusion at its core. Importantly, these models are incompatible with one another at the conceptual level. The question is how do these issues manifest themselves in practice at the community level. It is to this question that we now turn.

Chapter 3: Context and Methodology

This chapter is divided in two sections. The first offers an overview of the community under study. The section then surveys the origin and history of the community mobilization efforts in the region. In doing so, this section seeks to justify the choice of this community as the case study for this thesis. The second section closely examines the research design and methodology used in this research. This includes a detailed description of every step in the research process, from the scheduling of interviews, to the actual data collection and analysis, and everything in between.

Site Selection

The data for this thesis was collected as part of a larger, multi-site study on the sustainability of community-based crime prevention activities. The Evangeline region in Prince Edward Island, the research site of this thesis, was one of five communities that participated in the multi-site study. Evangeline was chosen to examine the questions of inclusion and representation since this community encompasses a large rural region west of the city of Summerside, PEI. It is made up of 15 small villages, of which only two are incorporated: Wellington and Abram Village. However, it also includes Urbanville, Mont Carmel, St. Thimothee, Cap. Egmont, St. Chrysostome, Harmony, Higgins Rd, Union Corner, St. Phillippe, St. Gilbert, St. Hubert, St. Raphael, Maximeville, Baie Egmont, Richmond, St. Nicholas, and Muddy Creek. (Caputo et al. 2002: 1). The total population amounts to approximately 2500 individuals, including 427 in Wellington and 330 in Abram Village. There are a number of school-age children in the region including: 212 in grades 1 through 6, and 243 in grades 7 through grade 12. There are over 70 community

organizations active in the region. There are also numerous organizations for children and youth including Jeunesse Acadienne, Boys and Girls Club, Scouts, and the Club 4-H (Caputo et al. 2002: 66).

The community is one of two 'Acadian', French-speaking regions in the province. The population is quite homogeneous and many of the families have lived in the region for a long time. The economy relies mostly on agriculture and fisheries, but also on tourism, construction, the hotel business and public administration. The region also has a long history of voluntarism and cooperation. The cooperative movement is strong in the community and the residents have a long history of relying on each other for support. This has resulted in a strong tradition of volunteerism as well as community leadership. Being a minority in the province, the residents of this Acadian community have learned how to work together to achieve collective goals.

The region faces numerous challenges. The economy is seasonal, with many low-paying jobs. Because people are faced with long periods of unemployment, it has problems with alcoholism, drunk driving and family violence. Other concerns in the region relate to substance abuse, child abuse, bullying and problems of self-esteem. There has also been some concern about the well-being of the young people in the region. They have few opportunities for advancement and many leave the area to pursue post-secondary education or to find appropriate, full-time employment. While the region had a history of low high school completion rates, this issue has recently been addressed and much higher completion rates are now reported. However, education and completion rates continue to be of concern to community residents.

The Evangeline Community Consultative Group (ECCG) sponsored the initiative that was the focus of the multi-site research project. The ECCG is a group of volunteers

who meet on a regular basis with members of the East Prince Detachment of the RCMP, to identify problems in the community, which necessitate a response from the police. They attempt to identify the cause of these problems and work together to resolve them. They are comprised of representatives from many sectors of the community. The following people form the group: the Principal of the local elementary/high school, a representative from the Senior's movement, a representative from the Evangeline Community Health Centre, a student representative, a Wellington Community Council member, the Abram-Village Community Council Chair, the General Manager of the Baie Acadienne Development Corporation, and the resident RCMP officer. All areas in the Evangeline region are represented on the ECCG.

The consultative group was founded by the local RCMP officer in 1994. In the first few years it operated much like a typical RCMP consultative group, but has now taken on a much broader and more independent role focussed on immediate crime issues as well as situational crime prevention strategies. However, in 1998, the members of the group proposed to further partner with the National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC) by adopting and promoting their philosophy of 'crime prevention through social development'. "We firmly believe that the only way to prevent crime and to promote 'safe homes and safe communities' is by investing in families and communities" (Caputo et al. 2002: 31). This new approach is deemed important to the community because it addresses the roots causes of crime and provides a flexible community inclusive solution for crime prevention. It is also important for the community in that it provides a framework through which the school, families and the community can work together towards the elimination of the risk factors which can lead to criminal activity (Caputo et al. 2002: 34).

Part of the interest in this particular community mobilization effort is that the group in question has broad representation from all sectors of the community: youth, seniors, health, municipal administrators, school administration, Acadian women, child services, political representative, RCMP personnel, and general public representation. Members report their experience and knowledge of their specific sectors at the group's monthly meetings. Moreover, they bring information back to the groups they represent (Caputo et al. 2002: 94). It is this process, among others, that sparked an interest in this community's efforts.

In 1998, the ECCG applied for and received funding from an NCPC mobilization grant. This initial grant launched the current round of activities. They were thus the beneficiaries of a new NCPC 'Strategic Fund' (SF). Projects are identified internally as opposed to calls for proposals as is the case with other funds. Because of this, this funding program is not advertised. Promising projects may be identified through a joint management committee review process or by NCPC staff. The objectives of the SF are to provide additional support to promising projects until they can become sustainable or are further developed for consideration under one of the other funding programs of the National Strategy, other federal departments, levels of government or the private sector. (Caputo et al. 2002: 1). Since the initial grant, the group has also sought project funding to achieve specific objectives such as instituting an anti-bullying program. The funds from projects also help to pay the salary of the ECCG Coordinator. This is critical, as we will see in the next chapter, since the Coordinator performs a variety of functions for the ECCG that help to sustain this community initiative.

With the initial funding, the ECCG proposed to conduct a community mobilization meeting/workshop in order to: (a) Introduce a community-based crime prevention program;

(b) Update and expand a needs and assets survey; and (c) Construct an action plan for the period from January 1999 to March 2000 (Caputo et al. 2002: 33). Using NCPC funding, a community-wide forum was held and community concerns were sought. Seventy associations of the Evangeline Region, junior and senior high school students, and teachers met in a series of crime prevention forums in March of 1999. The forums explored 3 key questions relating to crime prevention: (a) What are the strengths of the Evangeline region?; (b) What are our weaknesses?; and (c) What are possible solutions?. All of the responses were compiled and analyzed (Caputo et al. 2002: 21). This analysis led to the conclusion that prevention of crime needs to be addressed by concentration on family, school and community focusing upon the following priorities: self-esteem; alcoholism and other addictions; violence in teen dating; sports violence; family and domestic violence; child abuse; TV violence; and information (Caputo et al. 2002: 3).

These concerns served as the framework for an action plan that was developed by the ECCG. This action plan informed the series of activities and events that were undertaken by the ECCG. The plan outlined a direction to the group regarding what strategies the residents wanted to implement (Caputo et al. 2002: 21). Actually, a second community consultation is planned for this year by way of several theme-based community forums at which time progress on the initial action plan will be reviewed, current concerns will be discussed and a new action plan will be developed.

Another point of interest in this community was the breadth of the various initiatives undertaken in the region. These included the distribution of information bulletins on topics such as drinking and driving, self-esteem, teen dating relationships, sports violence, family violence, and on addictions (Caputo et al. 2002: 4); the organization of family fun festivals that showcased information booths for adults and games and prizes for children (Caputo et

al. 2002: 4); and their most recent initiative, the Virtues Project. The Virtues Project was implemented in order to empower individuals and families to live by their highest values. It was inspired by the desire to do something to counteract the rising violence in and around families. Education is the key to transformation, but it must involve education that touches the human spirit. The ECCG felt that initiating the Virtues Project in Evangeline would allow them to address many of the concerns identified in the action plan.

The Virtues Project is an approach that calls people to remember the qualities of character. It has been applied in a variety of settings which include: federally funded community development and healing projects in First Nations communities in Canada; programs with urban street children in Los Angeles; as an enhancement of the religious life of virtues congregations of diverse faiths in the northwestern United States; drug and alcohol rehabilitation programs and in Australian and North American prisons; in the restructuring of the curriculum and culture of schools; as an enhancement to unify organizations, and as a tool in daycare centres, palliative care programs, and in parent education programs throughout the world.

The project proposes to teach a language that builds self esteem because it replaces shaming and blaming languages by calling each other to the gifts of character, namely: courage, flexibility, helpfulness, etc. The language can be used to empower children, employees and friends. Viewing life as an opportunity for learning, this approach to recognizes teachable moments and uses the 52 gifts of character strategy. This enables the participants to bring out the best in one another. The approach is built on the notion that in all relationships, clear boundaries based on respect for each person are a strong preventative of violence and a builder of unity, thus empowering people to act on the best within themselves (Caputo et al. 2002: 19).

The Virtues Project is considered an option in Restorative Justice. The ECCG sees it as enabling people to become involved in the particular stories of the suffering child or youth, adult or senior citizen, employer or employee, teacher or student, inmate or prison guard, by being deeply present, by asking clarifying questions and by drawing out the person's own truth in the context of the Virtues, the Gifts of Character (Caputo et al. 2002: 20). For the Virtues Project, the ECCG received \$24,000 of financial and in-kind support from a combination of partners. These included the Diocese of each town's religious communities, caisse populaire and Coops, School Board, the Club Richelieu, and the East Prince Health Council, EDA, and Entente Qc-PEI. (Caputo et al. 2002: 40).

The Consultative group was also interesting because of its emphasis and sustained efforts at raising awareness in its community on various issues. The ECCG lists as some of their main objectives: a desire to have a public that is better informed, that has more vocabulary to speak to the issues, that is more aware of its responsibilities, that knows better where to go for help, and that better equips children and youth to speak to adults about difficult issues happening to and around them (Caputo et al. 2002: 11). The ECCG also strove to reach out to the English minority in the regions in order to help them better meet their needs and seek their involvement. This inclusivity dimension is of central interest to this thesis.

Another factor that made Evangeline an interesting community to study were the numerous partnerships involved with the ECCG. These partnerships included: the Congregation of Notre Dame; the Evangeline School and French Language School Board; Centre Scolaire communautaire Evangeline; the Evangeline Community Health Centre; the Club Richelieu; Jeunesse Acadienne; the Wellington Boys & Girls Club; Femmes acadiennes et francophones de l'I.-P.-E.; the Caisse Populaire Evangeline; Ben's Bread; McCain Foods;

Co-ops de Wellington et de Mont-Carmel; Coolers Restaurant & Donnie's Esso; Cavendish Farms; the incorporated villages of Abram-Village and Wellington; Kids R First; Les Aines/Ainees de la region Evangeline et IPE; Arlington Orchards; Acadia Construction; Wellington Construction; the Governments of PEI and Quebec; etc. While some groups gave donations of food and/or money for the Family Fund Day, others helped with providing space for meetings and/or activities; some gave time for janitorial services, while others shared their expertise or helped them with support letters. All in all, it is the community at large which seems to support the ECCG in whatever way they can (Caputo et al. 2002: 14).

The ECCG received considerable support from the community mobilization program of the National Crime Prevention Centre (Caputo et al. 2002: 86). A total of \$43,540 was approved in support of the ECCG for the period of 2002-2004 from the Canadian government in their National Crime Prevention Strategy (Caputo et al. 2002: 44). This demonstrates the ECCG's continued longevity and sustained effort at community mobilization.

Research Design and Methodology

The next section of this chapter provides a detailed description of the research design and methodology used in this study. I initially received an information package that included relevant details on the Evangeline region, the ECCG, and the nature of their activities. This package provided me with a better understanding of the characteristics of this particular community mobilization effort. The package was put together by the research team for the multi-site study and included material on many aspects of the community. The weeks leading to the actual site visit were spent studying and summarizing this information.

I was part of a three-person research team that visited the Evangeline site from October 2nd to October 4th 2002. My task as part of this team was two-fold: first as a second or third facilitator at the francophone Evangeline site, depending on the session; and second, as a transcriber/translator of the taped interviews and focus group sessions.

Once the team arrived at Summerside, we met with the Coordinator of the Consultative Group. This meeting served as an initial contact. She had scheduled the meetings and interviews that would take place over the following two days. The Coordinator would be a constant presence during our stay in the Evangeline region. She made the whole experience easier not only by her planning, but also by acting as an ice-breaker between the researchers and her colleagues in the community.

We met with 9 different groups over the following two days. On the first day, we met with members of the seniors' community in the region. The interview took place at 13:30, in the conference room of Access PEI, a provincial-government services building. There were three women in this particular group interview, representing the two major Senior's organizations of the region. The second group interview of the day, done right after the first and in the same building occurred at 15:00. It was conducted with three employees of the PEI government. These three women were, among other things, responsible for funding issues and translation services that were relevant to the ECCG's efforts in the region. The third and final interview of the day took place that evening in one of the rooms in the Elementary/High School. This group interview was conducted with 4 anglophone members of the community. The four women were all mothers of children in the francophone school system. They were interviewed to ascertain how much or little the initiatives of the ECCG in this francophone community were also responsive and inclusive to their needs.

The second day started with a first group interview at 8:30 a.m. with the Femmes Acadiennes, an organization of Acadian women. There were two women present who represent an active community organization of women in the region. This interview also took place in the conference room of Access PEI. The second group interview of the day was at the health care centre with two of the health care workers. The interview took place at about 10:30 in the morning at their office. The third group interview was at the Elementary/High School for lunch. There, we met with six students of different ages, from grade 7 to 11. Many of them were members of Jeunesse Acadienne, an organization for Acadian youth. The fourth interview was with the president of the minor hockey association and the sports representative on the ECCG. We met him at 16:00 in the ECCG Coordinator's office. Our fifth interview of the day was with the ECCG members themselves. This took place at 19:00 in a room at the Elementary/High School. Present at this meeting were the RCMP member, the president of the ECCG, the Coordinator, the representative of Wellington and Abram-Village, the representative of Quatre-Enfant, and the representative of the seniors group. Our last group interview of the day was with members of the religious community. We met them at 21:00 at a church meeting room. There were six individuals there, two of whom were the priests of the two dioceses of the region.

Every session followed the same format. What took place can be more easily called group interviews than focus groups. Questions were asked of the group in general, sometimes only one answered for all, sometimes every participant made their own contribution. While there are a number of definite questions that were asked to all, the process allowed for maximum flexibility, in order to probe and be responsive to each groups' unique connection with the ECCG - as a partner, sponsor, or client.

Every group interview took place in French except for the Anglophone group interview that was conducted in English. Initially, we would first introduce ourselves and briefly explain the purpose of our visit. We told them we were interested in finding out the key elements behind the success of the ECCG and that above all else, we were not there to evaluate their work. We passed out an information sheet that summarized the goals of the research and other pertinent information. This sheet can be found in the appendix. We also distributed an Informed Consent Form to every individual present. A complete copy of this form can also be found in the appendix.

We asked every group if we could tape the interviews, except in the case of the students, where no such request was made and no taping was done. We were given permission to tape the interviews every time. All the interviews were taped on a total of three cassettes. It should be pointed out that due to technical difficulties, neither the interviews with the religious community nor the Femmes Acadiennes were adequately taped.

The only source of concern that was raised in regards to the general scope of the group interviews was whether the Coordinator of the ECCG should be present during the interviews. She acted as our guide during the duration of our visit, thus she was on site for almost all of them. It was suggested that her presence would unduly influence the responses of some of the groups were interviewed. She is a well-respected member of her community, and she is a representative of the ECCG. Because of this and other concerns, we felt that some of the interviewees would be tempted to provide information consistent with the Coordinator's opinions as much as their own. For this reason, the Coordinator was asked to deliver us to the site of the interview and return only once it was over.

While the format of the group interviews was flexible, the research team did have a number of set questions to cover. These questions were organized in four main sections

with a number of further probes for each. The interview guide is included in the appendices. The first set of questions focussed on the types of crime prevention activities that were underway in the community. The second set of questions addressed how the community activities were organized. The third set asked people whether those community-based initiatives involved any partnerships. The final set of questions asked people for their views of why they thought the community-based activities have persisted as long as they have.

There were few difficulties with the questions. One noteworthy exception surrounded the concept of crime prevention itself. In many instance, the facilitators were asked what was meant by crime prevention activities. In these cases, we responded that our interest was with their understanding and definitions and not ours. However, it is fair to say that more than one group did not conceive of their activities as crime prevention per se. As the group interviews advanced, the concept of crime prevention was replaced by the concepts of a community's safety, health and well-being. The individuals in many of the group interviews related their activities and understanding better to this definition.

There were no other systematic difficulties encountered with the phrasing of the questions. It must be emphasized that given the flexible format, the interviewees were welcomed to ask clarification questions whenever they wanted. Aside from these difficulties, the responsiveness of the interviewees can be described as 'eager to participate'. On more than one occasion an interviewee would answer a particular question at length and then ask us if that answer was too long, narrow, or good enough.

All of the interviews lasted between 45 and 90 minutes. The only exception was the meeting with the students that lasted only 30 minutes. The substantial variation in time is attributable to the number of individuals involved in the given group interview and to the level of engagement with the questions asked. Another factor in the length of interviews

was the amount of questions from the interviewees to the researchers at the end of the session. In a few instances, as the formal interview ended, it was transformed into a more informal discussion surrounding some of the key issues.

The next step was to compile and organize the data. The transcription and translation work was done during the months of November and December 2002. There were 9 hours of interviews recorded on three tapes at double speed, for a total of six groups. A transcriber machine was used for five of the six groups. All of the tapes were recorded in French, except for the Anglophone group and all were translated immediately into English. There were very few difficulties in the translation apart for some of the key concepts. The French of the Acadian proved to be slightly different than the French I normally use but this was not a problem in the end.

There were other types of difficulties encountered in the transcription. Given the placement of the microphone and the great variation in number of participants in the group interviews, the quality of the voices fluctuated greatly. On most group interviews, one or two voices were much harder to decipher than others. In one of the groups, the interviewers could not be heard, while in another, the interviewees' voices were barely audible. This made the transcription more difficult, but caused minimal loss of data when patience was employed. Individual voices were not identified, except for those of the interviewers. Finally, due to the omission of backing up the data on a floppy disk, when my PC crashed, a total of 4 group interviews were lost. Some of the work was thus done twice.

The transcription of the tapes produced 8 typed pages for the ECGG group, 6 pages for the governmental employees, 14 pages for the Anglophone group, 8 pages for the minor hockey association president, 10 pages for the health care workers, and 9 pages for the seniors. These totals are all single-spaced and constitute the bulk of the data gathered for

this study. The rest of the data included notes taken during the other three group interviews. All the researchers' voices were printed in red, while all the voices of the interviewees were in normal type. Each transcribed document includes the date, the hour, the location, and the individuals involved.

Once the data was recorded and organized, the next step was data analysis. This took place during the months of February and March of 2003. Initially, all of the transcripts were read twice from beginning to end, to get an overall picture of what was there. Slowly, a picture emerged regarding the theme of inclusion. The transcripts were read a third time with this theme in mind and a list of different topics was developed. Most of these topics were clustered around 5 areas of interest: representation, information, initiatives, keys to success and inclusion. These clusters were put in this order because of the logical progression in which they appeared in the data. The data show that the group started and made claims about representation; then they gathered and sought out information; they then organized and planned community initiatives; keys to success are then discussed; finally, other relevant information surrounding the topic of inclusion was noted.

These five clusters can be understood as loose ensembles of ideas surrounding a given theme. It is important to note that I operationalized each of these clusters solely through the data available rather than around pre-conceived definitions I might have had. I operationalized initiatives and factors of success fairly straightforwardly. Initiatives included any mention or discussion of the activities and events organized or supported by the ECCG. The keys to success were solely defined by factors mentioned by the interviewees. Since this was one of the questions asked to every group, we got a breadth of answers. Any answers offered to this question or surrounding factors contributing to the success and sustainability of the ECCG was included in this cluster. The cluster of representation was operationalized

as both claims of representatives and around the various community representatives on the council, meaning the constitution of the group. I operationalized the information cluster as any mention of gathering information or disseminating information and around the topic of communication in general. Finally, I operationalized inclusion as anything that discussed efforts at reaching out to people, at including more partners, or at obtaining more voices. I then read the transcripts a fourth time, altering and expanding the five categories on the basis of what appeared in the data. This process was very flexible and the criteria of inclusion changed many times.

Once I had a good idea of what would be within each cluster, I went over the transcripts one more time coding every instances of each theme. I used codes which I wrote in the margins and underlined the various appropriate passages. I also wrote on the back of each sheet all the passages and which cluster they belonged to. Once that process was over, I re-wrote all the material relevant to a cluster on a separate document. I thus gathered all the significant quotes that would be found in each of the five themes.

The last step of was to present the findings. Once again, some of the information shifted and moved from one theme to the other as it became clear that the distinctions I had originally drawn were more arbitrary than originally believed. The link between the prepared documents of relevant passages and the presentation of the findings was fairly straightforward. The original list of topics included in each cluster was used to separate the information within each theme. A logical outline was then set within each theme about the presentation of the various pieces of information. A narrative was then constructed with the bigger picture in mind and using direct quotes wherever possible. It is to the presentation of these findings that we now turn.

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion

This chapter is divided in two sections. The first covers some of the basic findings garnered from the Evangeline site visit through the use of two themes: initiatives and factors of success. The various initiatives organized or supported by the ECCG is the subject of the first theme. While the core initiative of the ECCG is the implementation of the Virtues Project, they have also organized family fun festivals and put together community bulletins. They have supported other initiatives in numerous ways, like the Speak Out program, health days for the seniors, topical workshops on issues of health and well-being and a 'buddy system' at school. A description of each initiative is provided including their intended goals and their individual degrees of success.

The second theme investigates the various 'keys' to the success of the ECCG outside of the individual initiatives. Since success is a concept that can be defined in numerous ways, this sub-section addresses some of the oft-mentioned factors that may have contributed to the perception of a successful community mobilization in Evangeline. There are many such declared 'keys', and this sub-section details some of the most prominent cited: (1) various types of financial support; (2) the means taken for the sustainability of the community mobilization; (3) the degree of independence and autonomy the ECCG kept from state agencies, namely the RCMP; (4) the level of community involvement and energy in the Evangeline region; (5) the early presence of success; (6) the group organization and leadership; (7) the presence of a permanent, full-time, coordinator; (8) the minority status of the Evangeline region inhabitants; (9) the breadth and number of partnerships within and outside the community; (10) the visibility of the community consultative group; and (11) the personality of the full-time Coordinator.

The second section of this chapter, while offering a description of findings, presents a thorough discussion of findings more directly related to the issues of concern to this thesis. This discussion is organized around two further themes: representation and inclusion. The third theme covers the constitution of the Evangeline Community Consultative Group and its partners (ECCG) as well as their claims to representativeness. The fourth theme covers the ways the ECCG promotes inclusion. In doing so, the theme builds a narrative around the topics of information gathering, consultation, deliberation and decision-making. The close links between the issues of representation and inclusion are also discussed.

Findings: Initiatives and Factors of Success

As part of the larger multi-site study, and built-in in the questions asked of all the respondents during the focus groups, was an interest in the actual activities of the ECCG. It is to this topic we first turn our attention.

Initiatives

There are numerous ways the ECCG is involved in the community but for the purpose of this section, I will only concentrate on a few. Some initiatives were organized by the ECCG themselves and other initiatives were not directly organized but clearly supported in various ways. These initiatives range from activities, to training, to dissemination of information and support work for some of their partners.

By all accounts, the main ECCG initiative is the Virtues Project, a behavioural program. From their action plan and looking at the community, the ECCG determined that what they needed was “A basic behavioural formation. Because often in crime, the

criminals, the people who do crimes have little choice, they don't have any formation, no 3-4-5-6 so they have two choices, do or not do and its more easy to do. So, we said we need to give people a formation in choices, at least. So, we looked everywhere and finally found a project called Virtues," (Ecc1) explains the president of the ECCG. "Our objective is to form the entire region" he pursues, "that includes the janitor here at school, the bus driver, so its in this region, a little bit like the Mormon church, everybody treated the same. If you look at their behaviour, it's the same. I see that and I say wow. If the behaviour of people were all the same, the small guy would have the same response as the guy at church. They would say, 'ah that's the behaviour I should have'. That's what we are doing. Really, the formation. We have done the schools, we have done the seniors, we have done with groups here and there" (Ecc2). Formation, here, is meant to signify behavioural training.

The Virtues Project is at the core of their activities and their locomotive insofar as the initiatives they take within the community. Their goal is to have everyone partake in this behavioural formation. It appears to be well received by members of the community, as one senior citizen told us "Virtues...makes us feel good. We can educate ourselves from this. It helps us to live" (Sen1). A healthcare worker also pointed out the benefits and affirmed that, "I think that Virtues will be very positive" (Hea3). This formation was explained as giving people a language to express themselves. Virtues is given in both languages by the Coordinator of the ECCG. She was trained in the Prairies by the author of the project. The Virtues Project is also the centerpiece of the financial sustainability of the consultative group. The Coordinator offers the training to other interested groups for a set fee, thus ensuring some revenue for the ECCG.

Another initiative coming out of the action plan was the idea of having an activity for rich and poor, for kids and adults, that would be educational and fun. With this in mind, the

ECCG organized what they called a 'Family Fun Festival'. A member of the council offered the following description, "we had a non-threatening brunch done by the Richelieu, on a Sunday. People came in, there was a mass, and at church the clergy invited people to the family fun festival. We had activities and fun for kids like kite flying and music and free brunch. And what the parents did is we set up tables in the middle and we had identified what was helpful info for families. People would just go around and pick up all the pamphlets and we felt it was important that they get information. If they have a problem, they need to know, they need to know where to go. That was the goal of the festival, was non-threatening" (Hea3). The president of the consultative group states, "We have done two family fun festivals in the region here. We brought some information" (Ecc2).

This event was supported by many organizations in the community. Actually, the Coordinator told us, "We picked up things from the entire island. That was fun, because our partners were not just from the Evangeline region. We had some from everywhere across the island: English, French, 40 places or so" (Ecc5). The event also had funding coming from the provincial government. "We have financed already a few projects that they presented like the family fun festival" (Acc1) a government employee told us. Perhaps the most significant fact that can be said about this event is that every group we interviewed in the community mentioned it to us. The formula with the dual nature of entertainment for kids and information for adults seems to have been one that people both remembered and supported.

While the Family Fun Festival was organized for two consecutive years, the ECCG changed the format for the third year. "We made some evaluations and phoned here and there to get people's reaction. Rather than do a festival of one day, we decided to bring a team of two clown from Quebec, that came for a day with the kids from grades 1-8 and for

the evening with the adults, we had a session around the question of violence, intimidation. We also used the week of the family. We did it that way, it was more educational” (Ecc5) explains the Coordinator. Through the use of feedback, the ECCOG feel they continue to be responsive to the community and try different things to share the information and messages they feel are important.

Another important initiative headed by the consultative group was a community bulletin that ran for almost a year. The Coordinator noted that, “For a while, we had a community bulletin each month” (Ecc2). The community bulletin “disseminated information on topics, on where to get help, 800 numbers, where to go for information for drug use or addiction, etc.” (Hea3) explains one of the group’s members. Part of the strength of this community bulletin was giving information on points of concern from the original community action plan, such as “crime prevention, drugs, how to speak to kids, to teenagers, and other things that touch us” (Ecc2). The bulletin “went to each house”. Furthermore, “the bulletins really gave us a lot of publicity and educated people”, according to the Coordinator. The bulletin ceased publication due to a lack of funds. However, the group affirmed their commitment to re-start the bulletin now that some additional funding has been approved for them. The bulletin filled an important need according to the group, “As soon as we missed one, people started to call. Where is our bulletin? Do you have other topics?” (Ecc2).

While these were some of the initiatives headed by the ECCOG, there are also initiatives led by other organizations that are actively supported by the consultative group. An example is the Speak Out program given by the minor hockey association of the region to the parents of their players, their coaches and their referees. This program teaches parents about the decorum preferred at hockey games and aims to minimize instances of

verbal abuse, animosity and violence coming from parents towards coaches, referees, players and other parents. The ECCG supports the Speak Out program by having their Coordinator give the program in French. The president of the minor hockey association explained, “She [Coordinator] went, took the 2-3 day course in Charlottetown on her own time and now she is qualified to give the Speak Out program course. Before that we had a guy from Charlottetown to come in and he spent 4 hours here or whatever. And because we are in a French speaking part of the island, we’d like to have it in French. We went and got some information from the province of Quebec and it’s called Dis-Le and it’s been very helpful” (Hoc2). The involvement of the consultative group allows for better accessibility of this program to the majority of the community who is French.

Other examples of supported initiatives by the ECCG include health days organized by the seniors’ association in the region, information workshops given to the community members on various topics, and the buddy system working through the local school. “We have some health/schools sessions, some health/community sessions. We have a session for teenagers where we speak with a psychologist. We speak about violence and for things like that we contact the Coordinator of the ECCG and we do a session. Sometimes it’s us that go to them; sometimes it’s them that come to us. Same thing for drugs. The partners with the school at the ECCG level get together” (Hea1). In each of these cases, the ECCG Coordinator is involved in either translating material from French to English, being a speaker on behalf of the consultative group on various topics surrounding crime prevention, and publicizing these various initiatives through their many partners. This helps in the visibility and participation rate of all these examples of community mobilization.

The links between the initiatives the ECCG promotes and the main interests of this thesis, representation and inclusion, are many. The ECCG actively seeks to reach out to all

members of its community by organizing initiatives that can include everyone. Its primary initiative, the Virtues Project, for example, was offered to every single segment of the population. The ECCG also raises awareness about its availability in the community by distributing information through a series of mediums: community bulletins, information sessions, and family festivals. The organization makes its presence known by working with many partners in the community, such as the school, the police, the health care centre and sports association, among others. The type of initiatives the ECCG organizes and the level of participation are both partly due to its representation and inclusion. More will be said on these issues shortly.

Factors of Success

It is important to note that it was not in the mandate of the researchers to determine whether the ECCG was successful in their community mobilization efforts. It was, however, the purpose of the study to learn from the respondents what they saw as the keys to the ECCG's sustainability success. This second theme reviews the factors related to success that were identified by the various individuals and groups we interviewed.

The first factor was mentioned by the president of the ECCG, "eventually, we asked for a subvention for the region. That was really a key that started it all" (Ecc1). There was some level of financial support that helped facilitate a lot of the activities of the consultative group. Another member of the council states, "if we didn't have money, the subventions and all that, something would be done, but the success would not be as good, I think it's sure" (Ecc7). Actually, the loss of money "for the program itself I think it would be a disaster" (Hoc6) confirms yet another member of the consultative group. It seems apparent

that as a list of important keys is compiled, the presence of financial support lies at the foundation of the current success of the ECCG.

While external financial support is important to the ECCG, there is also a level of sustainability coming from internal financial means. The Coordinator of the consultative group tells us that “me, on top of doing the work with the people, at the same time I go here and there to give sessions of formation [training] so that we have a financial sustainability, as much as possible” (Ecc7). “This group, this group, and that group. We charge a little bit. It gives us money to do other things” shares the president of the consultative group. The group’s long-term plan is to be as financially independent as they can be. This way they would not be constantly dependent upon uncertain financial assistance from various governmental agencies.

A third success factor for the group is its independence. The RCMP officer told us, “what I have noticed also is there are many consultative groups in PEI. The majority of these councils after a little while, they disappear. Often it was the RCMP officer who was in charge, that was running the entire game and then as soon as the officer was too busy or had less time or was transferred, at that moment the people in the community told themselves, well the officer is gone... So when I arrived I said I did not want this to happen here, I wanted the group to become more and more independent. So, I consider myself like a support individual, only a partner, I don’t run the show” (Ecc2). He continued, “if tomorrow morning I get transferred in another province, because we know that RCMP officers move around a lot, well then the ECCG will still continue its activities, even if there are no other member of the RCMP comes here. That was less done in the other consultative groups of the region. They are the only one that remains. The only one.” (Ecc3). The ECCG attempts very hard to depend as little as possible on a single individual,

single organization, or single institution. From time to time this is unavoidable, but as the case of the Evangeline consultative group seems to suggest, their independence from the RCMP may be part of their sustainability.

The fourth factor that was brought up by many we interviewed was the special nature of the people who live in this region. One member of the council told us “the people from the Evangeline region are very energetic people that get involved a lot. It is impressive to see the number of volunteers in the Evangeline region. People are not scared to work and to give their own time” (Ecc3). More specifically, another told us “the Acadians are people that I dare say are tenacious, they are not like others, they never quit. For me it is something that we have in our blood. The Acadians are maybe a people different from others” (Sen6). Many in the community attributed the sustainability of the ECCG to the unique character of the people. “I think this spirit in the community has always been there. Its networking, it’s the way we are,” (Hea5) states a healthcare worker. “We are a close-knit community,” (Hoc8) adds another member of the council. There is an active commitment on the part of the community to foster this sense of energy and civic engagement. It is done partly through education. A community member told us, “We start forming leaders early, because of what we call Jeunesse Acadienne. There are meetings with kids especially to form leadership” (Sen7). This seems to create a strong sense of Acadian identity fostering a sense of community in the region.

Another factor worth mentioning is that members of the ECCG achieved results from their efforts fairly early. “The success came quickly, very quickly. It encourages people” (Ecc3). Members of the ECCG feel the consequence of the relative speed of the success of some of their initiatives strengthened the commitment and resolve of the partners. The president of the council asserts that, “we had a group that wanted to do

something” (Ecc3). As it appears results were immediate, members of the community didn’t need to exercise patience, waiting for effects over a long period of time. This seems to have energized the members to believe they could make a difference.

Another factor contributing to their success is the organization and leadership of the ECCG. “Our management approach in this group is the Carter approach. There is no one more important than anyone else. We answer to ourselves. Around the table, the leadership of the group changes every month that we meet. It’s the people that change and it works,” (Ecc6) states the president of the council. Elsewhere he says, “I think one of the reason it works here and maybe not in other regions is because there the leader did it all. Then the leader gets transferred, its not his fault, it’s just the process” (Ecc3). The consultative group has partners from all the major institutional players and organizations and their meetings are very apolitical. Many members shared with us that everyone has an equal say on what goes on and on what is done. That certainly leads to greater durability than if there were interpersonal conflicts and unstable hierarchies within the group.

Two more inter-related factors that contribute to ECCG’s success are the presence of a full-time coordinator in the consultative group and the specific personality characteristics of the person who is their Coordinator. Starting with the existence of the position, many individuals interviewed told us of the importance of having someone there full-time and accessible. “If someone had a problem, they have someone that they can go talk to,” (Ecc4) says a member of the community. The RCMP officer tells us, “I am not aware of another group that has a person working full time” (Ecc4). Volunteers do a lot of the work, but as many told us, the Coordinator is crucial, “I don’t think they [volunteers] have the time. Volunteers can only do so much” (Ang6). The Coordinator does most of the paperwork required and is the face of the consultative group in the community. “The

ECCG sends her to sessions on family violence, it's her that is the representative of this region on crime prevention at the provincial level. Victim services, it's the same thing. Networking, she does it at a provincial level, among the organizations here, within the Atlantic, and at a national level," (Hea7) according to a healthcare worker in the region. The Coordinator is key. "The work of the committee is more enjoyable because there is someone to execute the actions. Someone that can push the recommendations a little farther maybe than a volunteer would, because they have the contacts, the partners, they have establish relations of communication" (Acc6). She can be found in the community very easily and is very approachable.

A member of the consultative group told us that, "it works because people come to the meetings, they are interested, we have a good Coordinator. We want to come" (Sen6). Many told us she energizes people. "The employee is there, that makes a big difference also, she is 100% devoted, she loves what she does. It makes a difference in an organization. At the base, it's a job and I will do my job, but her she loves what she does. For it to work, you need a person who has a lot of will. It makes a difference" (Acc2). "She is so dedicated to her work. She is so dedicated to her job. Anybody can go by here at 6:45 in the morning and she's in the office. To me, she's a big part," (Hoc3) added another member of the council. Above and beyond the nature of the role, the characteristics of the Coordinator were mentioned time and again as key to the group's effectiveness.

Before we turn to the last two key factors of visibility and partnership, one member of the ECCG mentioned the minority status of the community as a contributing factor of success. "I notice that the Evangeline region is a little privileged for subventions, since it's considered a minority in PEI and because it's francophone...that is one of the factors that contributes I believe to the success of the ECCG" (Ecc4). This may or may not be the case,

but is worth considering as money is a crucial element. Some groups may have more success than others in obtaining it.

While on the subject of money, there is a link with the factor of partnerships. The ECCG has been very good at reaching out to various organizations and institutions in the community. Their philosophy in regards to seeking financing from partners is described well by their president, “An expression we have in English says: a friend in need is a pest, get rid of him. Ok. We did not become a pest to the people we work with. We do something that touches them; it’s very emotional when you speak of children, when you speak about battered women, when you speak about family things, its very emotional. So, when we do project X, sometimes we go somewhere, sometimes we go somewhere else. They know what we do; they know we’re not wasting their time or money. Sometimes some people say no. I think it’s really that we are not dependent on anyone. It would be easy to go to the bank every time, every time, every time. Sometimes we go, sometimes we don’t” (Ecc6).

Apart from financing initiatives, the ECCG’s foundations in the community are recognized to be very strong. “I think one of the reasons it continues is often the number of partners that they get involved for their projects. For example, if you can get the school, here it tells us that this project here is important because this group gets involved, and if this groups gets involved, its really something that they need. It responds to needs for the school and pre-school” (Acc4). When asked if these partnerships are formal, we were told, “no, they are informal” (Hea5). A healthcare worker explained to us that “I think informally, people meet to discuss common needs at an organizational level and people bring in, like we had a discussion on the importance of self-esteem, everyone comes to the table with difference, but find projects that have an impact on everyone. I think the organization is the driving force for the community. If you look at the constraints of the school, the concern of

the ECCG, when it's a major concern, you work on it together. That's why it works. They will use the ECCG because they are interested in the issues that are the issues of the community" (Hea5).

The last factor to be mentioned here is the importance of visibility. This factor was explored actively by the researchers and found a number of different answers were provided by the community members. When asked about the visibility of the group in the community, most individuals interviewed believed the members of the community might not know about the consultative group. That puzzled the researchers, but was explained in numerous ways. Firstly, it is important to note that the story for the Coordinator of the group is markedly different. "She is very visible in the community" (Hoc6). She is a name and face everyone is familiar with. She thus gives the group high visibility. Another factor is that "the group uses everybody else's visibility" (Hea6) according to a healthcare worker in the community. Because the various partners of the ECCG are well-known, the healthcare center, the school, the pre-school, the RCMP, the minor hockey association, the seniors, etc, when an event is organized each of the partners spreads the word, creating visibility.

When asked about the importance of visibility, the president of the ECCG was quick to tell us "to be visible might be important in other regions. Here, I think our visibility is the actions we have taken. Not the big sign, the office, the telephone, the paperwork, it's the actions that gives us a visibility" (Ecc4). Activities like the Virtues Project and the family fun festival seem to be well known in the community even if there is low name recognition of the ECCG itself. A healthcare worker in the community stated, "if they don't know necessarily what everybody's mandate is, and when 50% of people are illiterate in the community...then all they know is someone is organizing this even in the community. And very often it is different people that get together, different people that sit at different tables.

So for example, I go to a meeting here and I will mention family fun festival. The school will for example inform parents through school bulletin that this activity is happening. So people receive it from various sources, so they don't necessarily know who the group [ECCG] is" (Hea4).

The Coordinator of the consultative group explains that the lack of visibility of the consultative group was done on purpose, "at a certain point it was discussed whether we should tell people about the organizations sitting around the table. We decided together that we must wait. And each time that we did an activity, we said that the ECCG organized it. But recently, in the Voix Acadienne last week and this week, we named the groups that were there. We said the seniors, the school, the incorporated villages, the Quatre-Enfants, the RCMP, and others. As time goes by more the people will recognize us. We were always in a tough situation because we never knew if we would be able to continue. The budget always only came for a year. We could never plan ahead. Now, we have just gotten a note saying we were accepted for 3 years. So now, we will be able to say. Now we will have a lot more visibility. It makes a difference as much for the group as for the people who tried to coordinate and to tell people to get involved" (Ecc5). So now that the ECCG feels secure in the knowledge that their activities will continue for awhile, they will more actively publicize the presence of their group in the community.

Two particular factors of success warrant further discussion about their link to the issues of representation and inclusion. The first finding concerns the large number of voluntary organizations in the region that is estimated to be as high as 70 organizations by some sources. The ECCG is somewhat unique in that it is a consultative group that includes members from all the major sectors of the community. They are not mobilized around a single issue, but rather aim to tackle the community's health, safety and well-being in general.

They have members, as will be covered shortly in the representation theme, from the education, law enforcement, health, sports, and municipal government sectors as well as from the seniors' movement, the women's movement and youth. These members come together around issues that are wide-reaching and that concern as many people as possible. Initiatives are designed with the common goals of the partners in mind, so as to garner support and assistance from everyone in the group.

The critique that might be launched at this type of organizational model is that some issues and problems that are specific to some of the partners are not addressed because of the ECCG's focus on issues on which everyone agrees. While this may be the case in other communities, this critique cannot be easily levelled at the ECCG. They do not restrict their activities to those that are general in scope such as their Virtues Project, the community bulletins and the family fun festivals. They also sponsor and assist in many projects that are specific to one of their partners. The Coordinator of the ECCG goes into the school and talks to the children about their own issues. The ECCG translates material coming out of the school for the use of Anglophone parents. The ECCG works with the RCMP officer as a liaison in dealing with specific problems. They assist the Hockey Association in their efforts to promote the Speak Out program, etc. In their model, they are not only able to find common issues around which all the institutional partners may rally, but they also tailor their help to specific projects undertaken by their partners.

The second important point from the findings that has an impact on representation and inclusion is 'visibility'. Much was made during the interviews about the discrepancy between the visibility of the ECCG as an organization in the community and the sustainability of the group over time. Most of the respondents could agree that the activities of the ECCG are well-known, however, community members might not link community

initiatives to the ECCG per se. The explanation of this that now seems evident was offered during one of the interviews. The ECCG operates in the background while using the visibility of its partners to achieve its objectives. In a sense, the ECCG is a little like the United Nations. It has a dual role. It has its own initiatives and projects on a variety of issues. These projects would not be possible without the participation and support of its members (countries for the UN, partners for the ECCG). However, it also acts as a channel through which these partners can speak to each other and communicate more effectively. This opens up a myriad of new possibilities. This second role is much less concrete but no less important than the undertaking of its own initiatives.

The visibility of the ECCG may not be crucial to the success of the group because their members are, as will be covered shortly, representative of all the major institutions of the region. One community member will participate because of her involvement as a parent through the school system. Another will participate because of his involvement with the healthcare centre. The strength of the ECCG is based on the commitment of its members to work together. Given the willingness of individual citizens and community organizations to get involved, it is no wonder that this particular community volunteer group has been 'successful' and able to sustain its efforts over such a long period of time. Representation and inclusion through this mechanism is thus a key to the sustainability and efforts of the ECCG.

Findings and Discussion: Representation and Inclusion

Lets now turn to the main issues of representation and inclusion. As noted in the introduction, the issue of representation and inclusion is central in the debate on the move toward community and in the greater debate on social equality. This section examines how

representation and inclusion manifest themselves in the Evangeline community mobilization effort. Understanding how these concepts are reflected through the ECCG's efforts will help us to address some of the questions raised above. The intent of this discussion is to use the data gathered in Evangeline to critically examine the theoretical issues and debates around representation and inclusion in the context of an actual, community-level initiative.

It is not difficult to make the case that representation and inclusion are experienced at the national level. This is the way they are discussed in most of the literature on this topic. However, a case can also be made that representation and inclusion operate at the community level. For example, authors such as Askonas have written that, "Community organizing is only one of an astonishingly substantial number of groupings who promote inclusiveness at the grass roots level" (Askonas 2000c: 238). In the case of the Evangeline community, our study was looking more precisely at the activities of the Evangeline Community Consultative Group, which is a volunteer organization. Walzer emphasizes the link between the debates surrounding inclusion and our community-level focus when he notes that, "Every voluntary association - church, union, co-op, neighborhood club, interest group, society for the preservation or prevention of this or that, philanthropic organization, and social movement - is an agency of inclusion" (Walzer 1993: 61). Building on these ideas, this section examines the particular experiences of the ECCG with respect to representation and inclusion.

The purpose of the community mobilization efforts of the ECCG was the health, safety and well-being of the community. This starts with their main initiative, which is the Virtues Project, "a basic behavioural formation" (Ecc1). This formation was explained as giving people a language to express themselves. Another initiative was what they called a family fun festival. It was a brunch organized two years in a row, with fun activities for

children, and information pamphlets on all types of topics for parents. The ECCG also published and distributed community bulletins containing “information on topics, on where to get help, 800 numbers, where to go for information for drug use or addiction, etc.”

(Hea3). Part of the strength of the community bulletin was giving information on points of concern from the original community action plan, such as “crime prevention, drugs, how to speak to kids, to teenagers, and other things that touch us” (Ecc2). In these and their other activities, the goals of the ECCG are presented as the community’s safety, health and well-being.

There is also a special emphasis on issues surrounding community crime prevention understood as including a wide variety of topics from violence, theft, family abuse, drugs, etc. This is the general context of the ECCG’s efforts. The end goal is increased awareness through the diffusion of information about specific topics, through the community bulletins, family fun festivals and numerous seminars organized by the ECCG. They also provide information about services available, whether at the health center, the school, or through the Coordinator of the ECCG herself.

It would be difficult to argue that the primary goal of the ECCG is inclusion. The community is already very cohesive, due perhaps to its minority status. A healthcare worker said, “I think this spirit in the community has always been there. Its networking, it’s the way we are” (Hea5). “We are a close-knit community” (Hoc8) adds another member of the ECCG. There is an active commitment on the part of the community to foster this sense of energy and civic engagement. It is done partly through education. A community member told us, “We start forming leaders early, because of what we call Jeunesse Acadienne. There are meetings with kids especially to form leadership” (Sen7). This seems to create a strong sense of Acadian identity that fosters the feeling of community that is present in the region.

While social inclusion may not be their main goal, it is undeniable that concerns over representation and inclusion are ever-present in their activities. However, it may take a different form than we expect. A useful way of understanding what is going on is suggested in the work of Stewart (2000). In describing a project on inclusion, he uses the following words that echo clearly in the data we have gathered in PEI: “the project of democratic inclusion” as opposed to the widespread conception of social inclusion as a remedy to social dislocation “prioritizes process, participation and representative accountability as the key values of immanent communities of inclusion” (Stewart 2000c: 295). Process. Participation. Representation. These themes were overwhelmingly present in the comments and answers provided to us by the Evangeline community members. Let us examine how these elements appeared in the data.

Representation

Plant (2000) discusses various incarnations of the concept of representation. He sets apart the principal/agent view of representation where single individuals represent an entire ‘constituency’, from the microcosmic approach to representation that seeks to approximate as much as possible, the ‘society’ it represents (Plant 2000). While an ideal microcosmic representation may not be possible because of the multiplicity of identities, there can be an effort to have as many distinctive groups represented as possible. The EOCG’s constitution and its representativeness are the foundation of its community mobilization efforts. “We are at the table with the entire community” (Ecc6) states the Coordinator of the group. The entire community in this case means that the council has a representative from the elementary/high school, law enforcement (an RCMP officer in this case), the health center, the sports community, the senior’s group, women’s organizations, youth, and

the municipal governments.

There are many different community organizations in the region, so the question is why have all these partners remained committed to this particular consultative group for so long? The Coordinator may offer the beginning of an answer when she states that, “There is a lot of strength around the table in the groups that are represented. People...come here with experience and go from our table with new things from other groups” (Ecc6). This sentiment was echoed many times throughout the interview process. A clear benefit many respondents said they derive by being involved in this group is the possibility of exchanging and receiving support from other groups in the community and bringing this experience back to their respective organizations. Through this council, the sectors of education, policing, health, sports, senior citizens, women’s organization, youth and municipal governments have an opportunity and a context in which they can exchange information.

We were also interested in whether the presence of many partners on the council was a personal commitment on the part of the individual participants or if there was a commitment on the part of their respective constituencies to this community group. When asked about what would happen if a member of the council had to leave, we were told, “I would have someone jump in right away” (Hoc6). For many, it seemed clear that their respective groups benefited from their presence on the council and that the sustainability of the ECCG was not dependent on a few individuals but rather on a more permanent commitment on the part of the partners.

Now that the identity of the various partners has been established and an initial motivation for staying involved over the years has been presented, we can tease out the issue of representativeness. Due to the diversity and number of partners in their group, the ECCG believes the opinions and perspectives of the community are well represented on its

council. As the president of the ECCG states, “In our group, we are represent [sic.] of the entire region” (Ecc2). It could also be said that the ECCG takes a dynamic rather than a static approach toward representing their community. They do this by continually working toward reaching out to new partners and organizations. The Anglophones, the religious community and the youth are three examples as we will see shortly.

Representation, here, is about inclusion. The ECCG works toward continually being more representative by including more voices in their organization. There seems to be a real recognition on the part of the ECCG that the more inclusive and thus the more representative they become, the more voices they have access to. “The more people get involved and I think they are really putting their arms around English people in the community, there will be even more voices and more,” (Ang7) expresses a community member. They believe their dynamic efforts to be more representative and reaching out to more and more members of the community will lead in an increased impact of, and greater participation in, their initiatives. The Anglophone community, the religious community and youth are three distinctive groups who bring their own perspectives and experiences. By reaching out to them and making efforts to include them, the ECCG is fostering a more pluralistic and inclusive environment.

Representation and inclusion are directly related in that the ECCG is reaching out to the community in order to include more partners. As found from the data collected at the Evangeline site, representation becomes deeply enmeshed and embedded in a broader set of inclusionary processes. Representation is one way the ECCG reaches out to its community. The ECCG may be an example of a community organization where representation and inclusion are closely linked. While that may be the case, the claim could be made that since the ECCG is constituted by mostly institutional partners, it is not completely representative

of its community members at large. The ECCG, however, as we will see, continually and actively reaches out to the community in the design of its mission statement, in the planning stages of its initiatives, and in the scope of its activities. The ECCG may then also be an example of a community organization where representation and inclusion are sometimes distinct.

Inclusion

Many writers have emphasized the dynamic aspect of inclusion, that it is as a process rather than just a state (e.g., Hills, 1999; Freiler 2001). Lister puts it best when she writes that, “The case for listening to the ‘voice’ of those in poverty and other excluded groups and promoting user-involvement in welfare services and anti-exclusion initiatives is inspired by a belief in the importance of process as well as outcome. Strategies for creating an inclusive society must themselves be inclusive in their development and implementation. Exclusion has to be tackled at both the material and the symbolic level and across a range of dimensions of inequalities” (Lister 2000: 51).

I believe that while it may be hard to see the ECCG as tackling the material dimensions of inequality, they may indeed be making headways in tackling it at a symbolic level. They may be doing so, as Lister points out, by creating strategies to be inclusive in the development and implementation of their activities. Social inclusion is understood in this conceptualization as a process that, “describes people’s opportunities for meaningful participation” (Wotherspoon 2001).

Efforts at inclusion will take different forms depending on each community. In the Evangeline region, the major ‘divider’ is not class, race or gender, but rather language. The

region has 2000 inhabitants, most of whom are Francophone, isolated within the province of PEI that has a great Anglophone majority. There is a small Anglophone presence in the Evangeline region and while they are few in number, the ECCG makes great efforts at including them in every one of their initiatives. The Coordinator of the consultative group states that, “When we have something that goes out of the office, even if we have to do it twice, we do it. It means we have to do everything in double, but it matters not, it builds bridges. It’s also one of our strengths that we did not put them aside and telling them we will give you services when its convenient for us. The bulletins were also always in both languages” (Ecc6).

Inclusion for the ECCG is part of the process. They recognized that a section of the community was being left out and thus adjusted themselves and started to offer all their services and activities in both languages. In this way, the ECCG built a reputation for inclusiveness in the community. This is because they are responsive to every member of their community, and willing to reach out and be inclusive to those who feel left out. This is achieved by the ECCG within the regulations of their institutional partners, such as the school. “Whatever comes out of the school cannot have English translation on it. So what I do. On the French notes, I make them add on the bottom in French that an English session is available or it’s taking place such and such. And if the note doesn’t go through the school, then its bilingual” (Ang3) explains the Coordinator of the consultative group.

Previously, the Anglophones in the community felt excluded. “What happens to the 10% of us who are English?” (Ang6) was an initial concern of one English-speaking member of the community. However, she remarked that the Coordinator and ECCG “have a big big impact in involving the English part of our community” (Ang6). This community member adds, “When I first came here, I thought everything was in French and I thought some

doors were a little closed. I now realize that through this program, it is now bilingual” (Ang3). Another English community member shares that, “we approach the Coordinator because we know she is involved in it. She had a session last spring. It was in French and I went to it. I am bilingual but I am more English than French I would say, and I went to her after and I said I understood three quarters of that. I said when are you having an English session. She said nobody is approaching me. I said I am approaching you right now. In a week or two, she had one. It wasn’t held off until later” (Ang2). Thus, the ECCG is building a reputation for inclusiveness in the community. This is because they are responsive to every member of their community and willing to reach out and be inclusive to those who feel left out.

The efforts of the ECCG toward greater inclusion are not restricted to language barriers. The Coordinator is attempting very hard to reach out and make connections with the religious institutions in the region. While they have been reluctant in the past to associate themselves with the consultative group, and have been more reclusive in their activities, the consultative group has continued to keep them informed of their activities and attempted to foster a tighter relationship with them. At the time of our visit to the Evangeline community, there were some positive signs of a willingness on the part of the religious community to get more involved with the consultative group.

Equally, the ECCG has a very inclusive and dynamic relationship with a group often without a voice in the community, the youth. As one member of the council noted, “When we do sessions with teenagers, we meet the student council and we ask them if they have suggestions or subjects that they would like us to address. Also, after each activity, we have some evaluations, where we ask what other topics we should address. We also take some of these ideas for our activities” (Hea2).

Through its attempts to reach out to the Anglophones, the religious community and the youth, the ECCG's efforts provide a starting point in order to understand social inclusion as a process-oriented concept. However, it is important to explore in greater detail, the myriad ways this community mobilization effort helps us understand inclusion in relation to the debates found in the literature. As each of the debates is examined, the case becomes stronger for us to see inclusion in this study as a concept related to process rather than outcomes. In order to accomplish this, the topics of information and listening, consultation, and deliberation and decision-making will be discussed in turn.

Glossop states, "It occurs to me right off the bat that listening is possibly the most important tool with which to begin to build an inclusive society" (Glossop 2001a). Stewart remarks that, "information is the essential ingredient of a free and inclusive society" (Stewart 2000c: 295). These thoughts are well reflected in the words of the president of the ECCG when he notes that, "In principle, we need information. We need information. That's what we need" (Ecc2). When the group was started, they determined that their first step should be to accumulate information. The information collected about the community included their needs, their worries and their ideas. Rather than using their respective experiences as a guide, the ECCG members went to the community and garnered the information from them. This was done deliberately through the organization of a community-wide forum.

A community forum was used to identify the main issues and concerns of the community members. In the words of the president, "We had a forum to meet people here and we asked all sorts of people, what is going on in the region? What are our strengths? What are our weaknesses? Do you have suggestions? Do you have priorities? What could we do? What happened from this is that we had a very good forum of 200 people from the region. We invited students, teachers, business people, people from the church, Quatre-

Enfant, all kinds” (Ecc1). Another community member stated, “you need to start at level one, break down the problems, identify your problems” (Ang10), and that’s what the ECCG did through this forum. The forum appears to have cemented the existence of the ECCG. A member of the ECCG told us that the forum is where “the Evangeline Consultative Group was formed” (Sen3). If the group existed only in theory before that date, it appears that the forum was the start of the ‘active’ stage of the group and their subsequent endeavours.

Another link between representation and inclusion can be made here. Since the partners in the ECCG felt they were representative of the community, they could have decided amongst themselves what the priorities for the community should be. However, by reaching out to the entire community and consulting a large number of people, they cemented what would be the foundation for their on-going success and sustainability: a very open and inclusive process through which many can be involved. The ECCG wanted everyone’s perspectives in drafting their action plan. They were inclusive in the process by building their agenda through the community members’ own concerns rather than deciding for them what the main issues in the community were. This, in practice, is the foundation of successful community mobilization.

As the following comments by a PEI governmental employee illustrate, the ECCG process generates a positive impression in the region, “I think personally that the ECCG does a lot of work for the needs of the community. They go get what the needs of the community are. They listen to the community’s concerns” (Acc1). A healthcare worker in the region summarized it well when she said, “The minute you bring up the public in a public forum, it gives the people a place to start speaking of the things that preoccupy them” (Hea9), and that is at the core of successful community mobilization. The ECCG sought

information and listened to what they were told. They used the information to develop an action plan. This exemplifies the role of 'listening' in an inclusionary process. There is no danger in Evangeline that the ECCG will be perceived as being out of touch with the real concerns of the community. Inclusion serves here as a model for a wide-ranging process.

The ECCG went out of its way to gather information and produce a document to shape the direction of its work. Significantly, both the gathering of information from all sources and the sharing of information are equally important to the flow of information in the community. Inclusion of the community in this instance is evident in both the collection of information and the drafting of an action plan. Inclusion can also be seen in the efforts of the ECCG to ensure that the information reached as many people as possible. This was achieved by making efforts at translating, by offering the information in a variety of formats and through the dissemination efforts of its various partners.

The ECCG sees itself as a group with many access doors. A member of the ECCG told us, "Someone has trouble in school or something like that, crime or RMCP. The services are practical, it does not matter what the access door is, there is someone in that group to help" (Hea6). Since the various partners have a medium through which they can communicate, and because they share information with each other, independently of the access door someone uses in the community, they will get the help they need from the appropriate organizations. According to a health center employee, "This is a resource that is useful to the community" (Hea6). When asked whether these types of exchanges between the various sectors in the community were present before, this healthcare worker said, "These informal contacts existed before. Because there is a person in position it now goes even better" (Hea6). This 'person in position' is the Coordinator of the ECCG. While it cannot be said that their group created these exchanges, they certainly seem to have

facilitated them. For that reason alone, this group's worth is recognized by the institutional partners.

One of the themes related to information gathering and sharing came up over and over again: communication. When asked what led to the sustainability and success of the ECCG, a governmental employee said, "I believe it is the communication and observation with the partners... We talk between governments, we talk between governments and organizations, we talk between organizations... I think the key is communication. We're all together" (Acc3). These comments were echoed by a community member who noted, "I can organize, but I need to know that [the communication is] there or if there is a need. The communication is crucial to me. If that goes, it's all gone" (Ang13).

The importance of communication is one more factor leading to the understanding of inclusion as a crucial process. To demonstrate that an inclusive process cannot be seen as a zero-sum game, the ECCG has changed the format of the community forum they were planning for this year. The original forum was open to all individuals in the community and according to ECCG estimates, approximately 200 individuals attended. The forum was a few hours in length during which time people had an opportunity to express their needs and concerns in regards to the community. This next forum is being organized, in part, to get feedback from people on the work the ECCG has accomplished to date and, in part, to get directions for the future. However this time, rather than having only one community-wide forum for everyone, they will have a series of public forums intended for the various sub-sections of the community. They will have a forum with the parents, a forum with the seniors, a forum with women, a forum with Anglophones, and a forum with youth.

This will allow each group to voice their particular concerns and identify the issues they feel need to be addressed. Rather than hold a community-wide forum in which some

voices may not be heard, (perhaps the seniors and youth not having as much input as the parents), this time the ECCG will have a clearer picture of each group's needs and concerns. This will allow them to be more responsive to each group and offer initiatives and activities specifically targeted to their unique interests. While holding a series of forums requires a lot of additional work, the ECCG believes that more detailed information will allow them to be even more relevant and effective in their efforts. Once again, this change in process reflects the dynamic quality of the ECCG and its ability to adapt and progress. A consultation mechanism that was already open to the public and thus inclusive, has become even more so. This reflects well why it is impossible to talk of the total presence and absence of inclusion. The concept, in this case, seems to be better understood as a continuum and as fluid rather than as static in nature.

The efforts of the ECCG exemplify the following principles of inclusion suggested by Stewart. (2000a: 8), "Any comprehensive analysis of social inclusion requires a consideration of any and all means by which processes of decision making from consideration and consultation, through negotiation to implementation can incorporate the widest diversity of interests and differences as possible". Through its actions, the ECCG has shown a commitment to these principles, not only in the process of the garnering and sharing of information from the broader community, but also in the deliberation and decision-making aspects within their own group.

In a discussion of social inclusion and the practice of democracy, Taylor (2000: 92) writes the following, "In addition, to form a decision-making unit of the type demanded here, it is not enough for a vote to record the fully formed opinions of all the members. These units must not only decide together, but deliberate together". While the ECCG does not exist in a ruling capacity in the community, the words still ring true about the

relationship between inclusion and decision-making in this context. The ECCG, perhaps unlike many other volunteer organizations, does not work as a hierarchy. Since each member is a representative of a significant section of the community, their approach is horizontal. "Our management approach in this group is the Carter approach. There is no one more important than anyone else. We answer to ourselves. Around the table, it [i.e. the participants] changes every month that we meet. It's the people that change and it works," (Ecc6) states the president of the council. Their meetings were described as apolitical. Many members shared with us that everyone has an equal say on what goes on and on what is done.

As we have seen, the concept of inclusion can be found throughout the community mobilization efforts of the ECCG. The particular manifestation of the concept is more process oriented than goal oriented. The links between inclusion and representation, and participation, information, consultation and decision-making are clear. Social inclusion, especially in the form of a process, is discussed in the academic literature in the context of these related topics. Some of these topics are also discussed in the literature on stakeholder theory,¹ on identity politics and in relation to the politics of recognition². Each of these

¹ Stakeholder theory is a theory that was originally meant as an alternative business model to the conception that shareholders should be the only ones considered when looking at a company's decision. Stakeholder theory is advanced as a more inclusive form of decision-making and management than the previous traditional business models. Stakeholding theory has now been applied to other contexts, including the social realm. Stakeholders collectively exercise rights of voice which establish accountability and control. "To be a stakeholder is to be recognized as having an interest in the decisions and actions of particular organizations and to claim as a result the rights of consultation, information and participation in decision making, while accepting that membership carries with it obligations". (Kelly, Kelly and Gamble, 1997: 240).

Given this definition, stakeholder theory offers a set of lenses that can be easily used to help understand and analyze what is taking place in the Evangeline community. The ECCG works with and is constituted by a number of organizations and institutions. When looking at a community mobilization effort, it could be stated that all community members are somehow stakeholders in this effort. By involving as many sections of the community in the decision-making body, in the council, in the ECCG itself, the consultative group is embodying the stakeholder model. One of the strength and one of the keys to their sustainability may well be the extent to which they have involved these stakeholders.

I think these sentiments are well-expressed by some of the individuals interviewed in PEI. The ECCG's foundations in the community are recognized as being very strong. "I think one of the reason its continues it is often the number of partners that they get involved for their projects. For example, if you can get the school here, it tells us that this project is important because this group gets involved, and if this groups gets involved, it's really something that they need. It responds to needs for the school and pre-school" (Acc). When asked if these partnerships are formal, we were told, "no, they are informal" (Hea?). A health care worker explains to us that "I think informally, people meet to discuss common needs at an organizational level and people bring in, like we had a discussion on the importance of self-esteem, everyone comes to the table with difference, but find projects that have an impact on everyone. I think the organization, the driving force for the community. If you look at the constraints of the school, the concern of the ECCG, when it's a

topics offers a potential lens through which the activities of the ECCG could be analyzed. However, a detailed discussion of these alternative approaches would shift the focus of the discussion too far away from the issue of representation and inclusion, which is our main concern here.

After a discussion of representation and inclusion in the context of participation, consultation, and decision-making, it is clear that representation and inclusion is not a zero-sum process. You can have a more or less inclusive process, but it is never completely so. Ratcliffe writes that exclusion is “invariably seen as essentially dichotomous in form. Thus, unemployment represents exclusion from the labour market (Levitas, 1996), dropping out from education (Gillborn and Gipps, 1996), homelessness from the housing market and so on (Power, 1998). But, this is clearly a dramatic oversimplification, in that labour market segmentation, the denial of equality of educational opportunity, and confinement to poor quality, overcrowded dwellings also represent important forms of ‘exclusion’” (Ratcliffe 2000: 170).

It can be argued that the data collected in Evangeline shows this to be the case.

major concern, you work on it together. That’s why it works. They will use the ECCG because they are interested in the issues that are the issues of the community” (Hea5).

Stakeholder theory in this case acts as a model for a more inclusive process. Perhaps some of the same decisions and initiatives would have been achieved if only a select few members of the community would have been involved in the planning, deliberation and decision-making process of the ECCG, but the embeddedness of the consultative group in the community and the commitment of all the organizational and institutional partners would have been much less so, at least according to stakeholder analysis.

² A brief discussion of the politics of recognition is both a necessary and logical continuation on the previous discussion of stakeholder theory. One of the keys to stakeholder theory is the recognition of the said stakeholders. Without the recognition of certain groups and interests as stakeholders, they could not be involved in the process. Without the ECCG recognizing the presence of a key anglophone minority, and the youth as a voice often unheard, they would not have gone to the lengths they did to include them. There can be all the willingness to be inclusive, but if a set of interest is left un-recognized, then they cannot be reached out to.

Sennett writes that “Inclusion, be it in a small-scale project or in a nation, requires mutual recognition; people must signal that they are aware of each other as legitimately involved together in a common enterprise. The sociologist Norbert Elias called such mutual recognition a matter of ‘social honour’; this rather grand phrase denotes simply that members of a group feel that they are noticed and heard” (Sennett 278). Iris Marion Young argues that “we should show how recognition is a means to, or an element in, economic and political equality” (Young, 1997: 156). A politics of recognition in this context is about the assertion not of group differences but of equality of status and respect, together with according value to community members’ own interpretation of their needs and rights so that they become actors in the political and policy process and not just its objects” (Lister and Beresford, 1999). In other words, the ECCG is not a community organization paternalistically helping out a community in need, in a top-down fashion, but rather they are a community organization that uses the community members’ own concerns and needs as the central focus of their activities. It starts with the recognition of the interests in the community and it is followed by an involvement of those interests as stakeholders in the efforts of the consultative group.

Their consultation mechanism, for example, was previously inclusive, but their upcoming one is even more so. The constitution of their group includes many different partners, and yet they continue to seek out more partners who are not yet actively involved. To talk about the presence or absence of inclusion is to take the wrong road. What ought to be discussed are ways to create more inclusive processes - processes that ought to be dynamic and ever-adapting because the characteristics, composition, needs, and interests of a community are always evolving.

A word of caution is in order at this point. Even with all the efforts of the ECOG, and groups like them, at promoting inclusion, there will always be certain groups or individuals not completely included. Not everyone's concerns are heard for at least two different reasons. First, some people may not be heard because of the nature of the initiatives organized. In an example from Evangeline, if a particular community activity is organized for youth, some individuals "are not involved because they don't have kids in that range. For example, this teenager thing we're going to do next week, that's not going to include everybody in the community," (Ang4).

There is thus, a recognition that some people are left out of specific activities because the initiatives may not be aimed at their particular needs or interests. The solution in this community was to undertake a series of activities rather than just one. If the school is the only one promoting an event, then some people are left out. If the school, the health center, the church, the police officer, the government office, and the sports association create access doors to information, as is the case in the Evangeline region, then many more people are reached. "There are some people who are not comfortable to go to school, but enough to come here (the health center). They have confidence that the Coordinator will give this information, and I will go see her" (Hea10). Perhaps even then, not all people in the

community will be reached. There is a greater degree of inclusion, however, with more access points than if only one access door had been used to diffuse information about their initiatives.

The second group of people who may not be heard are those who choose to stay away. This group can be present in a particular context and it is often seen as problematic. When asked about this possibility, a community member told us, “there might be a group. There are a few teenagers in this school who know these programs are there, who know these sessions are on and I personally know a few of them and I don’t think they are being reached completely” (Ang4). When asked if they know about these programs, the answer is yes, but they choose not to use them. As one community member put it, “We can’t make them” (Ang4).

This question is important when talking about offering community programs because as one of the researchers noted, “we’ve been trying to sort some of this out about inclusion...what about those kids that don’t come, what about those people who feel intimidated to speak in public. We were talking last night about reaching 80% and the same amount of effort would be needed in reaching the last 20%”. A healthcare worker added that, “this 15-20% are those who are most impacted” (Hea9). The need to reach and involve the more elusive members of the community is a continuing challenge for the ECCG and no answer was offered during the group interviews.

Helgason (2001:) writes that, “The excluded must be ensured the right to decide when they wish to remain excluded and act on their own terms”. No one can be forced to join or participate. If they choose not to get involved, it does not mean that they should not have some rights. The individuals who choose not to participate may do so for a variety of reasons, some of which may be addressed, others may not. It is important to point out that

this purposely self-excluded group still has needs and concerns. Community organizations must find the balance between reaching out to these groups and individuals, and address some of their needs while respecting their choice not to be involved. For years, the ECCG has reached out to the clergy and continues to give them information despite their ongoing reluctance to be part of the broader community initiative in a more formal manner. Some teenagers have also refused to get involved despite numerous efforts and activities directed at them³.

As we can see, no method of representation and inclusion is perfect. The data gathered in PEI suggests that these issues are better understood as processes at the community level than as a model or outcome. The efforts of the ECCG demonstrate the usefulness of this notion since it helps us to understand the impact of their activities. Moreover, their efforts are better seen as a road taken by the consultative group rather than as a destination they are trying to reach. The consequences of seeing representation and inclusion as a process-oriented concept for the move toward community and for the conceptual debate on social equality will be reviewed in the next chapter.

³ While on the topic of teenagers, the role of education is rarely discussed as a contribution to the creation of a more inclusive society. Crick writes that "It can, for instance, encourage children to value diversity in its various forms so that they grow up citizens attuned to an inclusive and internationalist culture and it can prepare children for full democratic participation as citizens" (Crick, 1998). Crick elsewhere states that "What seems to me crucial is whether a society is prepared to educate its inhabitants to think of themselves not just as legal citizens, but as active citizens, and towards what some of us have called 'political literacy', the skills, knowledge and values that relate to the practice of citizenship, in voluntary groups and in public bodies and political parties or pressure groups. We all have something to say" (Crick 220).

The Evangeline community with their leadership program that every single child will have an opportunity to take, is seen as key to the health, safety and well-being of the community. The inclusion process starts early with responsabilizing of the children and teaching them the advantages of agency. If children are the future, then it only makes sense that education would be a medium through which social inclusion ought to be promoted. The ECCG, in their recognition of the pivotal role of children and youth, is actively committed to being involved in both educational endeavours and in the promotion of children and youth as a crucial component of social inclusion in their community.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

This thesis examined the issues of representation and inclusion in a community-based crime prevention initiative. It provides some evidence of what happens in actual communities with regards to the move towards the community. While questions surrounding representation and inclusion arise in many fields at the community level, including health and economic development, they are particularly prevalent in the field of criminal justice. The debate between supporters and critics of the move towards community in the field of criminal justice raises a number of important theoretical and policy issues which can be usefully examined with data from an actual community-level initiative.

In recent times, there is evidence of a growing movement towards the community as a location for social action. Communities are seen as potential focal points for intervention. There is, however, debate around the benefits and drawbacks of the move towards the community. Supporters of this move point to the potential increase in flexibility of this medium and its increased responsiveness, not to mention an increase in the participation of community members. For example, a focus on 'community' can lead to considerations of how to integrate community members into decision-making, planning, and the identification of local problems.

While the move towards the community has many supporters, there are a growing number of observers who critique various aspects of this development. Some are concerned that shifting towards a community-based approach will result in the downloading of responsibility from more senior levels of government onto local communities. This downloading is primarily related to funding cuts associated with the rise of neo-liberal governments. One consequence of the downloading is that problems such as crime can

become identified as local and individual responsibilities rather than those of more senior levels of government.

The data for this thesis were collected as part of a larger, multi-site study on the sustainability of community-based crime prevention activities. The flexibility of the research design of this larger project allowed for the exploration of a number of issues surrounding the move towards the community, including the issues of representation and inclusion. A total of nine group interviews were conducted with key representatives in the community. A further number of individual interviews were also conducted with key informants from various sectors of the community.

The specific concern with representation and inclusion within the debate on the move towards community represents part of a larger debate on social equality. In fact, concerns about representation and inclusion resonate with another current debate regarding social stratification and inequality. In this debate, the idea of social inclusion is examined against the backdrop of a traditional egalitarian ideals model. The broader debate on social equality pits those who believe that a social inclusion model (Gray 1996; Glossop 2001; Lauziere 2001) offers a better vision and model for social activism against those who articulate a traditional egalitarian ideals model (Stewart 2000; Lister 1996; Levitas 1996). The social inclusion model has emerged recently as an alternative to the traditional egalitarian ideals model that is perceived by many to be antiquated.

These models embody different ideal visions of inclusion. The social inclusion proponents point to many problems associated with the traditional egalitarian ideals model. On the other hand, there are also some concerns regarding the concept social inclusion. Clearly, there are difficulties at the theoretical level with both models. The question was how these issues manifested themselves at the community level.

The data garnered from the Evangeline site centred around four main themes: Initiatives, Factors of Success, Representation and Inclusion. The various initiatives organized or supported by the ECCG is the subject of the first theme. While the core initiative of the ECCG is the implementation of the Virtues Project, a behavioural program, they have also organized family fun festivals and put together community bulletins. They have supported other initiatives in numerous ways, like the Speak Out program, health days for seniors, topical workshops on issues of health and well-being and a 'buddy system' at school.

The goal of these initiatives is the distribution of information in order to raise the awareness of the community on a myriad of topics. The ECCG reaches out and includes as many community members as possible through its activities. It attempts to foster open communication between the service providers and the community members. The ECCG, through its initiatives, raises awareness among community members that they have somewhere or someone to turn to for help in case of need.

The second theme investigated the various 'keys' to the success of the ECCG in sustaining its efforts outside of the individual initiatives. This theme outlined some of the oft-mentioned factors that may have contributed to the successful community mobilization initiative in Evangeline. There are many such 'keys' to success and this thesis detailed some of the most prominent ones mentioned by the respondents including: (1) various types of financial support; (2) the means taken for the sustainability of the community mobilization; (3) the degree of independence and autonomy the ECCG kept from state agencies, namely the RCMP; (4) the level of community involvement and energy in the Evangeline region; (5) the early presence of success of the ECCG activities; (6) the group's organization and leadership; (7) the presence of a permanent, full-time Coordinator; (8) the minority status of

the Evangeline region's inhabitants; (9) the breadth and number of partnerships within and outside the community; (10) the visibility of the community consultative group; and (11) the personality of the full-time Coordinator.

Around the topic of partnerships, the findings illustrated that while there are as many as 70 other voluntary organizations in the region, the ECCG is somewhat unique in that it is a consultative group that includes members from all the major sectors of the community. These members come together around issues that are both wide-reaching and that concern as many people as possible, and around other projects that are specific to one of their partner's interests.

Concerning the topic of visibility, the findings showed that while the ECCG itself did not have high visibility in the community this was unproblematic because they have representatives from all of the major institutions in the region. It could rely heavily and successfully on the visibility of each of their respective partners. The representation and inclusion of these partners was a key to the sustainability and efforts of the ECCG.

The third theme discussed the findings surrounding the issue of representation. This theme covered the constitution of the Evangeline Community Consultative Group and its partners as well as their claims to representativeness. The members of the ECCG claim that they are representative of the entire community. They claim this on the basis of having representatives from all the major institutional partners, namely from the elementary/high school, law enforcement (an RCMP officer in this case), the health centre, the sports community, the senior's group, women's organizations, youth, and the municipal governments.

The findings showed the partners joined the ECCG in part because of the possibility of exchanging and receiving support from other groups in the community and bringing this

experience back to their respective organizations. The findings also showed that the representatives stayed with the ECCG over the years not purely out of a personal commitment, but reflecting the commitment of their respective organizations.

While the findings showed that the ECCG believes the opinions and perspectives of the entire community are well represented in their organization due to the diversity and number of partners in their group, they still take a dynamic rather than static approach towards representing their community. They do so by continually reaching out to new partners, such as the Anglophone minority in the region, members of the religious community and youth. Representation here is about inclusion. Members of the ECCG believe that their dynamic efforts to be more representative and to reach out to more and more members of the community, will lead in an increased impact of, and greater participation in, their initiatives.

The fourth and final theme covered the ways the ECCG promotes inclusion. Through an examination of the topics of information gathering, consultation, deliberation and decision-making, inclusion was understood as a process. The findings showed that the ECCG had a dynamic view of inclusion that led them to reach out to ever more members of the community, whether the Anglophones, the religious community or the youth. While representation was about including these groups in the formal decision-making processes, inclusion is about more broadly engaging them in the activities and providing activities specifically for them. Inclusion is about the process of participation, including the opportunity to participate in all aspects of the community group's activities. The findings demonstrate that in doing so, the ECCG built itself a reputation for inclusiveness.

The thesis discussed further ways the ECCG promotes inclusion as a process. This was done through the collection out of information from community members as to their

needs, worries and ideas about what needed to take place in the community. They were inclusive in the process by building their agenda through the community members' own concerns rather than deciding for them what were the main issues. This despite believing that they are representative of said community.

The findings also showed the ECCG's concern with inclusion in the sharing of information. This fits since it is about an opportunity to participate or to be informed rather than to be represented on the formal decision making body or to having input into this body's decisions. This was achieved by making efforts at translating, by offering the information in a variety of formats and through the dissemination efforts of its various partners. Because of this inclusionary form of gathering and sharing information, the ECCG promotes an environment of open communication, both between the partners and between the service providers and the community members.

The information gathered in PEI demonstrated the ECCG's dynamic understanding of inclusion through the change in format it had planned for their upcoming community forums. While the original forum was a general meeting open to all community members, the new format will involve hosting several forums for the various sub-sections of the community such as parents, seniors, women, youth, etc. This change in format was done in order to give each group an opportunity to voice their particular concerns and identify the issues they feel need to be addressed.

Finally, this thesis also explored the internal deliberation and decision-making practices of the ECCG. It has adopted a horizontal approach with no single leader making final decisions. All the members claim to have an equal status with an equal say as to the activities of the organization. This may be a common feature of community councils, but it none the less reflects an inclusive, non-hierarchical mode of decision-making.

In the previous chapter, I argued that representation and inclusion can not be seen as zero-sum processes. In the Evangeline community, despite all the ECCG's efforts, everyone's concerns are not necessarily heard. This may be the case for at least two distinctive reasons. First, perhaps because of the nature of the initiatives organized, some people may feel left out of specific activities that are not aimed at their particular needs or interests. The solution mentioned was to promote as many activities as possible through a multiplicity of sources in order to reach out to more community members and to meet their specific needs.

The second group of people who may not be involved are those who choose to stay away. While the ECCG cannot force anyone to participate in its initiatives, it can continue to reach out as it did to the religious community. In so doing, the ECCG showed its willingness to offer support if or when groups or individuals choose to reach out. Community organizations must find the balance between reaching out to these groups and individuals, and addressing some of their needs, while respecting their decision not be involved.

The findings and discussion outlined in the previous chapter clearly illustrated that representation and inclusion are better understood as processes at the community level rather than as an ideal model of outcomes. Moreover, the processes are better seen as a road taken by the consultative group rather than as a destination they are trying to reach. The implications of this realization will be reviewed shortly, but before that, I will quickly summarize the context in which the concerns around representation and inclusion were raised.

There are a number of supporters and critics of the move towards the community. The findings and discussion presented in this thesis help us to address some of the issues raised in the literature within this debate on the move towards the community.

Supporters have pointed to the benefits of the move towards the community. For example, a focus on 'community' can lead to considerations of how to integrate community members into decision-making, planning, and the identification of local problems (Savage 1984). This was clearly demonstrated in the ECCG's activities. From their information sharing and gathering, their deliberations, their decision-making, and especially their consultation mechanisms, they were able to be flexible and respond to diverse interests and needs in their community. The change in the format of their community forum is a good example of their attempt to reach out to all segments of the community.

As well, some supporters have mentioned improvement (Abucar 1995) and greater efficiency (Morgan 1989) in the delivery of services as another potential benefit of the move toward the community. Certainly, the existence of the ECCG, at the community level, facilitates communication between the various institutional partners and thus, helps improve the quality and efficiency of the delivery of various services, including health and safety. The key may be that the ECCG treats the members of its community as stakeholders. It allows the ECCG to continuously reach out to new members, as it has done with the Anglophone members of the community, youth, and the religious community. This recognition, in turn, allows it to be more effective in its community mobilization efforts. The more voices it listens to, the stronger its initiatives become and the greater the potential impact can be.

However, there are as many critics of the move towards the community as there are supporters. The biggest criticism of the move towards the community is that it leads to a downloading of responsibilities. Unfortunately, this issue cannot be assessed on the basis of

the data collected for this study. However, the data do allow an examination of some of the other important criticisms raised with respect to the move towards the community. For example, some authors are critical of the influence exercised by agency workers in defining the concerns of a particular community (Sampson 1988). Another criticism of the move towards the community includes the role of state agencies in determining appropriate solutions to local problems (Ericson 1994; Fyfe 1989). In this case, these criticisms are based on the divide between agency workers and community members. The existence of this divide is questionable in the Evangeline community. Perhaps due to its small population (2000 members in all) the agency workers on the ECCG, such as the health centre representative, the elementary school representative, and the RCMP officer all live in the community and are deeply embedded in it. The concern over power differentials raised in the literature between state agency representatives and community members is not evident (Taylor 1995; Crawford 1995). Moreover, the agenda of the ECCG is not driven by the agency workers such as the police, but by the community members themselves.

Some other criticisms deal directly with the issue of representation. Several authors (Morgan 1989; Fyfe 1992; Taylor 1995) see the community consultative process as potentially un-democratic and essentially constituted from very specific and limited interests. The members of the ECCG are not from limited interests, but rather from all the recognized institutional partners in the region. They have a dynamic understanding of representation and continually seek to reach out to other groups who may not have a voice at present. Having said this, the community members in the ECCG are not elected, they are volunteers. And as volunteers, their needs, worries, and ideas about the community may not be the same as the community as a whole. The concern is that if all the members of the ECCG represent institutional actors, then perhaps the needs and worries of individual community members

are not being represented and are thus not heard by the community organization. The institutional partners may perceive different problems and advocate alternative solutions than the 'average' individual. This could lead to a distancing between the interests and goals of the ECCG and those of the community at large. This, in turn, could mean the initiatives and activities organized by the ECCG would have less appeal and less participation by community members and thus reduce their impact. Furthermore, community members may be hesitant to reach out to the community organization for help or information if they feel they cannot relate to it or they feel its work is not relevant to them.

The impact of this criticism is diminished, however, in light of the other actions taken by the ECCG. As pointed out, rather than building an agenda based on their (perhaps narrow) understanding of the problems, they consulted and continue to consult the community at large to gather what they, that is the community, feels are its needs, worries and ideas. The ECCG gains access to the breadth of perspectives and views present in their community through the processes of information gathering and sharing, consultation, and by having many partners.

The data gathered at the Evangeline site can neither be used to uncritically support the move towards the community nor can it be used as evidence to support the criticisms levelled against this move. The data can, however, point to the community level as a location where individuals can be engaged with, mobilized and where dialogues can be opened. As for the question of representation and inclusion at the community level, the data clearly show that while these issues cannot be thought of as zero-sum processes, there is great potential for representation and inclusion to be fostered by the efforts of a community organization such as the ECCG.

As was noted above, the specific concern with representation and inclusion within

the debate on the move towards the community represents part of a larger debate on social equality. In this debate, the idea of social inclusion is examined against the backdrop of a traditional egalitarian ideals model. The debate is, in part, about whether the concept of social inclusion may “be too ‘soft’ on the need for structural change. Social inclusion may not adequately address the historic causes of social and economic exclusion” (Freiler 2001). The danger here, according to Bennett (1998), is that a focus on discrete problem groups could encourage the belief that these groups are themselves the problem. “It is therefore essential that the problem of social exclusion and strategies to promote social inclusion are located within a broader analysis of inequality and polarization both inside and outside the labour market” (Lister 2000: 42). Those sharing this perspective, clearly see structural change as an important part of the response to inequality and social exclusion.

On the other hand, many advocates of the social inclusion model point to the political liability, the failings and limitations of the TEI model and the types of welfare state politics that were prominent in many western nations in the latter half of the twentieth century. Some authors (Plant 2000) have argued that a social democratic approach that seeks to redistribute wealth and mitigate the consequences of the unequal outcome of the market is no longer compatible with global competitiveness. If the welfare state is to survive at all, it is argued, it will have to be as a limited safety net and linked to welfare-to-work strategies advocated by the supporters of the social inclusion model. Gray (2000) points out the political liability of classical egalitarian goals and argues for a shift toward a social inclusion model. This ‘new’ social inclusion model takes into account the realities of the current political landscape and the possibilities it offers.

Fundamentally, the social inclusion model can be seen to foster a vision of inclusion that is based on individual empowerment, independence and peoples’ capacity to enter into

social contracts. It promotes equality of opportunity while putting primacy on social cohesion. In contrast, the traditional egalitarian ideals model fosters a vision of inclusion that is based on collective empowerment and the generation of power through communal action. This model promotes interdependence and mutuality based on a greater equality of outcomes. While quite complex, this debate has questions of inclusion and representation at its core. Clearly these models are incompatible with one another at the conceptual level. One promotes the idea of equality of opportunity while the other underscores the importance of structural change and equality of condition. The question addressed in this thesis was how these issues manifested themselves at the community level.

What we discovered through an analysis of the data is how different the story about the move toward community appeared in the field compared with the theoretical debates. The issues of representation and inclusion were definitely present at the community level. The ECCG showed concerns with these related issues and it seems to inform many of the activities in which the ECCG was involved. However, what comes through are not clearly identified models of social equality. The ideal models seem far less important to people working at the community level than the actual processes they use in their day-to-day community activities. The issues of representation and inclusion are almost exclusively understood as process related by the members of the ECCG. This manifested itself in its concern with the constitution of its [ECCG] group, to its consultation processes, its deliberation and decision-making process, its continued emphasis on community members' participation and in its efforts to reach out to more members of its community. Each of these activities was discussed at some length in the previous chapter. Suffice it to say that while social inclusion may not be directly stated as the end goal of the ECCG, it is clear that

the importance of representation and inclusion is ever-present in the minds of the members as the ECCG organizes and plans its activities.

How does this analysis relate to the debate between social inclusion and the traditional egalitarian ideals models? At the national level, the social equality debate takes place between proponents of the social inclusion model and those supporting the traditional egalitarian ideals model. The proponents of the social inclusion model forcefully reject the traditional egalitarian ideals model as antiquated and unsuitable for current political realities. They object to the over reliance on the state and the vast redistribution of income. On the other hand, the supporters of the traditional egalitarian ideals model dismiss the social inclusion model as ignoring structural inequality. They criticize the focus on equality of opportunity demanding equality of condition. The consequence of this is that these two models are pitted against one another and appear to be incompatible conceptually and in terms of practical political activity.

This thesis explored how the issues raised in this debate played out at the community level. This type of investigation is needed since the theoretical models discussed above inform many who work and write about the community level. The data collected for this thesis suggest that for community organizations, there is less emphasis on ideal theoretical models of equality than there is on more immediate community-based issues and concerns. In the Evangeline community, these concerns are about identity and the needs of the community. These were ultimately translated into activities aimed at improving the health, safety and well-being of community members. The implications of these findings are that the community organization in question (the ECCG) is interested in promoting inclusionary processes in order to address community needs and concerns. For the members of the

ECCG, the process was the key. This focus on process was more important to them than striving for abstract and global goals related to theoretical models of equality.

This being said, some of the processes present at the community level underlie both social equality models. Clearly, the traditional egalitarian ideals model and the social inclusion model are closely related. They share a common intellectual pedigree. It is important to remember that their proponents are both striving for similar goals - equality, democratic participation, etc. However, at the community level, people try to meet their own needs through community action. In an important sense, the lesson learned in the Evangeline community points to the role of participatory democracy. Local experiences are seen as the basis for social activism. Once processes based on participatory democracy are in place, the community itself defines its own agenda. This process sometimes results in fostering opportunities for individuals in the community and at other times, it results in structural inequalities being addressed. At the community level, elements of both models of social equality come into play.

Perhaps it is the case that social inclusion as a goal remains incompatible with the goals of the traditional egalitarian ideals model. As one author puts it, "Indeed, one of the clear lines of distinction within the various positions on social inclusion is between those who continue to see general social inequalities as of central relevance to any adequate understanding of inclusionary possibilities and those who do not" (Stewart 2000a: 4). However, when it comes to the particular activities of the consultative group in Evangeline, the focus was clearly on process - a process leading to the resolution of more immediate concerns by identifying and meeting local needs. In this community-level activity, the two models do not seem so incompatible. Process is the key. Through an inclusion process, community members can decide whether to initiate activities and programs informed by one

model or another. In fact, the potential for 'process' to be the common ground at the community level between the two social equality models can be found in the literature on deliberative democracy (Miller 1993).

Stewart writes that deliberative democracy offers the possibility of "addressing the central dilemma of social inclusion in modern societies; the need to reconcile demands for justice and the pursuit of adequate degrees of social cohesion with social plurality as an inherent and desirable social characteristic" (Stewart 2000b: 61). He states that the "praxis of social justice is egalitarian to the extent that it is directed towards the removal of inequalities that clearly obstruct full and *meaningful participation in the determination of social outcomes*; that is, social justice concerns *not just outcomes but process*. A meaningful equality of opportunity depends upon an absence of those inequalities which clearly preclude the possibility of participation in the processes of deliberative democracy" (Stewart 2000b: 62 emphasis added).

This suggests that a focus on processes surrounding questions of representation and inclusion is completely within the purview of both theoretical models of social equality. Activities informed by either model that are based on local needs and determined at the community level could then have different outcomes. However, both would emanate from the set of inclusionary processes advocated by a representative community organization such as the ECCG. Whether through the constitution of the community group, the processes of consultation, deliberation and decision-making, the data collected in the Evangeline region show that these processes are key in mobilizing and engaging the community. Only through this type of democratic action can a community decide on the types of initiatives and activities that can best meet its own needs. Whether a particular theoretical model informs the democratic action taking place at the community level seems to be a secondary

consideration.

The focus on process rather than on outcome offers many benefits. It prioritizes agency as a critical aspect of representation and inclusion. It does so by pointing out a potential recipe for community organizations to be more inclusive and representative rather than offering an ideal picture (model) of how the final outcome should look. In this way, community activism interested in a number of different issues, from the general to the specific, could still find potential strategies to lead them to be more inclusive and more representative.

A focus on process rather than on outcome also makes it clear that inclusion and non-exclusion are not the same. “The removal of exclusion does not per se imply a policy of inclusion,” writes Ratcliffe (2000: 182). He continues by stating that the difference between the two “is essentially between the permissive/preventative and the proactive in policy terms,” (Ratcliffe 2000: 172). This point is important because sometimes the two concepts are tangled. The removal of exclusionary barriers is the focus of a large number of inclusionary projects. These projects are quite worthy, but the absence of exclusion does not necessarily imply inclusion. Perhaps one of the key differences between conceptualizing social inclusion as a process rather than as a goal is a focus on the proactive. By actively seeking out community members and various interest and identity groups in the community, the ECOG demonstrated a very proactive understanding of inclusion that went far beyond non-exclusion.

It is important to note that inclusion, like representation, as processes just like outcomes, are not static, once-and-for-all definable conditions. They are part of a dynamic, evolving process. The ECOG repeatedly demonstrated its understanding of this principle. It continually works to reach out to new interest and identity groups. It changed the forum

format that had been used successfully for one they felt was even more representative and inclusive. Arguments can be raised about whether a particular context is more inclusive or representative than another. A recognition of this dynamic principle, of this ever-evolving condition, however, should at least create the space for discussions about the nature of these issues. Ultimately, since this thesis is concerned with processes more than outcomes, that is all we can ask. A focus on process offers no guarantees that the outcome will be one supported by all. But, the question could be asked, is it better to have a representative and inclusive process that leads to unwanted outcomes, or outcomes based on a conceptual model which we support but arrive at through a road less representative and less inclusive?

This question has no easy answers. Perhaps the debate surrounding the move toward community can be framed partly through such a question. It is possible that many of those who support the community as the desirable location for action may have already answered this question for themselves.

The lessons learned in completing this research raise many possibilities for further work. Indeed, the end of one journey is only beginning of another. From here, I am interested in finding ways to understand a question directly related to the one pursued in this thesis. Can a more inclusive, representative and empowering process, especially at the community level, ever become an obstacle in the achievement of your desired goals and models? In the case of an incompatibility between the cherished process and the cherished goal, what would give way? An abandonment of the cherished process or the cherished outcome?

Another important question is representation and inclusion on what basis? A research project could be designed that would build on the present study and look at the bases for representation and inclusion. What is the process through which groups are

identified and recognized as deserving representation or inclusion? Without this identification and recognition, even the most well-meaning group could not reach out and include all the potential interests in a given community. What are the dominant features and standards, if any, applied in this process? What are the consequences of various standards? This project would build on this thesis in its focus on inclusion as a process-oriented concept, but would also be informed by the identity politics literature.

There are some limitations to this thesis which should be acknowledged, some of which have already been touched upon above. To begin with, the data garnered from the Evangeline region does not allow us to make conclusions about the ultimate benefit or drawback of the move towards the community. There are some important facets of this debate that could not be addressed in the context of this research project.

Other limitations concern the generalizability of the findings and implications of this thesis due, for example, to the type of community used in this case study. The Evangeline community is a small, rural community that is fairly homogeneous. The results may have been very different if the study had been conducted in a large, urban centre with a more heterogeneous population. Furthermore, the ECCG, which was the particular community organization under study, has a number of distinctive features that led to its sustainability. These features may render it different than most other community organizations. For example, the ECCG has a full-time coordinator and it has high visibility and access in the community through its institutional partners. These features lend themselves well to the pursuit of representative and inclusive processes compared to community organizations which may not share the same characteristics.

While these limitations are important to note, they are offset to some degree by the type of claims made in this thesis. There are no claims to the generalizability of the findings

in this particular community being representative of communities in general. Instead, this thesis provides an exploratory analysis of the move towards the community and the debate on social equality by trying to shed some light on how these play out at the community level. If the main finding of this thesis is that at the community level, community activity is more about processes informed by the immediate concerns than about ideal models of social equality, then the particular features of this case study that sets it apart from other communities is not a limitation per se.

That is so because this thesis sought to explore the debate on social equality on the basis of community-level activity. It found an opportunity for potential dialogue between proponents of the social inclusion model and the traditional egalitarian ideals model. Rather than making definitive statements about the utility of either model, it showed the importance of processes that promote participatory democracy at the community level.

Appendix A: Information Handout

A Portrait of Sustainable Crime Prevention in Selected Canadian Communities National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention

Who is doing the Study?

The Crime Prevention Partnership Program of the National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention has awarded a grant to the Centre for Applied Population Studies, Carleton University, to study factors related to the sustainability of crime prevention through social development in five selected communities across Canada. This Study has been requested by the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Working Group on Community Safety and Crime Prevention.

The Study Team includes: Dr. Tullio Caputo and Dr. Katharine Kelly of Carleton University in collaboration with Wanda Jamieson and Liz Hart of JamiesonGravesHart Consulting.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to explore how five communities across Canada have achieved sustainable crime prevention, and to identify the factors that contribute to its sustainability.

Study Issues

The study will examine the following questions:

- *What* is it that communities are trying to sustain?
- *How* has each identified community achieved sustainable activity that contributes to crime prevention?
- *What* is the nature of the sustainable activity communities are undertaking?
- *What* is the role of projects within sustainable efforts?
- *What* sectors and organizations (groups) are involved in sustainable efforts?
- *What* is the nature of partnerships within sustainable communities?
- *How* are community action goals and priorities identified?
- *What* are the physical, material, and human resources needed to develop sustainable community-based crime prevention?

What will this Study achieve?

This Study will provide governments and communities with insight into what factors contribute to sustainable crime prevention through social development in Canada.

How were the communities selected?

The Study Team consulted federal, provincial and territorial government officials knowledgeable in crime prevention through social development. They were asked to recommend potential communities for this study. The Study Team selected five communities that could provide unique perspectives on sustainable crime prevention through social development in urban and rural settings. This study is designed to provide a national perspective on sustainable crime prevention and to look at common factors. In our findings, we will not name any individuals, organizations or communities that are part of the study.

What are the research steps?

This study builds on the results of the Discussion Paper on the Sustainability of Social Development Activities in Canada: Some Implications For Crime Prevention produced by the Study Team (June 2001). It will involve gathering information about the community and its crime prevention action, through key informant interviews and focus groups.

For more information about this study

Pierre Senécal
Senior Strategic Policy Advisor
da
or

E-mail:

About the National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention

What is the National Strategy?

The National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention is a federal initiative that is overseen by the Department of Justice Canada and the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada. The overall goal of the National Strategy is to increase public awareness and support for crime prevention, and to increase the capacity of communities to deal with crime and victimization. The National Strategy is aimed at developing community-based responses to crime, with a particular emphasis on children, youth, Aboriginal people and women.

Objectives of the National Strategy

The objectives of the National Strategy are to:

- promote integrated action of key governmental and non governmental partners to reduce crime and victimization;
- assist communities in developing and implementing community - based solutions to problems that contribute to crime and victimization, particularly as they affect children, youth, women and Aboriginal persons; and,
- increase public awareness and support for effective approaches to crime prevention.

Funded Elements of Strategy

The National Strategy is comprised of three major program elements: the National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC), the Safer Communities Initiative and the Promotion and Public Education Program.

1. The NCPC

The NCPC is responsible for the overall management of the National Strategy and is part of the Department of Justice Canada.

2. The Safer Communities Initiative

The Safer Communities Initiative consists of five grant and contribution funding programs: the Community Mobilization Program, the Crime Prevention Investment Fund, the Crime Prevention Partnership Program, the Business Action Program on Crime Prevention, and the Strategic Fund. These programs provide financial support to communities and organizations to develop, implement and evaluate crime prevention models.

3. Promotion and Public Education Program

The purpose of the Promotion and Public Education Program is to increase awareness and knowledge about crime and victimization and effective responses to them.

Appendix C: Interview Guide

1. Can you tell me about the crime prevention activities in your community?
 - a) How and when did they get started?
 - b) Who was involved at the outset?
 - c) What type(s) of crime were being addressed?
 - d) How effective have you been in addressing these crime-related concerns?
 - e) Who does the work? (professional staff , volunteers, both?)
 - f) Do you have an office or other meeting place for these activities?
 - g) How have these activities been funded?
 - h) Is there any in-kind support being provided by anyone participating in the activities?

2. How have your community activities been organized?
 - a) Is there a central crime prevention council, group or committee that coordinates these activities? If yes, what is its' mandate?
 - b) Who participates/participated on this council/committee?
 - c) Does this council/committee have a role in establishing community crime prevention goals/activities?

3. Do your community-based crime prevention activities involve partnerships?
 - a) If yes, who is involved? How do the partnerships work?
 - b) What role(s) do the partners play?
 - c) Have any protocols been developed with respect to inter-agency co-operation?

4. Why do you think the community-based crime prevention activities have persisted as long as they have in your community?
 - a) Why did people/organizations get involved in the first place?
 - b) What keeps them involved?
 - c) Have you received any funding for projects or other activities?
 - d) How have you managed to obtain the (physical, material, and human) resources needed to sustain your community-based crime prevention activities?
 - e) Has there been any planning for the future?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abucar, Mohamed H.
1995. The Canadian Experience of Community Development: The Case of Guysborough County. *Community Development Journal*, 30, no. 4: 337 – 346.
- Andrew, Carolyn
2001. *Social Inclusion: The Foundation of Civic and Community Life*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa
- Askonas, Peter
2000a. The Ground of Inclusiveness. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press
- Askonas, Peter
2000b. What Kind of Hope for our Future? In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press
- Askonas, Peter
2000c. Voluntary: A Spark to be Nurtured. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press
- Atkinson. A.B.
1998. *Poverty In Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd.
- Bach, Michael
2001. *Social Inclusion as Solidarity: Re-Thinking the Child Rights Agenda*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa
- Bauman, Zygmunt
2000. What it Means 'To Be Excluded': Living to Stay Apart or Together? In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press
- Bennett, F.
1998. Comment : Unravelling Poverty. In C. Oppenheim (ed) *An Inclusive Society: Strategies for Tackling Poverty*. London : IPPR.
- Caputo, T., Kelly, K., Jamieson, W., and Hart, L.
2002. *Background Document on Evangeline Site Visit*. Unpublished.
- Chisholm, Sharon
2001. *Housing and Social Inclusion: Asking the Right Questions*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa
- Clutterbuck, Peter

2001. *Social Inclusion and Community Participation*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa
- Clutterbuck, Peter.
2003. Building Inclusive Communities: A Social Infrastructure Strategy for Canadian Municipalities. Final Report on Cross-Canada Community Soundings for the Children's Agenda Program, Laidlaw Foundation.
- Cohen, Stanley
1985. *Social Control and the State*. Oxford : Oxfordshire, Robertson.
- Collins, Richard
2000. Associative or Communal Society? The Globalization of Media and Claims for Communitality. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press
- Coyle, Diana
2000. Unpredictability and Exclusion in the Weightless Economy. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press
- Crawford, Adam.
1995. Appeals to community and crime prevention. *Crime, Law & Social Change*, 22: 97-126.
- Crick, Bernard
2000. Meditation on Democracy, Politics and Citizenship. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press
- Donnelly, Peter
2001. *The Role of Recreation in Promoting Social Inclusion*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa
- Drache, Daniel
2001. *Social Inclusion? So Much Effort So Little Effect: Do We Need to Rethink the Public Domain?* Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa
- Ericson, R.
1994. The Division of Expert Knowledge in Policing and Security. *British Journal of Sociology*, 45 (2) : 149-175.
- Frazee, Catherine
2001. *Social Inclusion In Context: From Experiences of Exclusion to a Vision of Inclusion*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa
- Freiler, Christa
2001. *From Experiences of Exclusion to a Vision of Social Inclusion: What Needs to Change?*

Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Friendly, Martha

2001. *Social Inclusion Through Early Childhood Education and Care*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Gillborn, D. and Gipps, C.

1996. *Recent Research on the Achievements of Ethnic Minority Pupils*. London : HMSO.

Glaser, Mark A., Mark D. Soskin, and Michael Smith.

1996. Local Government Supported Community Development: Community Priorities and Issues of Autonomy. *Urban Affairs Review*, 31, 6: 778 – 798.

Glossop, Robert

2001a. *Opening Remarks*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Glossop, Robert

2001b. *Closing Remarks*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Godfrey, John Ferguson

2001. *Focus Paper*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Goodin, Robert

1996. Inclusion and Exclusion. *Archives Europeennes de Sociologie*, 37, 2, 343-371.

Gray, John

2000. Inclusion: A Radical Critique. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press

Gray, J.

1996. *After Social Democracy*. London : Demos.

Grey, Josephine

2001. *Focus Paper*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Hatfield, Michael

2001. The Causes of Persistent Low Income: A Key Barrier to Social Inclusion. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Helgason, Wayne

2001. *Focus Paper*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a

Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Jackson, Andrew

2001. *Does Work Include Children?* Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Klasen, Stephan

2001. *Social Inclusion: Foundation of a National Policy Agenda*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Kunz, John Lock

2001. *Social Inclusion and Diversity: Fries or Stir-Fry?* Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Labrie, Vivian

2001. *Jeter les Bases de Sociétés Sans Pauvreté, C'est possible, A la Condition de "Rêver Logique"*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Lauziere, Marcel

2001a. *Opening Remarks*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Lauziere, Marcel

2001b. *Closing Remarks*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Levitas, R.

1998. *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour*. London : Macmillan.

Levitas, R

1996. The Concept of Social Exclusion and the New Durkheimian Hegemony. *Critical Social Policy*, vol. 46 (16), pp.5-20.

Lister, Ruth

2000. Strategies for Social Inclusion: Promoting Social Cohesion of Social Justice. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press

Lister, Ruth

1996. Introduction : In Search of the Underclass. In R. Lister (ed) *Charles Murray and the Underclass. The Developing Debate*. London : Institute of Economic Affairs.

Marsh, D and Rhodes, R.

1992. *Policy Networks in British Government*. Oxford : The Clarendon Press.

Miller, David

2001. *Speaking Notes*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a

Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Morgan, R.

1989. Policing by Consent : Legitimizing the Doctrine in Morgan, R & Smith, D.J. (eds) *Coming to Terms with Policing*. London : Routledge.

Novick, Marvyn

2001. *Social Inclusion: The Foundation of a National Policy Agenda*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Pateman, Carole

1970. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge : University Press.

Perraton, Jonathan

2000. The Consequences of Globalization and Corporate Structures for Projects of Social Inclusion. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press

Phipps, Shelley & Curtis, Lori.

2001. *The Social Exclusion of Children in North America*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Pierce, Marie

2001. *Social Inclusion: The Role of School Boards*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Plant, Raymond

2000. Political Inclusion. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press

Power, A.

1998. Down but Not Out in London. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 14 August, p. 16.

Ratcliffe, Peter

2000. Is the Assertion of Minority Identity Compatible with the Idea of a Socially Inclusive Society? In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press

Robinson, Peter

2000. Employment and Social Inclusion. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press

Room, G

1995. Poverty and Social Exclusion : The New European Agenda for Policy and Research. In G. Room (ed). *Beyond the Threshold*. Bristol : Policy Press.

Saloojee, Anver

2001. *Social Inclusion, Citizenship and Diversity*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa
- Sampson, A., Stubbs, P., Smith, D., Pearson, G. and Blagg, H.
1988. Crime, Localities and the Multi-Agency Approach. *British Journal of Criminology*, 28, 473-493.
- Scruton, P.
1985. *The State of the Police*. London : Pluto.
- Sennett, Richard
2000. Work and Social Inclusion. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press
- Sklar, R
1996. Empire to the West : Red River. In J. Hillier and P. Wollen (eds) *Howard Hawks : American Artist*. London : British Film Institute.
- Slinger, Giles & Deakin, Simon
2000. Company Law: An Instrument for Inclusion. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press
- Stewart, Angus
2000a. Social Inclusion: An Introduction. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press
- Stewart, Angus
2000b. Never Ending Story: Inclusion and Exclusion in Late Modernity. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press
- Stewart, Angus
2000. Social Inclusion: A Radical Agenda. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press
- Taylor, Charles
2000. Democratic Exclusion (and its Remedies?). In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press
- Taylor, I.
1995. Critical Criminology and the Free Market in L. Noaks *et al* (eds) *Contemporary Issues in Criminology*, Cardiff : University of Wales Press, 400-428.
- UK House of Commons.
1999. Internet Publications, Poverty and Social Exclusion. (National Strategy) Bill, as presented to the House of Commons on 10th February 1999 from <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm199899/cmbills/045/1999045.htm>

Walzer, Michael

1993. A Day in the Life of a Socialist Citizen *Dissent*, vol 38

Winstanley, Diana & Stoney, Christopher

2000. Inclusion in the Workplace? The Stakeholder Debate. In Askonas & Stewart (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions*. New York: St.Martin's Press

Wotherspoon, Terry

2001. *The Dynamics of Social Inclusion and Exclusion in Public Education in Canada*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa

Yelland, Lois

2001. *Social Inclusion in Action: Transforming Public Policies and Institutional Practices as It Relates to Community Services*. Paper presented at the A New Way of Thinking: Towards a Vision of Social Inclusion Conference, Ottawa