Reena Tiwari · Marina Lommerse
Dianne Smith *Editors*

M^2 Models and Methodologies for Community Engagement

Springer

M^2 Models and Methodologies for Community Engagement

Reena Tiwari • Marina Lommerse • Dianne Smith
Editors

M^2 Models and Methodologies for Community Engagement

Springer

Editors
Reena Tiwari
Faculty of Built Environment
Curtin University
Perth, Western Australia
Australia

Marina Lommerse
Marina Lommerse Consultants
South Fremantle, Western Australia
Australia

Dianne Smith
Faculty of Built Environment
Curtin University
Perth, Western Australia
Australia

ISBN 978-981-4585-10-1 ISBN 978-981-4585-11-8 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-981-4585-11-8
Springer Singapore Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014932417

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Foreword

Since the 1970s, the role of science and academics in general and of social science as self-reflexive and critical has come under increasing scrutiny. Critical research has aimed at a new progressive relationship between action and reflection, theory and practice. There has been a strong concern with awareness-raising and empowerment of hitherto marginalized and oppressed groups. Interesting precursors are Kurt Lewin (action research), Paulo Freire (awareness-raising) and Robert Jungk (Futures Workshop). After founding a Centre Paulo Freire in Vienna, we have been involved in diverse partnerships with local schools, green and anti-globalization activists, as well as setting up the first social platform financed by the European Commission, with the objective of fostering social cohesion in the city.

In a world dominated by neoliberal thinking, we are suffering from increasing commercialization and the subordination of academics as well as formal political power-holders to the needs and interests of economic power. Although there is a megatrend of fostering researchers to become 'relevant' and market-prone, promising alternatives have been flourishing at the margins and interstices. To me, *M^2 Models and Methodologies for Community Engagement* is an exciting testimony to the richness of community engagement as one example of a broad, worldwide, bottom-up movement which aims at making social science matter and work for a better world. Different case studies in this collection show the potential of a dialogue between transdisciplinary theories and practices in forms of community development that not only empower the community, but are rewarding for the professionals as well.

From the diverse learning and research partnerships in which I have had the pleasure of participating, I think that three main lessons emerge for transdisciplinary cooperation. First, researchers tend to neglect the importance of organizational issues in transdisciplinary research. Even researchers who sympathize with interdisciplinarity and recognize the importance of relevant research may lack the practical tools to make their knowledge matter outside the academy. Therefore, I very much appreciate that this book is not only dedicated to methods and tools, but also to models of practice involvement on a practical and organizational level. In our research, we have observed that good learning and research partnerships require trust and mutual understanding. We have coined the term *knowledge alliance* to describe a reality,

as well as an aspiration to lasting, respectful partnerships of knowledge production, diffusion and mobilization.

Secondly, I appreciate the importance given to power and empowerment in this collection. Researchers and practitioners will be reminded and encouraged to take the diverse dimensions of power relations into account when they read the case studies in this collection, which exemplify a multi-faceted awareness of and respect for the complexity of power relations in any community. Power can be fluid and all-pervasive in the Foucauldian sense, but also very concrete and personalized. All too often, empowerment implies that someone in power—who coincidentally often finances research—loses part of their power. Making decisions which empower the community in question requires an intellectual and political effort to appraise and balance social, political and economic forces.

Thirdly, creating happy communities gives great personal rewards to social scientists, as much as to the communities they work with. But only rarely is this recognized academically. One of the key merits of books like this one is its potential to overcome this duality and demonstrate that good transdisciplinary research not only leads to happier communities, but also to better knowledge about community dynamics for future practice. Transdisciplinarity has the key advantage over conventional research that it can mobilize the local knowledge of stakeholders systematically. A scientific approach which links these contextualized insights to existing social theories, as in this collection, will benefit social science, its practitioners and the communities served, and could pave the way towards a governance of knowledge beyond neoliberalism.

Andreas Novy
Chairperson of the Austrian Green Foundation
Associate Professor, Urban and Regional Development,
Institute for the Environment and Regional Development,
Vienna University of Economics and Business

Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference.
Robert Frost, *Mountain Interval*

Preface

The book was conceived as a project of the International Cooperation Research Cluster (ICRC), established in early 2012 at Curtin University. The cluster formation was a University initiative to bring together researchers, practitioners and postgraduate students from various disciplines working in similar fields, with the objective of building each other's capacity by investigating community development and cooperation projects from a research perspective.

Synergies were established following an exercise of mapping individual cluster members' research strengths, the nature of their work and the location of these works globally. Community-centric projects based in different disciplines and in various international contexts emerged as common ground for further exploration by the ICRC cluster members.

Questions for exploration were:

- How do researchers and professionals from different disciplinary perspectives working on community-based projects of different nature and scales and at different locations in the developing and developed world, engage with their own communities of practice and the communities under study?
- What are the effects of these engagements for both practitioners and local community members? Is capacity built in any form for the participants?
- If so, what are the models and methodologies of these engagements? What are the methods employed in these interactions with community?

An idea of a book dealing with the above questions was formed and *M^2 Models and Methodologies for Community Engagement* was born. The book unfolded as an act of co-production and co-creation, where academics, researchers, practitioners, graphic artists and editors were involved in an active process of threading together the myriad voices (personal and collective) and vignettes of perspectives.

Traditionally, a contributed book is structured as a series of stand-alone chapters on a targeted subject, bookended by a contextualizing introduction and a concluding chapter by the editor(s). Typically, the contributed chapters are a result of selected conference papers on a theme, or a call for interest, or an invitation to experts in the field to write on a targeted subject set out by the publisher/editor(s). Authors most often have no direct contact with each other, and therefore do not impact on

the development of the others. The evolution of this book was quite different, with authors contributing from the beginning towards setting the direction for the book. Writing workshops were organized and brainstorming sessions between the authors, followed by editorial sessions, demonstrate a shared creativity, a collective efficacy. Parts II and III evolved out of the workshops sessions once Part I of the Book was developed. For us, this book, an object of co-creation, helped us in opening up to new perspectives, embracing novel ways of moving forward and building on each others' works. The process aided us on a path less travelled and brought the book contributors together as an active, engaging, non-placed global community.

The editors would like to thank and acknowledge the following people for their creative participation, and for igniting debate and development of *M² Models and Methodologies for Community Engagement.*

- The contributing authors for their enthusiastic response to the intention of the book, and their ideas that shaped the book through the workshops, questionnaires and contributed chapters.
- The invited reviewers, all of Curtin University, Western Australia, for considered and constructive assessment of the editorial chapters, the book structure and participation in writing workshops:
  - Bob Pokrant, School of Media, Culture & Creative Arts;
  - Jaya Earnest, Director of Graduate Studies, Health Sciences, and Associate Professor of International Health in the Centre for International Health;
  - Mohammed Ali and Clancy Read, Centre for International Health;
  - Sarah McGann and John Stephens, School of the Built Environment.
- Andreas Novy, Chairperson of the Austrian Green Foundation, and Associate Professor for Urban and Regional Development at RUW (Institute for the Environment and Regional Development) at WU Vienna, for writing the foreword.
- Christina Houen, *M2*'s Production Coordinator, Adjunct Research Associate of School of Media, Culture and Creative Arts, Curtin University, and Editor/Director of www.perfectwordsediting.com, for her dedicated editing and production work, impressive attention to detail and timely advice to authors.
- Allyson Crimp, Designer, of et-al.com.au, for her graphic work and image editing.
- Jessica Winters, planning student, and Robyn Creagh, PhD candidate, Curtin University, for their research assistance, dedication and contributions to the book preparation.

We thank Springer for their enthusiastic approach to publishing the book.

Last but not least, we thank Curtin University for support enabling the research and production associated with this book project.

Contents

Contributors

Mohammed Ali Centre for International Health, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Denise K. DeLuca BCI: Biomimicry for Creative Innovation, Seattle, USA

Salvatore Di Mauro Queensland College of Art, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia

Jaya Earnest International Health, School of Nursing and Midwifery, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Centre for International Health, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Anne Farren Department of Design, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Mark Jones International Health, School of Nursing and Midwifery, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

May Lample Kimanya-Ngeyo Foundation for Science and Education, Jinja, Uganda

Marina Lommerse Marina Lommerse Consultants, South Fremantle, Australia

School of the Built Environment, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Damian Madigan School of Art, Architecture and Design, The University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia

Sarah McGann Department of Architecture and Interior Architecture, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Carmen Mendoza-Arroyo Department of Urban Design and Regional Planning, School of Architecture, Universitat Internacional de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain

Barbara Milech School of Communication, Culture and Creative Arts, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

David Morris School of Art, Architecture and Design, The University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia

Yatin Pandya FOOTPRINTS Environment Architecture Research Technology Housing (E.A.R.T.H), Ahmedabad, India

Bob Pokrant Department of Social Science and International Studies, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Veena Poonacha Research Center for Women's Studies, Dr. Avabai Wadia Archives, SNDT Women's University, Mumbai, India

Mokhlesur Rahman Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Center for Natural Resource Studies, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Clancy Read Centre for International Health, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Centre for International Health, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Debra Singh Kimanya-Ngeyo Foundation for Science and Education, Jinja, Uganda

Dianne Smith Department of Architecture and Interior Architecture, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Nancy Spanbroek Department of Architecture and Interior Architecture, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Reena Tiwari Departments of Urban and Regional Planning and of Architecture and Interior Architecture, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Pere Vall-Casas Department of Urban Design and Regional Planning, School of Architecture, Universitat Internacional de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain

About the Editors

Reena Tiwari is Associate Professor in the Departments of Urban & Regional Planning and Architecture at Curtin University, and Director of the International Cooperation Research Cluster. Her work focuses on the integration of urban development and place-making, with an emphasis on the importance of community involvement. Reena has received an Australian National Award for Teaching Excellence for leading and inspiring a model of teaching and research which has established a point of difference in the profession, in its commitment to community engagement.

Marina Lommerse is a designer, educator, curator, researcher and strategist with Marina Lommerse Consultants, and Adjunct Professor, Curtin University. She works with creative people and communities to strengthen individual and collective capacity and build supportive environments, mobilizing creative projects that promote positive change in communities, through publications, creative works, and curatorship of exhibitions.

Dianne Smith is Associate Professor and Head of Program in Interior Architecture at Curtin University, and Adjunct Professor at Queensland University of Technology. Dianne's research focuses on design for the cognitively impaired, the meaning of environments, the impact of colour on experience and our understanding of place, and design education.

About the Authors

Mohammed Ali coordinates postgraduate coursework programs in International Health at Curtin University. He worked as a physician-researcher in diarrhoeal diseases and nutrition in Bangladesh, and has conducted research in cardiac rehabilitation and forensic mental health services among Australian Indigenous people.

Denise DeLuca is Director and Co-Founder of BCI: Biomimicry for Creative Innovation, an emerging network that shares nature's principles with businesses and organizations to achieve radical transformation. Denise is also an adjunct faculty in the Sustainable Design Program at the Minneapolis College of Art and Design, and a biomimetic consultant for Swedish Biomimetics 3000.

Salvatore di Mauro is a Senior Lecturer in Design at Griffith University. Since 1997, he has focused less on his artwork in a gallery context and more on working with communities to develop public art and design needs. He finds working with creative thinkers, artists, crafts persons, designers and local industry both challenging and rewarding.

Jaya Earnest is Director of Graduate Studies in the Faculty of Health Sciences and Associate Professor of International Health at the Centre for International Health, Curtin University. She has worked for 26 years in India, Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, East Timor and Australia as an educator and researcher. Her central research interests are post-conflict adversity, resilience among refugee and migrant populations and interdisciplinary cross-cultural participatory research.

Anne Farren is Academic Coordinator of Fashion and Director of the Fashion Design & Research HUB at Curtin University. She maintains a creative practice as both a maker and curator of fashion and textiles. Her research interests include investigation into the relationship between design practice and technology.

Mark Jones is Professor for transcultural health improvement at Curtin, and Director of the Western Australian Global Health Alliance. Mark has built on his background in primary health care nursing, health policy development, and international nursing expertise to make a significant contribution to improving capacity and capability within health care systems of developing countries.

May Lample works as a research assistant at Kimanya-Ngeyo Foundation for Science and Education in Jinja, Uganda. She is also researching for her Master's degree in Public Health, majoring in Maternal and Child Health at University of California (Berkeley) School of Public Health.

Damian Madigan is a Lecturer in Architecture at the University of South Australia, Director of Madigan Architecture and a PhD candidate in the School of Art Design & Architecture at Monash University, where he is researching models of flexible housing.

Carmen Mendoza-Arroyo is Professor at the Universitat Internacional de Catalunya, and Co-Principal of the firm DACarquitectura. She has recently been appointed Sub-Director of the School of Architecture at UIC. Her research focuses on sustainable urban regeneration and development.

Sarah McGann is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Architecture and Interior Architecture at Curtin University. Her particular interest is in the intersection of architecture and social theory. Sarah's latest publication, *The Production of Hospice Space,* draws on her practice designing health, hospitality and recreation projects.

Barbara Milech Adjunct Professor, served as Curtin University's Humanities Director of Graduate Studies for more than a decade; here she worked to establish frameworks that support creative-production research. Her supervision and research interests are in literature and creative writing, and draw on narrative, cultural, feminist and Lacanian studies.

David Morris is an architect, builder and director of the Student Construction Program in the School of Art, Architecture and Design at the University of South Australia. The program has constructed many award winning projects, which focus on culturally responsive designs for Indigenous communities. David Morris is recipient of the Australian National Award for Programs that Enhance Learning for the Vanuatu Project discussed in the book.

Yatin Pandya is an author, activist, academician, researcher and practising architect in his firm FOOTPRINTS E.A.R.T.H. (Environment Architecture Research Technology Housing) at Ahmedabad. Environmental sustainability, socio-cultural appropriateness, timeless aesthetics and economic affordability are key principles of his work.

Bob Pokrant is Professor of Anthropology at Curtin University, Australia. His main research interests are fisheries, aquaculture, and community adaptation to climate change in South Asia, particularly Bangladesh.

Veena Poonacha is Professor and Director of the Research Centre for Women's Studies at SNDT Women's University in Mumbai, India. She is also honorary director of the Centre for Rural Development that runs empowerment and development projects for rural women in Southern Gujarat in Western India.

Mokhlesur Rahman is a development practitioner in the fields of community based natural resource management in wetlands, forests and coastal zones, and community livelihoods, climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction in Bangladesh.

Clancy Read completed her Doctor of Philosophy in International Health in the Centre of International Health (CIH), Curtin University. She is currently cofounder and lead consultant of I.D.E.A. Global Consulting offering research, project management and training services for humanitarian organizations.

Debra Singh is a medical doctor with a Masters in Public Health and is currently a PhD candidate at Sydney University. She and her husband established the Kimanya-Ngeyo Foundation for Science and Education in Jinja, Uganda. Her research and education focus is on female and youth empowerment through participation in health care processes and community health worker training.

Nancy Spanbroek is a Senior Lecturer in Architecture Interior Architecture at Curtin University. Her design research explores the interface between design pedagogy, community and exhibition as a testing ground for creative practice.

Pere Vall-Casas is Associate Professor at Escola Tècnica Superior d'Arquitectura de la *Universitat International de Catalunya*. His research focuses on cultural landscapes. He is currently working on urban sprawl repair through research into pre-urban patterns and participant observation.

List of Figures

List of Tables

Chapter 1
Navigating Community Engagement

Dianne Smith, Reena Tiwari and Marina Lommerse

Abstract What it is about community involvement that attracts some professionals to adopt ways of working that embrace the community members as partners? Which aspects make community work rewarding for a professional, and more importantly, successful from a community member's perspective? The theoretical constructs—community engagement, capacity building, and community empowerment—will be discussed in order to demonstrate how theory and practice are relevant to the development of ways to be involved in communities. A framework that we consider is of value has evolved that enables us to map or describe the attributes of community based projects; that is, an approach which aims to move beyond simply bringing people together from a variety of disciplines, to one which is transdisciplinary and applicable across cultures and genres of projects. Although a transdisciplinary approach is not new in itself, by making it explicit as an aspiration, we highlight the possible limitation of those projects that only bring together differing contributors at core moments for their expertise, without reflecting or planning for the potentially new ways of conceptualizing and of actioning what needs to be done. Such interactions are discussed in relation to participation and engagement. By constructing a project as transdisciplinary, all people—including the community—are ongoing contributors, who are able to wander into others' discipline-specific arenas and vice versa.

D. Smith (✉)
Department of Architecture and Interior Architecture, Curtin University, Perth, Australia
e-mail: dianne.smith@curtin.edu.au

R. Tiwari
Departments of Urban and Regional Planning and of Architecture and Interior Architecture, Curtin University, Perth, Australia
e-mail: r.tiwari@curtin.edu.au

M. Lommerse
Marina Lommerse Consultants, South Fremantle, Australia

School of the Built Environment, Curtin University, Perth, Australia
e-mail: marina@marinalommerse.com

R. Tiwari et al. (eds.), *M² Models and Methodologies for Community Engagement,*
DOI 10.1007/978-981-4585-11-8_1,

Keywords Community engagement · Community participation · Transdisciplinary · Capacity building

Introduction

Navigating the quagmire of considerations around community-based projects commences way before one gets to the location in question. This book strives to assist those considering such an adventure, and/or reflecting upon past interactions, by providing a collection of insights and strategies gleaned from the contributing authors' many varied experiences. We hope that this exploration will inspire many to choose to engage in community-based projects which involve the community as active participants and partners; an experience that the editors have found to be both challenging and rewarding.

When professionals set out to engage with a community, they enter a complex field of possibilities. Firstly, there is a multitude of ways of selecting communities, as well as those for being chosen by or appointed to a community. Forms of interaction and modes of engagement may differ widely, depending on the scale and complexity of the issues, the work to be undertaken, and its locational context. The duration and intimacy of the project, ranging from those involving a single household or act to those that may cover an entire region or issue, can also add to the complexity of issues around the tasks involved.

Therefore, we aim to consider what it is about community involvement that attracts some professionals to working this way, and what makes some community work rewarding for the professional, and more importantly, successful from the community members' perspective. The theoretical constructs—community engagement and empowerment, and capacity building—will be discussed in order to demonstrate how theory and practice are relevant to the development of ways to be involved in communities. This also positions the subsequent chapters in a framework that we consider is of value; that is, an approach which aims to move beyond simply bringing people together from a variety of disciplines, to one which is transdisciplinary and applicable across cultures and genres of projects. Although a transdisciplinary approach is not new in itself, by making it explicit as an aspiration, we highlight the possible limitation of those projects that only bring together differing contributors at core moments for their expertise, without reflecting or planning for the potentially new ways of conceptualizing and of actioning what needs to be done. By constructing a project as transdisciplinary, all people are ongoing contributors, who are able to wander into others' discipline-specific arenas and vice versa. We will expand on this overarching approach after clarifying the objectives of community intervention: engagement and empowerment, and capacity building.

Community Engagement and Empowerment

Community engagement and participation is an approach that has been widely debated and has generated varied opinions regarding its relevance and value (for example, Hall 2010; Israel et al. 1998; Israel et al. 2001; Kumar et al. 2011; Minkler and Wallerstein 2008; Mooney 2005; Patel et al. 2011a; Tsey 2008; Tsey et al. 2009; Wallerstein and Duran 2006; Wallerstein and Duran 2010).

These practices have prevailed; even in 1993, Dudley recognised the increasing use of this participatory approach in generating public policy. However, concerns have continually been raised because of practices which claim to engage communities, yet lack the participation of all members of the community at all levels of the project. Participation by all the various groups may not yet be possible because it is difficult to gain clarity concerning purpose and actions which all will fully understand, and therefore be willing to engage in. For example, Kumar notes the basic terms 'community' and 'participation' are understood differently, depending on the context of the project, and therefore, potential participants may be comfortable with, or wary of, the opportunity to engage (Kumar 2005, p. 55). For those who have influential vested interests, community participation as a methodology may pose a potential threat (Dudley 1993).

However, as Dudley notes, community participation can be used by professionals as both a tool and a goal. If used as a tool, it has the risk of creating an obvious 'us and them' divide, whereas, when used as a goal, it has the potential to transfer power to the community more equitably (Dudley 1993, p. 8). However, Kumar contends that true empowerment can only occur when someone in power loses part of their power. If this is true, what is the impact? Often, community-based projects involve a range of stakeholders where some are poor, marginalized or disenfranchized in some way. The involvement of such groups to create positive change is most likely to result in these groups gaining greater access to services and/or resources, and as a result, to become more empowered. Is a redistribution of power required 'that enables the have-not citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic process, to be included in the future' (Arnstein 1969, p. 216)? The question raised is: do those who were more powerful become less powerful? Or can change foster new ways of working or living together that acknowledge different forms of contribution, and in association, power structures and relationships?

By the late 1990s, the notion that participation and empowerment would lead to faster and more effective progress and development of the community started to take hold, and two ways of engagement evolved. The first relation usually involves a link to the community via one tier, such as a service provider or NGO, which may often be removed, as government is, from the way the community members operate within their lifestyle. Therefore, this tier may either leverage the potential for empowerment or limit it by acting as a filter. Change or development instigated by government agency has often been described as top-down, in that the power brokers set the engagement agenda. A variation of this form of engagement emphasized that market deregulation and institutional reforms deliver development outcomes due to

the existence of a civil society. However, this typically has not involved high levels of consultation with the members of that society. When there are two non-government players similar issues arise. Even so, non-government organizations provide a convenient alternative to deliver outcomes.

In contrast, the second way of engagement emphasized 'mobilisation of marginalized groups against the disempowering activities of both the state and the market' (Servaes 2003, p. 248) That is, the community members actively become involved to ensure their lifestyle—for example, practices and cultural beliefs—is not lost and they are still empowered within their community context.

Tandon describes the historical role of citizenship, wherein there arises an obligation to participate in the community, to exercise citizen rights and to engage. This perceived role of the good citizen intersects with the two participation models. These two models of engagement highlight how engagement and participation depend on the principles of citizenship and democracy (Tandon 2008). Tandon suggests that models of participatory programs which are integrated into the democratic political system can be extremely successful in 'enhancing representative forms of democracy' (Tandon 2008, p. 293). However, hegemonies exist within communities, so that the dominant societal paradigm operates even though not all community members are comfortable with the situation. Imbalance between community members in certain societies in regard to resources and access may be understood as the norm. This position does not necessarily flag a need for change for community members. People may accept their lot, while others with access believe the inequities to be fair and reasonable in this particular context. In these instances, non-participation may be seen as appropriate, rather than as demonstrating a lack of citizen involvement.

With the emergence of power-sharing concepts of collaboration, mediation and empowerment (Healey 1992; Wilcox 1994), more radical approaches to community engagement were instigated during the last century. Building on such understandings, in this book we introduce and critique some of the community engagement models, methods and methodologies. We commence our discussion by identifying others' conceptions of community engagement; and thereby, we identify potential implications for those who are considering working in this area.

Frameworks for community engagement and the facilitation of community capacity building have emerged. Kimmel et al.'s (2012) framework highlights how Flora and Flora, in 1993, identified three aspects of 'strong sustainable environments': 'robust physical infrastructure including roads, schools; and human capital such as leaders or access to education; and a strong social infrastructure to facilitate the process of community building and development such as social capital, networks…' (as cited in Kimmel et al. 2012, p. 225).

Kimmel et al. define social infrastructure as the complex and dynamic interactions among people, and through such linkages, 'infrastructure is developed through which information and knowledge are perpetuated within the community, resources and actions are mobilized, and problems are addressed' (2012, p. 226). Strong community social infrastructure depends on the capacity to:

- engage in constructive controversy and devise workable solutions that balance people, place, and economy, rather than divide, exclude, or privilege one portion of a community over others;
- mobilize local capital to invest in regional entrepreneurial activities that benefit a larger community;
- attract and disseminate resources, particularly information, into and throughout a community (Flora and Flora 1993, as cited in Kimmel et al. 2012, p. 226).

Kimmel's group developed a community engagement framework built upon three aspects—holding environments, learning action networks, and social and ecological entrepreneurship. Each is defined as follows:

- Holding environments:

  > are safe spaces in which individuals may share ideas freely, adaptive learning can occur, and which frequently rely on facilitation by external partners. A key function of these environments is to direct attention to the problems participants share and to collaborative opportunities to address them. (Heifetz 1994, as cited in Kimmel et al. 2012, p. 227)

- Learning action networks 'are comprised of relationships and linkages among what might otherwise be disparate stakeholder groups and individuals, enabling opportunities for collaboration, mechanisms for exchange and learning, and pathways for shared understanding and mutual benefit' (Stephenson 2011, as cited in Kimmel et al. 2012, p. 227).
- Social and ecological entrepreneurship builds community capacity by supporting entrepreneurship that complements community-identified goals (Kimmel et al. 2012, pp. 230–231).

The shift in power sharing to a model that is more inclusive and to recognize difference within a more equitable relationship is a challenge. That said, the role of user groups or community members is emphasized by Nimegeer et al. (2011) in their discussion of co-creation or co-production, where both service providers and users are recognized as being equal contributors to a situation—a concept originally defined by Alford (as cited in Needham 2008, p. 221). Methods have been employed to foster mutual contribution, but it is recognized that 'while many, including citizen juries and round-table workshops, had merit, it was felt they did not adequately account for the complex value laden and holistic nature of planning, as well as … context' (Nimegeer et al. 2011, p. 1005).

Therefore, in Nimegeer et al.'s Scottish community health study they developed a new planning simulation game: the Remote Service Futures Game. The simulation game uses a number of types and levels of cards, and allows community members, as part of a process of engagement, to express their priorities and designs in a form that is directly usable by health service managers, to contribute to a more applicable service provision. However, although researchers state it as self-evident that co-production of this kind will improve services (Needham 2008), this may not always be the case. To demonstrate, Needham uses social housing to illustrate that co-production requires active engagement, and 'the need for collective dialogue

and deliberation between co-producers, rather than purely transactional forms of co-production' (Needham 2008, p. 222).

The process is more than consultation, and Needham's observation reinforces the distinctions made by Christopher Day in 2003 regarding consultation, collaboration and consensus design (Day 2003). '[E]ngaging people in co-production does not happen through consultations, on citizens' juries or at council meetings: it needs to happen at the point of delivery and through conversation and dialogue rather than chance alone' (Parker and Heapy 2006, p. 15). Needham argues that 'the forms of co-production most likely to access therapeutic and diagnostic benefits are those that are collective, dialogical, positive-sum and focused at the point of delivery, rather than individualized, zero-sum and abstracted from service experiences' (Needham 2008, p. 225).

Of interest to those in the field of creating the built environment is the balance between what we see as good design and what may emerge from community consultative and collaborative processes, where the participants have equal and valued input. Fundamental to navigating this tension is a re-evaluation of what 'good' actually means in this context. As Heylighen & Bianchin state, it requires us to drop the preconception that only professionals can identify and appreciate good design (2013, p. 94), and to recognize that the attributes of good design such as 'commodity, firmness, and delight'—defined as far back as the first century BC by the Roman architect Vitruvius (1960)—can be appreciated by all people in relation to their everyday environments and possessions. The way we portray design will also need to be challenged. As Cuff discussed nearly four decades ago (1989, as cited in Heylighen and Bianchin (2013, p. 93), design and architectural journals and magazines reinforce mainstream and entrenched beliefs. This visual emphasis is currently being re-evaluated by spatial designers such as Juhani Pallasmaa (2005). However, the debate also needs to cross over into the community participatory domain, so that high quality design is achieved that is relevant for the community.

Implicated in such discussions are two concepts: community and community capacity. In brief, the former relates to those who participate in a society, while simultaneously constructing what constitutes a community—people, place, beliefs, values, practices, and rituals. Capacity implies the capabilities of both the collective and the individuals in relation to the practices that they desire and need to operate now and in the future. There are many ways these concepts are defined below, and these will be reflected upon to build an understanding of both concepts—community and community capacity—in the context of community engagement and participation.

Social constructs such as community and modes of operating influence how we perceive our places and other people, whether as individuals or as a sub-cultural group. For example, people implicitly enact their lives influenced by the assumptions that they hold, and these beliefs are in part socially constructed. Language also reinforces such understandings:

> That is, the concept of community has evolved from including the usual connotations of coherence and permanence to including the social processes and discourses that create, withstand and dissolve them; in a radio program on Belfast, a local resident, attempting to

> develop non-sectarian initiatives, made a comment along the lines of: 'when you hear the word "community" in this city, you know someone is going to get hurt.' (McManus 2001, p. 45)

Research towards a definition of community has noted that communities must contain 'sufficient social interaction, structure and permanence to allow an individual to identify as a member of that community' (Ragin et al. 2008, p. 1380). This yields a '…sense of membership; common symbol systems; common needs and a commitment to meeting them; and a shared history'; in other words, '…individuals [are] delineated by physical, social, or jurisdictional boundaries' (DiClemente et al. 2002, p. 197).

Thus, communities exist or can come into being because of common physical characteristics such as geographical and spatial boundaries, or by non-physical connections such as shared history or common needs, referred to as an ecological relationship between individual, family and environment (McMurray and Clendon 2011); or due to unforeseen interventions. Thus, physical or emotional bonds become key determinants for the definition of communities. The need to belong to an identifiable group raises the issue of 'others'.

A community may gain definition due to the perceived loss of social coherence of a sub-group of the community in relation to mainstream or dominant community groups; that is, its sense of who it is and how it defines its attributes. For example, rural communities affected by drought leading to high male suicides and rates of depression contradict stereotypical images of the strong country community. Emerging awareness of a sub-group's needs may be as a consequence of increasing social activism, cultural diversity, homelessness, displaced people and/or the need for sustainability (Lommerse 2011, p. 29). In association, 'The most serious political consequence of the desire for community… is that it often operates to exclude or oppress those experienced as different' (Young 1990, p. 234).

Therefore, it is important not to romanticize the concept of community. Communities will operate according to their own rules, and therefore, engaging with them requires knowledge of what these are within the community with which one is working. It may be necessary to ask what is the advantage or disadvantage of a hierarchical community over an inclusive, horizontally structured one for the people involved? And vice versa? Are there circumstances when the existence of one form over the other is not appropriate? For example, the suppression of women, segregation based on skin colour, access to food based on earning capacity, times of war, times of natural disaster, and the like?

In its strongest form, the community can take on structure that further contributes to the sense of community. This structure allows for individuals to partake in decision-making on behalf of their community, in which they are represented and feel ownership (Ragin et al. 2008). The more this structure is developed, the more likely that the community as a whole, as well as the individuals, will endure (Ragin et al. 2008), and therefore, grow collectively. 'Healthy communities are those places where belonging is valued, where the connections between individuals, families and the environments of their lives are as important as the life forces within' (McMurray and Clendon 2011, p. 5).

Because of the fine distinctions within the discourse of communities, community engagement, and participation and capacity building, the chapters within this book are collated into three sections. The first section presents a cross section of projects, which highlight how researchers and practitioners have undertaken community engagement projects across numerous locations and of varying scales and with differing objectives. From this collection it is possible to identify common issues but also insights into how different contexts demand alternative approaches. These involve different methods and can be seen as models for future projects. The second section seeks to reflect upon real life experiences in the field and to offer suggestions and tools for how one may commence projects, and the aspects to address prior to beginning and during the project development. The importance of learning from doing is highlighted. The third section brings together the issues raised in the introduction in light of the examples discussed and the literature. The editors also reflect on future needs and possibilities as a way of moving the debate forward to inform future community-based practices.

Community engagement is conceptualized as 'ways of working'—shaping and managing the environment through the development of strategies, processes, design and construction (Beeck et al. 2011, p. 17). Community engagement is about learning and exchanging knowledge, identifying priorities and possibilities, making decisions, and making things happen (Beeck et al. 2011).

In addition, for us, community engagement is a 'cooperative process of working with people to address their wellbeing, crossing disciplinary boundaries, and using multiple knowledge from inside and outside the community' (Lommerse 2011, p. 26), and as Bryan Bell argues, 'the process of creating the built environment can allow communities and individuals to improve and celebrate their lives. It can help solve their struggles by reshaping their existence and building capacity' (Bell 2008, as cited in Lommerse 2011, p. 26). In this way we aspire to develop and/or describe processes that will facilitate such outcomes; that is, those that are pertinent, meaningful, and positive for all members of a society or community wherever possible.

Capacity Building

Although not evident in all cases, it is assumed that those actively engaging in the majority of community-focused projects are aiming to facilitate positive change for the community members in some way. As part of this agenda-building, the capacity of the people and their community is a central focus. What is meant by capacity? And can it be built in the context of others? An overview of how the concept is defined and has developed follows, in order to establish what the overall goal may look like in relation to these two aspects.

Firstly, capacity building is described as helping people to help themselves (Eade 2007). This may involve incorporating ideas from outside the community. However, the increased or realized capacity emerges from the local context—perspectives, knowledge and skills. Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo (2001) illustrate the concept

of empowerment or emancipation in local culture with the story of how this was achieved in Kwara'ae culture, through the integration of indigenous knowledge towards development in the Solomon Islands:

> The Kwara'ae Genealogy Project [is] a research effort by rural villagers aimed at creating an indigenous written account of Kwara'ae culture. In recording, (re)constructing, and writing Kwara'ae culture, project members are not only doing indigenous epistemology, but also reflecting on and critiquing their own indigenous strategies for knowledge creation. (Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo 2001, p. 55)

In this project, community members are able to engage more fully, as their qualities, skills and knowledge enable them to participate differently (Gegeo 1998). This involvement adds to an individual's social capital. Thus, community capacity is not unlike social capital (McMurray and Clendon 2011). Social capital, a concept we expand on below in terms of Pierre Bourdieu's seminal work (1986), is the development of civic engagement, trust and reciprocity amongst community members; the greater the social capital, the more potential there is for improving community capacity (assuming that there are adequate opportunities to leverage from this for the breadth of members of the community).

This increase helps community members to cope with adversity and limitations, as well as fostering a sense of place (McMurray and Clendon 2011). DiClemente et al. (2009) discuss community capacity building in the area of health, while Patel et al. (2011) outline methods for facilitating communication between and within cultural groups to assist cross-cultural engagement. Civic engagement allows power sharing as well as enabling community members to mobilize, thereby collectively improving their quality of life either as individuals or as a collective (Smith et al. 2003).

Secondly, capacity building leads towards transformation—physical, social, economic or environmental—which strengthens our civil society organizations, and can build democratization and strong, accountable governance systems. Thus, capacity is built not only for the local community, but also for the resultant civil society, the policymakers, the professionals and other social actors. Responsibilities and risks are shared, mutual accountability emerges, and partnerships are created that contribute to bring lasting change. Community capacity building is possible within communities residing in both developing and developed countries. Different disciplinary perspectives may be applied. Seminal texts, such as those by Pawar (2005, 2009) and Pawar and Cox (2010), provide examples of community building strategies applicable to the developing and developed world, based on cases that focus on marginalized and excluded communities from India and Australia. Sirianni (2009) discusses the 'bottom-up' approach embedded in the US political system. Whilst focused on governance and politics, the text provides an exploration of the relationship between the term 'democracy' and how it is truly represented in the community.

The disciplines discussed in capacity building literature include social sciences, communication, political studies and development studies. However, a minority have gone beyond their disciplinary boundaries to dialogue with others and to investigate the mutual application and development of their disciplinary community