

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Practicing Community Engagement: Engaging contradictions in inclusion and exclusion in collaborative planning and policymaking

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/034502t1>

Author

Bredow, Victoria Ann Lowerson

Publication Date

2015

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
IRVINE

Practicing Community Engagement:
Engaging contradictions in inclusion and exclusion in collaborative planning and policymaking

DISSERTATION

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in Planning, Policy, and Design

by

Victoria Ann Lowerson Bredow

Dissertation Committee:
Professor Martha S. Feldman, Co-Chair
Professor Michael J. Montoya, Co-Chair
Professor David Feldman

2015

DEDICATION

To
my parents,
husband,
children, and
family and friends
and to
my compañer@s,
thank you
and let's keep going

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | IV |
| CURRICULUM VITAE | VI |
| ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION | XI |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| BACKGROUND | 2 |
| LITERATURE INTRODUCTION | 6 |
| METHODOLOGY | 13 |
| CHAPTER SUMMARIES | 22 |
| CHAPTER 1: ENACTING EXCLUSION | 25 |
| INTRODUCTION | 25 |
| LITERATURE REVIEW | 28 |
| METHODS | 41 |
| BACKGROUND | 43 |
| FINDINGS & ANALYSIS | 45 |
| DISCUSSION | 74 |
| CONCLUSION | 84 |
| CHAPTER 2: INCLUSION & POWER | 86 |
| INTRODUCTION | 86 |
| LITERATURE REVIEW | 89 |
| METHODS | 104 |
| BACKGROUND | 106 |
| VIGNETTE: CREATING COMPLETE STREETS | 108 |
| FINDINGS & ANALYSIS | 117 |
| DISCUSSION | 133 |
| CONCLUSION | 143 |
| CHAPTER 3: INSTITUTIONAL LOGICS OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT | 145 |
| INTRODUCTION | 145 |
| LITERATURE REVIEW | 148 |
| METHODS | 168 |
| BACKGROUND | 170 |
| FINDINGS & ANALYSIS | 173 |
| DISCUSSION | 215 |
| CONCLUSION | 226 |
| CONCLUSION | 227 |
| SUMMARY | 227 |
| IMPLICATIONS | 232 |
| LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH | 246 |
| REFERENCES | 253 |

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my committee chairs, Martha S. Feldman and Michael J. Montoya. Martha, as my advisor since day one, you have been a steadfast advocate for me as a scholar and a person, and have shown me that I do not need to separate these—nor can I. You had faith in me when I acted as though I could not and would not finish. You questioned me in ways that has pushed my scholarship to places I did not know existed. Michael, you *saw* the field site before I did. You have led by doing; you have demonstrated to me that scholarship and academia are so much more than I thought seven years ago, and neither is fully predictable. Both of you have influenced me tremendously, in ways that have yet to fully emerge.

I would like to thank my committee member and chair of UCI's Department of Planning, Policy and Design, David L. Feldman, for your mentorship on theories of power, about public policy, and translating my research into publications. You embraced my approach to research and showed *me* the forest you saw in a dissertation full of interesting and beautiful trees.

In addition, I owe thanks to Victor Becerra, the Director of the Community Outreach Partnership Center. Victor and his center contributed heavily to my decision to come to UC Irvine, which I knew to be a place that valued scholarship applied and oriented to social justice. You and Vicki have been unstinting supporters of my family and me—thank you.

I want to also acknowledge the Johnson Chair Fellows led by Professor Martha S. Feldman. These fellows, past and present, honorary and actual, include: Deborah Leftkowitz, Katharina Dittrich, Francisco Fernandez, Allison Laskey, Natalie Baker, Julka Almquist, Anja Schröder, Heather Goldsworthy, Jennifer Cordero, Katie Pine, and Kathy Quick—thanks to you *all* for providing a roadmap and hope for a finished dissertation, as well as lots and lots of feedback on lots and lots of writing. The Johnson Chair helped me to crystalize my fit as a public management scholar. I am also so grateful to have met and discussed the vision of Roger Johnson for the Fellows with his wife, Janice, and his daughter, Marek.

My participation in the Community Knowledge Project, significantly supported my doctoral studies and the writing of this dissertation. The Community Knowledge Project, a space/project/group of people—begun by Professor Michael J. Montoya—embodies, in his words, the notion that “community is a verb.” It was during my time as a research assistant for the Project that I collected data for my dissertation, learned what real fieldwork was, and wrote—and got rejected and occasionally accepted for—many grant applications. But it was also during this time that I lost my mom and had a baby. It was a space where I could do *and* be all these things at once. And this was possible because of everyone that helped to create this space: Connie McGuire, Edelina Burciaga, Erin Kent, Katie Cox, Andrew Eads, Brande Otis, Bonnie Ho, Yesenia Calderon, Ignacio Velazquez, Ismael Corral, Sal Arriaga, Sergio Figueroa, Matine Azadian, Soumar Bouza, David Liu, Yvonne Montanez, Melissa Gang, and more. I hope I can continue to create CKP with everyone at UC Irvine and in future spaces and relationships. Key ingredients: chocolate, beach and reflection.

Thank you also to the Practice Theory Reading Group convened by Martha Feldman, the Dissertation Writing Seminar led by Professor Melissa Mazmanian, and Working Title

writing workshop hosted by doctoral students of UCI's Anthropology Department. These groups and the individuals within them improved my understanding of the contribution I was making and made me write and own it.

The Ph.D. is much more than the dissertation and the dissertation is the result of much more than words on the page. In this spirit, I also need to thank Santa Ana Building Healthy Communities—the initiative that I worked with as a graduate student researcher throughout my doctoral career. Thank you to the residents, nonprofits, city agencies and foundation representatives who taught me so much about community engagement.

Furthermore, I would like to express my deep gratitude to the people and organizations from Central City, my field site, for making this dissertation, and the person emerging from it, possible. The time and knowledge you shared with me transformed my scholarship and personhood. I am forever an ally.

This dissertation and pieces of it also benefited from feedback given at various conferences and through various publishing channels, including the teaching case competition at the Program for the Advancement of Research on Conflict and Collaboration at Syracuse University, the Public Management Research Association Conference, and the International Society of Public Management Research Conference.

The University of California Institute for Mexico and the United States (UC Mexus) Dissertation Grant financially supported this work, as have several institutions of UCI, including the Janet and Roger Johnson Chair for Civic Engagement and Public Management, Center for Organizational Research, School of Social Ecology, Graduate Division, The Department of Planning, Policy, and Design, UCI's Faculty Mentorship Program, and research assistantships supported by the NSF and The California Endowment.

Many people—colleagues and friends—have also supported me along the way. These include some folks already mentioned above but also Alexis Hickman, Mojgan Sami, Oscar Tsai, Heather Maloney, Laureen Hom, Brian Hui, Leah Ersoylu, Kristen Bendanna, Beth Karlin, Carolina Sarmiento, Mike Powe, Candice Carr Kelman, Anne Taufen Wessells, Juliana Zanotto and other Bull Pen-ers. This also includes other faculty from UCI and other institutions; since her visiting professorship at UCI, Monica Worline, has been a supporter and scholarly role model. Thank you also to my dissertation advancement committee members, Professor Maria Rendón and Professor Tim Bruckner. Mentorship began and continued from previous advisors, Dr. Mindy Fullilove, Dr. Robert Fullilove, and Dr. Lourdes Hernandez-Cordero.

The most difficult, yet most important, thanks go to my family – both the Lowersons and the Bredows. It was so special to have my husband, Paul, and father, Peter, at my dissertation defense. I would have not endeavored through—nor finished—this degree without the love and confidence of my husband, parents, and brother. It was bittersweet that my mother could not be here to see me get my Ph.D. or defend, but I can clearly see and almost feel her exuberant energy and pride. I am so grateful to have her pure joy in my son, Coleton. He has provided a depth of meaning to my life that faded with her passing. I hope to carry forward my parents' work ethic, loyalty, positivity, pragmatism, and kindness in my parenthood and scholarship.

Curriculum Vitae

Victoria Ann Lowerson Bredow, M.P.H, Ph.D.

victoria.lowerson@gmail.com

Research interests

Public affairs, public policy, public health, public management;
Community engagement; public participation, empowerment;
Engaged scholarship, community-based, action-oriented and participatory research;
Theories of power, knowledge, community, and social change

Education

PhD. (Planning, Policy, and Design), 2015
University of California, Irvine

Dissertation: Practicing Community Engagement: Engaging contradictions between
inclusion and exclusion in collaborative planning and policymaking

Master of Public Health (Sociomedical Sciences, Urbanism and the Built Environment), 2007
Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, 2007

Masters Thesis: The Role of the Social Ecology on Accessing Health Foods in the South
Bronx

Bachelor of Arts with Distinction (Social Studies of Medicine, and Art History), 2003
McGill University, Montreal, Canada

Awards and Honors

Center for Organizational Research Grant, Center for Organizational Research, University of
California, Irvine, (2015)

UC Global Food Initiative Student Fellowship, Sustainability Initiative, University of
California, Irvine, University of California Office of the President, (2015)

Graduate Dean's Dissertation Fellowship, Graduate Division, University of California,
Irvine, (2014-15)

Social Ecology Dean's Dissertation Writing Fellowship, School of Social Ecology,
University of California, Irvine, (2014)

Paul and Frances Dickman Award for Community Engagement, School of Social Ecology,
University of California, Irvine, (2014)

University of California Institute on Mexico and the United States (UC Mexus) Dissertation
Research Grant, University of California, (2014-15)

Outstanding Graduate Student, Lauds & Laurels, University of California, Irvine Alumni
Association, (2013)

First Place, Winner of the Snow Foundation Award for Best Case or Simulation in Collaborative Nonprofit Management. Program for the Advancement of Research on Conflict and Collaboration. E-PARCC. Syracuse University, (2012)

Pedagogical Fellow, Teaching, Learning and Technology Center, University of California, Irvine (UCI) (2012 – 2013)

Honorable Mention Recipient, Faculty Mentor Program Fellowship, UCI, Graduate Division (2011-2012)

Promising Student Award for Commitment to Community Participation, UCI, Institute for Clinical and Translational Science, Community Engagement Unit (2010)

Community Scholar Fellowship, Community Outreach Partnership Center, UCI (2009-10)

Publications

Karlin, B. Carr, C.K., **Lowerson Bredow**, V., Goodrich, K. (Forthcoming). Engaged Scholarship: The Role of University in the Anthropocene. In A. Dinar (Ed.), *The Social Ecology of the Anthropocene: Continuity and Change in Global Environmental Politics*. World Scientific Publishers.

Bany, J. A., **Lowerson**, V., Zender, R., Tiso, S., Grasska, M., Berg, J. (2013) Latina mothers feeding their children: A focus group pilot study. *Open Journal of Nursing*. 3, 214-220.

Lowerson, V. & Feldman, M.S. (2012) Building Healthy Communities. Teaching Case. EPARCC. Syracuse University.

Dresser, M., Short, L., Wedemeyer, L., **Lowerson**, V., Sacks, R., Larson, K., MPH, Joslyn Levy, J., Dumanovsky, T., and Silver, L. (2012) “Public Health Detailing of Primary Care Providers: New York City's Experience 2003-2010.” *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 42 (6) S2, S122–S134.

Baker, N.D., Feldman, M.S., and **Lowerson**, V. (2012) “Working through Disaster: Re-establishing mental health care after Hurricane Katrina.” *Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness*.

Graham, D., Hipp, A. and **Lowerson**, V. (2011) “Recreational Space” in *Green Health*. Ed. Paul Robbins. SAGE eReference.

Steps to Get New Yorkers Moving; Policy Recommendations for Increasing Opportunities for Physical Activity in New York City. (2006) Public Health Association of New York City. <http://www.phanyc.org/files/Physical%20Activity%20Report.pdf> Contributing Author.

Refereed Presentations

Lowerson Bredow, V. “Engaging Contradictions: Co-producing Local Policymaking” National Public Management Research Conference. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN. June 2015.

Lowerson Bredow, V. “Engaging Contradictions: Enacting Participation and Exclusion through Community-based Policymaking in Southern California” International Research Society on Public Management. University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK. March 2015.

Lowerson Bredow, V. and M. J. Montoya. “Infecting analysis in action: Navigating participatory collusion in cross-sector collaboration” American University Public Anthropology Conference, Washington, DC, October 2013.

Lowerson Bredow, V. and M. S. Feldman. “Co-production through Collective Impact: Investigating the Impact on Public Values & Noting the Implications for Public Management.” Public Management Research Conference, Madison, WI, June 2013

Feldman, M. S., M. Worline, N. Baker and V. Lowerson Bredow. Routines, Disruption and the Temporalities of Continuity. Presented at the 29th EGOS Colloquium, Montreal, Canada. July 2013.

Lowerson, V. “Santa Ana Building Healthy Communities: Using community driven data to increase underrepresented voices and build healthy communities” American Public Health Association Conference. Washington, DC, November 2011.

Research Experience

Graduate Student Researcher, University of California, Irvine

School of Social Sciences, Dr. Michael Montoya - July 2012 – May 2014

Conducted learning and evaluation for Santa Ana Building Healthy Communities including indicator development, and documentation support.

School of Social Ecology, Dr. Martha Feldman - September 2009 – Spring 2011

NSF Funded Research: Factors that Affect Collaborative Resistance: Conducted in-depth interviews with mental health service providers in New Orleans, LA. Recorded, transcribed, coded and analyzed interviews.

School of Social Ecology, Dr. Victoria Basolo - December 2008 - August 2009

Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Study: Conducted open-ended telephone interviews with neighborhood council presidents.

Research Assistant, Columbia University- July to November 2006

Graduate School of Architecture, Planning & Preservation, Dr. Jason Coburn - August to November 2006

Case study research of San Francisco Food Systems.

Institute for Social and Economic Research and Policy - July to September 2006

Conducted field observation of urban design measures related to neighborhood; Entered and cleaned data using Arc Map software.

Teaching Experience

Pedagogical Fellow, University of California, Irvine, Spring 2012 – Spring 2013

Selected for a yearlong university instructor training and development program. Planned and implemented training for incoming teaching assistants for the School of Social Ecology. Served as a teaching coach and mentor.

Graduate Student Instructor, University of California, Irvine

Public Policy Analysis, School of Social Ecology, Department of Planning, Policy & Design, Spring 2013

Foundations in Public Health, School of Public Health, Summer 2012, 2011, & 2010

Guest Lecturer, University of California, Irvine

Participatory Action Research, PhD Introduction to Qualitative Methods (Dr. Maria Rendon) Fall 2015

Conducting Oral Histories of Food, Community Health (Dr. Mojgan Sami) Spring 2015

Qualitative Methods, Public Health Honors Course (Dr. Brandon Brown) Fall 2012

Qualitative Methods, Social Ecology Research Methods (Dr. Jared Lessard) Fall 2012

Community Participation in Policy Making, Collaborative Management - Graduate; Public Policy & Management – Undergraduate Course (Dr. Martha Feldman), Fall 2012, 2011; Spring 2012; Fall 2015

Teaching Assistant, University of California, Irvine

Naturalistic Research Methods (Dr. Ken Chew), Fall 2015;

Public Policy & Management (Dr. Martha Feldman), Spring 2012;

Introduction to Urban Studies (Dr. Victoria Beard), Winter 2012 & (Dr. Rudy Torres), Winter 2011;

Brownfields: Law & Policy (Kristen Dallaire), Spring 2009;

Health Policy (Dr. Dana Mukamel), Winter 2009

Select Practitioner Experience

Citywide Coordinator & Evaluator

January 2007 - August 2008

New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

New York, NY

Clinical Systems Improvement, Bureau of Chronic Disease

School Wellness Council Leader, PS/MS 29, Bronx

October 2006 – June 2007

New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

New York, NY

Nutrition and Physical Activity, Bureau of Chronic Disease

HarlemLIVE

October 2006 – January 2007

Community Based Participatory Research Photovoice Project

New York, NY

Community Organizing & Food Assessment Intern

October 2005 to September 2006

City Harvest

New York, NY

Conducted Focus Group Research with participants of mobile farmers market program.

Public Policy and Public Information Intern
City Harvest
Researched and prepared policy analysis relevant for organizational priorities.

October 2005 to June 2006

New York, NY

Administrative/Clerical Officer
National Health Service (NHS) Camden Primary Care Trust

April 2004 to April 2005

London, UK

Community, Institutional and Professional Service

Article Reviewer, Journal of Public Administration, Research and Theory

Book Reviewer, Journal of Planning, Education and Research

California Convergence Steering Committee and Policy Subcommittee, Southern California Representative, Los Angeles, California, 2013

National Convergence Partnership, Southern California Representative, Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., May 2013

Community Health Action Network for Growth through Equity and Sustainability (CHANGES), founding member, a Southern California Collaborative of academics, practitioners and residents 2012 to present.

Civic and Community Engagement Committee, Graduate Student Representative University of California, Irvine 2010 to present.

Common Ground Collective Volunteer, New Orleans, LA March, 2006.

Volunteer, South Bronx Food Justice Coalition and South Bronx Food Co-op, 2005 – 2007.

Volunteer Steward, Teenage Kicks soccer tournament for underprivileged youth and Street League, soccer League for adults in transitional housing, London, UK, 2004-2005.

Abstract of the Dissertation

Practicing Community Engagement
Engaging contradictions in inclusion and exclusion in collaborative planning and
policymaking

By

Victoria Lowerson Bredow

Doctor of Philosophy in Planning, Policy, and Design

University of California, Irvine, 2015

Professor Martha S. Feldman, Co-Chair
Professor Michael J. Montoya, Co-Chair

This dissertation analyzes community engagement practices as a fundamental feature of democracy, planning, and policymaking processes. Multiple disciplines, including public policy, planning, and public health, understand community engagement as a mechanism to make planning, policymaking, and research processes and their outcomes more democratic, effective, and sustainable. Yet scholars, practitioners, and community residents continue to observe and experience difficulty collaborating in the design and implementation of policy. I investigated these conundrums of democracy, representation, governance, and collaboration through this dissertation, a four-year ethnographic study of community engagement in a foundation-funded neighborhood health initiative in Southern California.

In this dissertation research, I inductively expand current understandings of exclusion and inclusion in planning and policymaking by enlisting practice theory as a theoretical and analytical lens. Practice theory entails both agency and structure; thus, it provides an alternative view to social phenomena, like community engagement, that are commonly studied using an agentic focus (e.g. practitioners need more training to be inclusive) *or* a structural analysis (e.g. practitioners have the decision-making power and thus exclusion

persists). Using a practice lens, I define exclusion through a set of exclusionary practices, all of which prevent connections between different stakeholders, between their issues, and between current and preexisting advocacy and community organizing efforts. I also relate exclusion and inclusion to structural advantages and disadvantages, including the use and maintenance of common organizational and institutional practices in community settings. I describe structural advantages and disadvantages as practices that constitute community power dynamics. Specifically, I explain the relationship between power, defined as the ability to take action, and practices of exclusion and inclusion. I explore the rationale and implications of exclusionary and inclusionary practices by drawing from scholarship on institutional logics. I conclude that community engagement and planning and policymaking are ontologically nonlinear and emergent processes, and that empirical or practical approaches to community engagement must embrace nonlinearity and emergence in order to be inclusive.

Introduction

This dissertation analyzes community engagement practices as a fundamental feature of democracy, and of planning and policymaking processes. Organizational representatives, governmental and nongovernmental, often use community engagement practices to include residents into planning and into the implementation of services and policies that affect their lives. I focus on practices in order to make visible *how* residents are engaged, rather than simply *who* is engaged or *who* is excluded.

I inductively analyze community engagement practices gathered through a multi-year ethnographic study of the Central City Community Change Initiative, a community-based, policy-focused, foundation-funded health initiative in Southern California. During my analysis, I was surprised to notice that community engagement practices intended to be participatory were actually exclusive. Accordingly, the following **research questions** guide this dissertation:

- *How do exclusionary community engagement practices persist within a community-based planning and policymaking initiative committed to resident-driven change?*
(Empirical Chapter 1)
- *How do cross-sector planning and policymaking actors practice community engagement inclusively in collaborative and complex organizational settings?*
(Empirical Chapter 2)
- *How do institutional logics influence the exclusivity and inclusivity of the community engagement practices?* (Empirical Chapter 3)

Background

Community Change Initiatives. Community Change Initiatives and Place-based Initiatives assume that the health and social well-being of individuals and groups is profoundly affected by where they live—their physical, economic, cultural, social and political environments. This approach to improving neighborhoods' health and wellbeing has a rich history in the United States, dating back to the Kennedy-era Economic Recovery Act of 1964 that created Community Action Organizations in poor neighborhoods (Moynihan, 1969). In the 1990s, comprehensive community change initiatives emerged to address the needs of poor neighborhoods (Kubisch, Auspos, Brown, & Dewar, 2010). More recently, in 2008, the Obama Administration began its Promise and Choice Neighborhood Programs, modeled after Harlem Children's Zone. Local place-based efforts have also sprung up across the country.

Community Change Initiatives are often implemented by governmental and nongovernmental entities and take a holistic approach to community problems by accounting for social, economic, political, and geographic factors that impact communities. They employ a systems-change approach to solving community problems and work “according to community building principles that value resident engagement and community capacity building” (Kubisch et al, 2010, p. vi). A systems-change approach deploys initiatives focused on changes in policy, rather than efforts to implement services or programs (Clark et al., 2010). An example of systems change would be the establishment of departments within local government that bring together public health and planning department staff to address issues relevant for both, such as active transportation. Policy change might involve the legalization of needle exchange programs and the allocation of a percentage of the city's budget to needle exchange programs, rather than the provision of needle exchange services. While systems and policies are intimately related to services and programs, they are also

distinct; the former is associated with institutional and long-term changes, and the latter with individual level and shorter-term changes.

Seasoned practitioners in Community Change Initiatives (CCIs) acknowledge that while systems change sets CCIs apart from conventional interventions that focus on service-delivery, the emphasis on systems change also poses many challenges for those involved in CCIs. Due to their systems change approach, CCIs often require a long-term time commitment. Even when funding permits ample time to plan and implement systems change, stakeholders must still juggle other personal and professional responsibilities in order to respond to the immediate and short-term needs of the communities they serve. Such initiatives also engage stakeholders across sectors and encourage participatory decision-making. The process of building new relationships among new and possibly contentious stakeholders while also engaging in participatory decision-making can be time-intensive. Also, as research on CCIs has shown,

[C]ommunity-based efforts can partially compensate for, but not solve, the problems of siloed public and private funding. Nevertheless, community change efforts have succeeded in changing policies or systems in two ways. One indicator is funding levels. The presence of an organized, legitimate, and effective community intervention in a neighborhood increases its visibility and influence, helping to leverage new public, private, and philanthropic resources. Other examples of policy and systems change come from partnerships between communities and actors who are successful advocates and have access, leverage, and influence in the public sector (Kubisch, 2010, p. viii-ix).

This research demonstrates that while CCIs have experienced success in these various areas, they have not accomplished the community transformations planned for, or imagined by their designers (Kubisch, 2010, p. ix).

Fieldsite. The Central City Community Change initiative began in 2009, when The Foundation for Healthy Places selected over a dozen cities across California to receive 10 years of funding for place-based, community-driven health strategies and interventions that prioritized policy and systems change in order to reduce health disparities.

Before the initiative began, the Foundation for Healthy Places selected sites for their Community Change Initiative by requesting data on various social and health indicators from local organizations and agencies. The Foundation then assessed and selected places based on their need, but also on each site's readiness for change. Central City represents a subsection of a larger city selected for the initiative and comprises about a dozen neighborhoods. The city is densely populated and demographically young. The majority of residents are Hispanic or Latino, with most households reporting speaking a language other than English at home (U.S. Census, 2010). The population has low levels of higher education attainment. Most residents work in the service industry, a sector traditionally offering low-wage jobs that either do not offer health insurance or offer coverage that is not affordable for workers. Despite the deficits outlined by the statistics above, Central City was home to a number of nonprofits that were working, residents who were organizing, and coalitions and community groups that had been working to improve Central City for decades. The Foundation therefore selected Central City, in addition to other sites, because it was deemed to have the capacity and readiness to implement the initiative (Mack et al., 2014; Yu & Abrazaldo, 2010).

When the initiative began, The Foundation for Healthy Places required each chosen site to write a community plan and to develop a governance structure to guide the 10 years of funding. It allocated the first nine months to planning, with the expectation that the site would have a written plan and a plan for the governance structure at the end of those nine months. A local organization acted as the fiscal agent during the planning year and established a steering committee to lead the planning year. The foundation provided 10

outcomes that each site would address over the 10 years. The *10 outcomes* serve as goals and metrics that signify progress toward building healthy communities.

The ten outcomes were:

- All Children Have Health Coverage
- Families Have Improved Access to a Health Home That Supports Healthy Behaviors
- Health and Family-Focused Human Services Shift Resources Toward Prevention
- Residents Live in Communities with Health-Promoting Land-Use, Transportation and Community Development
- Children and their Families are Safe from Violence in their Homes and Neighborhoods
- Communities Support Healthy Youth Development
- Neighborhood and School Environments Support Improved Health and Healthy Behaviors
- Community Health Improvements are Linked to Economic Development
- Health Gaps for Boys and Young Men of Color are Narrowed
- California has a Shared Vision of Community Health”

The Central City Initiative requested an extension, the foundation granted this extension, and Central City submitted their community plan to the foundation in June 2010. After Central City turned in their community plan, the steering committee spent six months designing their governance structure, the Central City Collaborative. Once the governance structure was in place, the foundation began to distribute grants in January 2011 based on the priorities laid out in the plan. The chapters that follow expand upon the background information provided here in order to describe the necessary context for the data presented. In the chapters, I describe instances from a five-year period during the initiative, from planning through implementation.

Literature Introduction

Scholars, practitioners, and community residents continue to observe and experience difficulty collaborating to design and implement policy (Innes & Booher, 2004; Prowler, 2007). Ineffective engagement of community residents results in undemocratic processes; it also produces policies and plans that neither represent nor serve residents, and are thus unsuccessful in addressing public problems. Lynch (1981) describes the challenges and consequences of failing to include residents in evaluations of their city, writing,

Most difficult of all, perhaps, and quite at the heart of the city experience... is to find some objective way of recording how residents think about the place in their minds: their ways of organizing it and feeling about it. Without some knowledge of this, one is hard put to make an evaluation, since places are not merely what they are, but what we perceive them to be (p. 354).

Concerns about the effectiveness of community engagement in enabling democracy and ultimately impacting public problems have persisted even as community engagement scholars, practitioners, and community members continue to advocate for the inclusion of community members in planning and policy-making processes in order to make such processes more democratic, effective and sustainable (see Ahmed & Palermo, 2010; Israel et al., 2005; Minkler, 2012; Minkler & Wallerstein, 2003). Recent calls to describe, measure, and replicate community engagement affirm both a persistent lack of clarity over how to conduct community engagement effectively (Knight Foundation, 2012) and a commitment to address such concerns.

Practices of planning and policymaking which are still current, dominant, and often taken for granted constitute major obstructions to effective community engagement (Friedmann 2002; Innes & Booher 2010). Flyvbjerg (1998) demonstrates that a normative emphasis on technocratic practices and rationality leaves modern democracies ignorant of

power, which results in the exacerbation of the very problems they seek to solve. In the United States, power dynamics between professional planners or policymakers and ordinary community residents have been shaped by the history of American federalism, and by a context that attributes legitimacy to professional skills (Wolf-Powers, 2014). In the United States, “planners and other actors in local government exert an unusual level of control over land use and development decisions” (Wolf-Powers, 2014, p. 219). Flyvbjerg (1998) explains that understanding how power works is key to solving public problems.

Flyvbjerg (1998) also calls for research on democratic practices over a long period of time, and with a historical perspective. He writes, “[P]reexisting social practices limit the possibilities for implementing modern democratic reform. In most societies entrenched practices of class and privilege form part of the social and political context and limit the possibilities of democratic change” (p. 235). In this dissertation, I focus on practices in order to understand community engagement through a lens that considers both structure and agency, acknowledging the mutually constitutive nature of social phenomena like community engagement and power, and rejecting dualisms such as inclusion and exclusion as a way of theorizing. From this perspective, I describe the potential that community engagement practices present for inclusive and democratic planning and policymaking.

Practice. Based on the social theories of scholars such as Giddens (1984) and Bourdieu (1990), practice theory conceptualizes action as situated and consequential, and social phenomena as relational (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011). Practice theory assumes a mutually constitutive view of agency and structure. Therefore, practices encompass actions that simultaneously constitute social structure, which then constrain and enable such actions. Using a practice lens, I depict the construction and reconstruction of community engagement, and also induce a theory of engagement that accounts for both structure and agency.

Drawing from Giddens' (1984) duality of structure and Bourdieu's (1990) habitus, in Practice Theory, structure takes agency into account and agency takes structure into account because they are mutually constituted through practice. In practice theory, the researcher's ontological lens focuses on practices--inclusive of agency and structure, rather than focusing either on agency *or* structure. A practice view of structure also dissolves the divided vision of structure as semiotic (i.e. anthropology's focus on culture) and materialist (i.e. sociology's focus on social structures such as race, ethnicity or systems like education). This vision challenges the view of structures as reified categories that can be used to explain social life, for example "class ... structures politics, gender ... structures employment opportunities, [and] rhetorical conventions ... structure texts or utterances" (Sewell 1992, p. 2). Instead, structures are constituted and reconstituted through dialectical human action. For Sewell (1992) structure is "profoundly temporal." Structures are both continually evolving processes and outcomes produced and reproduced through everyday social interactions.

Rational/Normative planning and policymaking. Dominant practices of planning and policymaking, which are often taken for granted, reflect a rational approach and a dominance of technical rationality (Flyvbjerg, 1998). I describe some of the practices below. A rational approach to planning and policy-making assumes a process in which all possible information is collected; then courses of action are designed, evaluated and chosen systematically; and finally, the plan of action is implemented and the predetermined goal achieved (Banfield 1955, 1959; Lindblom, 1959). The rational approach to planning and policymaking is grounded in the idea of the rational man, one who makes choices based on own interests, and is not based on direct observation (Innes & Booher, 2010).

In the rational approach, planners rely on technical forms of information because these are the forms they are trained to produce and use, and because they provide 'objective' information (Flyvbjerg, 1998). Flyvbjerg (1998) calls the use of these forms of information

technical rationality, and observes that engagement with technical rationality means a lack of engagement with power, which results in unchanged power imbalances (Flyvbjerg, 1998).

Friedmann (2002) describes the divisive effect of practices that involve the use of authoritative and objective representations of the city such as graphs, maps, diagrams, models, and statistics by professional planners and decision-makers (p. 90). He says that these representations often carry legal authority, but are also “emblematic of scientific and professional authority.” Friedmann (2002) contrasts these “abstract reductive, and static renderings of the city” with the “panoply of meanings” that the city actually holds, which “rarely inform the plans that reshape urban space” and are often “swept aside by the powerbrokers of the city, because they are thought to be irrelevant for the grand purposes of city building” (Friedmann, 2002, p. 90). The use of these incomplete representations of the city then get told as the “official story,” rendering the multiple meanings and the everyday experiences of the city, often attributable to residents, invisible (Friedmann, 2002, p. 90).

Likewise, Flyvbjerg (1998) describes professional planners’ use of such authoritative and objective representations of the city as technocratic rationality. Technical rationality involves planners’ use of information they term ‘neutral’ or objective, such as documentation of the environment, land use, traffic, and planning (Flyvbjerg, 1998). Technical documentation constitutes a major practice of public affairs professionals (e.g. city planners). Technical rationality has a vested interest in maintaining power imbalances and accomplishes this by depoliticizing and making decisions in terms of technical interests, rather than political ones. However, Flyvbjerg (1998) finds that power prevails over technocratic rationality in democratic societies; thus, while democracies frequently choose and enact technocratic rationality, there is still a need to understand how power works.

Innes and Booher (2010) describe professionals’ practices to reflect certain expectations that they “fix” public problems. They write,

[P]owerful mental model that grips professionals and scholars in policy fields.

The assumption is that their job is to “fix” problems and meet goals.

[Professionals] need to find answers and to sell them to decision makers. [But]

Because the world is so complex and changing, problems will never be “fixed,” though they may be reframed, new actions, may be undertaken, new players maybe empowered and new purposes identified and pursued (p. x).

The problematic practices suggested by Friedmann (2002), Flyvbjerg (1998), and Innes and Booher (2010) are deeply embedded and often taken for granted in organizational and professional settings.

These problematic practices are often tied to the maintenance of institutions. Flyvbjerg (2001) points out that “the mechanisms which operate in a given institution are designed to ensure the maintenance of that institution” (p. 117). It is in the interest of organizations to maintain stable power relations, which are characterized by negotiations and consensus seeking, rather than confrontation or open antagonistic exchange (Flyvbjerg, 1998). Not only are practices deeply embedded over time, but also they are often tied to organizational or professional survival and maintenance of existing power relations. These, in turn, are nested in what Tomlinson and Lipsitz (2013) describe as a society that cultivates antagonism and aggression among individuals through its dominant reward structures (e.g. grades and prestige in the educational setting).

Nonlinear/Phenomenological planning and policymaking. Scholars such as Feldman (1989), Innes and Booher (2010), Shaw (2010) and Stone (1997) provide an alternative to the rational planning and policy-making described above; they describe planning and policy making as an emergent, nonlinear process. It is an iterative process, in which the policy problems and solutions are continuously contested and defined. Policymaking is thus a nonrational process in which “fixing” a problem with policy is a long and incremental

process (Lindblom, 1959) marked by a collection of “small wins” (Bryson, 1988; Weick, 1984). As suggested by Flyvbjerg (1998) and interpretative policy and management scholars such as Feldman, Khademian, Stone, Quick, and Yanow (see Feldman 2004; Feldman & Khademian, 2000; Feldman, Khademian, & Quick, 2009; Stone, 1997; Quick & Feldman, 2011; 2014; Yanow, 1994), planning and policy can be best understood through emergent practices that continuously create and recreated social reality.

These scholars and their colleagues suggest a number of strategies to improve participatory processes. For instance, Bryson et al. (2013) propose that “effective public participation processes [be] grounded in analyzing the context closely, identifying the purposes of the participation effort, and iteratively designing and redesigning the process accordingly” (p. 23). Bryson, Crosby, and Stone (2006) point to practices that are important for collaboration. These include forging agreement, building leadership, building legitimacy, building trust, managing conflict, and planning. Quick and Feldman (2014) discuss practices that help public managers work across differences and manage inclusively.

Innes and Booher (2004) point to authentic dialogue, networks, and institutional capacity as critical for successful collaborative participation. They “propose that participation should be understood as a multi-way set of interactions among citizens and other players who together produce outcomes” (p. 419). Quick and Feldman’s (2011) work on inclusive management identifies three inclusionary practices: coproducing the process and content of decision-making, engaging multiple ways of knowing, and sustaining temporal openness.

Moreover, planning and policymaking are power-laden processes (Flyvbjerg, 1998; Stone, 1997). Flyvbjerg (1998) demonstrates a need for understanding how power works. He writes about forms of participation that consider power as “practical, committed, and ready for conflict” and “provide a superior paradigm of democratic virtue than forms of participation that are discursive, detached, and consensus-dependent, that is, rational” (p.

236) Bryson, Crosby, and Stone (2006), in their work on collaboration, propose that power imbalances are a key challenge to collaboration, and they suggest building in resources and tactics for dealing with power imbalances and shocks.

In this dissertation, through an ethnographic study of Central City Change Initiative focused on practices, I discover that the entrenchment of practices often facilitates exclusion and maintains existing power relations. I also reveal the abilities of participants, even in constrained environments, to enact inclusion and have new experiences of power.

I also build on and extend the literature reviewed above. From the emphases on deliberation and practice, to the critiques of democracy, to challenges of (and remedies for) community engagement and collaboration scholarship and practice set forth by scholars, I build a theory of community engagement that hinges on how power works. I use a practice lens in order to scrutinize community engagement practices and articulate how they create potential for inclusion and exclusion.

In the forthcoming chapters I bring together discussions of community engagement from the planning, public management and policymaking disciplines as well as from the Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) literature in public health. I bring these literatures together because they are all concerned with the involvement of residents in processes typically managed by experts or professionals. I then go on to present my own study of community engagement. I provide descriptions and explanations for the persistence of exclusion and the possibilities for inclusion, drawn from my own data. I also explain the challenges that community engagement scholars and practitioners and community members face as they try to work together effectively. I then reconcile my findings with the literature and conclude with my findings' contributions to theory and practice.

Methodology

This dissertation is an ethnographic interpretivist research study anchored in practice theory and informed by a grounded approach to theorizing. Ethnography is a qualitative, inductive method of research. It involves direct and sustained contact between the researcher and the community or culture being studied. Ethnography entails “richly writing up the encounter, respecting, recording, representing at least partly *in its own terms*, the irreducibility of human experience” (Willis & Trondman, 2000, p. 5). Even though interpretivist ethnographies may appear to have a sample size of one, their explanatory power is not derived from the number of cases, but from rigorous methods and intense data collection, followed by iterative analysis and thick description of findings that are then transferable to other contexts (Geertz, 1973).

Interpretivism. Interpretivism is an ontological and epistemological orientation to research in which the researcher assumes the nature of reality to be socially constructed and multiple. Interpretivism focuses on the “conscious and unconscious explanations people have for what they do or believe” (Lin, 1998). In addition, “[n]ew’ knowledge ... is ... produced not through disembodied reason but through the situated context of the ‘knower’ producing it” (Yanow & Schwartz-Shea, 2006, p. 10). Interpretivist researchers embrace and document the complexities of the social world rather than trying to control them, in order to understand the phenomena under study. Interpretivism focuses on explaining how social phenomena, such as community engagement and inclusion and exclusion, work. Explaining these processes requires extensive and detailed material on community engagement in practice. Interpretivism uses the multiple data sources, multiple methods of access, multiple researchers, and multiple theories to triangulate and make reliable conclusions (Yanow & Schwartz-Shea, 2006, p. 102).

Interpretivist ethnography derives its certainty and communicates the impact of its findings through the rich detail of the situation under study, not from the large number of cases. As Geertz (1973) said we “don’t study villages (tribes, towns, neighborhoods ...); [we] study *in* villages” (p. 22, emphasis added), because we choose a site based on richness of information and not for the specificity of the site. Forester (1999) describes the importance of these rich accounts for planners; he writes,

The very richness of stories that threatens their generalizability enables them to be so revealing: to show as well as to explain, to connect as well as to predict, to frame in a new light as well as to put an argument in context. Imagine, for example that we want help before walking into a difficult meeting with a developer’s lawyer and architect. Forced to choose we are more likely to want the particular story of their previous negotiations with our department than we are to want a more general study of architect versus lawyer influence in developer-planner negotiations (p. 40).

This dissertation provides in-depth accounts and analyses of an existing collaborative effort that communities, governments, and nonprofits can relate to and learn from as they continue to collaboratively plan, implement and evaluate public policy.

I use an interpretivist ethnographic approach in order to gain an insider perspective on community engagement. I had access to people, events, and experiences unavailable through other research strategies, such as surveys (Gaber & Gaber, 2007); through participation and immersion as collaborative partner with the Central City Community Change Initiative, I was able to gain an emic understanding of the complex and ever-changing ways people worked together, tried to participate in the initiative, and aimed to improve the health of the city. I conducted this interpretivist ethnographic study to understand community engagement as a shared social construct, created and recreated through practices.

An interpretivist ethnographic approach with its focus on the construction of shared meanings allowed me to see beyond the intentions that the initiative be resident-driven. I was able to witness and document the nuances of engagement (i.e. when participation was experienced as exclusion or inclusion). I also observed the practices that constructed meanings of community engagement in this context. Through my research, I came to understand community engagement, as Yanow and Schwartz-Shea (2006) describe, by listening, reading, and observing people construct community engagement themselves. The long-term nature of ethnography allowed me to witness and participate in the interactions between participants over time, and to see these practices unfold and change. I was then able to document, interpret, and compare events and practices.

Analysis in interpretive research starts with the collection of the first piece of data. The purpose of analysis is “to create an interpretation of the setting or some feature of it to allow people who have not directly observed the phenomena to have a deeper understanding of them” (Feldman, 1995, p. 1).

Practice theory. Practices are my unit of analysis. I focus on practices because I am interested in understanding what people do, and in the consequences of such actions for structuring future actions. I collected data on what people said and did in order to be able to analyze my data for practices. As demonstrated in the upcoming chapters, a practice lens allows me to show the actions that take place and the structures that constrain these actions as well as the constitution of these structures. For example, a practice includes the definition of policy problems. To study this practice, I looked at participants’ actions, including dialogue, in regard to the 10 outcomes and other public problems facing Central City (i.e., immigration reform). Their actions shaped the policy problems, but the 10 outcomes also constrained their actions. Thus, I also looked at the documents containing the 10 outcomes and considered how

these were used, as well as the foundations and organizations' interpretations of the outcomes and their use.

Grounded theory. My approach to analysis and theorizing draws on grounded theory (see Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Locke, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 2000). Grounded theory is a research method in which theories are built up and induced from the empirical data collected. The first step in a grounded theory approach to analysis is to code and memo on the data. Coding involves extracting concepts from raw data and giving the excerpts names or codes based on emergent themes, such as exclusion and inclusion (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 159). Memoing on the codes keeps “track of the cumulative and complex ideas that evolve over the research process” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 140).

A grounded theory approach involves two key features that build on coding and memoing: constant comparison and theoretical sampling (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Locke, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 2000). Constant comparison involves continuously comparing incidents, events, or actors when reading through the data (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Comparisons help the researcher interpret the data and identify where more data may need to be collected based on the concepts or themes that emerge from the data. They also help the researcher interpret the data and move to a more abstract level of analysis.

Theoretical sampling is sampling based on concepts that emerge from the data (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Theoretical sampling is useful in the discovery process, as it allows new things to emerge. In grounded theory, researchers *induce* rather than *deduce* conclusions from the empirical material. Theorizing is inductive both in the grounded approach and interpretivist ethnography. The former is data-driven while the latter is based on interpretation of—and fueled by engagement with—the empirical *and* theoretical material. In this research, the focus on induction and discovery was critical in understanding and

opening up new understandings of the longstanding concern with community engagement in planning and policymaking.

Data collection. Data collection took place from July 2009 to May 2014. I became an intern for the initiative in 2009 and immediately observed tensions between residents and organizations around community engagement, as well as resident and organizational demands for a more inclusive process and continuous attempts to accomplish this. As Lofland, Snow, Anderson, and Lofland (2006) have stated, the best place to start research is where you are—and this preliminary research as an intern formed the basis of my dissertation proposal to study the Central City Change Initiative as an example of community-based planning and policymaking in which community engagement played a central role.

I focus on practices in order to understand *how* engagement is constructed. During my research, I paid attention to what Schatzki (2012) has described as people's *sayings* and *doings*. These actions provided me with the traces of practices. In her description of communicative action theorists, Innes (1995), while not a self-ascribed practice theorist, states the need to “find out what planning is by finding out what planners do, rather than postulating what planning ought to be” (p. 184). This echoes Flyvbjerg's (1998) call for an orientation of modern democracy toward “what is actually done” and away from its current normative focus on “what should be done” (p. 236). To discover what initiative participants *did* and thereby understand how they interpreted and enacted community engagement, I collected three forms of data: field notes, interview transcripts and archival documents.

Participant observation. Participant observation was the main method of data collection. I documented the day-to-day proceedings of the community change initiative, from the mundane (e.g. introductions at the beginning of a meeting) to the extraordinary (e.g. participant outbursts about dissatisfaction with the initiative). The majority of my participant observation involved attending meetings, ranging from small groups of three to five people to

large community forums. During my time in Central City, I attended monthly steering committee meetings, community outreach events and trainings, foundation events (when invited), quarterly grantee meetings, and weekly or bi-weekly subcommittee meetings on topics such as community engagement, research and data, land use, and immigration. I also attended the weekly or bi-weekly safety, preventative health, youth, and economic justice subcommittee meetings. I attended less than ten safety and preventative health subcommittee meetings in total, but have access to archival documents from those meetings. I attended two meetings of the entire youth group and continued to meet with youth organizers. I attended all available economic justice meetings, although this subcommittee ceased to exist after a few meetings because residents and organizations were already committed to other subcommittees. I also accompanied my collaborative colleagues to city planning meetings or city council where they advocated for certain policies and practices. I observed and participated in these meetings in accordance with my position as an intern, graduate student, and later, as an evaluation consultant. Participant observation also involved talking and collaborating with residents, organizations and foundation representatives.

Interviews. My second form of data collection involved interviews with 30 collaborative members. I interviewed fifteen nonprofit employees, two public agency representatives, eleven residents, and two foundation representatives. I also sought and acquired permission from academic colleagues and their informants to use interviews conducted for a class project as secondary data. These provided three additional interviews, two with residents and one with an organizational representative.

I selected my interviewees using non-purposive and snowball sampling techniques. I reached out to as many collaborative members I knew and tried to obtain an even number of residents and organizational representatives. I also contacted the foundation representatives involved in Central City.

Each site had little day-to-day interaction with the foundation, but had a foundation representative assigned to them. This person was each site's most frequent foundation interlocutor. If invited to foundation events or if foundation representatives visited Central City, then each site would have interaction with additional members of the foundation staff, including executives.

At the end of my interviews, I asked the interviewee whom else I should interview. Often, they recommended someone I had already communicated with or had interviewed. But sometimes they would recommend an additional person and provide contact information. As per my IRB I was unable to interview any youth under 18 years of age.

During the interviews, I asked open-ended conversational questions to elicit interviewees' story of the Community Change Initiative. I was acquainted with each person and so would often ask him or her to tell me about his or her specific work. In the course of the interview, I also shared emerging hunches and theories from my analysis. I asked my interviewee to reflect on these ideas and to suggest additions or changes to my current thinking. For instance, in my interview with Lennon, we discussed the idea that the CCI was actually hindering the social change work that could be happening in Central City.

Archival documents. My third form of data is archival documents. I collected archival documents as I conducted participant observation. I have hundreds of hard-copy and electronic pieces of archival materials including meeting agendas, meeting notes, pictures, materials distributed at events, and official foundation materials. These materials are important parts of practice because they are ways of representing and guiding practices. They are also a form of knowledge production (see Orlikowski, 1992), which gets taken up in the community engagement practices. For example, meeting agendas were often treated as rigid guides. Failure to get through an entire agenda was a point of contention and the meeting

agenda was often used to justify certain actions, like the dismissal of residents' stories as off-topic or anecdotal (see Empirical Chapter 1: Exclusion).

Analysis methods. Analysis is a recursive process with sampling and data collection. As new conceptual categories emerged, this drove future sampling. This is called theoretical sampling (Corbin & Strauss 2008). To begin my practice-based analysis, I examined my data for people's actions, what they said and did, and then asked what structures these actions created or recreated. I coded my data and wrote memos about these actions and structures. I then read through the coded excerpts and scrutinized them to understand the essence of what was being expressed. Next, I began coding for inclusion and exclusion, and generated conceptual names to describe the forms of inclusion and exclusion. I asked what was being excluded or included, and who or what was involved in the practice of exclusion or inclusion. Constructing these concepts allowed me to organize my data into manageable chunks and conduct analysis using the concepts that were emerging from the data. Coding and memoing also allowed me to construct my practices using the actions and actors identified.

Memos varied in length. Shorter memos included explanations as to why I coded the passage as I did. Longer memos included pages of narrative that described a certain concept in the literature and then how I had coded it in the data so far. These memos acted as a venue to pull together data from across my dataset with literature and delve into a hunch. Both types of memos helped me to track the cumulative and complex ideas that evolved over the research process, not all of which are addressed this dissertation.

During my analysis, I also conducted a number of advanced qualitative analysis techniques, which included the use of heuristics and the use of metatheories like semiotics (see Feldman, 1995). Heuristics, a key piece of the analysis in the interpretivist research design (Abbott, 2004), helped stimulate the inductive process. Example of heuristics include questions about the data, such as "who or what is being included or excluded?" "How is this

exclusion happening?” “What kind of assumptions do these actions convey?” For example, in my first Empirical Chapter, after multiple iterations of coding and memoing, I asked and re-asked, “what practices exclude?” and “what are the exclusionary practices?”

Thick descriptions were the next stage of analysis. Thick descriptions are a form of data presentation used by interpretivist scholars in order to demonstrate their confidence in their interpretations (Yanow & Schwartz-Shea, 2006). I wrote thick descriptions of certain meetings, or a series of meetings. These descriptions provide sufficient detail for others to assess how plausible it is to transfer findings from one research study to another setting (Yanow & Schwartz-Shea, 2006, p. 109). In the empirical chapters (Chapters 2 – 4), thick descriptions can be seen in vignettes, one of the main formats I use to present my data.

Validation. I validate my conclusions through three types of triangulation (data, point of access, and theoretical) and also through reflexivity and member checks. Atkinson et al. (2003) argue that triangulation is about convergence and stability through the refinement of concepts and the elimination of anomalies. I tested and triangulated the emergent theories between my three forms of data (fieldnotes, interviews, and archival documents) in order to form reliable conclusions based on multiple data collection sources (Yin, 2009).

My different points of access to the field site also validate my conclusions. I began as an intern, then was involved as a graduate student studying the initiative for my dissertation, and then was part of a team led by my dissertation co-chair, Dr. Michael Montoya, that the collaborative nominated, and whom the foundation later hired to conduct an evaluation. I also attended a variety of meetings, ranging from large community events to small meetings to plan future meetings. Furthermore, in order to establish certainty for my findings, I consider multiple theories on community engagement, drawing on public management, policy, planning, and public health literatures.

Reflexivity means ‘turning social science back on to itself’ (Boudieu & Wacquant, 1992, cited in Yanow & Schwartz-Shea, 2006, p. 221). At meetings with the evaluation team as well as my advisors, I shared and reflected on my observations, research and participation in Central City. Collaborative members of the CCI also helped me be reflexive. For instance, in Lowerson and Feldman (2012), we describe a situation that arose when an organizational representative asked why all of the note-takers assigned to his group were non-local and white. This clearly depicted part of my positionality to the initiative—I do not live in Central City, nor am I from California, and I am white. I had to reflect on these aspects of my identity in order to keep participating. Another instance of reflexivity occurred during a collaborative interview with Dr. Montoya (dissertation co-chair and project P.I.) with Lennon. During this interview, Dr. Montoya asked him “Do you have any questions for us? You’ve been watching us work as long as we’ve been watching you work.” Another instance took place in my interview with Serena, she and I discussed an upcoming trip I was taking to Mexico to improve my Spanish and to learn about social movements in Mexico. She observed that no matter how long I stayed, in some way, I would always be an outsider. As a researcher and university partner, my stakes in the initiative were very different from those of Central City residents. This type of reflexivity is never complete, but plays an ongoing part in the work. Finally, I ensured the reliability of my findings through member-checks with collaborative members who reviewed their specific quotes, or the vignette(s).

Chapter Summaries

In each of the following three empirical chapters, I introduce the chapter, and provide a chapter-specific introduction, literature review, methods and background section.

In my first empirical chapter on exclusion, I describe exclusive community engagement through six exclusionary practices enacted by collaborative members: (1) Preventing people from being part of a group; (2) Preventing people from taking a specific

action; (3) Failing to address specific issues (particularly those important to residents); (4) Leaving out residents and their ideas; (5) Dismissing specific people's understandings of, or approaches to problems; (6) Disconnecting ongoing or pre-existing work or relationships. I illustrate each of these practices through a short vignette. Based on these practices, I find that exclusion centers on the prevention of connections between people, actions, issues, ideas, understandings, or previous relationships and work, and also hinges on the use of what I call structural advantage—certain rules and resources that participants used and created through their actions. These rules and resources constitute a form of power that enables exclusion, even when organizational actors took action to facilitate participation.

In the second empirical chapter, I describe *inclusion* and *power dynamics* in community engagement through a description of youth participation in a city planning process. I show that inclusion involves creating the conditions to facilitate individual and collective abilities and capacities to work together, as well as creating conditions that enable new actions and the incorporations of everyone's resources. Thus, inclusion relies on a productive view of power and what Ponic and Frisby (2010) describe as the consideration of *all* participants and their actions in coproducing and/or benefiting from community engagement strategies. In this chapter, I show how inclusion hinges on the inclusion of all participants' resources and assets.

In the third and final empirical chapter, I describe aspects of the various institutional logics associated with each major stakeholder group (foundation, organizational representative, and residents). Institutional logics are the “socially constructed, historical patterns of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules by which individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organize time and space, and provide meaning to their social reality” (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999, p. 804). I then explain the competition and conflict between various aspects of these logics and the challenges that arose

for collaboration and inclusion as a result of these aspects. Delineation of these logics also makes visible the features that needed to be acknowledged and worked through in order to collaborate. These features also suggest what Quick and Feldman (2014) call boundary practices that facilitate inclusion and collaboration.

Empirical Chapter 1:

Enacting Exclusion

Exclusion also involves being 'included' but on disadvantageous terms (Goodin, 1996, Note 6 p. 345).

Introduction

The exclusion of community members from planning and policymaking processes is a long-standing challenge in democratic systems (Eisenberger et al., 2003; Klinenberg, 2000; Yates & Saasta, 2013). Public engagement is seen as a pillar of democracy, as a mechanism to include community members, and as an important component of effective and sustainable public services and policies. Thus, excluding any group is inherently undemocratic.

Exclusion is a complex phenomenon that cannot be addressed strictly through new policies and regulations, but also requires transformation of human actions (Waddington & Mohan, 2004, p. 222).

Exclusion is often defined as being outside (Jones, 2010) and considered negative, repulsive and/or impure (Lamont, 1992; Zagofsky, 2013). Exclusion is also thought of as an outcome, often represented statistically in percentages of populations who do not vote or by the number of ethnically or racially diverse individuals not represented in political leadership. However, exclusion is also a process (Narayan-Parker, 1999), often defined by a lack of opportunities for forms of public participation such as voting, attending public meetings, and giving public comments. Exclusion also involves often-unintentional and necessary practices. Some forms of exclusion consist of bringing people into a political community, but on

disadvantageous terms (Amin, 1976; Cardoso & Faletto, 1979; Wallerstein, 1979, cited in Goodin, 1996, Note 6, p. 345).

Exclusion is often researched using structural analysis (Ponic & Frisby, 2010). It is also usually explained as a result of individuals' or organizations' lack of skills or commitment to community engagement, inadequate policies, or organizational mandates. Structural analysis enhances the visibility of broader patterns of *who* is excluded; the rhetoric in structural analysis often ends up blaming those excluded for their exclusion, and making exclusion synonymous with poverty. These analyses of exclusion tend to focus on structures *or* agency as the determinants of exclusion.

Practice theory provides a theoretical lens that accounts for both structure and agency through the principal of mutual constitution (Bourdieu, 1990; Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011; Giddens, 1984). Accordingly, social phenomena are constructed through the mutually constitutive relationship of structure and agency, in which actions create and recreate the social structures that constrain and enable these actions. My focus on practice, anchored in this relational view of agency and structure, allows me to unpack the structures involved and to reveal the actions, rules and resources that enable the persistence of exclusion despite commitment to participation.

In keeping with my overall use of practice theory, in this chapter, I develop a practice-based view of exclusion. Building on Quick and Feldman's (2011) definition of inclusion as the creation of connections between people and issues over time, I show that exclusion is about the prevention of connections that bridge boundaries between people, among different issues, and over time.

I draw on four years' worth of ethnographic data to induce a robust theory of exclusion organized around six ways exclusion was enacted. I use a practice theory lens in order to explain *how* exclusion is enacted in practice, particularly in environments where

individuals are skilled, organizations are committed, and policies are in place to encourage resident inclusion. In subsequent chapters, I will explore practices of inclusion, as well as broader structural elements that enable and constrain inclusion and perpetuate exclusive practices over time. A richer understanding of exclusion will also help us to understand inclusion (Goodin, 1996) as well as public engagement and policymaking.

I participated in the Central City Community Change Initiative.¹ Community Change Initiatives are community development and poverty alleviation efforts focused on funneling large amounts of funding over many years into a small geographic area known to suffer from social and health inequalities. During my fieldwork, I observed well-intentioned, resourced and skilled practitioners design highly-participatory processes that enacted exclusion in ways that caused difficulties for the initiative. Therefore, I was inspired to ask *how exclusion continues to be enacted* despite highly-skilled and motivated actors and an environment conducive for a resident-driven approach to planning and policymaking.

My fieldwork took place between June 2009 and May 2014 during the planning and implementation phase of the Central City Community Change Initiative (CC-CCI), a 10-year place-based initiative. I attended hundreds of meetings, conducted participant observation and interviews with participants, and collected archival documents from these meetings as well as from websites related to the initiative. Participants in the CC-CCI include executive directors, community organizers, and program staff representatives from local organizations including nonprofits and city agencies (e.g. the departments of health, parks and recreation, police, and probation), adult and youth residents of Central City, and foundation representatives. The foundation representatives included executive staff who came to Central City for larger, public events, such as the foundation's announcement that Central City had been selected for the Foundation's Community Change Initiative. Each site was assigned a

¹ All names have been changed as per IRB protocol

program manager from the foundation who was more present at the site, was in charge of delivering updates from the foundation's executive staff, and was ultimately responsible for the grant-giving in each site. Most meetings were bilingual, held either in English or Spanish with simultaneous translation into the other respective language. In this chapter, I describe events occurring between the beginning of the initiative in 2009 and the implementation period and renewal of grants in 2013.

Literature Review

Exclusion. Exclusion is the state of being totally but involuntarily left out from a system (i.e. political, education or healthcare) (Ryan, 2009). It is often defined as a failure of public engagement or political representation, such as failure to incorporate a diverse group of participants into political processes (Ahmed & Palermo, 2010; Blackwell et al., 2012). Exclusion is also conceptualized as a process that prevents citizens from participation—often political participation, such as voting or providing feedback or input. But exclusion is more than being kept outside of a system; it also means “being incorporated into it on singularly disadvantageous terms” (Amin, 1976; Cardoso and Faletto, 1979; Wallerstein, 1979, cited in Goodin, 1996, Note 6, p. 345).

Exclusion is often equated with a lack of diverse participants in political activities (i.e. voting, holding political office). Socio-demographic variables like age, race, ethnicity, and income are common markers for diverse participation (Roberts, 2004). Bloemradd (2006) points out the importance of immigrant populations' inclusion in political systems. In their research on southern California, Valle and Torres (2000) observe the trend of Latino political activity as disproportionate to the number of Latinos in the population. Goodin (1996) similarly defines exclusion as the “keeping out” of certain individuals or populations, and further specifies that the individuals or populations that are kept out are often deemed inferior (p. 347-8). Correspondingly, community-based participatory research (CBPR) criticizes the

historic exclusion of research subjects, individuals and communities, from research processes (Minkler 2012, 1997; Wallerstein & Duran, 2006).

The exclusion literature's focus on *who* participates is important to democratic process. To overcome common hurdles to full participation, public managers provide incentives like childcare, transportation vouchers and refreshments. They also focus on outreach and marketing to ensure diverse stakeholders are made aware of opportunities to participate and feel welcome to do so (Laurian, 2004 cited in Bryson et al., 2013, p. 29). Other supports for participation can include language translation and meeting times and places that are convenient for various constituencies (Bryson et al., 2013, p. 29).

Even when diverse members are present, participants' actions and ideas can be marginalized and full participation prevented. For example, in most cities, citizens can attend council meetings, but they are often given limited time to share their ideas and sometimes this is restricted to the end of the city council meeting. Bryson et al., (2013) point out that public managers decide what is on the table for discussion, placing citizen groups at a disadvantage. As a result, citizens can only be reactive to the agenda (Cooper and Nownes, 2003, cited in Bryson et al., 2013). Exclusion is not only about *who* and a lack of access to sites of participation (i.e. meetings); it is also about the hurdles in place that hinder full participation once everyone is "at the table." This means it is not only important to be present or being represented in a democratic process, but also to be accepted by others (Chen & Hamilton, 2015).

Moreover, diverse forms of input and action are only important if public managers can "make use of that diversity, for example, by being open to changing topics and policy outcomes in order to make connections among diverse perspectives" (Quick & Feldman, 2011, cited in Bryson et al., 2013, p. 29). Without making use of the diversity of people and

ideas to shape processes and policy outcome, citizen participation resembles tokenism (Arnstein, 1969) as more people are included, but are kept marginal (Goodin, 1996).

Scholars studying participation (Bryson et al., 2013) and inclusion (Quick & Feldman, 2011) suggest that certain activities and orientations can produce exclusion even when people are invited to the table. For instance, the inverse of “being open to changing topics and policy outcomes in order to make connections among diverse perspectives” would translate to the *inability* to or *unwillingness* to change topics and policy outcomes (Quick & Feldman, 2011 cited in Bryson et al., 2013, p. 29). This *inability* and *unwillingness* often occurs when planners predetermine decision-making processes (Healey, 2003) or engage community members in planning processes only after a decision is made (Innes & Booher, 2004).

Community-collaborative and coalition-based work focuses on bringing together a diverse set of community stakeholders in order to address common issues or achieve desired results; frequently, these stakeholders are new to one another and have divergent approaches, resources, experience and political influence. This mix of stakeholders creates a situation, which requires attention to relationships, but participation efforts as described above often focus only on getting diverse stakeholders to the table.

Creating connections between people and across often-divisive issues is fundamental to organizing (Christens, 2010), inclusivity (Quick and Feldman, 2011) and successful collaborative work (Ogden, 2009). A key feature of inclusion is being open to these connections altering the topics and policy outcomes (Bryson et al., 2013; Quick & Feldman, 2011). But connections between collaborative actors are often overlooked or seen as transactional—a means to an end, with ends usually defined as predetermined policy outcomes or systems changes. This box-checking approach to community engagement can be exclusionary and can qualify as nonparticipation and tokenism (Arnstein, 1969; Franklin,

2001). And while these outcomes and changes are important, collaboration experts argue that outcomes are inseparable from, and interdependent with, the relationships and processes that constitute collaborative work (Ogden, 2009). The importance of connections for participation and inclusion suggests that the *prevention* of connections among diverse perspectives is an important feature of exclusion.

Schneider and Ingram (2005) describe the contradiction between the American democratic ideal of equality and the perpetual marginalization of a domestic underclass “widely viewed as undeserving and incapable” (p. 2). This contradiction of democratic practices idealizes equality while practicing exclusion, demonstrating the consequences of such approaches to maintain rather than alleviate marginality. Schneider and Ingram’s (2005) argument resonates with Frye’s (2007) description of the “[t]he double bind” of oppression. She describes “situations in which options are reduced to a very few and all of them expose one to penalty, censure or deprivation” (p. 155). These scholars suggest that exclusion is a process that further empowers the domestic elite class, disempowers and punishes the most vulnerable, and is dependent on the social inequalities it maintains.

Exclusion, often described as being outside of or peripheral to a system, infers that there is boundary. Goodin (1996) argues that the discourse on exclusion is fixated upon margins and boundaries that keep certain people out as well as others in. He goes further and distinguishes a discourse on exclusion focused mainly on the policing of those boundaries. This focus on the boundaries of exclusion implies that even when people are “just over the line” they are considered included, even though this may not truly be the case in any meaningful way. For instance, an individual might be invited to a meeting but not called on to speak, or their item might be put on the agenda, but discussed so late in the meeting that by that time, few people remain. Policing the boundary also infers that exclusion involves

activities to allow people in and leave people out, but also to keep people in and monitor the people and activities at the boundaries (Goodin 1996, p. 348).

The constitution and use of boundaries are important for enacting inclusion (Quick & Feldman, 2011). Drawing on Lave and Wenger's (1991) work on Communities of Practice to define margins and boundaries, Quick and Feldman (2011) discuss inclusive practices "to orient all participants to manage boundaries in continuously open-ended ways in order to keep the community expanding" (p. 285). Part of their discussion of inclusion coincides with common understandings of inclusion, such as increasing a community's accessibility to new members, but their argument also disrupts assumptions that inclusion is about being central and exclusion is about being peripheral. Instead, they assert, inclusive practices are not about assimilation to a core set of principles; they are characterized by adaptive abilities to facilitate connections between actors and issues and to allow the community to continue to expand (Quick & Feldman 2011).

Sometimes efforts to be participatory actually enlist consumers or citizens in creating disciplinary forms of power and acts of exclusion. These practices of exclusion to police the boundary evoke Foucault's notions of governmentality (1991), biopolitics (2003), and disciplinary power (1986). Foucault's work was concerned with issues of inclusion and exclusion, and in particular, the practices that included people but on disadvantageous terms. He described administrative and political practices that circumscribed bodies and populations to be controlled by social institutions like the state, medicine and the criminal justice system. The excluded people and populations existed in a "non-state" comprising the poor and indigent who were framed as a threat to society (Booth, 1969; Booth, 1990; Mill, 1991 cited in Ryan, 2009, p. 357).

Critics of participation posit that mechanisms used to incorporate people into political communities actually constitute forms of collusion or tyranny (Cooke & Kothari, 2001;

Treolar, 2003). Ryan (2009) describes efforts to improve accountability and performance in organizations through the development of consumer audits: “it is here that we can see how the problem of governing social exclusion assembles a disciplinary apparatus around questions such as employability and dependency” (p. 360). Cohen (1985) noted that the trend toward decarceration in the 1980s did not signal the end of social control, but merely a reformulation through new modes of self-management and surveillance located in the community (cited in Ryan, 2009, p. 361). Cohen explained that individuals who were once controlled through institutions such as asylums and prisons were now relocated under the gaze and discipline of community psychology, which actually had more professionals and a broader scope of work (Rose, 1999). Garland (2001) described this shift in control as “new criminologies of everyday life” (p. 127-31, cited in Ryan, 2009, p. 361). Rose (1999) described this as a blurring of the inside and outside of social systems of control. Through these new modes of control, populations who were once physically excluded, and are now integrated back into mainstream society, are still excluded, through means that are subtler and more sophisticated. In community engagement, this subtle division between inside and outside can be manifested in situations where residents are invited to the table but their voices are silenced or marginalized, or even disciplined and enlisted into a predetermined process.

There is a rich social change literature that advocates for positive outcomes only possible *if* excluded from the dominant system (INCITE!, 2009). Tarrow (1994) described a situation in which people were left out of official proceedings, but were able to influence the formal decision-making process. Often, this literature assumes change can only happen outside of existing structures or systems. Exclusion in this case is equated with liberation from systems of oppression like the non-profit industrial complex (INCITE!, 2009).

The exclusion literature reviewed thus far demonstrates that exclusion is a complex and nuanced phenomenon. It remains a persistent challenge to those committed to democracy

and social equality. Much of this literature advocates for more inclusive approaches to avoid exclusion. It also aims to ameliorate power imbalances inherent in collaborative spaces, that historically characterize relationships between researched and researcher and government/designer and citizen/participant. An example of switching from a more exclusive to a more inclusive design would be “shifting from formal public hearings, which tend to be dominated by a small number of individuals comfortable with that format, to one-on-one interactions between public managers and residents” (Takahashi & Smutny, 1998 cited in Bryson et al., 2013, p. 29). Another possibility is to avoid delegating decisions to small, elite groups, or to avoid making decisions in haste, when time is not a legitimate factor for all stakeholders, as stakeholders will likely feel left out (Feldman & Quick, 2009; Nutt, 2002; Thomas, 1995, in Bryson et al., 2013).

While these examples illustrate design choices to reduce domination and marginalization, they may not accommodate for “[s]ubtle power codes”—such as the kinds of information and styles of expression that are considered relevant and appropriate—that shape who participates in the process and how their input is *received*” [emphasis added] (Briggs, 1998; Polletta & Lee, 2006, cited in Bryson et al., 2013, p. 29). In other words, even when spaces are created in which participants can voice their knowledge, experience or particular expertise, researchers, designers or the government may not understand, listen or act on such information. It is sometimes at this juncture that citizens and organizations advocate for working outside the formal structures and systems.

The extant exclusion literature often explains the exclusion of research subjects, citizens or participants as being associated with structural disadvantages, such as poverty, and then explains inclusion through structural advantages such as employment and educational attainment. Scholars acknowledge that there are people and interests “normally excluded from decision –making by institutionalized inequities” (Abers, 2000; Parekh, 2002;

Schlozman, Verba, & Brady 2012; Young, 2000, cited in Bryson et al., 2013, p. 29).

Schlozman, Verba, and Brady (2012) found that education and income mark advantages associated with political voice and that political advantages are handed down across generations. While social, political, and economic indicators are important markers of inequities (Galabuzi, 2004; Gingrich, 2008; Labonte, 2004; Richmond & Saloojee, 2005, cited in Ponc & Frisby, 2010), structural analysis can also often be overly deterministic (see Merton, 1968) and can overlook the role of agency as well as the possibility of change, the processes that create structure, and the more intangible and taken-for-granted structures (i.e. cultural codes and institutional norms) that contribute to more nuanced understandings of exclusion.

Practice theory and structure. Practice theory provides an analytic in which agency and structure exist as a duality, and do not represent dichotomous discrete phenomena (Bourdieu, 1977; 1990; Giddens, 1984; Heidegger, 1962). Agency and structure constrain and enable each other continuously through the principle of mutual constitution (Giddens, 1984).

Actions create and recreate the social structures that constrain and enable actions. In practice theory, actions are situated, consequential, effortful, and emergent (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011); they are not just a re-enactment of social norms or structures. Social phenomena are continuously produced through mutually constitutive dualities (Brown & Duguid, 1991, 2001; Gherardi, 2009; Gherardi, Nicolini & Odella, 1998; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Orr, 1987; Osterlund & Carlile, 2005; Swan et al., 2002; Wenger 2003).

Sewell (1992) draws from Giddens' (1984) duality of structure and Bourdieu's (1990) habitus to articulate a view of structure that accounts for agency and ongoing change, and dissolves the divided vision of structure as semiotic—a vision often associated with anthropology's focus on culture—and material, a characterization often associated with sociology's focus on social structures such as race, ethnicity or systems like education. This

vision challenges the view of structures as reified categories that can be used to explain social life, for example “class ... structures politics, gender ... structures employment opportunities, [and] rhetorical conventions ... structure texts or utterances” (Sewell, 1992, p. 2). Instead, structures are constituted and reconstituted through dialectical human action. For Sewell (1992) structure is “profoundly temporal.” Structures are both continually evolving processes and outcomes, produced and reproduced through the micro-practices found in everyday social interactions.

Feldman and Khademian (2007) note that

[S]tructures do not continue to exist unless they are enacted. This raises questions about a whole range of phenomena that are often called structures, such as laws or organizational hierarchies. Practice theory draws attention to the fact that it is how they are used or acted upon that brings them to life (p. 310).

Feldman and Khademian (2007) cite the example of laws that require public hearings. Laws and public hearings are both structures, but as they point out, there are many ways to have public hearings: “both the laws requiring public hearings and the public hearings take on meaning through the ways that we enact them” (Feldman & Khademian, 2007, p. 310)” Structure through a practice theory lens is recast as an assemblage of actions continuously created and recreated. People take actions that are constrained and enabled by structures and that use, interpret, and enact new and existing meanings and forms of such structures.

Actions are not only constrained by the structures that they create in their entirety; Sewell (1992) points out that the relativity of social positions *within* dominant social structures like gender, class, and ethnicity can also constrain action:

Occupancy of different social positions-as defined, for example, by gender, wealth, social prestige, class, ethnicity, occupation, generation, sexual

preference, or education-gives people knowledge of different schemas and access to different kinds and amounts of resources and hence different possibilities for transformative action. And the scope or extent of agency also varies enormously between different social systems, even for occupants of analogous positions. The owner of the biggest art gallery in St. Louis has far less influence on American artistic taste than the owner of the biggest gallery in Los Angeles (p. 21).

In sum, this dynamic view of structure encourages an ontological shift, requiring us to view structures as relational phenomena, whose meaning depends on how they are used and constructed in practice. The relational and dynamic view of structure outlined above also expands structures beyond broad social categories (i.e. gender, class) to include rules and resources (Giddens, 1984; Sewell, 1992).

Rules are important features in the creation and recreation of social institutions; they determine who or what is deemed relevant, appropriate or legal. Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) show that the rules that institutions use to govern often disadvantage certain actors and exclude them from the polity. Scott (1995) distinguishes regulative, normative and cognitive rules. Regulative rules are explicit and formal. They constrain behavior and regulate interactions, e.g. property rights, contracts, patent laws, tax structures, trade laws, legal systems (North, 1990, cited in Geels, 2008, p. 904). Normative rules confer values, norms, role expectations, duties, rights, and responsibilities (e.g. Durkheim, 1949; Parsons, 1937, cited in Geels, 2008, p. 904), while “[c]ognitive rules constitute the nature of reality and the frames through which meaning or sense is made” (Geels, 2008, p. 904).

Rules are connected with other rules and are organized into rule systems to structure and regulate “social transactions and which are backed by social sanctions and networks of control, are referred to as rule regimes” (Burns and Flam, 1987, p. 13, cited Geels, 2008 p.

904). Foucault (1979) documented how silence became the rule in terms of human sexuality (Slagle, 1995). In the case of silence, for example, a rule is not explicit but becomes normative through the repetition and sanctioning of certain actions and inactions. Rules are mechanisms that control and legitimate people's actions as a part of, or deviant from, the respective community.

According to Giddens (1984), rules are virtual phenomena that generate social practices and social systems (Sewell 1992). Sewell (1992) defines social systems as “what most social scientists mean by “societies” but would also include social units greater (e.g., the capitalist world system) or more limited (e.g., the neighborhood community) in scope than the nation-state” (p. 6). Rules are not like those conceptualized by Durkheim (1949) and Parsons (1937) and do not infer fixed ‘rules of the game’ (Barnes, 1980, p. 301, cited in Ortner 1984) in which actions are a mere enactment of rules (Ortner, 1984). Sewell (1992) considers rules, which he defines as schemas, to encompass the codes of culture: “conventions, recipes, scenarios, principles of action, and habits of speech and gesture built up with these fundamental tools” (p. 9).

Resources, the second fundamental feature of structures, play an important role in exclusion. Exclusion is often associated with a lack of resources on the side of the researched, citizens or participants (Murie & Musterd, 2004). These resources can include literacy in the particular policy arenas, or simply the time or transportation required to attend a meeting; however, resources are often discussed more broadly as power (Arnstein, 1992). At the same time, exclusion has also been attributed to the researcher, government or designer lacking the competency, time or institutional support necessary to include diverse stakeholders. Conversely, researchers, governments or designers have been critiqued for excluding in order to protect their resources—mainly their privilege and power.

Giddens (1984) describes resources in terms of power and as levers of social change. He argues that power is generated through the creation and reproduction of structures of domination. These structures of domination consist of two sorts of resources: allocative and authoritative. Allocative resources include material features of the environment such as raw materials; means of material production and reproduction, i.e. instruments of production or technology; and produced goods such as artifacts created through the interaction of material features and the means of production (p. 258). Authoritative resources include organization of social time-space; production/reproduction of the body or bodies in relation to one another; and organization of life chances.

Sewell's (1992) work draws on Giddens, and he defines resources in two forms, human and nonhuman. "*Nonhuman* resources are objects, animate or inanimate, naturally occurring or manufactured, that can be used to enhance or maintain power" [emphasis added] (Sewell, 1992, p. 10). "*[H]uman* resources are physical strength, dexterity, knowledge, and emotional commitments that can be used to enhance or maintain power, including knowledge of the means of gaining, retaining, controlling, and propagating either human or nonhuman resources" [emphasis added] (Sewell, 1992, p. 10).

The storage of resources has implications for structures of domination. Giddens describes different possible 'containers' that store the resources. For instance, the community could be the 'container' that stores authoritative resources; profession could also be this 'container.' These 'containers' play a large role in structuring society. Giddens (1984) quotes Mumford's (1960) description of cities to convey that the city was a modern "container or 'crucible of power'" upon which the formation of class-divided societies depends.

The city proper... was marked by a sudden increase in power in every department and by a magnification of the role of power itself in the affairs of men. A variety of institutions had hitherto existed separately, bringing their

numbers together in a common meeting place, at reasonable intervals: the hunters' camp, the sacred monument or shrine, the Paleolithic ritual cave, the Neolithic agricultural village- all of these coalesced in a bigger meeting place, the city (Mumford, 1960, p. 7).

Modern capitalism then replaced the city with a new type of power container, the nation-state. The nation-state consisted of a consolidation of a highly elaborate administrative order within different, but also distinct boundaries.

Feldman (2004) points out that resources only become resources when used (p. 296; also see Giddens, 1984, p. 33 and Orlikowski, 2000, p. 406, cited in Feldman, 2004 p. 296). This practice-based view of resources widens the scope of resources to include atypical resources such as personal possessions, or objects at hand that people use in order to make do (see de Certeau, 1984) in austere or otherwise compromised situations (Baker et al., 2013). Quick and Feldman (2009) talk about engaging vocal critics as a part of inclusion; vocal critics could be an example of an atypical resource used to enact inclusion.

This practice-based view of resources makes visible a host of potential resources. In the Community Based Participatory Research and participatory planning literatures, community members' knowledge and expertise are seen as the primary excluded and untapped resource inhibiting novel solutions to social problems. However, as explained earlier, even if this knowledge is included, it may not be acted upon, or may just be included as tokenism (Arnstein, 1969). Repeated exclusion may infuriate and activate new forms of political participation, but it may also exhaust and silence these vocal critics.

In the next section, I describe the methods I employed to investigate exclusion and answer my research question, '*how do individuals and organizations enact exclusion and how does it persist?*'

Methods

To understand *how exclusion was enacted and persisted* despite commitments to inclusion, I compiled examples of exclusion from four years of ethnographic data, wrote thick descriptions of each example and then analyzed these data. I began to identify exclusion using a definition of exclusion based on the dictionary definition, which squared with the fundamental elements of exclusion found in the literature, as well as Quick and Feldman's (2011) features of inclusive processes.

The dictionary definition of exclusion is as follows: *preventing someone from taking a specific action or being part of a group; leaving out or not including something and thinking that (something, such as a possibility) is not worth attention*. Quick and Feldman's (2011) features of inclusive processes include: (1) co-producing the process and content of decision making, (2) engaging multiple ways of knowing, and (3) sustaining temporal openness (p. 272). I identified exclusion by the absence of these features, for example, when actions were taken that prevented actors from co-producing the process.

I analyzed the examples I compiled inductively, and the findings I present emerged after multiple iterations of analyses. Through this analysis, I found that these examples of exclusion shared similar features, including the presence or absence of elements preventing or discouraging connections between people and issues, which resulted in the omission of people, issues, expertise, and approaches to problem-solving as well as a disregard of preexisting or ongoing community development work in Central City.

I define a connection as an action that brings together actors, issues, and/or expertise in the accomplishment of work. I also discovered that actions were constrained and enabled or constituted or reconstituted by the structural advantage of the organizers, whether the organizers were the foundation, nonprofit grantees, or meeting facilitators. These structural advantages could be a resource, such as financial support, or could comprise experience and

familiarity with the rules of getting funded by the foundation. I will discuss these findings below.

Data collection. The data used for this chapter span from August 2009 to August 2013 and include field notes taken at initiative meetings and events, interviews, and archival documents such as meeting minutes and foundation publications. I collected these three main forms of data in order to understand people's actions in the complex context in which they occurred, to understand how people make sense of these actions, and to ensure my findings are supported by data triangulation (Atkinson, Coffey, & Delamont, 2003; Yanow & Schwartz-Shea, 2006; Yin, 2009).

Analysis methods. I used established coding, memoing, and categorizing techniques for qualitative data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995; Lofland et al., 2006) to identify examples of exclusion. I coded examples of exclusion by coding broadly at first for exclusion, then identifying who or what was excluded, and how the exclusion happened. I then brought in the definition described above to understand the coded material. Codes based on the definition above included: preventing someone from taking a specific action or being part of a group; leaving out or not including something; thinking that (something, such as a possibility) is not worth attention; not co-producing the process and content of decision making; not engaging multiple ways of knowing; and not sustaining temporal openness.

As I coded the material, I also wrote memos to document why I coded it as I did. After I coded instances of exclusion, I wrote thick descriptions of each example (Geertz, 1973). I then mapped out the practices within each thick description to understand how exclusion was achieved. Like in my early iteration of coding, I again examined who, what and which actions were involved, and then identified what the actors were doing, what was

being excluded, and how these practices excluded. Then, I developed categories based on these patterns of how exclusion was enacted to create a theory of exclusion.

In the following section, I provide some background information on the Central City Community Change Initiative. I then present the thick descriptions of exclusion in the form of six vignettes. The vignettes represent a wide range of empirical evidence; they involve different combinations of actors in meetings of different sizes and with diverse purposes at varying times during the initiative.

Background

The foundation selected Central City in spring 2009; planning began in April and they requested the plan be submitted by December 2009, which was later extended till June 2010. From June 2010 to December 2010, the Central City Change Initiative established their governance structure, which would provide local ownership and implementation of the plan as well as a local conduit for grant distribution. In January 2011, the Foundation distributed the first round of grants in accordance with the community plan.

From the outset, the Central City Community Change Initiative and the various actors within it committed to making the initiative a resident-driven process. The foundation required that each site carry out community engagement and include residents during the planning year. And as the planning year began, organizational representatives and residents formed a community engagement subcommittee to ensure there was adequate resident involvement. This subcommittee oversaw an extensive door-to-door effort to collect resident input to inform the content of the plan, and eventually drafted its own outcome on *civic engagement and community empowerment* to add to the plan.

The Collaborative began with a governance structure that included a nonprofit that acted as a fiscal agent to provide logistical support and liaise with the foundation and a Steering Committee. Halfway through the planning year, the steering committee decided that

two-thirds of its representatives needed to be residents. Then the Steering committee decided it needed to divide into three separate groups, youth residents, adult residents, and organizational representatives, to discuss the outcomes. This change came in response to residents' experiences of organizations overpowering conversations and, as one Steering Committee member explained it, "there are two conversations, one by the residents and one by the organizations." As the collaborative entered the implementation phase, the steering committee maintained its two-thirds resident, one-third organizational representative composition. The three separate groups continued to meet separately, but not as sub-sections of the steering committee. Organizations met as grantees, while adult and youth residents met to discuss their own priorities and projects.

A small group of organizational representatives and residents worked intensely with the consultant hired to write the plan, including issues important to residents by adding two additional outcomes on immigration reform and community empowerment. This small group presented the draft-plan to the Steering Committee; the Steering Committee approved the plan and prioritized the civic engagement and community empowerment outcome as the first outcome to receive funding during the implementation phase. These instances represent a commitment to a "resident-driven plan and process." Nevertheless, as the plan was going through the approval process and commitment to community engagement was being archived in the history of the Central City Community Change Initiative, there was a simultaneous shift by some organizations from talking about the plan as "resident-driven" and "our plan" to being "their (the residents') plan" (Montoya, 2013).

In the following section, I provide vignettes in order to detail several instances of exclusion from four years of fieldwork (including the planning year and 3 years of implementation). I present a variety of ways that exclusion was enacted, at varied times, in different spaces, and with different actors. These varied examples simulate the cumulative

experience of exclusion experienced by Central City Collaborative members, and often by residents. Each vignette represents one way that exclusion was enacted. I do this to create parity for simplicity even though in each vignette multiple forms of exclusion exist.

Findings & Analysis

Exclusionary practices. I found that collaborative members enacted six exclusionary practices. These six practices were:

1. Preventing people from being part of a group
2. Preventing people from taking a specific action
3. Leaving out issues (important to residents)
4. Leaving out residents and their ideas
5. Dismissing people's understandings of or approaches to problems
6. Disconnecting ongoing or pre-existing work or relationships.

The six practices were also not mutually exclusive. They also mirror aspects of the dictionary definition of exclusion as *preventing someone from taking a specific action or being part of a group; leaving out or not including something and thinking that (something, such as a possibility) is not worth attention*. These episodes of exclusion also mirror the definition I drew from the inclusive management literature, in which exclusion is about *preventing* connections among people, issues and across time.

1. Preventing people from being part of a group.

Vignette: Planning for Participation. In early 2009 the president of the foundation came to Central City to talk to nonprofit and institutional leaders from across the county, because the foundation was considering Central City as one of the sites for their 10 year Community Change Initiative. In April, the foundation announced that Central City was one of the 14 sites selected, and that the first nine months would be designed for planning:

“residents and systems leaders or nonprofit agency leaders would sit around a table and come up with a plan,” (Foundation Representative Interview).

Oliver, a resident of Central City and later Steering Committee member, was not told about the meeting, but when he found out he felt that he and other residents needed to attend. It cost around \$40 dollars to attend. He recalled, “We were able to [attend] through a nonprofitI don’t know who sponsored us –So somebody said that you guys could come in. ... [Said] you don’t have to pay [it was] like \$40, \$45 dollars... so we went to the meeting and basically everybody was there. ... the who’s who [from Central City and the County] and... and you know there were CEOs of nonprofits and what have you. And very, very few residents.” Oliver told the foundation president “they needed to do resident engagement ... [and] – as a resident – that we wanted to be a part of the solution in some of the issues that they were going to address.” The president replied that they “intended to do this and that they wanted to be very inclusive and they wanted to work with the communities and that it was you know critical for that to be successful, that that was going to happen” (Oliver Interview December 11, 2013). Thus, while there was a commitment and intention to be inclusive of residents in the initiative, by that time, Oliver already had the experience of not being invited to a meeting, and he began to call for better resident inclusion within the Central City Community Change Initiative before the initiative even began.

Analysis: Preventing people from being part of a group. In the *Planning for participation* vignette, residents were prevented from being a part of the kick-off for the community change initiative. While the exclusion of residents is notable – this exclusion is particularly important, because it prevented residents from connecting with other stakeholders and with the foundation to start building the relationships necessary for the collaborative endeavor that was about to begin.

The Foundation considered residents the target audience for the initiative, yet not for this meeting. Oliver recalled that ‘the who’s who’ of the county were present, including nonprofit executives and directors of public agencies, but very few residents. The organizers charged a \$45 fee to attend. Oliver was able to attend because a nonprofit sponsored him. Organizations paid for their employees to attend, yet people unaffiliated with an organization did not have this support and in the Central City initiative, almost all participants without organizational affiliations were residents. While these fees are common practice for organizational meetings simply to cover venue and food costs, they also prevented residents from attending, and signaled to them as well as others not affiliated with organizations, that they were not in fact the intended audience of this meeting and the initiative. This example reflects what Goodin (1996) described as being incorporated, but on disadvantageous terms.

Preconceptions of the audience and meeting organization excluded some actors. A person who eventually became a steering committee member likened her journey to be invited as “clawing herself to the table.” She explained that she represented a city agency that, in her words, others did not think would want to be involved. In her situation, the preconceptions of ‘who’ needed to be involved prevented her, at least initially, and possibly others, from being part of the initiative.

Preventing people from being part of a group is also seen in other times and places in the Central City Community Change Initiative. In December 2009, during the planning year, the steering committee broke up into three ‘homogeneous’ subsections – adult resident, youth resident and organizational steering committees. This structure aimed to create spaces where youth and adult residents felt more comfortable speaking up. While this may have avoided conflict in meetings and may have helped the collaborative make decisions about the community plan quicker, it perpetuated separate conversations. The separation of stakeholders also prevented interactions and collaboration between these stakeholder groups

and thus stalled the development of relationships, connections, and trust between the different stakeholders and stakeholder groups. It also avoided rather than normalized the kind of conflict between divergent participants that is common in collaborative work.

2. Preventing people from taking a specific action.

Vignette: Voting for a Real Definition of Safety. The Central City Community Change Initiative began its yearlong planning process with a two-day training, Define and Discover. The foundation suggested that each of the 14 sites select 3-5 outcomes to address in their respective community plans. One goal of the training was to start narrowing the 10 outcomes down to 3-5 outcomes that Central City would prioritize. During the first day of the training, there were a few presentations and activities that focused on getting to know one another, becoming familiar with the initiative, and beginning to discuss the 10 outcomes.

To discuss the 10 outcomes, the facilitator arranged break-out groups for the outcomes. The safety outcome was very popular among the residents. Organizational representatives also attended this group, including nonprofit representatives from health organizations and a law enforcement representative.

In Central City, the relationship between the police and the community was very strained. Residents often expressed mistrust and anger towards the police. Residents described how law enforcement discriminated against, racially profiled, and sometimes even acted violently towards their family members and friends. Moreover, the police department received over half of the city's budget, which frustrated many residents and organizational activists because despite the amount of funding, Central City was a place of relatively high violence, criminal activity, gang presence and overall poor community safety as well as under-resourced parks and schools. Also, Central City had recently begun collaborating with federal agencies to detain undocumented immigrants in city jails. This was affecting many residents and their family and friends; ICE was deporting parents and separating families.

During the safety breakout group, people explained that the community did not trust the police, there were raids targeting undocumented immigrants, and gangs recently green-lighted their sons. Joe, the law enforcement representative, shared the idea of Central City implementing a gang injunction whereby identified gang members can be incarcerated for activities on the street. The law enforcement representative explained that the City Council was currently exploring this approach for Central City. Serena, a resident and organizational representative, then said, ‘ultimately safety is everyone’s responsibility!’ Other residents nodded and Ava, another resident and organizational representative echoed Serena saying, “yeah, we cannot blame any one person but everyone needs to help. We need to work together.’

At the end of the day, the facilitator asked participants to vote on which two outcomes were the most important. The facilitator said he would tally the votes and on day two of the training, a week later, he would report the results. When the time to vote arrived, people turned to their neighbors to clarify the instructions and see how they were deciding and voting. Sophia, a Central City resident said to Victoria, another resident, “I think safety is the most important, but we are not safe because we are afraid that my husband is going to be deported. So how do I vote?” Victoria agreed, saying that it was tough, she wanted to vote for safety, but didn’t believe in a gang injunction; the police were the ones she did not trust or feel safe from.

Organizational representatives circled to collect people’s notecards on which they wrote down their prioritized issues. Victoria and Sophia wrote down their selections. They could have decided not to vote at all in order to avoid supporting a view of safety they did not believe in or want to reinforce. On day two, the facilitator announced that safety received the most votes. But it was not clear what safety *was*. Was it about creating a gang injunction? Or was it about creating a place where residents were free from fear including fear of

deportation, racial profiling and domestic violence? It was clear that people were experiencing serious problems around safety in their lives and it was also clear there was not consensus around what safety meant; in fact, defining what safety meant was contentious.

Analysis: Preventing people from taking a specific action. The *Voting for Real Safety* vignette exemplifies exclusion because there were no opportunities for residents to co-produce or define the policy problem of safety before they prioritized outcomes.

Residents were prevented from co-defining safety for many reasons. The foundation wanted each site to ‘make the outcomes their own’ to ensure that the outcome would meet local needs, but at the same time, the foundation required that each site select between three and five of the predetermined 10 outcomes. The facilitator, unfamiliar with the Central City context, tried to create a process in which residents were involved in prioritizing outcomes, but he and the collaborative also met the foundation guidelines and timeline. The facilitator created a voting process in which participants gave input, but could not co-produce or define the outcomes before voting.

Problem definition is an extremely important part of policymaking because it influences the possibilities of solutions availability. And policymakers (broadly defined) often make the mistake of defining the solution (i.e. gang injunction) either before the problem is defined *or* as the problem itself (Bardach, 2011). Including those most impacted in defining the problem and solution promises potential for innovative, effective, and sustainable changes, because community members are invested in the success of the solution (Barber, 1984).

In this case, the problem definition process held high stakes for those at the meeting. The problem definition could include or exclude certain issues, as well as certain organizations, from funding. Residents did not feel the police department needed more funding or that the solution of a gang injunction would address safety in Central City. They

felt that safety needed to be addressed in a different way, one in which the police were not the only solution. Going to a vote on day 1, before the problem was defined more democratically, made it unclear whether residents and their ideas would be included in the definition of safety. The facilitators did not disclose the future impact of the vote, e.g. on future planning year activities or on the initiative writ large (i.e. would future community forums only focus on the top two priorities, or would there be more time to define safety?).

Potentially skipping this definitional process could exclude the residents who experienced the effects of a broken safety system and desperately wanted to make Central City safer. Residents saw connections between safety and other issues like immigration. Including their understanding and experience of safety into how the outcome was defined would have expanded the domain of safety beyond the control of law enforcement. However, the early and unclear voting process prevented those issues from being included in the definition of safety before the group moved to a vote.

The example of co-producing safety captures the key feature of exclusion: preventing people from co-producing the process and outcome. This feature of exclusion could be seen across the Central City Community Change Initiative (CC-CCI). Narrowing down and prioritizing issues and topics was common to CC-CCI, as time and resources were limited. Each workgroup that formed went through a prioritization process to decide on which topic the group would work. As the campaign processes began in 2013, organizers often guided, rather than co-created, the process of political advocacy work and leadership development with participants. Organizers' attempts to carry out predetermined decision-making processes (Healey, 2003) prevented residents from taking actions to co-define the policy problem, processes, or outcomes.

3. Leaving out issues (important to residents).

Vignette: Making Immigration Healthy Policy. The main goal of the planning year was to draft a community plan to submit to the foundation, which they would fund over the subsequent 10 years. The foundation required that each of its 14 sites submit a logic model as a part of their community plan. A logic model is a visual depiction of the plan made up of boxes and arrows that lay out discrete steps, inputs, outputs, activities and resources needed to reach desired goals and outcomes. Logic models are commonly required by funders and created by program implementers in government and non-governmental settings, during planning periods or for the purpose of guiding evaluation. Using logic models in community initiatives has proven challenging, as the symbols and language involved in logic models are unfamiliar and daunting, and are difficult regardless of educational level (Kaplan & Garrett, 2005, p. 169).

Two of the most important issues to Central City residents, civic engagement and immigration reform, did not show up in the language of the ten outcomes. Participants were concerned as to how these issues would fit into the logic model, especially considering that in their logic-model training, the foundation suggested that each site choose 3-5 of the 10 outcomes to prioritize and to include in the model.

During collaborative meetings and community forums, immigration came up as related to all outcomes. For example, during a community forum that convened youth in their teenage years and early twenties from Central City, when youth were asked what community safety meant to them, youth said that safety meant ‘having access to resources irrespective of immigration status.’ The youth suggested making Central City a Sanctuary City in order to make it safe. A Sanctuary City is a term that denotes municipalities that enact local practices or policies that protect undocumented immigrants. At another meeting in September 2009, immigration status was cited as a barrier to improving the health of the community in terms

of the fear of destabilizing families. A community resident explained that “Some things are great, we cannot ignore it—like immigration reform.”

The fiscal agent reminded the steering committee about the foundation requirement to make a logic model and plan, and many people questioned if and how a new issue could be added. This question was complicated. They felt that the issue cut across and affected all outcomes, so it needed to be included in the logic model. In the spring of 2010, as the logic model was being written, residents and organizations again expressed concern that immigration would not make its way into the logic model, despite being a major hurdle to, and interrelated with achieving all the other outcomes. Immigration did make it into the logic model. But after submitting the plan, the collaborative found out that the immigration outcome could not receive direct funds from the foundation because they were a health foundation. A steering committee member explained,

Regardless, the foundation, like anything else, has its structure, its rules. When we said immigration is the first thing, they said ‘yes but no.’ it can be indirectly but not directly. So, they are not following their policies.

Because the foundation could not commit to fund immigration work explicitly, a group of nonprofits and residents formed a coalition outside the formal structure of the Central City Collaborative. The members felt it was imperative to work on immigration reform, whether it was inside or outside the logic model or collaborative structure.

Analysis: Leaving out issues (important to residents). The *Making Immigration Health Policy* vignette exemplified a third way of excluding, *leaving out issues*. In this example, immigration was left out despite being identified by residents as a root cause of all health issues.

Immigration was left out for a number of reasons. The foundation and organizations created a planning process that was focused on narrowing down outcomes, but residents and

allied organizations wanted to *expand* the plan, logic model and foundation's definition of health to integrate immigration reform into Central City's plan. Even though the plan-writing consultant worked with residents and organizations to write an immigration reform logic model, the foundation said they could not fund it directly because they were a health foundation. Ultimately immigration reform was left out as an issue, because it did not fall within the scope of the foundation's definition of health. This sent a message to the effect that even though residents and many organizations felt that immigration issues were critical to the community's health and this was to be a resident-driven initiative, the foundation had the ultimate ability to determine what work could receive funding and what could be done under the umbrella of the initiative.

Leaving out issues important to residents also occurred at other times. During Steering Committee and Workgroup meetings, residents and organizations frequently shared issues of immediate or personal concern. Sometimes these issues were brought up in relation to a topic on the agenda, but often these issues were not specifically on the agenda. Meeting organizers and facilitators usually struggled to integrate these comments or testimonies into the meeting and instead would regularly redirect the individual and group back to the agenda, leaving that person's (or those persons') issues disconnected from the work as well as unresolved and delegitimized.

In the *Making immigration health policy* vignette and in the background, I described how the foundation circumscribed a broad definition of health, but this did not include immigration reform. Residents and organizations were able to share their ideas, but these ideas were initially not enough to change the Foundation's discourse on immigration. The foundation's inability to take direct action to support immigration-related work at this time disconnected health issues as defined by the foundation, from health issues as defined by the Central City community.

4. Leaving out residents and their experiences.

Vignette: More than statistics and agendas. In the couple months following the two-day training, the steering committee began to meet regularly. The Steering Committee focused on continued community outreach to make more people aware and involved in the initiative, and elicit more input into what should be prioritized in the Central City plan. The fiscal agent organized community forums at schools, churches, and other institutions.

Steering Committee meetings were held twice a month, once at night and once during the day. The room was set up so that steering committee members sat around a set of tables in the shape of a 'U' in the front of the room. The fiscal agent would facilitate the meeting in front of the 'U'. In the back of the room, behind the 'U,' were rows of seats where non-steering committee members sat.

The meeting agendas were ambitious. They began with brief introductions of name and organizational affiliation for steering committee members only. Then there were a number of agenda items to do with the progress on the plan and logic model. These were mostly reports in which steering committee members stood at the front of the room and updated the steering committee on what their subcommittee was working on, or how an outreach event went. At the end, there was time for comments for non-steering committee members.

At the end of meeting in the beginning of September, a resident stood up and said, "I am saddened because we are repeating, repeating, repeating. What happens is there is a triangle that forms and the residents are at the end. The residents should be first so the preparers can take the input from the community and get the results from that. We have young people who are killing each other right now...have you taken the time to ask the parents what *they* think? No, instead we are coming from the organization's point of view. We [residents] are intelligent and not afraid to work, we do what we can to survive. How many of you have actually gone into the community and gotten to know the community?!"

You are looking at us like a statistic. But working together with the community will make the money a *good* investment. The community will show its gratitude by working hard. Our children are so important to us and we only want the best for them. Please take a humanistic approach to this when making such big decisions that will affect us for the next 10 years. We are not sure of our children's lives right now because of the economy, jobs, and violence. With respect, I ask that we take action and that we really begin to work!" (Steering Committee Notes September 1, 2009).

Eduardo said, "stop being so strict with an agenda, we are talking about our lives and OUR community. The power should rest with the community residents." Another resident expressed that "the Steering Committee needs to come out and meet the community, get to know the community." Residents expressed frustration that the organizations did not know the community. The meetings were a waste of their time. One resident expressed a common complaint that there was "too much process and not enough action." When residents brought up an immediate need, in response, the foundation representative or meeting facilitator reiterated that the initiative was a policy and systems change.

A couple months later, as a result of continued frustration about the process and tension between residents and organizations, residents created their own discussion group. A resident stated that residents were not included in the Steering Committee discussion: "there are two conversations, one by the residents and one by the organizations." For the remainder of the planning year, the Steering Committee divided into three sub-steering committees: organizations, adult residents and youth residents. Each group met separately to discuss the content of the outcomes and upcoming decisions. Then the three groups reconvened to make decisions.

Analysis: Leaving out residents and their experiences. The *More than statistics and agendas* vignette conveys residents' frustration with organizers' loyalty to meeting agendas

as well as the foundation's agenda, policy and systems change. The resident above felt that the "residents' point of view" was missing or marginalized. Residents often shared serious concerns and situations about their lives, their neighborhood and their city as a way of understanding, explaining and connecting with the outcomes. It was a way to connect with the very complicated and ambiguous work going on in the initiative. Moreover, on a daily basis, residents were dealing with very challenging situations that this initiative was seeking to change. But when residents shared their experiences, facilitators often did not know how to incorporate these comments into the conversation, instead dismissing them as being off-topic—related to immediate needs, and not to policy and systems change.

The foundation was willing to fund only policy and systems change work, not programs and services. This was a change from what the foundation had funded previously, as well as what most foundations typically fund. A foundation representative explained that the policy or systems-level approach would have a permanent impact, because policy and systems changes addressed the root causes rather than providing Band-Aid solutions through services and programs. In practice, the foundation and organizers took actions that dismissed residents, residents' experiences of the failing policies and systems, and residents' potential energy to work on and address urgent needs from the collaborative work.

The resident's assertion that the organizations should, "come out and meet the community... we are not a statistic" signaled frustration with organizations talking *about* the community through inadequate measures like statistics. The residents' words above also signal residents' diagnosis that Central City residents and their lived experience were missing from discussions of "the community;" the processes, agendas and rules about systems and policy change were a part of the problem.

5. Dismissing alternative understandings and approaches to problems and solutions.

Vignette: Roots and Branches. During the implementation period of the initiative, a group of nine organizations funded to carry out the civic engagement and community empowerment outcome designed a root-cause activity to select an advocacy campaign to work on collectively. They planned to do activities with residents in response to the complaint that they did not work with residents during their first grant-cycle. Root causes are in contrast to causal factors or more proximate causes (Kraft & Furlong, 2012). Often, root-cause analysis traces a visible symptom or statistic, like a high obesity rate, back to a policy, system or process that creates the conditions for the respective symptom or statistic to arise. The group of organizations had come up with 14 potential campaigns that the initiative could work on. They recruited two residents to co-facilitate the activity and invited residents to attend so that residents were the ones who selected the campaign. The organizations created a large paper cutout of a tree to help facilitate the meeting.

Nina, one of the organizational representatives announced that the group would go campaign by campaign and discuss where to tape each campaign on the tree. One of the campaigns was ‘rent control.’ The group could not come to a decision on where to put this one so the facilitator suggested coming back to it later. Oliver said, “I think it goes hand-in-hand with fair wages. They complement one another.” Serena said, “I agree with Oliver, if we control the rent but at the same time if salaries don’t improve you’ll be in the same place, if the rent is frozen or capped, it doesn’t matter if your wages don’t increase.” Another resident, Louis said, “even if we have a rent control, [the] ambition of owners is not going to stop. Who agrees?”

Silvia, an organizational representative with topical expertise said, “sorry to do this to you but ... this program, it should be a [trunk] problem because the root is bad living conditions. I don’t know if this makes sense?” Nina placed it on the trunk.

At this point all the campaigns were placed somewhere on the tree. Nina asked everyone to make sure they were ok with where everything was and if anything needed to be moved. After a few minutes, Nina asked, “does anyone want to move anything? Do we all agree?” No one spoke up. She continued, “So now the next activity is with Margarita.”

Margarita began, “for my activity we will go ahead and deal with [just] the root causes, we want to make sure this is something that will affect different policies and affect the rest of the items. Before we move on, any changes?” In her section of the agenda, the group would now only look at the campaigns they placed at the roots.

Lawrence, a resident, clarified, “Are you saying we will just look at roots?”

Margarita responded, “Yes, because we want to push things forward, and cannot just focus on surface problems. That is why we will work from roots.”

Lawrence responded “I agree that’s how it should work, but if we have a simple problem, and we make it a community issue and bring the whole community behind it, like police oversight, or after-school programs. These are close to all of us and we are emotional about them... as opposed to just school board elections. If we go up the tree a little, we can draw more people in and accomplish the roots a little easier. Rather than major overhaul.”

Olga responded that the “workgroups will attack some of these [campaigns on the branches and leaves].” And she clarified that “People working on these [root causes], with civic engagement [grantee organizations], are just focusing on roots.”

Analysis: Dismissing alternative understandings and approaches to problems and solutions. In the *Roots and Branches* vignette, residents’ understandings of the problem were dismissed. Oliver and Serena stated that they saw the rent control problem not as a branch or

a root, but as interconnected with other issues. Their description provided an opportunity to engage with a different perspective on the rent control problem. Instead, Silvia, the organizer, interjected and told residents, Oliver and Serena, how they should be thinking about rent control – that it was a trunk problem and that bad living conditions is the root.

In this vignette, Silvia fit the campaigns on the tree and excluded the residents' understanding of the problem. Thus, rather than using the exercise as a way to engage the residents and their experience and understandings of the problem, the exercise was used as a way of teaching the residents a certain way of understanding the problems, and indicating that her way of understanding was the right way.

Lawrence made a similar point to Serena and Oliver when he suggested addressing issues on the branches as a way of affecting changes at the root. Lawrence was talking about actions that the residents can take now to affect their living environment. "If we have a simple problem... like police oversight, or after-school programs... we can draw more people in and accomplish the roots a little easier rather than a major overhaul." But Margarita said just before his question, 'We will just focus on the roots' and "We want to push things forward, and cannot just focus on surface problems. That is why we will work from the roots." The focus on "just roots" severed connections residents made to other issues. And by focusing on "just roots" the organizers excluded Lawrence's approach to addressing problems. By ruling that such actions were out of bounds, the organizers delegitimized alternative approaches to addressing problems. This process and the initiative writ large aimed to be resident-driven, but these actions implied that the participants in the meeting, residents, neither were in control nor shared control of Central City Initiative's agenda.

6. Disconnecting ongoing and preexisting work and relationships.

Vignette: Being 'true' to resident-driven change (early in the initiative). During the first half of the planning year, in a Steering Committee Meeting, Serena, a resident and

community organizer in Central City, and Harriet, another resident, stood up. Serena spoke in Spanish and asked for some more time before the next community forum that the fiscal agency had scheduled. Serena wanted more time to do outreach with residents to obtain more input from neighborhood residents about the forum to be held at their local school. Harriet translated this to the group. The forum would be an opportunity to share information about the initiative and gather more resident input about what residents wanted to see change in the community.

In a follow-up email to the Steering Committee, Harriet expressed concern that the Steering Committee and Lillian had not listened to Serena. Lillian was the representative of the Fiscal Agency and lead person convening and supporting the Central City Community Change Initiative's planning process. Harriet also wrote that Serena was concerned that Lillian had asked mothers at the school to do the majority of the work for the forum without providing them with the necessary training to do so; she felt that the mothers should *participate* in this process, *not* be put to work.

Harriet explained that with another school they took the appropriate "time to ensure that we got involvement from the neighborhood because in the past our residents have not been well represented, either by choice or due to lack of outreach." She explained that the school where the upcoming meeting was to be held, "to us, is one of those 'battleground' victories that we would have liked to have. We would have liked more time to outreach in the community and get more community involvement." Harriet sent the email because she could not attend the steering committee meeting that day, and she wanted the steering committee members to know about these concerns. She ended by writing in underlined text, "Whoever translates for Serena needs to voice the concerns that she has and be true to what she is saying—Please." At the meeting, Serena voiced her concern again, but Lillian proceeded with hosting the event at the earlier date, not allowing Serena the time to work with parents

from the school beforehand in the way she felt was necessary to build relationships with them and adequately prepare them to host the outreach event.

Analysis: Disconnecting ongoing and preexisting work and relationships. In the *Being 'true' to resident-driven change* vignette, Lillian did not consider the history of the relationships with the school. Lillian was likely feeling pressure to keep moving forward and to complete more outreach in Central City. A preliminary group of organizations selected Lillian's organization to be the fiscal agent, and the Foundation then began funding this organization to shepherd the planning year process. Thus, Lillian was often in the spotlight.

Serena and Harriet tried to slow down the outreach process in Central City because this school would be a "battleground victory." Serena explained that the relationship with this school was very important, because in the past, the residents and neighborhood had not been engaged enough in community events. Serena and Harriet wanted to connect with the school first and then introduce the initiative, rather than introduce the *initiative* first and cull input from parents without spending time getting to know the parents and school. Despite the advice to slow down the process, Lillian did not consider the history of exclusion important enough to change her plans, despite Serena and Harriet's advice to do so. Instead, Lillian went on with the meeting as originally scheduled.

At this point in the initiative, the planning process, schedule and agendas were organized by Lillian, as the representative of the fiscal agent assigned to the initiative. Thus, Lillian was in a position to make decisions to move forward with meetings. As the primary representative for the fiscal agent, she had a lot of responsibility, and was trying to do a lot of outreach in a relatively short amount of time. Serena and Harriet recommended making these changes in the process because they were concerned not only about saying they had done outreach at this school, but also about the relationships they were trying to build by having this meeting. In this situation, Lillian made the decision, which signaled that following the

schedule and doing outreach was more important than how outreach was done, and the relations that would come out of it.

Often, new initiatives overlook existing relations and work, frustrating residents who see programs and funders come and go. In Central City, a coalition of residents and organizations worked on community development issues for decades. As a resident said in the two-day training described in *Voting for a Real Safety*, “Our community is organized, energized and has been doing “community change” for decades” (Central City Residents Define and Discover). But the Foundation carried out its initiative separately, even though many of the same organizations and residents were involved in both, as well as other community change efforts. A foundation representative reflected that it would have been better to invest in existing resident organizing and have residents list and examine their priorities, and then bring in systems leaders to help pursue those goals. He explained that the foundation’s attempt to push both of those things at once confused things.

So far, I have explained six different features of exclusion I found in my research and presented these through short vignettes from my fieldwork. I showed how residents and residents’ ways of knowing were excluded by organizers’ actions. They were left out, marginalized, or incorporated but on disadvantageous terms, which ultimately privileged organizational understandings of who and what mattered, and what constituted expertise or legitimate forms of expertise and activity.

Across the vignettes and the vignette analyses, exclusion, consistent with my definition, was enacted in ways that prevented connections. I also found that connections were prevented in ways that preserved the structural advantage of individuals and organizations. This meant actions that excluded also affirmed there was a “right way” to act. Also, these actions often involved residents as participants, but required that they follow the organizers’ rules and plans for the meeting.

Practicing exclusion by preventing connections. Across the vignettes and analysis so far, there is a common thread: exclusion was enacted in ways that prevented collaborative members and potential members from building connections between one another, between issues, and across time. Creating connections across people and issues and over time is the definition of practicing inclusion (Quick & Feldman, 2011).

Preventing Connections between People. Organizational representatives' actions—specifically, the way they structured processes and spaces—prevented connections between residents and organizations. For example, as shown in the *More than statistics and agendas* vignette, the meeting room was set up in a way that separated the Steering Committee members from other attendees, who were called “observers.” Other research finds that this room setup makes those in the back of the room “uncomfortable” and makes it “nearly impossible to hear and follow the conversation” (Zagofsky, 2013, p. 58). This spatial design discouraged interactions between the steering committee and observers. The communication that did occur was primarily didactic, from a person at the front of the room to the steering committee. Most of the meeting agenda was dedicated to this type of communication, called “report outs.” The organization of the space and the agenda left little time or space for other modes of interaction.

In the same vignette, *More than statistics and agendas*, the steering committee decided to create three sub-steering committees. While this was effective for helping these groups move through the planning process quicker, once the planning year was over and they came back together as a big group to implement the plan, residents and organizations did not have any practice working together. The planning year was structured in such a way that it allowed work to get done, but it did not strengthen the connections between organizations and residents.

Preventing Connections between issues. Organizational representatives' actions also prevented the formation of connections between issues. In *Roots and Branches*, residents made connections between and across issues located at the leaf, branch and trunk, but the facilitators told the group that they would just focus on the roots. In *Voting for a Real Definition of Safety*, residents connected the issue of safety and violence prevention with atypical issues such as fear of deportation. They also made a connection between the police and safety. They did not discuss the typical role police are supposed to play as stewards of community safety, but instead stated that police and the distrust of police were main components of the safety problem in Central City. Organizers did not seize these connections as opportunities to co-create and redefine Safety. Alternatively, they prevented connections to different understandings of safety by executing a predetermined decision-making process, and moving to a vote.

Preventing connections over time. Organizational representatives' actions also communicated that they were not concerned with the work or relationships that preceded the Central City Community Change Initiative. Lillian disregarded concerns brought up by Serena and Harriet about the preexisting tarnished relations with this school and their desire to take the time to build relationships with this school. One Central City resident explained at the two-day training described in the *Being true to resident driven change* vignette: "Our community is organized, energized and has been doing "community change" for decades" (Central City Residents Define and Discover).

The foundation also did not connect with ongoing work, but started their initiative from scratch. Research and interventions came and went in Central City. Connecting with ongoing efforts might have jeopardized the control the foundation had over the initiative. At the same time, it would have complicated issues of accountability and ownership, making the foundation's successes less direct, visible and legitimating.

While the foundation aimed for the Central Community Change Initiative to be participatory, a closer look explains how it continued to enact exclusion. Foundation initiatives that require community participation reflect shifts in philanthropy over the past decade to support Community Based Participatory Research in response to disappointing results from more traditional research and intervention efforts (Knickman & Schroeder, 2000; Minkler et al., 2003). This “results-oriented philanthropy” recognized the role of communities as going beyond informed consent, to include the co-creation and co-production of community interventions (Minkler et al., 2003). While the foundation, and others following this trend, aimed to have residents play a central role within the confines of their initiative, they were not able to connect with previous and ongoing work in Central City. The foundation’s actions demonstrated its ability to intervene in a community, but also its inability to connect with the community and its history, which are proven resources for more sustainable community change.

Practicing exclusion by structuring advantage. Per my definition in this dissertation, structures consist of resources as well as rules or schemas (Sewell, 1992). Structures are created through ongoing actions (Bourdieu, 1990; Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011; Giddens, 1984) and how they are used or acted upon is what brings them to life (Feldman & Khademian, 2007; Sewell, 1992). In the next few paragraphs of this sub-section of findings, I describe the structures that allowed exclusion to endure even when organizational actors took actions to facilitate participation, and thus suggest how actions that enable participation also can structure exclusion.

Connections structure exclusion. In the previous sub-section, I suggested that practices illustrated a host of missed opportunities to leverage people, issues and the community’s history as resources. They also established or reinforced norms for community engagement practice.

Prior to the community change initiative, the connections between residents and organizations could be characterized by their relationship to one another. Residents and organizations mostly interacted with one another as service recipient and provider, or program participant and outreach worker, or targets of outreach or intervention and intervention specialists or implementers. Some organizations worked with residents as community organizers on campaigns related to their organization's mission (i.e. affordable housing or citizenship). Residents did not have a direct relationship with the foundation. Many of the nonprofits in Central City had established relationships with one another and with the Foundation. They had worked together previously in other collaborative and coalition-based efforts, and many had received funds from the foundation previously. The previous relationships provided organizations the advantage of understanding formal and informal foundation rules for being a grantee (i.e. logic models are a requirement for funding).

As mentioned in the background and vignettes, the initiative began with the premise that the foundation would bring system leaders and residents to the same table to create a plan. However, simply bringing people together at the same table disregarded the differing social positions and histories between people and groups. Social positions provided knowledge of different rules, access to different kinds and amounts of resources (Sewell, 1992, p. 21) as well as access to certain power codes (i.e. kinds of information or styles of expression) (Bryson et al., 2013). Thus, the foundation's actions in the beginning of the Central City Change Initiative put residents in a situation where residents came to the table, but at a disadvantage; they set up the meeting and subsequent process in a way that made it advantageous to possess knowledge of certain rules, and access to certain resources associated with the organizations position.

The foundation's actions created an environment that facilitated residents' exclusion. They charged a fee, which made it difficult for those not sponsored by organizations to attend and begin to build relationships with the foundation and other future collaborative members. The meeting spaces and agendas also reinforced the impression that the organizers were the intervention experts and implementers, and residents and their knowledge were recipients of information. The admission fee and meeting set-up resemble features of the definition of exclusion, *preventing someone from taking a specific action or being part of a group*. In these instances, the foundation's actions and the structures these actions created stifled residents' and non-steering committee members' participation and actions.

The foundation also told each fiscal agent to select 3-5 of the 10 outcomes. The organizations were familiar with such expectations by foundations, but residents typically have less experience interacting with foundations and their expectations. The consequences of narrowing down, for organizations, included bringing the organization closer to receiving funding, because the foundation was closer to releasing funds according to the prioritized outcomes. But for residents, narrowing down represented a potential omission of important issues. This action resembles the following exclusionary practices that constitute the definition of exclusion: *leaving out or not including something and thinking that (something, such as a possibility) is not worth attention*. The foundation also required residents and organizations to come to the same table without providing what Minkler et al. (2003) described as adequate front-end relationship-building time for residents and organizations.

The actions of organizers' (e.g. foundation representatives, nonprofit grantee recipients, meeting facilitators) represented and upheld what one resident called the "organization's point of view" (quote from *More than statistics and agendas* Vignette, Steering Committee Meeting Notes September 1, 2009). The vignettes show that actions included "calling a vote on priorities before the policy problem had been co-defined with

residents,” and “going forward with a scheduled meeting despite residents’ requests to not do so.” These actions reified organizational rules and resources, such as abiding by a predetermined plan or decision-making process. These actions that advantaged organizational rules and resources excluded residents and their ways of knowing, and prevented connections between people and issues and across time.

(More) resources that structure exclusion. In the vignettes, collaborative members created and used an assortment of resources to enact exclusion. Resources included items commonly accepted as such, including money, funding and grants as well as social resources like connections and previous relationships, as described above.

Funding was a highly divisive resource as organizational representatives, facilitators of the meeting, and residents varied in the amount of funding they received for the work they did in the Central City Change Initiative. Many organizational representatives attended the first meeting described in *Planning for Participation* for the possibility of funding. As one informant told me, “all of a sudden everyone was in the health business” (May, Interview April 3, 2014). Notably, most of these organizations were nonprofits that survived on donations and grant funds. Foundation funds were also used to offer stipends for residents’ participation, adult and youth, on the steering committee. But these stipends did not compare with the amounts of money given to organizations that paid for programming as well as salaries. As one foundation representative explained, hiring residents was not the purpose of the initiative (Rica Interview, December 3, 2014).

The discrepancy in dollar amounts given to organizations versus residents communicated the pragmatic reality of traditional foundation funding streams, that requires nonprofits to be the fiscal agent (Heydemann & Hammack, 2009; INCITE!, 2009). This traditional funding of nonprofit organizations conveyed a message that change comes from organizations, and also communicated that the value of residents’ time and work was unequal

to that of organizations. This message contradicted the message of the foundation and the Central City Collaborative that “this is a resident-driven initiative.” In terms of money, the rules and norms of grant distribution and the structuring of foundations by these resources and rules continued to privilege organizations, and despite a commitment to participation, this perpetuated the exclusion of residents.

Another prevalent and related resource was people’s relative status or position in the collaborative.² Funding was an important part of status, but status also has other features such as organizational position (i.e. executive director or organizer), expertise (i.e. public health, housing, or poverty) and position in the meeting (i.e. facilitator, note-taker, steering committee member or observer). In *Roots and Branches*, when Silvia, an organizational representative said, “sorry to do this to you but ... this program, it should be a [trunk] problem because the root is bad living conditions. I don’t know if this makes sense?” Silvia drew on her position as an (funded) organizer of the Roots and Branches activity as well as “topical expert” and Nina affirmed her authority by placing the campaign on the tree accordingly. In the Roots and Branch activity, organizations enacted their structural position and excluded residents’ issues and problem-definitions, preventing residents from shaping the process and the outcome, a key feature of inclusion (Quick and Feldman 2011).

Across the vignettes, organizations’ actions used resources ranging from material resources like money, meeting spaces and meeting agendas, to less-tangible resources like connections, social position, status, and logic models, to constrain rather than enable residents’ inclusion. In *Voting on Real Safety*, the hired facilitator for the two-day training inferred from this position that he would design a prioritization process to prioritize a subset of outcomes as the foundation suggested, and then carry this out. As Feldman and Khademian (2007) point out, there are many ways to carry out public processes like public

² When I refer to status or social position; I do not infer that a person occupies only one social position, but as Mol (1999) describes social realities as multiple, people can and do occupy multiple social positions at once and over their lifetime. And as Sewell (1992) explains, these positions are relative.

hearings. The facilitator could have acted differently: he could have used his authority, as Denhardt and Denhardt (2000) describe, to serve and not steer the group through a prioritization process. Instead, he enacted a prioritization process that resembled exclusive modes of planning that are not open to change.

The *Roots and Branches* vignette also demonstrates that certain styles of expression constituted resources in their own right. By resources, I mean that these styles were not only expressed, but also received, acted upon and thus legitimated by collaborative members. By contrast, excluded forms of expression, primarily synonymous with residents' lived experience or ideas, were not taken up and carried forward in the actions of collaborative members. Instead, residents' understandings or alternative approaches to problems were dismissed or left out as possibilities for future action.

Often, organizational representatives drew on their organizational resources and missed opportunities to engage with residents' resources. In *Voting for Real Safety*, the facilitator drew on his own expertise, the predetermined decision-making process, and the outcomes, which precluded opportunities for residents to shape the topic before they voted it. The facilitator also assumed that there was an agreed-upon interpretation of the foundation's outcome, or even that Central City would use the foundations' outcomes in their work plan. In the *Making Immigration Healthy Policy*, residents' knowledge of immigration reform as important for achieving all outcomes was initially left out, because it did not fit the pre-drafted logic models based on the 10 outcomes. During this time, the logic model was emphasized as a resource that needed to be used. The collaborative members' actions also reflect efforts to reconcile the foundation and the residents' definition of health. Ultimately, these two could not be reconciled. Immigration made it into the community plan, but was not immediately funded by the foundation because it was not considered related to health. This example demonstrates how collaborative members' actions reserve advantages for certain

ways of knowing, and that these actions are interrelated with other resources such as money, status, and planning tools (i.e. logic models).

Rules/Schemas that structure exclusion. Structural advantage was manifest when organizations planned for collaborative meetings in ways that made sense for organizations, but not for residents. The *Planning for Participation* vignette exemplifies the common organizational practice to charge attendance fees for events in order to cover basic costs for venue and food. This action advantaged organizations that would be able to pay the fee, and often this was taken for granted by attendees. At the same time, these actions disadvantaged residents, because it required them take many more actions to attend. Residents had to find out about the meeting, figure out how to cover their fees, and then potentially figure out how to take time off work in order to attend.

As mentioned above, organizational representatives, because of their previous relationship with the foundation, were aware of and proficient in navigating the foundation's rules. These rules placed residents at a disadvantage in several regards. Firstly, they disadvantaged residents because they did not have any experience with these rules, although they may have been informed or unknowing subjects of previous foundation interventions. Secondly, the foundation rules varied from principle to practices. In principle, the foundation said that they wanted the Central City Change Initiative to be resident-driven. But in practice, the foundation and organizations took actions supporting a schema wherein the foundation was in control and residents felt they needed to ask for permission from the foundation first (Serena Interview August 23, 2013). Organizations needed to acquire funding from the foundation to survive, so they would attend meetings and take other actions to meet these formal and informal requirements for funding. Often, organizations moved forward with meetings or meeting agendas – even when residents were not on board with these actions.

Like the foundation, in the day-to-day meetings, facilitators enacted rules and reinforced them in ways that excluded new ideas for process and content. In *More than statistics and agendas*, a resident called out some of the taken-for-granted rules of organizations when she proposed an alternative schema, in which the steering committee would go out and meet the community. Going out to the community was not the way organizations typically came up with a plan. They usually had meetings and invited or recruited residents to come to these meetings. This unwritten but accepted approach to work privileged certain forms of knowledge and learning. She proposed this alternative schema of going out to the community so that the steering committee would learn about the most urgent issues by seeing and experiencing them first-hand and in context. This approach also offered opportunities to connect with new people, issues and the history of Central City and potentially legitimize other forms of information. A tour of Central City was organized for Steering Committee members, after which business as usual persisted. But as mentioned in the background section, a community engagement subcommittee formed and conducted door-to-door outreach, living room and school conversations to gather resident views on the plan. So even though the organizations went back to their customary meeting practices, the efforts of the subcommittee signaled that new schemas can emerge and coexist, but they may be kept marginal (at the subcommittee level) and not centralized (in the steering committee)

Structural advantage does not imply exclusion, but it can be used in ways that reinforce social inequities and exclusion. In *Being true to resident driven change*, the fiscal agent was under pressure to complete the planning process and deliver a plan to the foundation within 9 months. Thus, she wanted to complete outreach events to meet this deadline, pushing forward with the event and not slowing down as Serena and Harriet recommended. A foundation representative described this pressure when he said,

When you put the foundation in the mix and you put money in the mix then it you know, creates this power imbalance and then the grantee, you know the organization then of course has to then think about pleasing the foundation (Malcolm Interview October 30, 2013)

So organizations felt pressure from the foundation because of its position, and the foundation representatives and the foundation itself was also under the pressure of its board to make the success of their work visible in order to maintain or even elevate their status. Actions focused on connecting with ongoing and preexisting work and relationship-building would have made the foundation's work less visible and made Lillian seem inefficient, in that she would then be taking a long time to complete her tasks, putting their structural positions and status in jeopardy. Thus, in these as well as other instances, organizations and the foundation engaged their structural advantage to benefit their goals, regardless of residents' goals.

Iterative analysis of the collaborative members' actions demonstrates that these actions constitute structures, but also that these actions are constrained and enabled by these structures. I found that the practices that constituted the six features of exclusion were made possible by creating and using resources and rules that confer advantage on the foundation and organizations and their ways of knowing. The advantageous nature of certain practices, especially practices focused on designing and implementing planning and decision-making processes, also represent practices that maintained disciplinary forms of power (Foucault, 1986; Lukes, 1974).

Discussion

In this discussion section, I explore the relationship between my definition of exclusion and other understandings of exclusion found in the literature. I also discuss the theoretical and practical implications of my understanding of exclusion for community-

focused collaboration, planning and policymaking processes.

My definition of exclusion, the prevention of connections between people, issues, and previous work, is based on the exclusionary practices described above in the findings section; it extends the existing literature on exclusion and inclusion. These exclusionary practices were: *Preventing people from being part of a group; Preventing people from taking a specific action; Leaving out issues (important to residents); Leaving out residents and their ideas; Dismissing people's understandings of or approaches to problems, and Disconnecting ongoing or pre-existing work or relationships*. Such practices represent efforts to prevent connections between people, between issues, and between current initiatives and previous work. These practices relied on and solidified various structural advantages that excluded people and their ways of knowing. Structural advantages ranged from tangible resources, like foundation funding, to more subtle rules and resources, like awareness, experience, and familiarity with knowledge and norms common to the foundation and other organizations.

The literature establishes exclusion as a multi-faceted concept and suggests some nuances. Recall that exclusion can entail being incorporated on singularly disadvantageous terms (Goodin, 1996) as well as being totally left out of a system (Ryan, 2009). Often, the focus of exclusion literature is on *who* is left out or unfavorably incorporated. My definition of exclusion starts primarily with the exclusion of residents, as this was a frequent form of exclusion. This form of exclusion is well-articulated and motivates participatory approaches to research and practice (Minkler, 2012). However, I also demonstrate that exclusion is more clearly distinguished through practices.

A practice orientation brings together not only actors, but also the knowledge, actions, organizations, rules and resources required and implicated in the creation of exclusion. The exclusionary practices and vignettes illustrate this. In *Leaving out issues (important to residents)*, the exclusion of immigration reform from planning and funding implicated

various actors, definitions of health, and resources such as the logic model and funding in action.

Exclusion is often evidenced through a “lack of.” Much of the literature on exclusion points to public engagement’s failure to incorporate a diverse group of participants into political processes (Ahmed & Palermo, 2010; Blackwell et al., 2012). Exclusion is often defined as a lack of input and is frequently explained by a lack of resources (i.e. time, topical knowledge, or money) or design principles (i.e. public hearings instead of one-on-one interactions between public managers and residents) (Takahashi & Smutny, 1998, cited in Bryson et al., 2013, p. 29). In contrast, the exclusionary practices described above demonstrate that exclusion can also be a lack of action; for example, Lillian did not listen to Serena and Harriet and did not delay the meeting at the school as they had requested.

It is worth noting that a lack of action or inaction is also a form of action (Fergensen, 1977) and this lack of action is consequential. In the case of *Being “true” to resident-driven change (early in the initiative)*, Harriet and Serena were frustrated that Lillian moved forward, damaging the relationship between Lillian and these residents. Her inaction communicated that organizations could move forward despite opposition from residents. It also ran counter to the purported resident-driven commitments of the collaborative. This inaction also used and reinforced Lillian’s advantages as the fiscal agent with regard to her ability to move forward and make decisions independent of residents. Inactions were accompanied by actions which constituted exclusionary practices. In *Being “true” to resident-driven change (early in the initiative)*, these actions and inactions constituted the exclusionary practice of *Disconnecting ongoing and preexisting work and relationships*.

Exclusion is sometimes explained as the result of a lack of resources and inadequate participatory design. A practice lens acknowledges the importance of resources and design, but these elements are situated (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011) and relative (Sewell, 1992);

their meanings are dependent on how they are enacted (Feldman & Khademian, 2007). In *Voting for Real Safety*, residents suggested a definition of safety based on their expertise on real safety in Central City. The facilitator then took actions reflecting the common planning practice of predetermining decision-making processes, and he also drew on his position as a hired consultant. These actions prevented connection and engagement with residents' knowledge on safety. This situation can be described by observing that the residents' understanding was simply left out, or that the residents lacked decision-making power. While this is accurate, however, it does not tell the whole story: a practice analysis of the situation reveals not only that which was left out (residents' knowledge), but also that which was left *in* and privileged (a predetermined voting process) and the actions taken that made exclusion possible.

Exclusion also focuses on the margins and boundaries that keep certain people out, as well as keeping others just inside or just outside the boundaries (Goodin, 1996). My work acknowledges the importance of boundaries, but focuses less on exclusion as the creation or policing of boundaries. Instead, building on Quick and Feldman's (2011) definition of inclusion as the creation of connections between people, across issues, and over time, I show that exclusion is also about preventing connections that bridge boundaries between people, issues, and time periods. Quick and Feldman (2011) define inclusion as an orientation to managing boundaries in "continuously open-ended ways in order to keep the community expanding" (p. 285). My findings likewise indicate that exclusion is not only a result of boundaries that exclude; it is also induced when boundaries are managed in ways that inhibit the expansion of communities by hindering connections between people, among issues and over time. For example, charging a fee was an action that made it difficult for those not sponsored by organizations to attend and begin to build relationships with the foundation and other future collaborative members. The facilitator's move to vote without discussion about

the definition of safety exemplifies the type of actions preventing connections between issues. The facilitator's decision fostered uncertainty as to whether fear of deportation and distrust of the police would be included in the collaborative plan for community safety.

Exclusion also implies organizational practice as a form of governance and control (Foucault, 1986, 1991; Ryan, 2009), which enlists or silences diverse voices and ways of knowing. For example, in *More than statistics and agenda*, residents did not want to be enlisted in a process which only took place in meeting rooms: "The Steering Committee needs to come out and meet the community, get to know the community." In the literature, Cohen (1985) explains that individuals who were once explicitly excluded from society in prison and asylums remained excluded even after decarceration, due to new modes of self-management and surveillance located in the community, such as community psychology (cited in Ryan, 2009, p. 361). Similarly, in my theorization of exclusion, exclusion was sometimes obvious, e.g. residents not being invited to a meeting; however, exclusion also happened in more subtle ways, as Cohen (1985) described, through organizational practice and disciplinary modes of power. Therefore, exclusion cannot be entirely defined by location in terms of a boundary separating the inside from the outside, because organizational practice and disciplinary modes of power blur this distinction.

I have shown that public engagement processes often interpret exclusion as a lack of input opportunities and a choice to keep certain actors out of a political community. I have also demonstrated that exclusion is much more than a lack of opportunities for input. Exclusion is a practice jointly produced by various actors, actions, resources, rules, and structures.

The nuances of exclusion that constitute my theory of exclusion demonstrate and affirm its complex nature. This complexity explains why exclusion is a challenge to address and can persist despite commitments to participation.

The literature offers many analyses of the persistence of exclusion in connection with macro-social structures such as gender, income, and education; it is sometimes assumed that these are deterministic in their relationship with exclusive outcomes. By taking a view of structure informed by practice theory (Bourdieu, 1990; Giddens, 1984), my theorization of exclusion makes actions visible as the micro-foundations of structures. It also calls attention to more subtle structures, including material and symbolic structures, organizational rules, norms, and human and nonhuman resources (Sewell, 1992) that facilitate exclusion.

Rules of organizational practice such as creating and executing predetermined decision-making processes function to exclude residents and their ways of knowing. Social movement scholars Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) show that the rules used by an institution in order to govern often disadvantage certain actors and exclude them from the polity. Bryson et al. (2013) talk about acceptable forms of information and styles of expression. These reflect what Scott (1995) called regulative and normative rules, which were enacted as collaborative members excluded certain forms of information and styles of expression.

Across these vignettes, organizers' actions and rules often constrained residents' actions. These actions and rules placed residents in what Frye (2007) called the double bind. She describes "[t]he double bind [as] situations in which options are reduced to a very few and all of them expose one to penalty, censure or deprivation" (p. 155). In this case, options for action within the collaborative were constrained by the rules of organizational practice and suggestions for alternative actions were often ignored and therefore excluded.

Organizational actions and rules required that residents sort their ideas in some way—for instance, by outcome area or by where they might fit on a root-cause-analysis tree. Montoya (2013) discusses this forced sorting as the fabrication of boundaries within the ecologies of life and hardships that residents experience in their everyday lives (Montoya,

2013, p. S49). These actions, and the rules invoked by these actions, forced decisions between important issues, e.g. between deportation and safety and between immigration and health.

Organizational rules like *sticking to agenda* seem relatively innocuous until situated in practice as seen in the vignettes. This organizational rule demonstrates how the meaning of a rule (or structure) depends on how it is used (Feldman & Khaedmian, 2007). In this case, the *sticking to agenda* rule excluded residents and their ways of knowing. In collaborative contexts that include participants who do not have an organizational point of view, rules taken for granted in organizational contexts, like the *sticking to agenda* rule, can be exclusive. Such rules can serve to advantage organizations in their goals (e.g., completing the agenda, selecting a campaign, accomplishing their work plan, and securing foundation funding), but may exclude residents and their goals (e.g., addressing urgent needs for their community).

The advantageous nature of certain practices resembles Foucault's (1986) notion of disciplinary power, in that certain rules and practices become normalized. This normalization and integration into practice of such rules signal what Ryan (2009) called a disciplinary apparatus, wherein residents' input and participation was allowed and welcomed, but *not* included. Residents' input was included on disadvantageous terms (Goodin, 1996) and was unable to change the process (Healey, 2003), which made it impossible for the process and content to be co-produced (Quick & Feldman, 2011). Instead, organizations upheld rules and required residents to format their input according to organizational rules. Ryan (2009) describes the consequences of such governing practices of exclusion for defining categories of employability and dependency (p. 360). Likewise, in my vignettes of exclusion, the governing practices of exclusion circumscribed categories that represented who was setting

the agenda for the Central City Change Initiative; who was making the decisions; and how those decisions were being made.

My conclusions do not assert that organizational rules *always* create disadvantage and exclude; instead, I highlight the significance of how the rules are used, and how the structural advantage constituted or conferred by the rules constitute is used. Exclusion is not a fixed state of being inside or outside the polity. It is, as Sewell (1992) described, “profoundly temporal.” Actions as the micro-foundations of social structures suggest potential for more inclusive practices. Nevertheless, these actions are constrained and enable by structures, which have a tendency to endure. Actions and inactions that constituted exclusionary practices in the CC-CCI context also co-existed and combined with other actions and inactions to produce inclusion, which I will discuss in subsequent chapters. This reflects practice theory’s rejection of dualisms as a way of theorizing (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011). Thus, exclusion and inclusion are not dichotomous, but the way rules are implemented in action, that can make an action constitutive of exclusion or inclusion, is highly significant.

The common trope in social policy is that resource-poor individuals and communities are those who are usually socially and politically excluded. This echoes my statement above to the effect that exclusion is seen as a *deficiency*. This view rests on two inaccurate assumptions I confront in this chapter. First, people either have resources or they do not. Second, resources include more traditional advantages such as wealth, education and employment. In this chapter, drawing on practice theory, resources *become* resources because they are deployed in action. In addition, resources include material and immaterial object, concepts, and more; also, as mentioned above, they become resources based on how people use them (Feldman, 2004; Feldman & Worline, 2011).

In this chapter, building on the community-based participatory research literature that tells us communities are full of resources and assets (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993;

Minkler, 2012), I have shown via the vignettes that organizational actions and structures affirmed through those actions prevented connections to potential resources attributable to residents, such as their ways of knowing, experiences and histories. In the *making immigration health policy* vignette, collaborative members were at an impasse because of foundation expectations to address some of the outcomes and use the logic model. They interpreted these resources, the logic model and outcomes, in terms of the letter rather than the spirit of the law. They struggled to understand how to fit immigration into the logic model and when they did, initially, the foundation also could not find a way to fit immigration into their funding structure. Thus, while the logic model and outcomes were intended to be tools for each city to use in order to help collaborative members create a plan and achieve change, these resources often stood in the way of including residents, and in this case, they also prevented connection with and direct focus on the fundamental issue of immigration in Central City.

Connections are important resources for practicing exclusion. Connections between people and organizations have been shown to influence future collaboration (Powell, 1990). Connections are also well-established as important for inclusion and organizational practice (Granovetter, 1973; Powell, 1990) because these facilitate the community's capacity to continue to work together and solve future problems (Quick and Feldman, 2011). Scholars also demonstrate the impact of social connections on a variety of issues ranging from health to poverty (Putnam, 2000). In my case, I demonstrated the consequences of connections for exclusion, and my analysis of structural advantage demonstrated how actors treated their existing connections and social positions as resources to give their actions an advantage and exclude residents.

Collaboration scholars tell us that in collaborative structures, relationships should be reciprocal (O'Leary & Vij, 2012); my analysis in this chapter led me to find that actions

solidified hierarchical relations typically seen between researchers and research subjects and between citizens and politicians. Organizers remained in their roles as experienced collaborators, funders, grant-recipients, decision-makers, and service providers, and residents remained as recipients of services or instructions, and targets of intervention or change. Quick & Feldman (2011) point out that designating “designers” and “participants”—a dynamic illustrated by the meeting organizers and meeting participants in most meetings of Central City—prevents the creation of connections between these groups and prevents the possibility of opening up control of the process and content to all collaborative members (p. 284). My research shows that using meeting structures that reinforce these relationships and relative social position (Sewell, 1992) creates a favorable context for these relationships and social positions to be exploited as important resources that advantage the ‘designers’ and exclude ‘participants.’

My theoretical contributions rest on this expanded definition of exclusion and my articulation of the rules and resources that enable exclusion. While the literature on exclusion identifies its nuances, this chapter further elaborates these nuances and outlines other nuances that can emerge given new actors, actions, rules, resource and structures. I also contribute to the public management field, where there is a lack of literature on the micro-foundations of exclusion. Scholarship on inclusive citizenship suggests that by focusing on the experiences of the excluded, we can also contribute to a better understanding of inclusion (see Goodin, 1996; Kabeer, 2005).

This chapter also provides analysis that can be instructive for future and current public officials, administrations and those who work and collaborate with communities. These implications suggest ways for practitioners to be more sensitive to the consequences of their actions, but I also think that these findings can inform institutions’ efforts to structure themselves in ways that can avoid harmful exclusion.

Addressing the institutionalized exclusion I have described in this chapter could involve a host of changes, including formal rules such as adequate and flexible funds in order to support longer front-end time to build relationships (Minkler et al., 2003). This could also involve establishing practices to dissolve the boundary between “designer” and “participant” and establish new relations to facilitate collaborative members’ co-production process and outcome (Quick & Feldman, 2011, 2014). Minkler et al. (2003) also suggest “flexible, discretionary dollars or “braided funding streams,” allowing these programs the authority to fund efforts that are based on emerging community needs and are not tied to rigid preprogram budget” (p. 1212). These are just a few examples, but the possibilities, just like the practices, are dependent on where and how they are situated. They also depend on all the possible actors, actions, rules, resources and other structures that are present and shifting in multi-year cross-sector collaborations.

The consequences of ineffective participatory processes include, but are not limited to burn-out, distrust and suspicion (Aleshire, 1970; Taylor, 2003; DelliCarpini, Cook, & Jacobs, 2004; Koontz & Johnson, 2004, cited in Quick & Feldman, 2011, p. 272; Bryson et al., 2013). I show that even processes that are set up to be participatory can end in exclusion when practices prevent connections between the public, organizations and politicians. My effort to understand exclusion in practice aims to contribute to a longstanding conversation about persistent exclusion and shed new light on this concept for theory and practice.

Conclusion

In this dissertation chapter I showed *how* exclusion was created and recreated in practice, *how* these practices centered on the prevention of connections, and *how* these connections play a significant role in producing exclusion, in a way that continues to leave out residents and their ways of knowing by structuring advantage.

This dissertation chapter revealed *how* people enact exclusion, the relationships that are prevented, and the structural advantage that is reified through practices of exclusion. In this chapter, I provided a theory of exclusion grounded in micro-practices of everyday life to show *how exclusion continues to be enacted* despite environments intended to promote participation and inclusion and well-intentioned, highly-skilled and motivated actors. Thus, exclusion is not necessarily a set of deliberative actions. This explanation is based on how relationships and structural advantage are enacted and the resources they draw upon. This expanded understanding of exclusion provides important contributions to the community engagement literature that has extensively studied inclusion, but under-theorizes exclusion and attributes it deterministically to structural advantage. This chapter also provides important features that practitioners can look for and engage with to try and be more inclusive. Given that exclusion can be both deliberative and intentional, as well as also unintentional and reflective of structural advantages and taken-for-granted organizational practice, it is not enough to conclude that practitioners can and should receive better training and develop better plans to avoid exclusion. Instead, this chapter provides evidence of accidental and institutionalized exclusion. This evidence suggests practitioners will likely enact exclusion, but as I discuss in following chapters and in the conclusion, actions associated with exclusion can also be inclusive. I will describe how the collaborative also practiced inclusion by using structural advantage. I then delve deeper into the questions of how and why inclusion and exclusion co-exist and persist.

Empirical Chapter 2:

Inclusion & Power

“The meaning of exclusion and inclusion does not derive from political actors’ (or sociologists’) definitions but from the people’s interpretations. People’s interpretations and their resulting actions must become the core subject of empirical research”(Vobruba, 2000, p. 609).

Introduction

Power is an important feature of inclusion in planning and policymaking processes. Typically, power is theorized and practiced as if it were the property of those who are “somebody” (Arnstein, 1969) and as if it were an implement to control the “nobodies.” Scholars and practitioners also often refer to power as negative (Hardy & Clegg, 2006)—it signals strife and represents something to be resisted or overthrown (Arnstein, 1969). Flyvbjerg (1998) states: “power *defines* what counts as knowledge and rationality, and ultimately... what counts as reality” (italics in original, p. 27). In this dissertation chapter, I provide evidence for an alternative understanding of the relationship of inclusion and power. This understanding is grounded in a rich empirical description of inclusion, and a view of structure as a process and social phenomenon that exists in a mutually constitutive relationship with action (Giddens, 1984; Sewell, 1992).

Mandated and discretionary community engagement strategies are frequent sites for the inclusion of citizens and community residents in policymaking. From the perspective of public administrators and policymakers, inclusion is an approach to community engagement and social policy that aims to bring “outsiders” in—often, this means bringing disadvantaged and disenfranchised groups into political processes (Phillips, 1995). Inclusion also commonly

refers to the aims of social policies designed to reduce poverty and social deviance (Pantazis, Gordeon, & Levitas, 2006).

Public managers and community residents have become increasingly intertwined in the postindustrial age: “citizens need administrators and administrators need citizens” (Box, 1998, cited in Roberts, 2004, p. 327). At the same time, policymaking has become highly professionalized (Wilensky, 1964) and bureaucratized (Weber, 1946), requiring special training, resources, time and literacy in complex socio-political-technical policy problems. These processes have estranged policymakers and citizens from one another, resulting in a documented tension between these respective actors in the multiple arenas in which they interact (Roberts, 2004).

Research and practices in the inclusion of residents in democratic governance are both extensive and motivated by various ends, but remain dominated by a conflict-oriented approach, which focuses on power redistribution from the “haves” (policy experts) to the “have-nots” (community residents) (Arnstein, 1969; Tritter & McCallum, 2006). This adversarial approach to community engagement and community power dynamics assumes community engagement is a means for “nobodies” to become “somebodies” (see Arnstein, 1969) and for these “nobodies” to gain control over political decisions (Alinsky, 1971; Betten & Austin, 1990; Delgado, 1994; Tritter & McCallum, 2006). Inherent in this view is a deficit-based view of citizens as the “nobodies” and “have nots” (Ellis & Walton, 2012; McNight & Kretzmann, 2012). This approach also conflates the inclusion of community residents in policymaking with citizen power (Roberts, 2004; Tritter & McCallum, 2006).

A traditional focus of community engagement on the inclusion of typically marginal groups and people overlooks the possible disciplinary nature of engagement practices to enlist community residents and thus reassert the unequal power dynamics they seek to address (Goodin, 1996). Recall from the exclusion chapter, organizational representatives,

residents enlisted to co-facilitate, and foundation representatives designed and implemented planning and decision-making processes in ways that enacted exclusion despite their skills and commitment to resident participation. The taken-for-granted nature of organizational practices, the enrollment of representatives and residents committed to participation, as well as the consequential nature of these practices to exclude resembles Foucault's (1986) concern with administrative and political practices that circumscribed bodies and populations to be controlled by social institutions like the state, medicine and the criminal justice system. In his work, the poor and indigent were excluded and framed as a threat to society (Booth 1969; Booth 1890; Mill 1991 cited in Ryan 2009, p. 357).

As detailed above, typically community engagement strategies are seen as opportunities to empower residents to become politically active and to shift power from the "haves" to the "have nots" (Alinsky, 1969; Arnstein, 1969). Yet, this view of inclusion is limited. It overlooks the processes through which power gets created and recreated as well as the conditions created through these processes that can prevent or foster inclusion, as seen in the exclusion chapter. The typical view of power also neglects consideration of disciplinary power, which is imbedded in the institutions into which community residents are being included (see Foucault, 1977, 1986). It also disregards positive and productive notions of power in policymaking as discussed by Parsons and Foucault (Clegg & Haugaard, 2009).

In this chapter, I draw from practice-based understandings of community (see Lave & Wenger, 1991; Montoya, 2009) and of inclusion in public engagement (Feldman & Khademian, 2007; Quick & Feldman, 2011) to see community engagement, power and inclusion as processes that are created through actions. I show how community engagement can be practiced in a way that acknowledges disciplinary power, but also structures opportunities for inclusion. These opportunities for inclusion are realized as new actions and new forms of community engagement and planning. Community residents not only

participate in the decision-making processes, but also co-produce such processes and new experiences of power.

In this dissertation chapter, I describe a community engagement process in a local planning and policy-making initiative, and provide evidence for an expanded understanding of community engagement and power, one in which

- Planning professionals' privileged positions can create collaborative opportunities for new actions and inclusion
- New actions and inclusive practices constitute new skills, abilities and capabilities which provide new experiences of power.

These findings emerged through iterative analysis of my data and support an expanded view of community engagement, inclusion, and power. This expanded view goes beyond the dominant understanding of community engagement as adversarial means to redistribute power and shows inclusion to exceed efforts to incorporate marginalized groups.

Literature Review

Community engagement. The involvement of community residents in the decisions facing their communities is important for both policymakers and community residents (Roberts, 2004). Community involvement is known to facilitate the inclusion of local knowledge and lived experience, which ensures that programs and policies address problems as they are experienced in the everyday lives of residents (Lejano & Stokols, 2010). The inclusion of residents also fosters legitimation of decisions for policymakers (Roberts, 2004) and is seen to empower residents, to create increased local ownership and to foster stewardship (Ahmed & Palermo, 2010) leading to more locally relevant and sustainable interventions (Herbert, 1996; Metzler et al., 2003).

Over the past 60 years, the inclusion of citizens in policy and administrative practice has increased by mandate and administrative discretion (Chambers, 2003; Fischer & Forester,

1993, Majone, 1990; Roberts, 2004; U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 1979). This increase in citizen engagement reflects a shift in government practice from a focus on response and reaction, characterized by command and control, to a focus on partnership, characterized by collaboration (Feldman & Khademian, 2007; Vigoda, 2002). Despite these legal and normative trends, policymakers often view public participation as simply a mechanism to provide context for a respective decision (Kieffer & Reischmann, 2004; Steckler et al., 1993) and to take into account multiple interests (Sabatier & Jenkins, 1993). At the same time, scholars of cross-sector collaboration identify many barriers to inclusion, such as the fact that community residents and organizational professionals speak different languages (Bryson et al., 2006), with regard to actual mother tongues and stakeholder-based dialects alike.

Scholars have documented the isolation of individuals from social and political activity in the United States (Klinenberg, 2002; Putnam, 2000). And for many community residents, “public policy has become unfamiliar and irrelevant, complicated, inaccessible and confusing” (Blackwell & Colmenar, 2000, p. 162). As community residents distance themselves from the political sphere, political scientists, who theorize community power dynamics, affirm the dominance of elite or business interests and dismiss the influence individuals and communities can have on political decisions (Domhoff, 2007; Molotch, 1976; Stone, 1976). These scholars attribute the conditions of community life to macro social, economic, and political determinants outside the scope of community action (Molotch, 1976, p. 309). This legacy of research on the enduring imbalance of community power dynamics in favor of business elites, combined with research on social and political isolation, motivates efforts and scholarship on the creation of more democratic, participatory and inclusive politics. Most of these efforts focus on *who* participated or *who* is represented (Bloemraad, 2006; Cheadle et al., 2005; Minkler, 2012; Petersen et al., 2006).

Community engagement as engaging people. Community engagement literature and practice tends to focus on the dyadic relationship between policy professionals and community residents. In Arnstein's (1969) "ladder of participation", a touchstone for policy makers and practitioners promoting community engagement (Tritter & McCallum 2006 p. 156), she sets up an "us" against "them" relationship between citizens, she terms the "have nots," and planners she calls the "haves". Arnstein (1969) posits that citizen participation is the mechanism through which "have nots" take decision-making control from the "haves." Other literatures that focus on the inclusion of community residents in decision-making also focus on *who* is at the table whether that is those who live in the affected area (Cheadle et al 2005; Minkler 2012) or certain groups underrepresented in political activity (Bloemraad 2006).

Arnstein (1969) and her contemporaries, Alinsky (1971), Davidoff (1965) and Krumholtz (1994) pioneered approaches citizen participation and planning, called advocacy planning; an approach that Harwood (2003) explains as still existent today. "The primary goal of advocacy planning is the transfer of power and resources from established, well-represented groups to underrepresented groups" (Fraser, 2005; Harwood, 2003; Peterman, 2004; cited in Dandekaar & Main, 2014, p. 158). Advocacy planning-informed scholarship and practices focus on confrontational mobilization of resident, e.g. protest, marches, or rallies (Diaz, 2005, Fraser 2005, Gittel and Vidal, 1998; cited in Dandekaar & Main, 2014, p. 159). Gonzalez (2006) argues less is known about how community groups, and their leaders actually participate in planning and policymaking process.

Community engagement as engaging practices. While the research focused on the dyadic relationship between policy professionals and community residents establishes problematic inequities in political participation, newer collaborative approaches to and deliberative modes of planning and policymaking demonstrate that inclusion is a more

complex phenomenon, and that the design and process of community engagement is critical for the democratic and inclusive outcomes sought.

Collaboration scholars demonstrate that the policymaking environment has become characterized by cross-sector collaborations in which residents, for-profit and nonprofit organizations, and public managers and policymakers converge (Bryson et al., 2006). These multi-actor contexts further complicate the simple relationship between citizens and policymakers that is often assumed in community engagement efforts. Scholars build on Habermas' (1989) work to point out the mismatch between a single, overarching public sphere for civic engagement and the diverse range of multicultural communities by calling for multiple democratic spaces for civic engagement (Fraser, 1990; Mouffe, 2002, cited in Zagofsky, 2013, p. 23). Collaborative settings also layer multiplicities of values, norms, hierarchies, and leadership (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003; Crosby & Bryson, 2005, cited in Bryson et al., 2006). The expanded definition of policy actors makes community engagement challenging for public administrators and managers who seek to reach out to and include "the community". It also disrupts longstanding adversarial views of power in community engagement processes, because the "haves" and "have nots" are multiple and not discrete. These new forms of democracy, citizenship, and community also decenter the "person" from ideas of inclusion and instead centralize practices (Dryzek, 1996; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Montoya, 2013).

Newer modes of democratic practice and community engagement that emphasize deliberation (Roberts, 2004) expand typical notions of residents as synonymous with citizens defined by geographic location (i.e. the nation-state). Residents are not defined by their legal status, formal residence, or voting registration. These new modes of participation develop ideas of citizenship to include nonterritorial forms (Friedmann, 2002) and thus expand who can participate and how. Nonterritorial forms of citizenship ground citizenship in the actions

people take and define citizenship through communities of practice (Friedmann, 2002, p. 77). Scholarship on Communities of Practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and Community-Driven Research (see Montoya & Kent, 2011) similarly expand notions of community beyond the geographic and demographic variables to ground ideas of community in practice. These expanded understandings of citizenship and community transform the political community from a circumscribable entity to a permanently unfinished project (Mouffe, 1992, p. 234-35) that transcends conventional categories of citizenship and community, e.g. youth, Latino or low-income, created through inclusion (Jones, 2010).

These broadened understandings of citizenship and community couple with expanded notions of community engagement to result in community engagement as a continuous deliberative process (Dryzek, 1996; Forester, 1999; Montoya & Kent, 2011). Scholars of inclusive management define community engagement through practice (Feldman et al., 2006; Feldman & Khademan, 2007; Quick & Feldman, 2009, 2011; VanBuuren, 2009). Quick & Feldman (2011), for instance, distinguish inclusion from participation by identifying practices commonly associated with each phenomenon. Participation practices are oriented toward creating opportunities for input, whereas practices of inclusion are oriented toward creating connections between people, across issues and over time. This shift in scholarship to focus on community engagement as practice makes visible *how* people enact inclusion and exclusion, not just *who* is included and who is excluded.

As mentioned above, community engagement is a required or voluntary practice to involve residents in the policymaking processes. Participation scholars acknowledge these efforts as a way to shift power to local communities (Arnstein, 1969; Israel et al., 2005) and to re-democratize the policy-making process (Fischer, 1993; Kubisch et al., 2010). A broadened scope of community engagement to involve multiple actors and their multiplicities as well as to center community engagement in practices renders inadequate the traditional

view of power in community engagement as a contest between the “haves” and “have nots.”

Community engagement and power. Power is central to community engagement scholarship and practice (Aleshire, 1972; MacNair, Caldwell, & Pollane, 1983; Roberts, 2004). Historically, studies of power focus on behavior (Dahl, 1986) and control over behavior (Barach & Baratz, 1962, in Lukes, 2005) and rely on conflict, whether overt or covert (Lukes, 2005). This relationship between engagement and power also focuses on who is included, as described above. Democracy scholars have analyzed the decision-making power of citizens for decades (Dahl, 1961; Walker, 1966; Young, 2000) and have focused on “Who gets what, when, how?” (Lasswell, 1950). Much of the participation literature also makes the problematic assumption that community engagement is adversarial in nature.

Adversarial view of community engagement and power. The adversarial view of community engagement is best depicted by Arnstein’s foundational ladder of citizen participation, which continues to guide community engagement scholarship and practice (Alinsky, 1969, 1971; Delgado, 1994.³) In Arnstein’s (1969) ladder she assumes that power resides in professionals and organizations (such as politician, planners, cities, nonprofits) and not in citizens. Arnstein presents a hierarchical typology of citizen participation in which citizen control *over* political decisions is the goal of community engagement.⁴ She defines citizen control as when “‘have-not’ citizens obtain the majority of decision-making seats, or full managerial power” (Arnstein, 1969, p. 218).

An Arnstein-informed view of community engagement and power contains assumptions that limit its applicability to practice and other empirical studies, as well as its contribution to theories of community engagement and power. The focus on “haves” and “have nots” sets up an “us” against “them” conflict between citizens and planners. Flyvbjerg

³ Alinsky (1971) discusses organizing similar to the way Arnstein (1969) discusses community participation; for Alinsky, organizing is the means through which citizens build relationships to press an agenda and gain power through that process (Alinsky 1971; Delgado, 1994).

⁴ Many scholars in the Community-Based Participatory Research field also espouse a view in which citizen control over research is the pinnacle for community engagement (See Ahmed & Palermo, 2010).

(1998) notes the common and requisite nature of conflict in planning processes, but for these authors it cannot be simplified to “us vs them.” Flyvbjerg (2001) acknowledges conflict as a normal part of democracy to de-romanticize community engagement:

In real social and political life self-interest and conflict will not give way to some all-embracing communal ideal like Habermas's. Indeed, the more democratic a society, the more it allows groups to define their own specific ways of life and legitimates the inevitable conflicts of interest that arise between them (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 108).

Flyvbjerg (1998) also points out that stable power relations are more typical of politics, administration and planning than antagonistic confrontation, drawing from Nietzsche (p. 5). He says studies tend to focus on conflict because it is visible. Lukes (2005) explains that for Bachrach and Baratz (1970), power lies not in conflict, but in a person or group’s creation or reinforcement, whether conscious or unconscious, of barriers that prevent conflict. They quote Schattschneider (1960):

All forms of political organization have a bias in favour of the exploitation of some kinds of conflict and the suppression of others, because *organization is the mobilization of bias*. Some issues are organized into politics while others are organized out (p. 71).

In the quote above, Schattschneider, like Flyvbjerg (1998) does not discredit conflict, but he shifts focus from the conflict to the organization of the bias that makes visible and suppresses conflict, and allows some issues in and others out.

In the adversarial view of community engagement, who has power and who does not explains which issues get organized in, and which ones get organized out. This focus on “haves” and “have nots” sets up an adversarial relationship and also assumes that power is zero-sum (Parsons, 1986). In order to have power, citizens must move up the hierarchy of

policymaking to the organizational position of the professional planner or policy-maker in order to become decision-makers. This view infers that power can be possessed, given or taken away, or even divided up (Clegg et al., 2006, p. 226, note 1). It views power as an entity rather than “strategies and tactics” (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p. 5). This view of power dominates in the discourse of community organizing scholarship and practice, in which power must be “brought to” communities (Warren, 2001) or “taken” by communities (Alinsky, 1969).

The adversarial view of power aims to bring participants into processes and give them power. However, Quick and Feldman (2011) point out that it keeps participants and designer/conveners, or the public and government, confined to separate roles in the policymaking process, and suggest that “having designated ‘designers’ and ‘participants’ reinforces boundaries between the parties, confining opportunities to build connections that are important to building community capacity for ongoing policymaking work” (p. 284). According to Bourdieu’s view of power (1977, 1990) in which power appears through the objectification and institutionalization of subjective relations (cited in Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011, p. 1243), even though participants are brought in, as long as they are kept in their participant role, power relations are maintained and this prevents participants from being included.

This adversarial view of engagement and power overlooks the everyday, less-institutionalized, more pervasive practices of power (Foucault, 1991) and the way power works as a facilitative medium (Parsons, 1986). It also assumes that citizens do not have power over decisions or agendas, and thus dismisses and depoliticizes other forms of power like everyday forms of resistance (Scott, 1985) and tactics (de Certeau, 1984) that marginalized individuals may implement to shape the context in which they live. Ortner (1995) attests that sometimes, “for certain kinds of compounded powerlessness (female and

poor and of minority status), ‘the refusal of subjectification’ may be the only strategy available to the subject” (p. 184).

Positive view of power and community engagement. An alternative view of power in community engagement acknowledges every actor’s agency and power to act, even within structures that constrain these actions. The institutional theory literature describes this as embedded agency (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991; Friedland & Alford, 1991; Sewell, 1992). Similarly, organizational scholars describe power as always exercised in a context of norms (Clegg, 1989, p. 132), but these do not overly determine people’s actions. Instead, actions constrain and enable these systems of norms and routines, and demonstrate actors’ “power to” take actions within organizational settings (Clegg et al., 2006, p. 194). Ortner (2006) describes the possibility of action even within extremely constrained environments:

People in positions of power “have”—legitimately or not—what might be thought of as “a lot of agency,” but the dominated too always have certain capacities, and sometimes very significant capacities, to exercise some sort of influence over the ways in which events unfold. (Ortner, 2006, p. 144)

Weber (1986) makes a similar point that opposes the zero-sum idea of power. He points out that it is not just the powerful that constitutes power, but also the powerless. Ponc and Frisby (2010) also argue for a focus on the actions of the “subjects” to coproduce, experience, make meaning of, and/or benefit from inclusion strategies in health promotion (p. 1520). They explain that most inclusion researchers and practitioners focus on structural analysis at social, political, and economic levels (Good Gingrich, 2008; Richmond & Saloojee, 2005, cited in Ponc & Frisby (2010, p. 1520), “despite feminist arguments that important knowledge exists in women’s everyday realities” (Smith, 1987 cited in Ponc & Frisby, 2010, p. 1520).

Giddens (1984) makes power a necessary component of the human condition: “an agent ceases to be such if he or she loses the capability to ‘make a difference,’ that is to exercise

some sort of power” (p. 14).

Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) also objects to the idea of “the powerless,” a typical characterization of low-income neighborhoods and their residents, who are often cast as “deficits”, “at risk”, and/or “future service recipients” of programs and services. Instead, in CBPR, individuals and organizations are assets or potential assets for communities in accordance with their skills and talents and the experience of residents, local associations and organizations, formal and informal (McKnight & Kretzman, 2012, p. 172). The CBPR approach assumes that power *already* exists in communities; it is not something that needs to be transferred or taken from policymakers and organizational entities and given to residents. CBPR scholars draw on feminist perspectives of community practice, which assume a “power analysis that stresses ‘power with’ (Follett, 1918) and ‘power to’ (French, 1986) rather than more traditional hierarchical notions of ‘power over’ (Minkler, 2012, p. 12).

At the same time, CBPR is driven by concern for social inequities and the history of exploitative treatment of communities by research institutions. Thus, CBPR acknowledges the power of communities as an often-oppressed resource, as well as communities’ right to be engaged in the decisions and interventions that affect their lives (Barber, 1984; Box, 1998, cited in Roberts, p. 316). Van der Velde et al. (2009) go further to challenge the idea of communities that must be saved; they argue that inclusion must involve participants’ choice and consider all participants as active agents, “especially when structural conditions are co-created to foster inclusion,” adding that it is not “up to those in positions of relative power to ‘include’ those from the margins” (Ponic & Frisby, 2010, p. 1527). Inclusion is not possible at all if the participants are not considered active agents in the process (O’Reilly, 2005, cited in Ponic & Frisby, 2010, p. 1527).

In the CBPR literature, community and power can be “an essentially limitless

resource” (Minkler & Wallerstein, 1997, p. 39). This does not romanticize the process nor preclude conflict. Conflict and cooperation can co-exist and are inherent features of political work (Warren, 2001, p. 29). The redistribution of power may be an intention or outcome, but “should not be a limiting factor in its definition” (Roberts, 2004, p. 329). CBPR researchers take a capacity-oriented view of power similar to Barnes (1988). He describes power as capacity and asserts that power exists beyond the moment of action. Like a car with a specific horsepower, it is able to move whether it is currently mobile or parked.

Years of government-funded community-based interventions also show that community engagement is more than a means to redistribute power. It is both a means *and* an end unto itself (Kubisch, 2010); it fosters and strengthens connections between community members, as well as focusing on capacity building. It has been shown to build the community’s capacity to address current and similar issues in the future (Blackwell & Colemar, 2000; Feldman & Quick, 2009; Holling, 1978; Van Buuren, 2009). Moreover, Tompkins et al. (2002) argue, “the primary benefits of participation may not be instrumental in terms of outcome, but rather in the building of social capital through the processes of empowerment (Hayward 1995; Healey 1997)” (p. 1098). Increased trust is seen as one of the greatest benefits of participatory processes (Beierle and Konisky, 2000).

The dark side of the productive view of power and inclusion. The discussion of inclusion so far resonates with normative assumptions that community engagement is beneficial because it is often equated with democratic ends. However, inclusion can also have a dark side, as it can imply a kind of homogenization or mainstreaming (Goodin, 1996). Disciplinary notions of power explored by Foucault (1977, 1979) demonstrate the dark side of inclusion as collusion or control. For example, governments and new regulations broaden definitions of illegal activity, criminalizing larger sections of the population and expand the jurisdiction of law enforcement (McGuire, 2011). Social programs focused on community

engagement or inclusion “utilize the language of empowerment” and “deploy strategies which attempt to govern social problems through the autonomous decision of individual and various types of community” (Rose 1996, 1999, cited in Ryan, 2009, p. 359).

The historical trend to require the inclusion of poor communities in the planning and implementation of interventions to alleviate poverty (Roberts, 2004) makes their marginality, often defined through economic indicators or social deviant behavior, more visible (Goodin, 1996). Engagement can also be conducted in ways that require citizens and community members to become literate in professional knowledge in order to participate (Palumbo, 2014). The negative possibilities of engagement also include those we have seen recently in places like Ferguson, Missouri and Sanford, Florida as citizens co-implemented community safety through volunteer police and neighborhood watch programs (Brewer & Grabosky, 2014; Williams & Miller, 2013). Indeed, it was in Sanford, on February 26, 2012, that George Zimmerman, an armed volunteer community watchman, shot Trayvon Martin, an unarmed teenager. Community engagement holds the possibility to foster change, but is also embedded within multiple and shifting unequal power dynamics, which always present the possibility to silence those with relatively less power or legitimacy (Tett, 2005) and to recreate the exclusion the effort sought to address (Wallerstein & Duran, 2006, cited in Ponio & Frisby, 2010, p. 1525). Ultimately, those in positions of relative power can also act to use their position to facilitate inclusion or exclusion.

Alternative view of inclusion and power. An alternative view of inclusion, one that does not assume inclusion is about homogenization, is found in some democracy, public health and management scholarship.

According to Young (2000),

[i]nclusion ought not to mean simply the formal and abstract equality of all members of the polity as citizens. It means explicitly acknowledging social

differentiations and divisions and encouraging differently situated groups to give voice to their needs, interests, and perspectives. (p. 119)

Inclusive management similarly focuses on “bringing people together from different perspectives in ways that allow them to appreciate one another’s perspectives enhances the design and implementation of policies” (Feldman & Khademian, 2007, p. 306). Inclusion is defined as creating opportunities for “actions aimed at increasing the range of perspectives in deliberation” (Feldman et al., 2006, p. 89). According to Quick & Feldman (2011), “inclusion is oriented to *making connections* among people, across issues, and over time” (p. 274).

Public health scholars Ponic and Frisby (2010) and inclusive management scholars Feldman and Khademian (2007) build on Giddens’s (1984) idea of mutual constitution to account for both structure and agency to understand inclusion. Ponic & Frisby (2010) draw on feminist readings of Giddens’s (1984) structuration theory to argue the co-constitution of effective health promotion through the actions of women to determine their health and the social and economic structures affecting it (O’Connor, Denton, Hadjukowski-Ahmed, Zeytinoglu, & Williams, 1999, and Ponic, 2000, cited in Ponic & Frisby, 2010). Feldman and Khademian (2007) draw on practice theory (see Bourdieu, 1990; Giddens, 1984; Reckwitz, 2002; Schatzki, 2001) to explain that “structures do not continue to exist unless they are enacted” and “it is how they [structures] are used or acted upon that brings them to life” (Feldman & Khademian, 2007, p. 312).

Feldman & Khademian (2007) also note that the continuous construction of structures raises questions for social phenomena often assumed to be immutable, such as laws or organizational hierarchies (p. 312). Feldman & Orkilowski’s (2011) explanation of practice theory shows that organizational hierarchies and the positions within them are all examples of other social structures that are created and recreated in action; it is how they are created and used that matters. This does not reduce the significance of social structures; organizational

theory, for example, tells us that no matter the enacted structure of organization (e.g. market, hierarchy, or network), position within an organization is important, but it provides an understanding of what constitutes this significance. In this view, power is not detachable and transferable from certain social positions to another. Rather, power is a process that has consequential meaning which is created by how it is adopted and implemented in action, and the position's relative power is in flux accordingly.

As reviewed in Chapter 1 on exclusion, Sewell (1992) made a similar point about the relativity of dominant social structures like gender, class, and ethnicity. He wrote

Occupancy of different social positions—as defined, for example, by gender, wealth, social prestige, class, ethnicity, occupation, generation, sexual preference, or education—gives people knowledge of different schemas and access to different kinds and amounts of resources and hence different possibilities for transformative action. And the scope or extent of agency also varies enormously between different social systems, even for occupants of analogous positions. The owner of the biggest art gallery in St. Louis has far less influence on American artistic taste than the owner of the biggest gallery in Los Angeles (p. 21).

The consequentiality of action in the production of social life, a key principle of practice theory (Feldman & Orkilowski, 2011), challenges the adversarial approach to community engagement because it destabilizes the assumption of power as a fixed and limited resource. Instead, meaning is created through practice; for example, the power structure is not fixed but its meaning is created and recreated through actions. Latour (2005) similarly sees structures as *what gets created*, not as *what does the creating*. He also understands the meaning of structure to shift in accordance with different ways phenomena are used in practice. His ideas can apply to tangible objects like cell phones and intangible

technologies or practices like language, as well as concepts or inanimate objects like power. These objects, technologies or practices can operate like black boxes and transport meaning without changing it, or they can transform meaning (Latour, 2005, p. 37). Similarly, Flyvbjerg (1998) says that democracy is also something that relies on the everyday actions of individuals willing to fight for it. A process view grounded in practice theory makes visible how inclusion and power are enacted and how these concepts are mutually constituted.

An approach informed by practice theory acknowledges structural forms of power (Kweit & Kweit, 1981), but understands these as under continuous construction, which overcomes a trend in inclusion studies to solely focus on structural analysis where structures are fixed entities (Ponic & Frisby, 2010). “Conceptualizing inclusion as a process highlights the understanding that people are always negotiating multiple roles and positions (Ortner 1995) and individuals have varying life circumstances that are shaped by gender, race, class, health, and other makers of difference that create inequitable power relations” (Luxton, 2005, cited in Ponic & Frisby, 2010, p. 1520).

Inclusion happens in fleeting moments (O’Reilly, 2005), which can leave traces or expectations for future actions (Feldman & Khademian, 2007). Tarrow’s (1994) work suggests the potential impact of the inclusion practices. He refers to the legitimation of the sit-in as a type of practice associated with collective action, as well as the impact of simultaneous and community-organized counterparts on the official proceedings of formal policymaking conferences, like the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. Community engagement efforts often aim to address long-standing power inequalities, but Tarrow’s (1994) work demonstrates that small, repeated actions in the name of inclusion or collective action can leave a lasting impact.

In this dissertation chapter, I propose an alternative to the adversarial-informed view of community engagement, inclusion, and power. I draw on the alternative approaches found

in the democracy, public health, and inclusive management literatures described above to suggest and to provide evidence for an interpretation of inclusion and power that is practice-based and capacity-oriented, but that also recognizes the practices of inclusion as existing in and contributing to an environment that is multiple, complex, and continuously changing.

Methods

Data collection. The data presented in this chapter centers on a story about the inclusion of residents in a city planning process. This process took place over the course of approximately 6 months and consisted of multiple city meetings as well as meetings between planning consultants, youth, and nonprofit representatives. I rely upon field notes from these meetings, key informant interviews, and a focus group of key collaborative members, as well as archival documents from media coverage to PowerPoint presentations, to write the analytic vignette. Study participants were representatives from local Gold County nonprofit organizations, including executive directors, program staff, and community organizers, as well as adult and youth residents of Central City and executives and staff from the Foundation.

Analysis methods. I analyzed the data for instances of community engagement and inclusion using an interpretivist approach (Yanow & Schwartz-Shea, 2006, p. 23). In this tradition, conclusions emerge through interpretation of the data and the researcher constructs a reading of what happened based on iterative analysis of data collected through long-term and imbedded fieldwork (Geertz, 1973).

Practice theory also informed my analysis. Practices are patterns of activity that are created and recreated through the production and reproduction of everyday actions and structures that constrain and enable each other (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011; Nicolini, 2013; Osterlund & Carlile, 2005). I drew on what people did and said (in my field notes, interviews and archival documents) to constitute the practices of community engagement (Schatkzi,

2002). I focus on practices because I am interested in *how* people co-produce and create and recreate community engagement, inclusion and power relations through the actions they take, and the consequences of such actions.

I defined community engagement as instances when residents and organizational representatives or professionals acted in the same policymaking process. Sometimes this looked like an intentional effort by residents to participate or a requirement for professionals to provide an opportunity for community input, but I also included instances that were not explicitly times of “engagement.” I included these instances because the Central City Community Change Initiative and the Foundation were committed to a resident-driven process, and so I was interested in *whether* and *how* this commitment played out in practice. Additionally, I analyze community engagement with the assumption that community members and policymakers are both implicated in the creation and the production of policymaking processes, regardless of intentionality (Osborne & Strokosch, 2013).

To define inclusion, I draw on the inclusion literature described in the literature review encompassing scholarship on inclusion and exclusion from sociology, anthropology, and political science and, in particular, deliberative democracy and social geography. I also borrow from the Community Based Participatory Research literature in the field of public health, and from public management research, specifically scholars who write about inclusive management and cross-sectoral collaboration.

Quick and Feldman’s (2011) piece on inclusive management provided concrete features of inclusive processes, which I used iteratively to fine-tune my understandings of the examples of inclusion and community engagement. These features include: (1) co-producing the process and content of decision making, (2) engaging multiple ways of knowing, and (3) sustaining temporal openness (see Quick & Feldman, 2011, p. 272). The social geography literature defines inclusion in terms of being allowed inside the spaces of policymaking,

which can mean the physical spaces of meeting or social spaces such as decision-making spaces (de la Blanche, 1913). In the Central City Change Initiative (see Dissertation Background section for explanation), being “inside” could mean an invitation or presence in a meeting (see exclusion chapter vignette *Planning for Participation*), or the comprehension or performance of language, norms, or rules (i.e. logic models). The deliberative democracy literature (Dryzek, 1996; Weeks, 2000) steered me to look at instances in which multiple actors engaged in discourse around public problems. In the vignette below, youth residents learned planning terminology.

After I coded instances of community engagement and inclusion, I wrote thick descriptions (Geertz, 1973). I then zoomed in to pinpoint the actions people took that constituted inclusion. I identified what the actors were doing, what was being included, what facilitated inclusion, and the power dynamics enacted through these inclusive practices. Through this analysis, I found the example I wrote into the *Creating Complete Streets* analytical vignette, which is the focus of this chapter. I begin by providing some background information on *Creating Complete Streets*.

Background

The Central City Community Change Initiative’s (CC-CCI) work plan prioritized Health-Promoting Land Use, Youth Development and Civic Engagement and Community Empowerment. The original Ten Outcomes provided by the Foundation included: Residents Live in Communities with Health-Promoting Land Use, Transportation and Community Development; and Communities Support Healthy Youth Development. Later, during the planning year, the collaborative added the Civic Engagement and Community Empowerment outcome. The addition of this outcome was evidence of the collaborative’s concern for the inclusion of residents since the initiative began in Central City. At a steering meeting in the beginning of November in 2009, a resident steering committee member got up and said, “We

need to pause and not move forward ... , we need to focus on the fact that residents especially youth are still not meaningfully engaged in the process!”

To address community engagement concerns, during the planning year, the collaborative formed a community engagement subcommittee. This subcommittee planned a door-to-door campaign and organized multiple community outreach events in different spaces like churches, schools and private homes. This subcommittee also took the lead in drafting the Civic Engagement and Community Empowerment Outcome, which was the first to be funded in January 2010.

One of the grantee organizations, YouthMatters, began their implementation by creating and hosting a network of youth organized around the 10 outcomes. Within the first year of their grant, community organizers at YouthMatters learned that youth had little interest in the existing outcome areas, so they decided to let youth work on what did energize them. One of the first issues youth started working on was biking in Central City. They created a Complete Streets Team within their youth network to work on biking in Central City. In this team, youth discussed wanting more bike lanes in Central City and questioned why there were so many more bike lanes in a neighboring wealthier city. Miguel, a youth organizer, explained that comparing the two cities in this regard helped youth to identify bike lanes as a social justice issue:

[They put] the bigger pieces of structural inequalities together between these two cities that are next to each other, in their day to day life of having to bike or having to walk through these streets, they can connect that. And then from there you go to why do they have this and we don't? Then youth connected with other cities like Paris and Barcelona who have bike lanes and asked why don't we? And then they start focusing on history ... [and] how does that relate to obesity or diabetes, you know? Or why [does] downtown

[have] more complete streets and [our neighborhood street does] not?

(Miguel Interview, September 23, 2013)

The vignette below opens with youth's attempt to participate in a community engagement process that would contribute to an update of the Circulation Element and Bike Master Plan for Central City. Through the community engagement requirements, community stakeholders had an opportunity to shape the definition of the policy problem.

Problem definition is a critical component of the policymaking process (Bardach, 2011). As Weiss explains, “[p]roblem definition is concerned with the organization of a set of facts, beliefs, and perceptions” (1989, p. 118). Dery (2000) explained that “[p]roblems do not exist ‘out there’, are not objective entities in their own right, but are analytic constructs, or conceptual entities” (2010, p. 40) by drawing from scholars such as Wildavsky, 1979; Lindblom and Cohen, 1979; Schon, 1983; Weiss, 1989; Weick, 1995. Policy scholars point out that problem definition is important for agenda-setting in the policy arena, in addition to the solutions that are crafted (Baumgartner & Jones, 2010; Dery, 2000; Weiss, 1989).

Community planning scholarship tells us that

Those whose voices are heard in the comprehensive planning process, often and repeatedly, are those who are connected and understand the influence of the general plan—the affluent, the well-educated, the retirees—and those who are mobilized as members of special interest groups... and of course, the interest groups of business owners, real estate developers and small proprietors that populate the chamber of commerce (Dandekar & Main, 2014, p. 162).

Vignette: Creating Complete Streets

In the summer of 2012, the Central City planning department began holding community forums to update their circulation element. The circulation element is one of the 7

planning documents that guide city planning; it takes into account the mobility and connectivity of different forms of transportation across the city. In terms of the policymaking process, the elements define the policy problems and set the agenda for policy solutions, such as priority projects and changes to the streets and sidewalks. Because of a new capital project to bring a light rail into Central City, the state required the city to update this element with a Complete Streets approach. A Complete Streets approach requires planning to account for all forms of transportation, including walking, biking, trains and cars—moving away from the auto-centric planning that Central City and the surrounding cities espoused in the past.

The city hired a consulting company, Beta, to draft the element. Elements are often updated through subcontracts with consulting companies that actually write the element. Planning departments oversee these processes, but do not always do them in-house. When plans are outsourced, the consulting company leads the community outreach portion of any update process in accordance with city and state requirements, drafts the plan, and provides a proposal to the city staff, which the city council approves. As part of the scope of work for the element update, the city also contracted Beta to create a Bike Master Plan. The city had not updated the Bike Master Plan since 1998. Central City was 3rd in the state in terms of the number of bikers, yet there were only five bicycle lanes (YouthMatters Presentation, Archival Material). The State of California requires planners to host two community outreach events to inform and to get input from residents and other community stakeholders—in this case, those who live, work, and play in Central City.

The Complete Streets Team decided to attend the city circulation element community forum in accordance with their interest in biking and improving bikeability in Central City. To prepare for the community forum, the youth spent a month prior studying the Circulation Element and Complete Streets. They researched what the Circulation Element and Complete Streets were, and learned the various terminologies associated with

each.

Ramona, a program director at YouthMatters explained: “We prepared for that [meeting]... we did the research and we studied, we had the terminology to be able to engage” (Complete Streets Focus Group). Youth were eager to attend the forum to “to voice their concerns and opinions and their experience” (Ramona, interview, November 8, 2013).

The first community forum for the Circulation Element update was attended by Beta, city representatives, adult residents from Central City, some collaborative members, and youth from YouthMatters. The director of Beta delivered a presentation at the front of the room. He stood in front of a screen, dressed in a suit, and gave a PowerPoint presentation. After the presentation, he took questions from the audience, calling on people as they raised their hands.

After the forum, youth met with the youth organizers including Ramona and the executive director, Veronica, of YouthMatters, and complained to these adults that they felt ignored and set aside...I was trying to get myself in the middle of a conversation and I was trying to share what I know, yet I was never given importance because there was another adult that they were talking to. (Ramona, interview, November 8, 2013)

Youth wanted to ask questions, yet they felt that they were not taken seriously and instead were ignored. A youth representative attested,

It was really that feeling that here we go, trying to participate in the community forum that we prepared for, that we did the research and we studied, we had the terminology to be able to engage... and [we were] literally being ignored (Youth Representative, Complete Streets Focus Group, March 7, 2013).

After hearing this, the executive director emailed a contact in the city to report that

the youth felt sidelined. She told her contact, “this is supposed to be a community process and youth are part of community. They felt ignored and disrespected” (Ramona, interview, November 8, 2013).

The next day, Beta responded by contacting Veronica and said, “We want to involve youth in the process.” They decided that Beta representatives would meet with youth at YouthMatters. During this meeting, three Beta employees, eight youth and a youth organizer discussed the circulation element update and the youth asked the Beta employees to “be a part of the analysis of the streets.”

Ramona explained,

“[We asked] because they had these [...] architects [...] coming in to do the assessments of the streets, but we feel that the youth knew more about the streets than someone coming from the outside. Yes, they might have the tools and they might know how to evaluate it but it’s gonna be very quantitative and there’s not gonna be that qualitative data to support that. (Ramona, interview, November 8, 2013).

A team of about three youth took the lead of the “Complete Streets” team at YouthMatters. The youth divided up the city into chunks in order to be able to share responsibility among team members to cover the city and collect data on the streets. They also assigned data assessors to the streets where they lived, or that they knew well.

The Complete Streets team met weekly, and during the next meeting youth read through the assessment form Beta was using. Liam, one of the youth, felt that “the assessment they had given us was not very comprehensive.” The assessment form provided did not capture how the streets felt or the intersections that the youth knew were the most dangerous. Liam said, “Even though the speed limit is 35 we know that cars go really fast on this street and it’s not safe” (Liam, Complete Streets Focus Group).

Ramona explained this point in an interview:

When the youth are outside on the streets and we notice that a lot of those streets that our youth walk, are not complete streets. [0:25:05.5] They don't have the um, they don't have boundaries that are protecting the youth from the curb. ...some of them don't have pavement and they're walking on the streets without sidewalks. ... we've noticed that there are certain areas around that don't have sidewalks. They don't have ramps for people with disabilities or mothers with strollers. ... a lot of those streets that the youth are walking are not complete streets (Ramona, interview, November 8, 2013).

As a result the youth developed their own questions and modifications for the form in order to augment what the consulting firm had provided, and to “address some of that qualitative information that they wanted to have” (Ramona, interview, November 8, 2013).

Youth discussed the inadequacy of the form in a focus group discussing their work on the Circulation Element. Liam said,

[T]he forms given to us from Beta ... had some things that were not understandable for youth, we kind of narrowed it down, made it simple (Complete Streets Focus Group, March 7, 2013).

Rosie continued Liam's description, saying,

[W]e removed some things that we thought were not necessary and then added some things that we thought were important for the reports [such as] the center median on there, so that is why we added it... We also added a notes section, because we noticed our streets are not good here and the assessments don't go into depth [describing] how the streets are or say

specifically what the streets needed (Complete Streets Focus Group, March 7, 2013).

Liam added:

Like between this street and this street there is an issue (Complete Streets Focus Group, March 7, 2013).

Beta hosted a training session with the youth to teach them how they were assessing the streets. Youth learned that Beta was primarily using Google Earth to collect their data on the street, whereas in contrast, one youth said:

[W]e were actually walking the street and collecting data and observation... [which] is also a challenge because instead of using Google Earth to collect... our data as a way to use observations, the stories ... they are the tool that we have. (Complete Streets Focus Group, March 7, 2013)

She also said they used strategies such as counting bikes and then adding to the form how many bikes they saw in an hour. Rosie explained that these were examples of elements that were

missed when you are not out there.... [Google Earth] is just a snapshot, what they are seeing from out there. It is not like a city that is alive... this doesn't mean [that we did not use Google Earth] we did use [it] because we still came back and measured the streets. We couldn't measure the street out there. We collected all the other data and then came back and used Google Earth to match up the street. (Complete Streets Focus Group, March 7, 2013)

As youth began assessing the streets, they realized a limitation of their own plan. They focused on certain areas of the city because those areas were where the youth lived and that they knew well. Rosie explained that they did not know one of the areas very

well—none of the youth at YouthMatters lived or went to school there—so they wanted to reach out to El Salud, a health promotion nonprofit also involved in the Community Change Initiative, because they knew some of El Salud’s members lived in that neighborhood and would know it best. These youth trained a group of adults at El Salud to do the assessment.

Brian, another youth from the Complete Streets Team, explained that they also recruited new youth to help assess as much of the city as possible. He said, “So the youth went out and found other youth and did the assessments.” Rosie explained their process in more detail:

“[W]e went out into the streets and separated them by intersections and observed what were good and bad and recorded on a paper and made notes about what we wanted to change ... A lot of sidewalks had cracks and a lot of streets did not have continuous barriers that would separate the pedestrians from cars. (Complete Streets Focus Group, March 7, 2013)

Liam explained that a continuous barrier like a median

separates opposite traffic ... it would be something in the middle of the street... another thing we saw was narrow sidewalks... it’s a real problem here because a lot of people walk... another thing is bicycle lanes.

(Complete Streets Focus Group, March 7, 2013)

Ramona, the youth organizer explained:

The notes became really crucial for us, because some youth would go out on the weekend and [we] need to know the intersection, because if they [aren’t there on] Monday we will know where they went.” (Complete Streets Focus Group, March 7, 2013)

The notes section also helped the youth track their work and make sure efforts were not

duplicated. Rosie continued to explain the process: “so based on our observations we rated them as good, sufficient, and then explained why.”

During the time that they were collecting data, the youth also tabled at city outreach events for the circulation element. At a circulation element meeting in Fall 2012 that took place in the auditorium of a senior center in Central City, behind the rows of chairs in the auditorium, youth set up a few tables where they laid out a map of the city and provided information about their data collection project as well as the Complete Streets approach. Consultants for upcoming element updates were at other tables at the event. Before and after the event, people came up and talked with the youth. A member of the Central City Community Change Initiative who was speaking with a youth he knew from his neighborhood brought him over to their table, because this youth wanted to get involved and did not know how to do so.

As youth became more involved in the city process and more interested in bikeability in Central City they were eager to learn more skills. For example, an intern from a local university who was working at Youth Matters and with the Complete Streets Team taught the youth Geographic Information Systems (GIS⁵). GIS was another software program commonly used by planners to assess streets and create maps for plans like the circulation element.

Once the Complete Streets Team had completed their assessments, they wrote up a narrative report and submitted the assessments to Beta. In their report and discussions with Beta representatives, youth talked about boundaries and different kinds of medians, “city planning and GIS jargon” (Ramona, interview, November 8, 2013). Beta submitted the youth work as a part of their final report to the city for the city’s consideration. “We

⁵ Geographic Information System or GIS is a computer system that allows users to map, model, query, and analyze large quantities of data within a single database according to their location. GIS enables users to create maps. (Geographic Information Systems (GIS) | How We Use Data in the Mid-Atlantic Region. n.d.).

are currently waiting to see how our assessment was taken into consideration, that report has not been given back to us at this time” (Liam, Complete Streets Focus Group, March 13, 2013).

Submitting their assessment report to the city was rewarding and motivated youth to organize more and get connected with activism in the community, in addition to the work they did through the organization. It also helped them make connections in school.

Ramona explained:

Youth just organized a bike-it night...and brought in about 30 new youth. They attend because [they say] ‘I’m gonna have fun’ and that’s what it is, but they [also] use this opportunity to talk to other youth [and say] ‘imagine what this would be like if we had a bike lane and we didn’t need to have 30 people come together in order to feel safe going on our bike?’ And then they get them ... from transactional to transformational, where they’re in it for the long run... we do a lot of events because that’s how we pull in youth. And we use those events as teaching moments and we ... follow up with this youth because the conversation that we had [with them] shows that this youth would be really interested or he might be able to pull some other youth or he might be able to go and present [at city council]. So from the get-go, [the youth] know that they’re identifying talent. [0:29:55.1] But more than talent, they’re identifying people with opportunity. Like people that might give us an opportunity to use their skills or their passion into something different. (Ramona, interview, November 8, 2013)

Youth discussed the fact that this work also impacted the bike master plan. One youth said, “I went out on a bike and I looked at potential bike lanes, I know that this could be a bike type one or this could be a type two... or this could be type three...”

Veronica, the executive director of Youth Matters, explained: “with the whole Complete Streets thing, they’re getting GIS training. So they’re learning—so it’s not only helping them in this area where they develop a passion, but it’s also helping them in their day-to-day math, calculus class. Um, Liam who is one of our representatives for [the] Complete Streets [team]—he’s coming back to our staff and saying, now I’m getting the connection between calculus and real life because of this GIS mapping I’m learning. And you know... So it’s helping, you know it’s integrating... And for us [organizational employees/directors]... it’s working because they’re—they don’t stay with us forever. And they’re plugged into communities. And that’s what we want to see. [0:35:11.8] We don’t want to keep them forever; we just want to give them the foundations so that they could connect with community in a bigger scale.” (Veronica, interview, November 11, 2013).

Findings & Analysis

Through the following analysis I expand the understanding of inclusion and power. Inclusion was more than bringing youth into a planning process. Their inclusion involved more than a simple dyad of Beta and youth, because the moments in which youth and Beta came together represented the culmination of the efforts of many other people and organizations, many other experiences, and an acknowledgement that multiple democratic spaces are needed to accommodate the diverse communities that exist. Moreover, youth invited and trained adult residents to participate. These actions demonstrated the full inclusion of youth as partners able to take actions to expand the boundaries of the community. Inclusion in this context was characterized by new actions that the youth and Beta took in order to engage the multiple types of knowledge available and to take advantage of the resources brought in by diverse participants in the collaborative setting. Thus, inclusion became about creating the conditions to facilitate individual and collective abilities and

capacities to work together.

I found that residents' and planners' power to take new actions and develop new abilities and capacities indicated inclusion, and also provided evidence for "power to" and "power with" in community engagement processes. In contrast to the common discourse that power is obstructive to inclusion, I found that power here was generative of inclusion. The dominant view of inclusion and power assumes adversarial, binary power relations between planners and residents, the "haves" and "have nots" (Arnstein, 1969). Instead, in this case, inclusion hinged on the productive view of power addressed in the literature review. Specifically, planners and residents constructed and leveraged the structural advantages associated with their respective professional and community positions to allow for new actions. These new actions, abilities and capacities constituted new forms of power, not as a possession, but as created and recreated through practices. In sum, I found that inclusive practices (see Feldman, 2004; Feldman & Khademian, 2000, 2007; Quick & Feldman, 2011) allowed for the actions, skills, abilities, resources and assets of all participants (not just planners) to be incorporated, and for the possibility for new actions, abilities, and capacities. These new actions, abilities and capacities constitute new experiences of "power to" achieved by planning differently and demonstrate a "power with" (new actors, actions, skills, abilities, resources and assets). I will discuss these findings and provide evidence for each along with my expanded explanation of power and inclusion below.

Engaging structural advantages. As in the chapter on exclusion, I found that the practices to engage community members created and used the relative positions of collaborative members, as well as the advantages associated with these positions, to engage residents. In the exclusion chapter, the relative position of meeting facilitators or organizational representatives as grantees in the initiative was instrumental in practices that excluded residents. Specifically, structural advantages such as financial support, or

experience and knowledge of the rules for getting funded by the foundation, were resources associated with their position as facilitators or organizational representatives that enabled this exclusion. In this chapter, I found that planners used their relative position as authors of the draft and the structural advantages associated with this position to enact *inclusion*.

Specifically, the planners and youth structured the process to allow for new actions and capacities and to incorporate the advantages and assets associated with everyone's position.

Position in this context refers to where actors are situated within an organization and how actors relate to one another.⁶ Schattschneider's (1960) work calls for a focus on the organization of bias to explain what is included and what is excluded. Frequently, these relations and organizations are theorized to take a variety of forms such as hierarchies, markets (Reddel, 2002; Williams & Ouchi, 1981) or networks (Granovetter, 1973). Position, like structure, is socially constructed (see Berger & Luckmann, 1966), relative (Sewell, 1992) and is often shaped by institutional norms and patterns (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Position influences and reflects the possible, legitimate, or often required actions of organizational actors (e.g. decision-making). Professions (e.g. schoolteacher), level in an organization (e.g. executive director), and other group identifiers (e.g. service providers, residents, politicians) help to describe position.

In the Central City Community Change Initiative, terms associated with members' positions in the collaborative include resident, youth, organizational representative, executive director, community organizer, academic, or foundation representative. Just as in other cross-sector collaborations, in Central City, organizational position is multiple and dynamic; in other words, sometimes the same person is a resident *and* works for an organization. Concurrently, the same position can take on different meanings in relation to the context described by Sewell (1992). Also, depending on the meeting, actions are not solely

⁶ There is another use of the term position, which is based in negotiation literature (Fischer & Ury, 1991). Planning (see Innes and Booher, 2004) and collaboration (see Agranoff, 2004) scholars employ this meaning of this term.

determined by the labels listed above. In *Creating Complete Streets*, the planning professionals were ultimately responsible for the Circulation Element draft in comparison to youth; accordingly, they had authority over the plan and drafted it. However, at YouthMatters, it was the Complete Streets Team that had the expertise on the Circulation Element update, not staff members like Ramona and Miguel. So youth, including Liam and Rosie, led the updates on the policy drafting process for the Central City Community Change Initiative.

The contractual arrangement between the city and Beta positioned Beta to control the plan-drafting segment of the policymaking process. Contracts of this nature do not detail the actions required by the consultants. The consultants used this position and used resources (e.g. the circulation element draft) in a way that opened the planning process to new types of information and actions.

New actions. In *Creating Complete Streets*, the youth and the planning professionals used their position in the planning process to facilitate new actions. In this subsection of findings I will review some new actions that emerged, but these do not encapsulate all the new actions that took place in *Creating Complete Streets*. In subsequent subsections of my findings covering inclusive processes and new experiences of power, I will provide further examples of new actions.

The literature's common narrative says that "elites," represented in this case by the consultants, tend to use their power to pursue their interests and dismiss individual and community interests (Domhoff, 2007; Molotch, 1976; Stone, 1976). This accepted narrative describes what appeared to unfold in the beginning of *Creating Complete Streets*, when the consultants ignored youth at the community meeting. However, as mentioned in the literature review, inclusion and exclusion are both fleeting (O'Reilly, 2005), structure is "profoundly temporal" (Sewell, 1992), and conflict is a normal part of planning; it is how it is legitimated

that matters (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p. 10; see Lowerson & Feldman, 2012, for another example). The consultants were able to use this conflict and their own structural position to allow youth to share their ideas and input. In addition, the consultants and youth co-created a process that involved new actions by both parties.

Prior to the community meeting, youth developed new abilities and capacities as far as understanding policy advocacy, but at the community meeting Beta's actions and organization of the meeting prevented the youth from acting on these abilities and capacities. Before their involvement in YouthMatters and the CC-CCI, youth did not attend city council or planning meetings. It was unusual for youth, many of whom were undocumented, to participate in city council or planning meetings like the circulation element (Prowler, 2007). Youth came to attend this particular meeting as a result of a series of events and multiple factors. The foundation's requirement to focus on local policy change and YouthMatters' involvement in the CC-CCI bolstered YouthMatters' focus on policy advocacy and the inclusion of youth in planning and policymaking processes. Thus, youth who attended YouthMatters programming and events began to learn about and engage in local policy advocacy. Then, as a result of discussions at YouthMatters, described by Miguel in *Creating Complete Streets*, the youth became aware of the lack of bike lanes in Central City in comparison to more affluent neighboring cities and thus became interested in improving the bike infrastructure in Central City to make it safer and easier to bike.

At the community meeting described at the beginning of *Creating Complete Streets* vignette, the youth took new political actions by attending, but the planners conducted business as usual and repeated old actions, which constrained youth from acting on their new awareness and knowledge of complete streets and engaging in dialogue. Beta representatives gave a PowerPoint presentation to their audience and then fielded questions, collecting input but ignoring youth. This was a common format for community forums in Central City as well

as in general, in order to meet state requirements for community participation. Often consultants, do not have preexisting relationships with any of the audience members apart from their clients. Thus, these actions are legitimate, given norms in community engagement and their position in the planning process. These actions placed the onus on residents to attend meetings in order to voice concerns or ask questions, but at the same time, the dialectical format of the presentation and the question period reinforced the professional planners' control over the meeting.

After the community meeting, Beta leveraged their position to facilitate new actions and include youth and their expertise, while still accomplishing the work and meeting their contractual obligations to the city. The consultants met with the youth and youth organizers at YouthMatters, shared the data collection form with youth, listened to youth, and ultimately modified the data collection form based on youth's ideas and knowledge of the streets. These actions contrast with more expected actions, such as their attitude in the community meeting, ignoring youth and paying attention to other stakeholders and their client's concerns. During the remaining period of data collection and assessment for the Circulation Element draft, the consultants continued discussions with youth. They took actions that included youth in their work: they trained youth to use their forms and Google Maps to assess the streets, and invited youth to set up tables at future community engagement events for the Circulation Element. Ultimately, Beta enlisted youth as co-designers and co-implementers of the data collection, and did not censor the type of data they collected. This allowed youth to also take new actions such as recruiting and training more youth and adult resident data assessors.

Inclusive practices. The new actions and the use and creation of structural advantage as described above collectively made various aspects of the policymaking process more inclusive (such as the design of data collection methods, the implementation of data collection methods, and the problem definition). By inclusivity, I mean that youth, youth's

ways of knowing and their actions became an integral part of the policy-making process. Youth and planners co-designed the method and co-produced the implementation of data collection, as well as co-defining the policy problems to be addressed in the Circulation Element (i.e. lack of center medians and bike lanes). This resembles a feature of Quick and Feldman's (2011) interpretation of inclusion: the coproduction of the process and outcome of decision-making, the process of data collection, and the content of the draft were co-produced. The actions taken by youth and planners also engaged multiple ways of knowing, a key feature of inclusion (Quick & Feldman, 2011; Van Buuren, 2009). Ways of knowing (WOKs)

contain different knowledge elements: they contain different bodies of factual knowledge, formulate specific knowledge questions, and prefer different methods and knowledge institutes. WOKs also encompass different frames, interpretations, or normative perceptions of reality. And finally, different WOKs make use of different sources and types of organizing capacity (Van Buuren, 2009, p. 208).

Inclusion demanded incorporating and valuing both Beta's and the youth's assets such as their ways of knowing – as per Quick and Feldman (2011) – as well as incorporating their types of information and styles of expression - as per Bryson et al., 2013.

Co-creating data collection methods. Before they modified the street assessment form and the plan to implement it in order to include youth input, the consultants planned to collect data for the Circulation Element draft using Google Maps. But during the meeting at YouthMatters, the youth, their youth organizer, and the consultants discussed the youth's concerns about the city. Their knowledge of the problem areas was clear. For example, many of the youth walked to school, so they knew which sidewalks were too narrow to accommodate all of the foot traffic to school, and they realized that inadequate sidewalks

posed a safety concern for pedestrians. This type of information was not visible to the consultants via Google Maps; they also did not have the resources or the lived experience to collect this qualitative data. The youth's knowledge of the problem and their additional manpower were assets well-suited to complement Beta's professional knowledge and authority over the draft.

The youth also modified the assessment form to make the language accessible to youth assessors, and they added a notes section in order to collect the qualitative observations they felt were necessary in order to understand the problems in Central City. A youth explained the co-creation of the assessment tool:

[W]e removed some things that we thought were not necessary and then added some things that we thought were important for the reports [such as] the center median ...

[W]e also added a notes section, because we noticed our streets are not good here and the assessments don't go into depth [describing] how the streets are or say specifically what the streets needed ... Like between this street and this street there is an issue.

The modification of the street assessment form was a process that engaged youth, as well as their knowledge of the streets, in its creation. It also allowed other youth to be able to use the assessment form and collect data.

The inclusion of youth and their knowledge was made possible through a series of actions. These actions include the youth attending the meeting, Veronica talking with the city, and then the consultants meeting with youth. Then the co-creation process consisted of the consultants sharing the data collection form with youth, the youth expressing their ideas and concerns to the consultants during the meeting, the consultants listening to youth, the youth adding a notes section, the youth deleting and modifying questions that did not make sense to them, and the consultants also modifying the form based on youth feedback.

Beta and youth both modified the street assessment form and created plans to collect

data. Through these actions, Beta included youth and their expertise into their methods design process as well as their own. The inclusion of youth in the methods design phase set up the next stage of the planning process, data collection, to also include youth in the collecting of information about the city, which represented their lived experience in Central City.

Co-producing data collection. The actions taken by youth to actually assess the streets also illustrated the integration of youth and their ways of knowing as assets into the implementation of data collection. Youth wrote stories about the streets, calculated the frequency of car or bike passage, recruited and trained other resident data collectors, and sent their assessment forms to the planners. The planners used GIS and Google Maps, trained youth and used these methods with youth, received data from youth, and wrote the plan narrative.

Beta and youth co-produced the data collection implementation. Through various actions, Beta included youth and their knowledge in their data collection process. Moreover, during the data collection phase, the inclusion of youth could be seen in the additional and necessary actions they took to get the work done. They set up their own internal systems and recruited new assessors into the data collection process.

Co-construction of policy problems. The youth and the planners also co-constructed the policy problem, a critical component of policymaking (Bardach, 2011) and of the inclusion equation (Quick & Feldman, 2011). The narratives captured in the open-ended questions told the stories of the street, not just the static picture Google and GIS could provide. The inclusion of youth and the modified form afforded the initiative a method which better approximated a resident's perspective of a street. By including youth in the data collection methods' design and implementation, Beta and youth co-constructed the policy problem of a lack of complete streets in Central City. They also co-produced the process and content of decision-making, with the inclusion of youth in the data collection methods

constituting the process of decision-making, and the policy-problem as drafted constituting the content of decision-making.

New experiences of power

New abilities and capacities. The new actions and inclusive practices detailed above constituted new skills and abilities for the youth and consultants. It also provided opportunities to work together. Youth were now able to supply information to decision makers and influence the decision makers' choices. Consultants were able to listen to and act on resident concerns. Collectively, youth and the consultants demonstrated a capacity to co-create and co-produce data for planning processes and value each other's expertise. At the same time, the consultants and youth achieved their goals: for example, consultants created a draft circulation element, and youth engaged in policy advocacy.

New Abilities. The consultants and youth also developed abilities to work together and practice community engagement differently. The planners' community engagement practices now encompassed face-to-face meetings with youth and engaging vocal critics in the production of their work.⁷ Youth residents' engagement practices now involved co-creating and co-producing planning processes. Their knowledge became interwoven with the methods of the data collection process. Community engagement became an embedded feature of both the consultants' work process and of the products of their work, as well as a part of youth's experience with policy advocacy work.

Youth and nonprofit representatives expressed to me that residents felt like experts. One youth explained that much of the language around Complete Streets and the Circulation Element was very technical,

but if you can get a chance to look and say this is what the barriers [i.e.

⁷ Quick & Feldman (2011) discuss a similar move to engage vocal critics as a part of inclusion in their research in Grand Rapids, Michigan (p. 281).

medians] are ... [it] can be a little bit confusing at first but everybody can learn it. It's something that we can easily overcome because we are both experts.

An organizational representative from El Salud stated:

[E] verybody has different abilities and everybody is able to understand lots of different things, but you know everybody cannot be an expert at everything (Circulation Focus Group).

In community engagement efforts in city planning, professional knowledge is typically privileged (Flyvbjerg, 1998). This can also pressure resident and community groups to learn and adopt technical language in order to participate. In contrast, these quotes illustrate that in the collaboration between the consultants and youth, *expert* and *professional* were not assumed to be synonymous and multiple forms of expertise were treated as legitimate. Beta and the youth were able to engage with one another, which enabled multiple forms of knowledge to be used in the data collection methodology. Engagement went both ways; it was not a practice that only the planners could engage in. Together, they were able to create a process in which different types of information were valued.

New Capacities. Beta and Youth built their capacity to work together. For instance, the co-creation of the form required that the youth understand the issue, but also for Beta to listen to them. Ramona, the youth organizer, explained that the youth prepared for the first meeting, did research and learned the planning terminology, but the consultants still did not listen to or hear the youth. Even though the youth performed a considerable amount of work to become legible to the consultants, the consultants had not done the work necessary to be able to hear the youth. The consultants then called YouthMatters to set up a meeting to involve youth in the assessment process and began listening to youth. These abilities and capacities to work together and to be inclusive did not rest unilaterally on the planners'

inclusion of youth in a meeting or process. Veronica played a role by reaching out to the city, but also by creating a process in which youth actions were legitimate, and in which the planners could learn and take new actions (i.e. listening to youth).

Having the capacity to include youth meant engaging with youth on their own level and creating a process in which youth's assets could be acted upon.

Miguel explained the skills and abilities needed to work with youth:

[W]ith youth you have to kind of get them to understand the issue first and— and kind of invest in that. And then you have to kind of get them to understand the issue and to really—not just to bring them along because they're youth and you want to bring them along, but to actually have them understand the issue and to see what their point of view is. And they're still youth. [0:03:35.9] So they're relying on people to give them rides, or they have homework, or they do sports, or they wanna go hang out with their friends. (Miguel interview, September 23, 2013)

The consultants met youth in their physical space, but they also used their position to open up the design of the methods to youth and allow youth to offer their unique perspective about the street and then institutionalize a way to capture these insights through the notes section in the assessment form. Beta's initial plan was to include local knowledge through community outreach events, yet this is another example of how the consultants used their structural advantage to include residents; this meant reorganizing their engagement with youth to “not just to bring them along because they're youth ... but to actually have them understand the issue and to see what their point of view is” (Miguel, interview, September 23, 2013).

Thus, the youth and Beta took actions which created a new way to include, mobilize and archive community knowledge. Community knowledge represents what Bryson et al.

(2013) call a new type of information and style of expression. Specifically, Montoya (2013, p. S45) refers to it as a transformational way of knowing and being that understands and addresses social inequalities; he distinguishes community knowledge from local or lay knowledge. The latter is a form of expertise associated with the person's identity, while the former is a dynamic concept created in practice through ongoing processes of co-emergence and co-evolution in which actors, knowledge and the community are transformed (Montoya 2013, S53). In *Creating Complete Streets*, youth and planners created community knowledge both individually and collectively through their new actions, abilities and capacities, all of which transformed them as well as the planning process. These new actions, abilities and capacities represent forms of "power to" and "power with." In the following subsections, I will describe these forms of power and illustrate the presence of productive forms of power in inclusion.

The power to enable and take new actions. Inclusion involves the power to enable and take new actions. From the beginning, youth took new actions. They learned about complete streets, attended the meeting and reported back about their exclusion. Phillips (1993, 1995) argues that the presence of typically disadvantaged populations such as minorities, indigenous people, women, LGBTQ, youth, unemployed, underclass, recent immigrants, and people exposed to environmental risk is a political action unto itself (cited in Dryzek, 1996). In this case, however, the youth's political actions were limited because in the first community meeting, Beta began with actions that structured youth input out of the process. To even allow youth to give input required new actions on Beta's part, but they then went further and took actions that allowed the inclusion of youth and their ideas to shape the methods and policy problem.

At other times in the initiative, particularly during conversations about safety (see exclusion chapter), the mere presence of organizational representatives in positions of legal

authority prevented inclusion. In these situations, inclusion would have meant the *removal* of law enforcement representatives in order for residents to take new actions and attain decision-making authority. This example demonstrates the point made by Giddens (1984) that power is instantiated in action and also that inaction is a form of action and power (Lukes, 2005). Similarly, the consultants' choice not to call on youth at the initial forum was a way of exercising power.

The power to co-create, to co-produce and to co-define policy problems. As youth modified the assessment form, they displayed an ability to communicate and negotiate within the professional planning arena. They also demonstrated that they had influence over the assessment process. The youth's inclusion into the process placed them in a position to omit questions written by the consultants, as well as to add their own questions and modify wording. While the consultants still had the ultimate authority on the content of the draft, and the city needed to approve it, the youth shaped the information the consultants would use to draft the plan, and which the city would use to make decisions.

These new abilities and influence demonstrate “power to” and “power with.” They illustrate a “power to” because youth and planners were able to take new actions and produce new forms of interaction, new methods of data collection, and a definition of the problem that was likely very different from what it would have been if the youth had not been included. Such powers demonstrate what Ortner (2001) describes as actors' significant capacity to exercise influence even in constrained environments.

These new abilities and influence also represent a “power with” because youth and the planning professionals co-created these new ways of knowing and of engaging the community. Such powers are central facets of what Barnes called power as capacity—as the ability to do something (Barnes, 1988; Haugaard, 1997, p. 23)—and resonate with Community Based Research scholars' understanding that communities are powerful (not

“have-nots”).

The power to engage different forms of knowledge and redefine expertise. In *Creating Complete Streets*, the consultants developed the capacity to engage the expertise of the youth and residents. The youth also developed their capacity to engage with planning officials. Such powers to navigate and operate within, as well as transform, a professional space demonstrate Foucault’s (1980) knowledge/power duality. Before the first forum, although youth researched and learned about the technical language of Complete Streets and later learned mapping using GIS and Google Earth, this “language” did not help them be heard initially, nor did they become planners by using this language. Instead, during the first meeting with the planners, they used this language to talk to planners and discuss the problem areas in the city’s streets, sometimes using planning terminology (i.e. center medians). In the course of *Creating Complete Streets*, as mentioned earlier, the actions and inclusive practices did not require all participants to be professionals; rather, the inclusive practices required the creation of conditions in which multiple forms of expertise were legitimate. If everyone were required to be a professional, youth might have been trained to use Google Maps, GIS or other methods to assess the streets and might have simply shadowed the consultants in their usual process. Instead, the youth and the consultants developed the conditions and the capacities to engage multiple forms of knowledge and thus redefine expertise in the data collection process.

The power to make connections. Making connections between new actors and actions is a central feature of Quick & Feldman’s (2011) definition of inclusion. In the beginning of the findings section, I explained the privileged position of the consultants for facilitating new actions. The youth exercised their power to make connections when they recruited new youth from the neighborhood and invited and trained adults from El Salud to

assess streets. They continuously expanded the community involved in the analysis process and defined the boundaries of who co-produced the data collection implementation.

The potential to act differently in the future. By recruiting assessors, the youth built a community of residents invested in the collection of resident-driven data. They also built up the capacity of community members to analyze streets and participate in planning and policy-making processes in the future. Youth created a civically engaged mass that was invested in the creation of Complete Streets. As Tarrow (1994) explains in his work, the actions taken in social change efforts have the possibility to shape the future, because they can change the prevailing discourse and can also normalize new forms of interaction and resistance, such as sit-ins. Similarly, Barnes' (1988) understanding of power likens power to a car's horsepower, in which power exceeds the moment of action. Despite his view that power is instantiated in action, Giddens (1984, p. 16), also argues that power can be "stored up" for future use (1976, pp. 111-12, cited in Haugaard, 1997, p. 107).

In this chapter, power has the potential for future use; as Feldman and Khademian explain, "[p]revious interactions leave traces in the form of memory or expectations, but structures do not continue to exist unless they are enacted" (2007, p. 312). Thus, *Creating Complete Streets* illustrates new possibilities for engagement practices that consultants can achieve with community residents, as well as what community residents can achieve using the community outreach process. Veronica, an organizational representative of Youth Matters, explained: "We don't want to keep them [youth] forever; we just want to give them the foundations so that they could connect with community in a bigger scale." This quote conveys that the power of the actions, practices, abilities, capacities and experiences described in this chapter are not only located in the moment itself, but also in the potential to translate what was accomplished in that moment into different spaces and times.

In this chapter, I parse the various forms of “power to” such as *the power to enable and take new actions, the power to co-create, to co-produce and to co-define policy problems, the power to engage different forms of knowledge and redefine expertise, and the power to make connections*. This phenomenological understanding of power demonstrates that the meaning of power, like structure, is defined by its use. Moreover, inclusion requires the allowing of new actions and connections to new issues; in short, inclusion requires emergence - allowing for new actors, issues, and approaches to be engaged, created, and implemented - and must be defined by those it is trying to include.

The new experiences of power documented in *Creating Complete Streets* ranged from single actions, such as attending a meeting, to inclusive practices, like co-creating data collection forms. Collectively, the new experiences constituted a “power to” and “power with” capacity to redefine community engagement in planning and policymaking.

Discussion

In this chapter, I offer suggestive evidence for an expanded understanding of inclusion and power in community engagement efforts—one that is grounded in asset-oriented and dynamic views of community participation (Minkler & Wallerstein, 1997; Walter & Hyde, 2012) and inclusion (Quick & Feldman 2011). *Creating Complete Streets* provided the rich empirical material and puzzle to illustrate community engagement as a process in which power played a vital role, but in an atypical fashion. Community engagement in *Creating Complete Streets* did not fit with Arnstein’s (1969) informed view of community engagement as an adversarial process, in which residents did not have power and the goal of the process was to transfer power from the “haves” to the “have nots.” What I witnessed was more a more complicated story, which required me to draw on and bring together multiple literatures to explain the new experiences of inclusion and power.

While the main contribution of this chapter is the expanded understanding of

inclusion and power in community engagement processes, as suggested above, this understanding is contingent upon engagement with related literatures often separated by discipline. I built my understanding of inclusion primarily on the inclusive management literature, but also borrowed from the social theorists of inclusion, exclusion and power such as Goodin (1996) and Foucault (1986). My focus on power in community engagement draws primarily on the Community Based Participatory Research (Minkler et al., 2012) and Citizen Participation literatures (Roberts, 2004). The inclusive management literature (see Feldman, 2004; Feldman & Khademian, 2000, 2007; Quick & Feldman, 2011) helped me to analyze and identify more nuanced forms of engagement, such as co-producing process and content of decision making, engaging multiple ways of knowing and sustaining temporal openness. The exclusion and social theory helped me question *whether* this was in fact inclusion, or just exclusion disguised as inclusion. The Community Based Participatory Research literature and Citizen Participation literatures motivated my focus to view power relations between researchers and their subjects, participants and designer/conveners, or public and government as integral to inclusive practices.

Setting up a dialogue between these literatures and my empirical material, I provide evidence for an understanding of inclusion and power in which community engagement is an opportunity to *create* power rather than an adversarial mechanism to shift power from the “haves” to the “have-nots.” In the remainder of this discussion section, I relate this expanded understanding of inclusion and power to the existing literature on community engagement. I also discuss theoretical and practical implications of the evidence and findings.

Practicing inclusion and power in community engagement. Since typical understandings of inclusion focus on *who* is included and do not explicitly identify new actions, abilities or capacities as signs of inclusion, they can overlook nuanced forms of exclusion that invite residents to the table, but require them to follow organizational rules that

do not make sense in relation to residents' experiences as described in the exclusion chapter. In this case, inclusion did not strictly require that youth be at the decision-making table, but they were included in shaping the data that was collected and thus the content of decision-making. This reflects Goodin's (1996) description of exclusion, in which exclusion can mean that people are included but on disadvantageous terms. Here, however, the reverse is true; inclusion can mean that actors may not be present (read: excluded), but their participation can still be structured into a process on advantageous terms in order to have influence on the decision-making process.⁸

I find that a definition of inclusion that only focuses on the actions of those in positions of power is insufficient. This echoes and builds on the work of public health scholars Ponc and Frisby (2010) who state that it is not "up to those in positions of relative power to 'include' those from the margins... all participants can be active agents inclusion processes, especially when the structural conditions are cocreated to foster inclusion" (p. 1527). According to the common view of community engagement being under the jurisdiction of planners and government officials, inclusion and power become phenomena that are only legitimate when authorized by a regulating agency or system, which perpetuates a view of residents as powerless. Instead, in my case, I support Ponc and Frisby's (2010) argument and demonstrate that participants' actions are vital to the creation of inclusion. But I also show that inclusion involves actions by those in positions of power to create the conditions to reorganize the process and legitimate participants' actions. Youth did not act alone in claiming the right to participate; YouthMatters staff also connected the students to the process, and planners responded and built upon these actions.

While I show that actions are indicative of inclusion, I do not conclude that the specifics of the actions matter for inclusion. Instead, in addition to the actions themselves, the

⁸ Exclusion also involves unintentional and often necessary practices as well as forms of exclusion in which people are brought into a political community, but on disadvantageous terms (Amin, 1976; Cardoso & Faletto, 1979; Wallerstein, 1979, cited in Goodin, 1996, Note 6, p. 345).

organization and structuring choices that created the conditions for these actions to emerge are significant. For instance, when the youth wrote a story about the street in the open-ended section of the assessment form, although the specifics of this action illustrate a meaningful effort in the creation of inclusion in this context, the meaning of this action exists in relationship with the other actions. This action demonstrates that in order for youth's ideas to be included, they did not have to be formatted differently. To lift this action or ability out of context and deduce that residents must write their own stories in order for inclusion to exist would be inaccurate. This interpretation threatens to echo common shortcomings of best practices conclusions in community engagement literature that often point to skills and competencies (i.e. the youth understanding planning terminology) or organizational mandates to explain inclusion, and then transfer them to inhospitable settings.

By taking a practice lens, actions, abilities and capacities are situated in what Orlikowski (2002) calls the conditions of skillful performance. She warns against viewing competencies in organizational contexts as

stable properties of particular individuals or units that can be invoked as needed in different situations. Thus, when skillful performance does not ensue, commentators seek explanations in the failure of those properties ('human error') or breakdowns in the system ('equipment malfunction'). (p. 270)

She then describes taking a practice view, focusing on the organizing and conditions to create opportunities for what she calls skillful performance. In the Complete Streets case, however, this skillful performance includes actions, abilities and capacities and the 'power to' findings. She states:

If, however, skillful performance is seen as an active accomplishment, its presence is not presumed and its absence is not sought in the failure of the parts. In contrast, when skillful performance is seen to lie in the dynamic

engagement of individuals with the world at hand at a particular time and place, both its presence and absence are understood as emerging from situated practices. The focus then is on understanding the conditions (e.g., human, social, structural, financial, technological, infrastructural) under which skillful performance is more and less likely to be enacted (Orlikowski, 2002, p. 270).

The ability of Beta and youth to enact inclusion rested on the conditions they co-created that allowed for Beta and youth's assets to be used. Thus, there is no single correct way to enact inclusion (e.g. this group of youth should always seek to collect data with planners). Instead, the focus should be on the practices that create conditions in which new actions, abilities and capacities are possible, and everyone's assets are incorporated. In this case, the practices that created conditions for inclusion involved the use of planners' authority over the planning process, and Beta's minimal and ambiguous mandate for community engagement—they could have met their community engagement requirements without meeting youth at YouthMatters. Instead, they engaged with youth in the extensive way described in *Creating Complete Streets*. Simultaneously, youth contributed to the conditions through which inclusion was possible through their actions (i.e. learning complete streets language and attending the community meeting). Their relationship with Youth Matters and the Central City Change Initiative also contributed to conditions for their political actions as well as the conditions for the planners to enact their mandates in an inclusive way.

Power is often discussed as an adversarial force that needs to be given to or reclaimed by communities, but I depict a productive view of power, in which power is located in practice and thus cannot be given away, since it is already present and possible in communities. I specify that the relationship between power and inclusion requires the creation of enabling conditions that are used to enact inclusion.

This focus on the conditions to allow for actions, abilities and competencies to

emerge affirms that inclusion is not about taking power or homogenization. As Young (2000) has explained, inclusion is not about *equality*, but “[i]t means explicitly acknowledging social differentiations and divisions and encouraging differently situated groups to give voice to their needs, interests, and perspectives” (p. 119). In my case, inclusion was about engaging multiple ways of knowing (Quick and Feldman, 2011), situated groups being able to give voice to their diverse needs, interests, and perspectives (Young, 2000, p. 119) and policymakers hearing and acting on these, and even engaging conflict (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p. 10; see Lowerson & Feldman, 2012, for another example). These practices required the creation of structures and the use of people’s relative advantages. Planners can and often do proceed with predetermined decision-making processes (Healey, 2003). But in this case, the professional planners used their position to open up the process for youth to co-create it with them and the youth also made this possible by attending the forum and co-creating the process through which they could collaborate with the planners.

The productive nature of power in community engagement. I have suggested that the empirical success of Beta and youth’s work together demonstrates that power can be a productive force, not just an adversarial one, in community engagement processes. Follett (1918), Foucault (1986) and Butler (1990) focus on a productive view of power, “power with” and “power to” respectively (Clegg et al., 2006). In *Creating Complete Streets*, power was not deployed in ways that kept Beta and Youth divided. Instead, Beta and Youth created connections with one another in accordance with Quick & Feldman’s (2011) definition of inclusion and blurred the boundaries between “designers” and “participants.” This did not mean that participants became “designers,” but rather that the youth and planners created the design together by connecting with the diverse needs, interests, and perspectives involved. This focus on connections as a fundamental feature of inclusion defuses the “us versus them” dichotomy espoused in the adversarial view.

This focus on connections also demonstrates another important power move related to Foucault's (1986) notion of disciplinary power. For Foucault, power resides in the creation and reification of boundaries around populations and disciplines, delineating categories like the insane and the sick. In my case, the blurring of the boundary between "designer" and "participants" demonstrated the power to make connections and constitute what Lave and Wenger (1991) call new communities of practice. Connections between actors, among issues and over time create the conditions for everyone to "play [with] their strengths" (Roberts et al., 2005). This is another way that residents are assumed to be competent and skilled partners (Finn & Chekotoway, 1998). In my case, youth were managing the boundary to include other community members, professionals, as well as different approaches to the work.

The central role of connections in inclusion also affirms Follett's (1918) "power with" suggestion that power is co-active and democratically productive, not necessarily authoritarian. In the case of Complete Streets, the actions, practices, abilities and capacities outlined in the findings were interdependent as well as dependent on an assemblage of previous actions, conditions, and actors. They could not be explained by authoritarian means or attributed to a single determinant.

The creation of connections also required continuous effort and ongoing actions. This affirms the fleeting and temporal nature of inclusion (Feldman & Khademian, 2007; O'Reilly, 2005), but also suggests the possibility for ongoing actions to create new experiences of power, influence future action and leave a lasting impact on those involved (Tarrow, 1994). In my case, the youth and consultants dialogued repeatedly to modify the street assessment form and data collection methods. Montoya & Kent (2011) infer that research is *ongoing* dialogue that creates opportunities and conditions for inclusion-- specifically, the conditions in which expertise is mutually constructed and no-one is the

object of research (p. 1000). In *Creating Complete Streets*, an important feature of the ongoing efforts to work together was the effort made by planners and youth to use their assets and sources of power to co-produce expertise. They each took actions that legitimated each other's assets; for instance, the planners met with youth and changed the form, and the youth learned planning terminology. In the practices of community engagement, the planners and youth created the conditions for inclusion.

Collaborative approaches like those described in *Creating Complete Streets* are often critiqued for not challenging the overall power structures (Hollander & Einwohner, 2004, p. 549). However, a closer look at the actions that constituted this collaboration reveals that new forms of inclusion and power *were* enacted. Youth pursued their own politics (Ortner, 1995) signaled by their presence and ultimately, their embeddedness (Phillips, 1993, 1995). Instead of trying to take the power from the consultants, the youth embedded themselves in the production of the data collection, which had an impact on the consultants as well as themselves; for example, the discourse on complete streets was reformulated through the archiving of youth's categories and descriptions.

The power to structure inclusion. In the literature review for this chapter and the exclusion chapter, I outline a theory of structure informed by practice theory (Bourdieu, 1990; Giddens, 1984). This view of structure assumes that it is always in a state of creation and recreation, that people's actions are constrained and enabled by social structures, and that these actions are also what constitutes these structures. In my expanded view of power and inclusion, understanding people's actions as constitutive of structures implicates all actions in the creation of structure. This provides a narrative divergent from the adversarial point of view, which lines up residents' actions in opposition to "powerholders'" actions. Instead, in my case, citizen power and managerial power were not synonymous. Arnstein (1969) stated that citizen control happens when citizens obtain the majority of decision-making seats, or

full managerial power. However, in *Creating Complete Streets*, full managerial power was not possible, while inclusion was. Inclusion did not mean that youth took decision-making seats, but that planners and youth took actions to create a process that continued to be open to new knowledge, actions, abilities, and capacities. Planners still occupied these figurative seats, but they and the content of the plan were forever altered by the youth's participation.

Inclusive practices in this context hinged on the use of the planners' structural advantage relative to the planning process to open the process and outcomes, allowing them to be co-produced by youth and consultants. While the citizen participation literature acknowledges the importance of social structures (i.e. education or income), they are often interpreted as transferable resources with fixed meanings. While social structures endure, as mentioned in the literature review, the meaning of structures depends on how structures are implemented in action (Feldman & Khademian, 2007). Thus, the meaning of structures, such as decision-making authority, depends on how those with such authority wield this authority. In this chapter, I show that professional planners wielded their authority to include youth, and that youth drew on their own advantages and assets to participate and be included. The central role of structural advantage in the multiple instantiations of inclusion in *Creating Complete Streets* indicates the interrelated nature of power and inclusion.

The mutual constitution of inclusion and power. In this dissertation chapter I have demonstrated that the relationship between inclusion and power is mutually constitutive; the actions and abilities used to create the conditions for inclusion also are shaped by the conditions created through these actions. Moreover, the actions and abilities that designate inclusion also mark new experiences of power. This demonstrates the productive nature of inclusion and power as something that gets created, not requiring "taking away" power from "powerholders." As mentioned above, the youth did not protest or boycott because they did not have decision-making authority, but this did not mean that they could not be included.

This also provides a positive view of these phenomena, because even in constrained environments where decision-making authority does not change and participation has a short timeframe, inclusion can emerge.

The youth also demonstrated a new mode of power in their expansion of the community of data assessors. By taking new actions in the policymaking sphere, the youth and consultants constituted new communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Power as the ability to define and expand community boundaries is similar to Quick & Feldman's (2011) discussion of inclusive communities and Young's (2000) understanding of inclusion. Quick & Feldman (2011) define inclusive communities as less focused on subjecting participants to the core principles of the community-of-practice, and more focused on orienting "all participants to manage boundaries in continuously open-ended ways in order to keep the community expanding" (Quick & Feldman 2011, p. 285). In this case, power was defined by the power to include, but this was not limited to expanding the boundary or the requirement for new members to become like those "inside." Instead, inclusion involves an appreciation of diversity, and it questions who is involved in boundary work and the criteria for how the boundary gets expanded. In my analysis, managing and expanding the boundary, while an act of inclusion, was also an act of power.

The youth's power to expand the community demonstrated that youth and the community were integral to the process and redefined everyone as experts. Youth and residents were not "nobodies" or "have-nots" transformed into "somebodies" or "haves" (see Arnstein, 1969); they were already somebodies who became boundary-makers in this context. This capacity-oriented view of community members echoes multiple literatures (e.g. CBPR; Barnes, 1988) in which community members are powerful creators of inclusion. The youth residents' redefinition of who could be considered a planning expert and their integration into the planning sphere of different forms of work that non-professionals could do reflected a

shift in disciplinary power, since these actions also required the professionals to recognize such boundary modifications as legitimate.

In practice, adversarial approaches to community engagement by policymakers and in public agencies persist today (Tompkins et al., 2002). As the trend toward more community engagement continues (U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 1979; Roberts, 2004), community residents are eager to be well-represented in planning the policies that affect their lives. Warren has called for “new forms of mediating institutions [...] that can hold public institutions, and eventually global corporations, accountable to communities” (2001, p. 28). This chapter provides community engagement scholars and practitioners with an alternative interpretation of inclusion and power in community engagement in planning and policymaking processes. This research demonstrates that inclusion amounts to more than bringing people into decision-making seats; it is a deeply situated and complex phenomenon in which power is integral and can be generated collaboratively. This chapter also initiates a new discussion on power in community engagement through a detailed description of the relationship between inclusion and power, which will enable us to better understand what constitutes inclusion and future possibilities for enacting inclusion.

Conclusion

This chapter contributes to the literature on community engagement in planning and policymaking. I detailed a situation in which inclusion was enacted in the context of community engagement in a local planning process, in a way that revealed power as productive and community engagement as a means for new experiences of power to become possible. In this chapter, inclusive practices are shown to depend upon the use of relative positions of power and the advantages associated with them, and the creation of new experiences of power. Processes and practitioners continue to engage communities as they become more skilled in, and committed to participation. This reality requires a closer look at

the practices of engagement to distinguish whether, and to what extent efforts to achieve inclusiveness are actually successful, or whether they are simply reinforcing disciplinary and institutional forms of power and organizational practice, which end up excluding. In the next and final empirical chapter, I will discuss the logics that undergird these practices of inclusion and power.

Empirical Chapter 3:

Institutional Logics of Community Engagement

“We must be careful of our mindsets while we are here. What is your need? Your view as a resident and as a businessman is very different. Everyone has different needs and we need to discover what those needs are. Much of the community is not ready for the process, we need the *language* first. We need to make the language easy and simple for the 90,000 residents”
(Central City Resident, Fieldnotes, September 1, 2010)

Introduction

In previous two chapters, I described and analyzed instances of exclusion and inclusion in the Central City Change Initiative, a cross-sector collaboration that prioritized community engagement. I honed in on the processes and structures that excluded and included. Specifically, I described exclusion and inclusion as hinging respectively on practices that prevented connections between diverse actors, between ideas, and over time, or on practices that advantaged everyone’s assets, allowing them to be incorporated into the process. I concluded that the use and enactment of structure and relative positions of power were significant for exclusion and inclusion. In this final empirical chapter, I describe the construction of exclusion and inclusion through an exploration of the institutional logics at work in the community engagement and collaborative practices of the initiative.

Institutional logics are the “socially constructed, historical patterns of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules by which individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organize time and space, and provide meaning to their social reality” (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999, p. 804). Collaborative management scholars Bryson,

Crosby and Stone (2006) propose that competing institutional logics exist within cross-sector collaborations⁹ and that these “may significantly influence the extent to which collaborations can agree on essential elements of process, structure, governance, and desired outcomes” (p. 50). Actors tend to adhere closely to the logics of their professional groups, but they can also borrow from logics from outside their background or position (McPherson & Sauder, 2013).

Practices are patterns of activity that are created and recreated through the production and reproduction of everyday actions and structures that constrain and enable each other (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011; Nicolini, 2013; Osterlund & Carlile, 2005). According to Lave and Wenger’s (1991) ideas of communities of practice and participation, practices are the building blocks of communities; participation in a community happens by learning and creating the practices, both explicit and taken for granted, of the community. In communities of practice, new members and changes in practice continually reconstitute the community (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998, cited in Quick & Feldman, 2011, p. 274).

Cross-sector collaborations bring together actors with differing backgrounds, experiences and organizational professions and positions, and their multiple taken-for-granted modes of working. In particular, cross-sector collaboration involves community residents as central collaborators. There is a distinctive tension, well-documented in the community participation literature, between “professionals” and “community residents” (Roberts, 2004). The divide between experts/professionals and citizens/participants in public policymaking is described as the result of differences in expertise, training, resources, and ultimately cogency in complex policy problems (Aron, 1979; Cohen, 1995; DeSario & Langton, 1984; Hadden, 1981; Morgan, 1984; Zimmerman, 1995 cited in Roberts 2004, p. 331). This usually falsely implies that community residents are deficient across all of these elements (McNight, 1995; Ponc & Frisby, 2010).

⁹ Bryson, Crosby and Stone (2006) define *cross-sector collaboration* as “partnerships involving government, business, nonprofits and philanthropies, communities, and/or the public as a whole” (p. 44).

While this analysis effectively identifies disparities and differences between collaborative actors, it does not address the mechanisms that advantage certain types of expertise, training, and resources in the creation of the process, structure and governance, and outcomes of collaborative work (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006). Alford and Friedland (1975) demonstrate the importance of institutional and structural analysis to understand public participation. Institutional logics offer a theoretical lens to understand the complexity of influences that create these tensions between various stakeholders, as well as to help explain the persistent challenges involved in engaging community residents in collaborative work.

I investigate the micro-foundations of the institutional logics to understand the role they played in the persistence of exclusion, despite a commitment to a highly participatory and collaborative approach by all participants (resident, nonprofits and the foundation). I also explore the relationship between logics and inclusion in the Central City Change Initiative. Specifically, I look at the different logics constituted by actors from different backgrounds, representing certain stakeholder groups, (e.g. residents, nonprofit employees, city employees, and foundation representatives), and discuss the impact of these logics on the performance of community engagement.

Though there was some overlap, I found that each of the three stakeholder groups—community-based nonprofit organizations, the Central City residents, and the foundation—had recognizably distinct logics of practice. The organizational representatives consistently took actions that collectively signaled a set of assumptions about accomplishing collaborative work. This included assumptions that in order to accomplish work, the collaborative must: meet deadlines, obtain funding, please the funder, stick to the agenda, and attend meetings. In parallel, I found residents' actions implied that to accomplish work, the collaborative must: account for personal and family issues, share, listen and integrate resident lived experience,

take action (not just go to meetings), and be skeptical of and monitor authorities.

The foundation's actions communicated that in order to accomplish work and social change, the foundation, while not the leader, could facilitate and convene as well as provide and promote conditions (such as those implied in the policy and systems change). The foundation also assumed that the collaborative must meet these conditions (such as the use of logic models) to receive funding, and that the foundation needed to, and could be, ambiguous. I also found that certain features of the foundation logic contradicted each other. While the foundation wanted to be open and flexible, they also had explicit and implicit expectations for the collaborative members.

In this chapter, I detail evidence for each of the logics above (resident, organization and foundation). Through analysis, I identified *what* was taken for granted or assumed necessary in order to accomplish the collaborative work, and to meet collaborative goals and needs. I present these taken-for-granted features of organizational, resident and foundation practice below as features of the respective institutional logic. In the discussion section, I present implications of this analysis for the literature and practice of community engagement and cross-sector collaboration. I also reconcile these findings with the literature on institutional logics.

Literature Review

Community engagement. In the introduction to this dissertation, I define community engagement as the collaboration between organizations and the communities (local, regional/state, national, global) that they aim to serve, in order to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes (Driscoll, 2008; King et al., 1998). Often attributed to civil society organizations like nonprofits and foundations, community engagement is also a term used by institutions of higher education (Ahmed & Palermo, 2010; Driscoll, 2008). Community engagement and public engagement differ in that the latter focuses on the public's participation in

governmental processes and political activities (King et al., 1998, p. 317). These are also distinct from civic and social engagement (in contrast to social isolation--see Putnam, 2000) which focuses on the participation of the public in political activities, or public volunteering in civil service organizations or informal neighborhood organizations or relationships. Brooks (2002) affirms that research on nonprofits, such as community engagement, is relevant for the public sector.

Nonprofit organizations and private foundations, central practitioners of community engagement, are fundamental to the structure of civic life in the United States (Heydemann & Hammack, 2013, p. 12). Nongovernmental entities “help solve the ‘institutional failures’ of business and government to provide public goods that are not sought by majorities of voters” and can deploy resources to target particular purposes, whether for a certain ethnic group or a certain issue (i.e. health) (Heydemann & Hammack, 2013, p. 13). And while nongovernmental organizations have the ability to ‘positively discriminate’ in their missions and focus on certain issues, this freedom is also a constraint, in that it can prevent organizations from shifting focus and broadening their scope according to community needs. This is particularly concerning in situations in which a foundation or endowment was created many years ago, and the founder had specified a purpose that made sense in an earlier spatial-temporal context but that did not translate to other times and cultures (Smith, 1999).

Over the past twenty-years, as evinced by interventions like Community Change Initiatives, foundations have acknowledged the importance of partnering and investing in communities to address complex social problems (Smith, 1998). Nongovernmental entities focus on engaging citizens in policy advocacy (Babcock, 1998). Many have invested in community-building, which represents an upstream shift of focus from the issue of the day (i.e. education, housing, or health) to the capacity of communities to address a variety of issues. Despite this investment in people, a meta-analysis of Community Change Initiatives

found that all initiatives prioritized community-building as important to making changes in communities, but there was a lack of convincing evidence that this investment resulted in success across selected health and social outcomes (Farrow, 2010; Kubisch et al., 2010a). This lack of clarity about the impacts of community-building resonates with scholarship that questions the effectiveness of community engagement efforts to shape the content of decisions.

Specifically, scholars question the impact community residents can have “through normal institutional channels” (Crosby, Kelly, & Schaefer, 1986, p. 172, cited in King, Felty, & Susel, 1998 p. 317; also see INCITE!, 2009; McNight, 1995). Often, the ineffectiveness of community engagement is attributed to a lack of adequate skills and resources, or poor planning or execution (King et al., 1998). At the same time, some scholars also acknowledge institutional factors such as “administrative systems that are based upon expertise and professionalism [which] leave little room for participatory processes” (deLeon, 1992; Fisher, 1993; Forester, 1989; White and McSwain, 1993, cited in King et al., 1998, p. 317). In sum, the literature so far suggests an important question: do community building or engagement efforts expect community members to participate in normal institutional channels, whereas these institutional channels are organized and structured in ways that prevent community members and professional partners from reaping the benefits of collaboration by preventing everyone’s assets from being incorporated?

While some respond to this conundrum by advocating for community members working *outside* the institutional channels to accomplish political change (see INCITE!, 2009; McNight, 1995), community and public engagement through existing institutional channels is still advocated as an approach for making planning and policymaking processes more effective and sustainable as well as democratic (Herbert, 1996; Metzler et al., 2003). Community engagement scholars such as Corburn (2009), Reisch (2002), Wallerstein and

Duran (2006), and Minkler et al. (2012) describe community engagement as “a central value in public health, social work, education, urban and regional planning and other areas that emphasize, in part, organizing and capacity building” (Minkler et al., 2012, p. 112).

As discussed in Chapter 2: Inclusion & Power, scholars studying deliberative democracy (Dryzek, 1996; Fischer, 2003; Forester, 1999) and inclusive management (Feldman & Khademian, 2000; Quick & Feldman, 2011) identify practices that *are* able to include diverse stakeholders and community residents within the existing political system. In other words, these scholars demonstrate the possibility for democratic and inclusive community engagement within existing institutional channels. However, Heydemann and Hammack (2009) suggest that the practices and rules that govern the “internal structures, funding, operations, and governance of nonprofit, [and] nongovernmental organizations” often hinder nonprofits from working inclusively with the communities they seek to partner and serve (p. 9).

Challenges of collaboration and community engagement. Bryson et al. (2006) have reviewed the extensive cross-sector collaboration literature, identifying the major barriers to effective collaboration. They pinpoint varied contingencies and constraints that affect the process, structure, governance and ultimately sustainability of the collaboration (Bryson et al., 2006, p. 50). The three main issues were types of collaboration, power imbalances, and competing institutional logics.

Types of collaboration refers to partnerships focused on service, as opposed to partnerships focused on planning for systems change. The authors suggest that the former are more common and easier to sustain than the latter because “system-level planning activities, like agenda setting in the public policy process, involve negotiating tough questions about the problem and creative solutions” (Bolland & Wilson, 1994, cited in Bryson et al., 2006, p. 50).

They also argue that partnerships with executive-level staff are more prone to conflict (Alter, 1990, cited in Bryson et al., 2006, p. 50).

In regard to power imbalances, Bryson et al. (2006) affirm that power imbalances are a source of distrust and disagreement, both of which are problematic for effective collaboration. They suggest that “[c]ross-sector collaborations are more likely to succeed when they build in resources and tactics for dealing with power imbalances and shocks” (Bryson et al., 2006, p. 50).

Lastly, they posit that competing institutional logics are instrumental to consider for effective collaboration, because they challenge the collaboration’s ability to build legitimacy, leadership, and trust as well as manage conflict (Bryson et al., 2006, p. 50). Institutional logics are the “socially constructed, historical patterns of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules by which individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organize time and space, and provide meaning to their social reality” (Thornton and Ocasio, 1999, p. 804). Institutional logics take into account the formal and informal rules that govern the “internal structures, funding, operations, and governance of nonprofit, [and] nongovernmental organizations” that hinder nonprofits from working inclusively with the communities they seek to partner and serve (Heydemann & Hammack, 2009, p. 9).

Logics provide a lens to account for the multiple and competing assemblages of actions, processes, norms, and structures in collaborative, multi-actor, organizational and cultural organizations, and the impact these have on cross-sector collaborations. For example, “the contradictions embedded in a cross-sector collaboration might include the extent to which efficiency (the market), adherence to bureaucratic rules (the state), or inclusive participation (democracy) is regarded by collaboration members as essential to the design of the collaboration’s process, structure, governance, and desired outcomes” (Bryson et al., 2006, p. 50).

In complex multi-sector collaborations that require community engagement, multiple and competing logics are more prevalent because of the diversity of actors. For example, in collaborations that bring together actors from government, nongovernmental organizations and community residents, Bryson et al. (2006) point out that contradictions in logics might play out as issues of efficiency, bureaucratic rules and principles of democratic participation compete with one another when collaborative members need to decide on a collective process, structure and outcomes for their work (p. 50). In addition, different collaborative members have different perceptions of legitimate action based on institutional logics; an action that is legitimate for one actor may seem illegitimate from the perspective of another logic (Bryson et al., 2006, p. 50). Thornton and Ocasio (1999) also explain that logics can focus “the attention of decision makers on issues, outcomes, and sources of power” that are consistent with that logic, but at the same time this focus may be irreconcilable with another logic (cited in Bryson et al., 2006, p. 50).

This view on logics reiterates that community engagement and collaboration is based on the cooperation of actors who have varied interests and diverse backgrounds and who ultimately speak different languages (Bryson et al., 2006). Community engagement requires that practitioners reach outside of their organization (i.e. university researchers must reach out to local nonprofits, or community foundations to residents); yet as mentioned above, practitioners often work within “administrative systems that are based upon expertise and professionalism” (King et al., 1998, p. 317) and may manage competing institutional logics (Bryson et al., 2006) which make community engagement challenging.

Inclusive management scholars Quick & Feldman (2014) argue that the practices that reinforce differences in interests, backgrounds and languages are significant for collaboration. They describe the frequent construction of boundaries that differentiate technical expertise and privilege it over other non-expert ways of knowing as a form of

boundary work (Fischer, 2000; Thacher, 2009, cited in Quick & Feldman, 2009, p. 5). They explain that the typical assumption is that the expertise must be translated for the lay stakeholder or non-expert policy maker, or that nontechnical stakeholders must advocate extensively if they hope for their perspectives to be considered (Jasanoff, 1990; Dawes, Creswell & Pardo, 2009; Feldman & Ingram, 2009, cited in Quick & Feldman, 2009, p. 5). These types of boundary practices reinforce differences between actors and thus make participation contingent on learning the language of logic policy experts (Yanow, 2004; Cupers, 2011, cited in Quick & Feldman, 2009, p. 6).

Community engagement brings together service providers and service recipients, designers and participants, or community residents and organizational professionals who occupy different positions of relative power. King et al. (1998) explain:

In the context of conventional participation the administrator plays the role of the expert (p. 320). White and McSwain (1993) suggest that participation within this context is structured to maintain the centrality of the administrator while publicly presenting the administrator as representative, consultative, or participatory. The citizen becomes the "client" of the professional administrator, ill-equipped to question the professional's authority and technical knowledge. This process establishes what Fischer calls a "practitioner-client hierarchy." (1993, p.165, cited in King et al., 1998, p. 320)

As suggested in my previous chapters' discussion of structural advantage and power and in the preceding paragraph, if these positions are enacted in ways that privilege certain institutional logics, administrative systems, processes and expectations of the organizations, or if they prevent the incorporation of everyone's assets, this can conflict with efforts to include community residents and thus result in tension or conflict, as documented by Roberts (2004).

Fischer (1993) describes the assumptions and agreements that underwrite the relationship between organizations, that he calls professionals, and residents, whom he calls clients.

On the professional side of this understanding, experts agree to deliver their services to the limits of their competence, to respect the confidences of their clients, and not to misuse for their own benefit the special powers accorded to them by the relationship. In return, the clients agree to accept the professional's authority in specific areas of expertise, to submit to the professional's ministrations and, of course, to pay for services rendered. ... [an] 'informal' contract in which the client agrees not [to] challenge the professional's judgment or to demand explanations beyond the professional's willingness to give them (Schon, 1983). In short, clients are expected to accept and respect the professional's autonomy as an expert (p. 168).

Scholars of democracy and participatory research (Fischer, 1990; Minkler, 1997; Reason & Rowan, 1981) challenge, "the conventional model of professionalism based on practitioner-client hierarchy" and advocate collaborative modes of inquiry (Fischer, 1993, p. 165). But as Fischer (1993) points out, these modes of professionalism are deeply-seated practices and are also tied up in reward structures (Larson, 1977, cited in Fischer, 1993), as well as metrics of evaluation and promotion (i.e. tenure in the university system).

Fischer (1993) explains that institutionalization of these modes of professionalism results in clients' problems not only being defined by professionals, but also by the "system's 'imperatives'" (p. 169). Thus, changes to work practices are not a simple venture. Forester (1999) recognizes this complexity in his description of the study of work; he writes, "[w]e always face the danger, in studying ordinary work, that we will listen to what is said and hear words, not power; words, not judgment; words, not inclusion and exclusion" (p. 37).

Similarly changes in work practices are inseparable from changes to institutional logics and norms of judgment, inclusion, exclusion and power.

Institutional logics. Institutional logics were originally identified according to the core institutions of society—the capitalist market, the bureaucratic state, families, democracy, and religion in which institutions are “supraorganizational patterns of activity” (Friedland & Alford, 1991). An institutional approach rejects individualistic, rational choice theories and macro structural perspectives (Thornton & Ocasio, 2012, p. 101). Friedland and Alford (1991) posit that each institution has a central logic that constrains and enables the means and ends of individual and organizational behavior. For example, the institutional logic of capitalism emphasizes the accumulation and the commodification of human activity; the institutional logic of democracy emphasizes participation and the extension of popular control over human activity; and the institutional logic of the family emphasizes community and the motivation of human activity by unconditional loyalty to its members (Friedland & Alford, p. 248).

Logics provide social actors with vocabularies and identities to accomplish their work (Thornton & Ocasio, 2012, p. 101). Professional vocabularies are now understood to be not only barriers but also largely unnoticed facilitators of organizing (Loewenstein, 2014, p. 65). Institutional logic scholars also liken logics to practices and symbols (Friedland & Alford, 1991, cited in Thornton & Ocasio, 2012, p. 101) and more recently to “tools that can be creatively employed by actors to achieve individual and organizational goals” (McPherson & Sauder, 2013). Logics provide a deeply contextualized explanation for actions and the meaning they create by situating individual and organizational behaviors in their social and institutional contexts and regularizing behavior (Thornton & Ocasio, 2012, p. 101).

Empirical work on institutional logics by McPherson and Sauder (2013) suggests that position in local structures constrains and enable the use of logics. Notably, “[c]entrally

embedded actors ... have more frequent communications with a wider variety of other professionals, giving them more information and more opportunities to become familiar with existing institutional frameworks” (McPherson & Sauder, 2013, p. 21). Their findings suggest that organizational actors’ positions’ in organizations may provide them with opportunities to become fluent and dexterous in multiple logics. Swidler (2009) describes how nonprofit organizations serve to mediate institutional logics that have shaped HIV/AIDS programs in the U.S., as well as mediating local logics in the context into which they are being imported (Heydemann & Hammack, 2009, p. 6). Forester (1999) also points out that planners play this mediating role between community residents and business elites. These works suggest that certain organizational actors may be positioned to be fluent in multiple logics, and use this fluency to translate meaning between stakeholder groups.

Thornton & Ocasio (2012) point out that contradictions are inherent in the different institutional logics, and that these contradictions do not always imply an impasse, but can also “provide individuals, groups, and organizations with cultural resources for transforming individual identities, organizations, and society” (p. 101). For example, in Marquis and Lounsbury’s (2007) study of the banking sector, the community logic counterbalanced the rise of market-based banking (Thornton & Ocasio, 2012, p. 13). During times of uncertainty and disagreement, institutional logics become more visible, but these times also offer opportunities for the transformation of individual and organizational behavior as well as institutional logics.

Recent work by Lee and Lounsbury (2015) attests that much of the institutional logics literature has emphasized the multiplicity and competition among them, yet overlooks *how* some logics become prioritized over others and shape organizational practice. The authors demonstrate the effects of “different kinds of community logics on environmental practices—specifically, toxic waste emissions—of facilities in a community” (p. 847). Their research

also suggests that community logics “amplify or dampen the influence of broader field-level logics” (p. 847). Their findings imply that instead of the community logic counterbalancing the market logic in Marquis and Lounsbury’s (2007) study of the banking sector, community logic may have dampened it.

Community Logic. Recent work on institutional logics describes community logic as a new institutional system that complements other governance systems like markets, professional and corporate (Thornton & Ocasio, 2012, p. 71). Community institutional logic means “behaviors and practices that extend beyond immediate profit maximization goals and are intended to increase social benefits or mitigate social problems for constituencies external to the firm” (Marquis et al., 2007, p. 925). Thornton and Ocasio (2012) add that “Schneiberg (2002) and Schneiberg, Kind, and Smith (2008) showed in the insurance, dairy, and grain industries that cooperative community-bound associations were competing forms of governance to markets and hierarchies in American capitalism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries” (p. 71). While the institutional logics literature focuses on “the greater good” as a key feature of the community logic, other scholarship on social movements, planning and community health complement this literature to flesh out the meaning of community logic.

In her work on social movements, Polletta (2012) articulates the fact that different relationships structure different models of organizing. These models range from relationships based on kinship or family, to relationships modeled on friendship, to those structured like co-worker relationships or those that are based on common interests. She says that democracy stops working at the limits of the relationships that underpin it; for example, organizations based on familial-style relations are hierarchical and often patriarchal, which may end up suppressing female and youth participation. She suggests the best models for

democracy many not be based on the most familiar relationships, like family and friends (p. 53).

Community as a suggested a mode of inquiry in planning conveys the messy, complex and detailed vitality of real-world social problems (Nussbaum, 1986, cited in Forester, 1999). As explained in Chapter 2: Inclusion & Power, the community-based participatory research literature locates solutions to social problems in the communities in which they are situated (not in professions); scholars like Montoya (2013) describe community as a verb, not defined or constrained by more static, homogenous demographic variables. Institutional scholars echo and advance this point to acknowledge that community logic is often comprised of, and the generator for, innovative new practices (O'Mahony & Lakhani, 2011, cited in Thorton and Ocasio, 2012, p. 72). Yet community logic does not embrace a dynamic view of community; instead, the term community is synonymous with the idea of the greater good.

Recent work by institutional scholars Friedland, Mohr, Roose, and Gardinali (2014) applies the institutional logic analytic to the concept of love. Freidland et al. (2014) state that to understand love “one must believe in order to participate in it, to be the kind of subject who can organize his or her life around it” (p. 7). This new territory for institutional logic scholars expands the literature in terms of what can be considered a core institution of society, which has possible implications for the expanded view of “community logic” I discuss in this chapter.

Professional Logic. The institutional logic of the professional (in my case, the nonprofits, planners and the foundation) has been the focus of the majority of the literature, as many empirical studies look inside formal organizations. It is also a long-standing interest of Foucault's (1973) work that investigates the construction and the consequences of professional expertise, and then links these practices to the creation of power and knowledge

that constitute disciplines and professions (cited in Fischer, 1993, p. 166).

Professional logics are prevalent in community engagement, as engagement implies either a civil society organization or public agency reaching out to the community members they aim to serve. Moreover, community engagement and participation have become institutionalized professions in their own right. Awards, associations and degrees are granted in community engagement, even as it is also an explicit or implicit part of professional planners and policymaker's job descriptions (NERCHE, 2015). While it is often required by legal mandate, Forester (1989) explains the challenges faced by professionals who must work with community residents, making visible some of the specifics of their professional logic (i.e. technical planning language).

[P]lanners find it easier to work with professionals like developers and lawyers because there's a common language—say, of zoning—they know it, along with the technical issues... But then there's the community. With the neighbors, there's no consistency. One week one group comes in, and the next week it's another. There isn't one point of view there. They also don't know the process (though there are those cases where there are *too many* experts!) (p. 86, cited in Forester, 1999, p. 187-188).

In Foucauldian terms, Forester finds that planners experience difficulty working with residents because residents, unlike lawyers or developers, lack a disciplinary formation, and do not have a circumscribed set of norms and practices that the planners can see in order to anticipate and manage.

In Flower's (1997) presentation of the logic of community outreach, she describes four logics at work in university-led community engagement. The first two of the four logics, the logic of cultural mission and the logic of technical expertise, are associated with the professional logic. The logic of cultural mission assumes a one-way relationship: from the

organization to the community. This logic is ingrained with “notions of philanthropy, charity, social service, and improvement that identify the community as a recipient, client, or patient, marked by economic, learning, or social deficits” (Flower, 1997 p. 98).

The logic of technical expertise assumes that outside knowledge, skills and resources are needed:

Technical expertise allows people to document polluted water, to test for diabetes, to create a sophisticated, computer-based distribution system for food banks, or to create a professionally constructed (fundable) proposal for youth jobs. But we must also recognize that when service is organized by this logic, the relationship is not only hierarchical, it can smother other kinds of expertise. (Flower, 1997, p. 98).

In community engagement, professional logics persist; and even if superiors sanction changes in organizational practice, employees often do not follow up on them (Kellogg, 2009). For example, even though foundation executives expressed their commitment to resident-driven change, program managers’ success was still evaluated on the policy changes accomplished; thus, they did not have the incentive to foster resident-driven change if it looked less promising than conventional organizational-led advocacy work. Kellogg’s (2009) research suggests a need for spaces that allow for actors who espouse alternative positions to form a collective that would be able to hold its own in the company of extant logics of organizational practice.

Philanthropy Logic. As mentioned under the professional logic section, philanthropy is known to have its own unique logic based on charity and authority (Flower, 1997).

Philanthropy is about gifts, which can imply a one-directional relationship from gift giver to gift receiver, with no expectation of repayment. However, scholarship on the gift economy demonstrates that gift-giving is more complicated, and that there are many unwritten expectations for gift receivers as well as gift givers (Mauss, 1954). This act of giving gifts

also relates to Heydemann and Hammack's (2009) concern with philanthropic projection. Philanthropic projection means that through foundations' donations of money, goods, human effort, and ideas, they also pass on organizational norms and practices (Heydemann & Hammack, 2009, p. 7).

While gift-giving is a central practice of a foundation's logic, foundations as nonprofit organizations in the United States also engage in practices that reflect their relationship with the market and the state (Heydemann & Hammack, 2009). The presence of multiple logics (market and state) in foundations is best exemplified through foundations' relations with nonprofits, which are also engaged in the exchange and subordination dynamics of the gift economy (Heydemann & Hammack, 2009, p. 9).

Prewitt (2009) describes the dependent relationship between foundations and the nonprofit organizations that they fund:

[O]rganized philanthropy is not only in and of the civil society sector; it has a vital interest in expanding that sector. This is where philanthropy finds the institutions which, for their part legitimate philanthropy by carrying out philanthropic missions. ... American grant-making foundations ... need client grantees as recipients to absorb obligatory spend-out funds, but more importantly as the real and the symbolic expressions of what philanthropy is supposed to represent—the attachment of private wealth to public purpose. In the absence of civil society institutions there is no philanthropy as we know it (viii).

Prewitt (2009) also discusses another layer that leads to multiple logics in foundations. He describes intra-organization variations in philanthropy, as foundation officers in the field are more inclined to defer to local institutional logics than executives or staff in the home office, who are focused on headquarter priorities (p. ix).

Conflicting logics. As mentioned so far, multiple logics can co-exist, but certain logics usually dominate, and their amplifying or dampening effect on other logics have consequential impacts (Lee & Lounsbury, 2015). Forester (1999) acknowledges the inherent challenges arising when professionals face other logics; he describes the difficulty professional planners experience when expected to use community logic.

[A]fter all, planners face enormous social problems. How can they—and we—learn about good practice through messiness, complexity, and particular detail rather than general rules, universal maxims, and all-purpose techniques?

[Nussbaum] writes, ‘certain truths about human experience can be best learned by living them in their particularity. ... It .. needs to be apprehended ... through putting oneself inside a problem and feeling it. But we cannot all live, in our own overt activities, through all that we ought to know in order to live well. Her [Nussbaum’s] literature, with its stories and images, enters in as an extension of our experience, encouraging us to develop and understand our cognitive/emotional responses. (Note 13 p. 255).

His use of Nussbaum’s (1986) work highlights planners’ need to know what it is like to live in the communities that they serve. However, this is not always feasible, so there are ways to approximate this (e.g. stories).

McNight (1995) also describes the challenges and consequences of professionals’ inability to espouse a community point of view. He describes the professionalization of the medical and social service field as a split between professionals and the community. He traces public services’ shift from an ethos of care to one of service, based on the professional management of need (cited in Flower, 1997, p. 98). He argues that this shift in ethos resulted in a view of communities and their residents as deficient; as described in previous chapters’ discussions of social inclusion and exclusion, community residents are often treated as

current or future recipients of services, from income assistance to incarceration, and characterized by economic, learning or social deficits (Flower, 1997, p. 97).

Heydemann and Hammack (2009) find that the logics of U.S. nonprofits and the non-U.S. legal, political and social contexts often conflict. They point to certain characteristics of U.S. nonprofit logics to suggest why this mismatch exists. These characteristics are universally important to understanding the institutional context and constraints of U.S. nonprofits working in the United States. They write:

[I]n the United States, nonprofits fit into a larger institutional context dominated by profit-seeking firms that operate in markets, and in which a wide variety of federal, state, and local governments also play key roles. American nonprofits take many forms, but in general must find their own income by seeking services, by obtaining payments from government, and by obtaining donated funds. The governing board of an American nonprofit is legally responsible for the organization's financial health as well as for assuring that it keeps a focus on its mission, obeys the general laws, and is accountable to its funders and to the larger society. The leaders of an American nonprofit operate in the context of a legal system that supports nonprofit autonomy in the context of government policies that assumes the existence of nonprofits and expect them to provide certain services for a few, and in the context of well-established markets both for nonprofits services and for donations. American nonprofits may encounter frustrations and challenges but, ideally, the logics of the internal organization fit well with logics of their external context (Heydemann & Hammack, 2009, p. 9).

Heydemann and Hammack (2009) discuss the importance of logic "fit" and the incompatibility between U.S. nonprofit logic, and international community and political

logics. McNight's (1995) work argues that logics can be irreconcilable; in his case, it was the professional and community logics. However, while logics have been found to compete with one another, this does not imply that they are not productive. Thus, in the second empirical chapter on inclusion and power, I discuss the normal and productive nature of conflict in collaborative planning and policymaking processes (Flyvbjerg, 2001).

Agranoff (2012) acknowledges that the multi-organizational and multicultural nature of collaborative activities requires the recognition and working through, or even working around, of different agency or organizational traditions and practices. He writes that "[r]espect for the 'other' is not only highly valued, it is essential to ultimately moving an organization representative toward agreement" (p. 169). Quick & Feldman's (2014) focus on translation across boundaries similarly acknowledges that if translation is done unidirectionally, it accentuates difference and reinforces "the other." But they point out that collaborative actors can perform multi-directional translation, and this form of translation decenters difference and finds alignment between different logics.

Co-existing logics. Logics can also co-exist harmoniously as well as being productive (Flower, 1997). Google's adoption of open source offers evidence of community logic, while still maintaining the company's market logic through their commitment to proprietary software. Their search algorithm exemplifies organizations' abilities to draw on and be faithful to multiple logics while remaining productive in their industry (Durand et al., p. 166). Community-based research scholars also demonstrate that some professional cultures are able to develop and work effectively with communities (Ellis & Walton, 2012, cited in Minkler, 2012), which suggests they are able to negotiate and enact at least two logics, professional and community, simultaneously and to the benefit of professionals and communities.

Fischer (1993) explains this is possible when

the expert is reconceptualized as a 'facilitator' of public learning and empowerment. As a facilitator, he or she becomes an expert in how people learn, clarify, and decide for themselves (Fischer, 1990). This process includes coming to grips with the basic languages of public normative argumentation, as well as gaining knowledge about the kinds of environmental and intellectual conditions under which citizens can formulate their own ideas. It involves the creation of institutional and intellectual contexts that help people pose questions and examine technical analyses in their own ordinary (or everyday) language and decide which issues are important to them. (p. 171)

This suggests that despite the challenges involved, professionals are able to negotiate multiple logics (McPherson & Sauder, 2013) and practitioners of participatory, inclusive and deliberative democracy do so in order to achieve full partnership with community residents (Fischer, 1993).

As the literature reviewed for the chapter acknowledges, the challenges professionals and communities face in order to work together are deeply embedded in institutional systems. Howard-Grenville (2007), like Lee and Lounsbury (2015), acknowledge the implications of certain institutional norms and practices. Howard-Grenville (2007) observes that certain issues and actions continue to be legitimated while others are not (Hardy, 1994; Phillips, 1997) which leads “to invisible agenda setting or ‘nondecision making,’” a pervasive form of power (Bacharach and Baratz, 1963, Lukes, 1974, Ranson et al., 1980, cited in Howard Grenville, 2007, p. 562). These agendas and decisions can have serious social, environmental and health consequences (Lee & Lounsbury, 2015).

Community engagement has been advocated as a method to influence agenda and decisions, and inform community residents of problems and solutions on decision-makers' agendas. But as my prior chapters and literature review establish, accomplishing community

engagement and cross-sector collaboration is far more complicated than inviting people to the table. It requires a reorganization of the institutional channels in which agendas and decisions get made. According to King et al. (1998), “overcoming barriers to citizen participation requires a learning process built on citizen empowerment and education, reeducation of administrators, and enabling administrative structures and processes that change the way citizens and administrators meet and interact” (cited in Roberts, 2004, p. 334). Institutional logics provide a lens to understand the embedded and taken-for-granted actions that impact the exclusion and inclusion of community members, and are important to consider in the design and implementation of learning processes, the reeducation of administrators and professionals, and the reorganizations of administrative structures and processes necessary to change the way citizens and professionals interact.

Most of the institutional logic literature focuses on macro-level processes, and there is a need for more research on the micro foundations of institutional logics (Thornton & Ocasio, 2012). Moreover, “we know very little ‘about how logics become manifest, the effects of logics, and the complex interplay among competing logics at the individual level of analysis’” (McPherson & Sauder, 2013, p. 168). An institutional perspective looks not only at the role institutional logics play in individual and organizational actions, but also at the micro foundations of institutional logics—in other words, it considers the potential ability of individual and organizational actions to shape or re-instantiate logics.

In this chapter, I describe how logics manifest in collaborative members’ actions, as well as the assumptions, norms, processes, rules and structures conveyed in these actions. Through this analysis, I explain the logics constructed in the context of the micro-level processes of the collaborative work (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006). My examination of these micro-level processes of community engagement and collaboration in the Central City Change Initiative will improve our understanding of institutional logics. In addition, the

constitutive features of these logics as important factors that constrain and enable collaborative and community engagement work can improve our more general understanding of how actors enact logics in collaborative work. In particular, I focus on the logics of the community residents, and organizational professionals including local nonprofits and the foundation.

Methods

Data collection. Data for this chapter is drawn from a 4-year ethnographic study of a Community-Change Initiative in Central City California from 2009 to 2014. Data include field notes, interview transcripts and archival documents. When I began participating in the Central City Community Change Initiative in 2009, I noticed and began documenting a strong commitment to resident engagement across the initiative, as well as struggles to convert this commitment into action in a collaborative context with multiple logics at play (Lowerson & Feldman, 2012). As mentioned in the earlier sections of this chapter, logics often become visible when there is uncertainty or disagreement about subsequent actions (McPherson & Sauder, 2013, p. 176). This view of logics guided my analysis; I paid attention to the points of tension and focused on those times of uncertainty and discord as places where I could see logics surface. Actors in this study include representatives from local Gold County nonprofit organizations, including executive directors, program staff, and community organizers; adult and youth residents of Central City; executives and staff from the Foundation; consultants, city staff and council members.

Analysis methods. I coded my data iteratively and thematically for instances of community engagement. I defined community engagement as instances where residents and organizational representatives or professionals worked together in a policymaking process. I drew on practice theory to identify the instances of community engagement. Practices are patterns of activity that are created and recreated through the production and reproduction of

everyday actions and structures that constrain and enable each other (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011; Nicolini, 2013; Osterlund & Carlile, 2005). I drew on what people did and said (in my field notes, interviews and archival documents) to constitute the practices of community engagement (Schatkzi, 2002). I focus on practices because I am interested in *how* people create and recreate community engagement through the actions they take, and how these actions constitute the micro-foundations of institutional logics.

I used an analytic framework informed by institutional logics to return to the coded material and identify logics. Thornton and Ocasio (2012) describe using logics as an analytical framework; they give an example from Swedberg (2005, p. 3): “in drawing from Weber ... ‘When the woodcutter brings down his axe on the wood, it can be a case of wage labor, provision for one’s household, or form of recreation—and which one it is depends on the meaning with which the action is invested.’” (p. 110). This excerpt signifies the dynamic relationship between actions and organizational context; if the context is one of recreation, work, or home, this constrains and enables the meaning of the actions taken. At the same time, actions also constrain and enable the structures that continuously constitute the organizational context (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011; Giddens, 1984). Swidler (2009) views institutional logics as the “practices that structure group life” (Heydemann & Hammack, 2009; p. 8).

In my data, I found that collaborative members (residents, nonprofit and city agency representatives, and foundation representatives) took actions that reflected their respective stakeholder group (resident, nonprofit, and foundation). Residents participated to improve their home or neighborhood—it was personal. Nonprofit and foundation representatives participated primarily because it was their professional responsibility to do so. The literature on nonprofits and public management indicates that public and nonprofit sector employees are often motivated by ideas and commitments to social and public good (Gabris & Simo,

1995; Mirvis, 1992). Some collaborative members were both organizational representatives and residents, so their reasons for engaging in the work were personal and also professional.

I coded my data thematically, creating codes based on the actions taken and according to these stakeholder groups. After multiple iterations of coding, I found common themes in the ways the different stakeholders acted, and the features of the respective logics that I present below emerged. These features provided the codes for my final iteration of coding. The codes represent actions (i.e. pleasing the funder), norms (i.e. life continues), processes (i.e. meetings), and structures (i.e. deadlines and requirements) that the respective group deemed a legitimate and necessary part of collaborative work. For example, *pleasing the funder* illustrates an institutional norm and assumption about the importance of certain practices, as well as the importance of actors like the funder. I provide more examples of these norms and assumptions in my findings, which I organize by stakeholder group.

Background

In the Central City Change Initiative, Central City residents and representatives from organizations such as nonprofit organizations and city agencies constituted the Central City Change collaborative. This collaborative was formed when the foundation for Healthy Places selected Central City for its Community Change Initiative; they required that residents and organizational representatives from local nonprofits and city agencies sit together at the same table to draft a plan that would guide the 10 years of funding.

During the year when the collaborative drafted a community plan based on the foundation's 10 outcome areas, tensions commonly seen in citizen participation efforts between experts and citizens (Roberts, 2004), emerged between organizational representatives and residents. Collaborative members described two simultaneous, yet independent, conversations: one among the nonprofit organizations and among the Central City residents. Nonprofit representatives often outnumbered residents and dominated

conversations. Residents attended and shared their expertise in meetings, but also felt they could not speak openly when organizations were present. At times, residents and nonprofit representatives also felt that they were in conflict with the foundation's logic. Residents felt that even during the *implementation* phase, the focus remained on process, not action. One organizational representative described the organizations and residents as operating on different wavelengths (Field notes, September 19, 2012).

When the initiative began, a local nonprofit selected to channel foundation money and provide logistical support for meetings for the planning period planned and implemented a series of outreach events to inform residents of the initiative, collect their input, and enlist them to inform and solicit input from their neighbors. The fiscal agent also oversaw the creation of a steering committee; this process involved the election of two representatives for each of the outcome areas. A few residents were elected, but the steering committee mostly consisted of organizational representatives. Many residents and other organizational representatives attended the steering committee meetings as observers. They also attended the larger planning meetings and participated in breakout groups based on the 10 outcomes. The steering committee, fiscal agent and those who participated in the various meetings were referred to as the Central City Community Collaborative.

During this early period of the collaborative, residents and nonprofit representatives consistently questioned whether there was enough resident participation. At a steering meeting in the beginning of November, a resident steering committee member got up and said, "We need to pause and not move forward with, we need to focus on the fact that residents especially youth are still not meaningfully engaged in the process!" This quote represents one moment in the planning year in which resident logics and organizational logics came into conflict. Organizations wanted to move forward, but for residents, this did not make sense without adequate youth engagement. The concern persisted throughout

implementation that residents were being left behind and that, as mentioned above, there were two simultaneous, yet independent conversations happening. Residents and some organizations acknowledged that in this type of foundation-led initiative,

[T]he reason a lot of people are there is 'cause of the money. I think when the money leaves, they're going to leave. That's the truth. (Margarita, Resident, Interview, October 13, 2013)

Collaborative members were skeptical of the intentions of those with whom they were supposed to work. In addition to the friction between residents and organizational representatives around how to perform community engagement, both residents and organizational representatives felt resistance to the foundation. Collaborative members did not understand or appreciate the imposition of formal requirements (i.e. the 10 outcomes) and ambitious goals (i.e. policy changes). An organizational representative explained:

[The initiative] was like systems change and stuff like that. But it was not easy to follow. [0:1601.3] ... everything was so confusing. And then [the foundation] kept talking about how they wanted, you know residents involved. And I'm ... educated and I'm privileged and I'm like all these things. Like I had had access that a lot of people in these rooms [did] not and I don't understand what the hell is going on! How is anyone making sense of any of this? And it was so frustrating and I felt like I was being so patient. Like this went on for over a year of where I was, still didn't know what was going on. And nobody could ever tell me.

(Roxanne, Organizational Representative, Interview, October 27, 2013).

During the planning year, the foundation did not give grants to organizations in the typical fashion and in general, collaborative members were not paid for their work. But when

the planning year concluded and the plan was submitted, residents' roles were now uncertain, but the organizations had a clear role—they would apply for funding.

The first outcome to be funded was the Civic Engagement and Community Empowerment Outcome, an outcome that the collaborative added to the foundation's 10 outcomes. In January 2010, the foundation funded a group of nonprofit organizations to start to carry out this outcome. But despite the group's expertise on civic and community engagement, one organizer acknowledged that their "different styles of organizing" presented an obstacle to collaboration between the organizations. These different styles were often described as direct action (e.g. boycott or protest) versus those that avoided direct action (Focus Group, March 13, 2013), or Alinsky-based models versus models informed by social work, whose approach is more collaborative than adversarial (Archival Document, February 20, 2010).

Luisa said:

[It's] not because there were not enough experts sitting around the table, but it's because we have different styles of working. And I think one of the biggest things in [...] be—the biggest issues that we have faced is that we don't know what those models are (Luisa, Interview, November 18, 2013)

Thus, even though there was a wealth of organizations committed to and skilled in civic engagement and community empowerment, they faced challenges in collaborating with one another because of their own differing "styles" or logics. These organizations simultaneously also negotiated the fulfillment of their foundation contracts with their own organizational priorities and limitations of scope.

Findings & Analysis

Institutional Logics: Organizational, Resident and Foundation Logic.

Organizational Logic. In the Central City Community Change initiative, in general,

representatives from community-based organizations and city agencies (i.e. parks and recreation) that participated in the collaborative espoused the organizational logic. For these actors, meeting deadlines, obtaining funding, sticking to agendas, and going to meetings were important practices, if not critical for their work.

Meet deadlines. During the initiative, the foundation set many deadlines. These included the plan due date and the due date to create a governance structure, and once the implementation and grant giving began, there were also a number of ongoing, and overlapping deadlines for grant requests, grant reports, and grant renewals. Ruben, an employee of the collaborative governance structure reflected that through his participation, he learned many of the features of the organizational logic:

I understand [now] how to do time management, how to do assignments and finish deadlines you know so... I think that's part of like my practice for ... school you know, just making sure you're able to do all these things at once.
(Ruben, Organizational Representative, Interview. September 26, 2013)

Burt, a community organizer for youth, also explained the impact of the work on youth and the fact that deadlines and timelines legitimized the youth's work, even if the youth were not certain what the final outcome would be:

[W]e're launching our restorative justice [campaign], and even if no one understands what that even means and that [pauses] even if they look at the year timeline and they're like oh, by June we're going to be here... that may not matter at the current moment; they're like okay, we're going to have a town hall, and I'm going to be the person in charge of registration because we need to—I need to—*my role [as a youth] is important to the June deadline* [emphasis added] or the timeline right, the restorative justice campaign. (Burt, Interview, December 19, 2013)

Burt's quote signifies that as an organizational representative who works with youth, he, like the youth, used adopted parts of the organizational logic. They used timelines and deadlines to plan their year of restorative justice work. He explained that part of what made the work meaningful, even when youth were unclear about it, was its relation to meeting a deadline. He felt that the relationship between the work and the deadline created a sense of accomplishment.

Obtain funding. Organizational representatives needed to meet deadlines to submit grant renewals because nonprofits survived on grants funds. Organizations had staff that relied on this grant money for wages and benefits, so they were consistently worried about funding or gaps in funding. A collaborative employee explained:

[A] lot of these nonprofits are funded by the same funders, or their funding sources are limited. So it's like ... this is more of a competition like, they're - there is one pot and everybody is trying to get what they can to stay alive.

[0:21:28.7] ... it's just circumstances. Like they have to get funding, or else they're not going to exist. Like you gotta eat food or else you're going to die.

So, you know I think that particular process you know it - it shapes you

(Ruben, Organizational Representative, Interview, September 26, 2013)

When the initiative began, many organizational representatives and residents noted that the promise of 10 years of funding would attract many people and organizations hungry for funding. Funding became a point of contention between residents and organizations. May, an organizational representative, recalled:

You know when you hear that an organization—that a funder is going to be coming in and making a commitment of you know... millions of dollars for ten years, you know all of a sudden everybody was in the health business.

(May, Organizational Representative, Interview, December 20, 2103)

May's quote illustrates the necessary, but contentious role funding played between organizations. As an organizational representative whose organization focused on health, she noticed the influx of organizations claiming to be health-focused, once a health foundation promised funding to a geographical area.

Pleasing the funder. To obtain funding, organizations became or were already skilled at completing the foundation requirements, such as the logic models and grantee reports. A foundation representative acknowledged that the foundation influenced the ways in which organizations did their work:

When you put the foundation in the mix and you put money in the mix then it you know, creates this power imbalance and then the grantee, you know the organization then of course has to then think about pleasing the foundation.

(Malcolm, Interview, October 30, 2013)

In 2012, the foundation required grantees go through a process to create a collective impact work plan in order to get their grants renewed. Collective impact involves organizations coming together to achieve a goal (Hanleybrown, Kania, & Kramer, 2012). In other words, the organizations needed to design part of their work plan together; each organization had to have the same language in a certain portion of the work plans they would submit to the foundation for grant renewal. A group of grantees got together to go through this process. At the same time, the foundation instructed grantee organizations and workgroups to focus on identifying and working on policy campaigns. Then, a year later, the foundation representative suggested that the initiative create campaign clusters to bring together campaigns. This inspired participants to organize a meeting of all grantees to cluster into overarching campaign groups. Organizational representatives were frustrated, as some felt that they adjusted to do policy and systems change, then adjusted to do a campaign, only to then be told they needed to cluster and create campaigns.

Sticking to the agenda. Meeting agendas are key features of organizational practice. In the Central City Change Initiative, meeting agendas played an important role. Agendas were important because they formalized the processes through which the collaborative defined and selected their work. The initiative began with meetings and these often had ambitious agendas. Collaborative members, including organizations, expressed frustration that the groups could rarely get through all agenda items. The perceived need to address all items on the agenda and to accomplish the purpose of the meeting exemplifies the practice of *sticking to the agenda*.

During the implementation phase, organizational representatives designed and executed a series of activities as a part of the collective impact work plan. These activities, such as the “root and branch” activity described in the exclusion chapter, demonstrated organizers’ desire to *stick with the agenda*. In the “root branch” activity, after the first attempt to guide the residents through a prioritization activity, the organizations observed that they had failed, because they still had all the campaigns listed as possibilities at the end of the meeting. They had not accomplished their agenda.

David, an organizational representative, explained, “We ended up with everything meets the criteria, but everything is accurate. It doesn’t help. [We m]ight as well throw a dart.”(Field notes, May 10, 2013) While David recognized the importance of all the possible campaign topics, he was frustrated that the meeting had not met its objective to narrow down the options. So he began with the understanding that the residents had conveyed that all campaigns were important, but this conflicted with the need to stick to the organization’s plan to narrow down the campaigns.

In the *Roots and Branches* vignette in my first empirical chapter on exclusion, I describe the subsequent meeting in which organizations used a “root and branch” activity to achieve the narrowing down of options and select an advocacy campaign. The organizer took

certain actions to ensure the agenda was accomplished the second time around. They steered suggestions to focus on the branches back toward the roots, and ultimately circled just the options at the roots, telling the group they would only discuss those and select a campaign from those options.

Attending meetings. In the CC-CCI, meetings occurred almost nightly. There were meetings for the various work groups, steering committee meetings, meetings to plan meetings, 1-1 meetings between organizers and residents, as well as city meetings that the CC-CCI members attended as a part of their advocacy work. An organizational representative, Luis, explained that meetings are a strategy and a place organizations use to shape the agenda. He gave the example of advocating for immigration in the logic model. Luis articulated this strategy:

We made it a point that in every single one [meeting]—every time we were subdivided, [0:09:26.7] there was a key number of people that would not only meet during all the various fucking meetings that we would meeting in, but we'd meet outside of those spaces and coordinate and make sure that the issues that we cared about were raised at every single meeting. At every single group. (Luis, Organizational Representative, Interview. September 3, 2013)

While meetings often make sense in terms of community-based and democratic practice, (Polletta, 2012), residents often felt that meetings were unproductive. For residents and some organizational representatives, meetings represented a problem—that there was too much process and not enough action in the initiative.

Resident Logic. Community residents were another key player in the Central City community change initiative. This group of stakeholders was diverse in age, educational background, income, and sometimes ethnicity; yet there were some common concerns and assumptions they brought into their collaborative work. For these actors, this initiative was

very important, because it had the potential to positively impact their future as well as their children's or family's future. Residents, by virtue of living in Central City, were intimately familiar and deeply embedded in the problems facing their city. They worried about raising their kids and siblings, affording and finding safe housing, food and healthcare, their parents' diabetes, family members and friends being deported, being profiled by law enforcement, being green-lighted by gangs, as well as worrying about which authorities they could trust. To participate in the initiative, they had to juggle other responsibilities to their family, job(s), school and other extracurricular commitments.

Take Action. Residents consistently expressed frustration over their sense that there was too much process and too many meetings, and not enough action. Luisa, a community organizer and resident of Central City, explained her frustration with the number of meetings and need for action, and she contrasted “meetings” with “moving forward.” Luisa explained:

I went to several meetings, maybe three or four meetings a week, but we didn't see a-n-y movement, nothing concrete. And I'm like, we're organizers we can't be sitting, meeting, we have to be moving. So I met my supervisors and I told them; this is what I've been doing, this is not gonna—get me to our goals, okay? [Meetings are] not going to be enough. And so I'm like we talk about process, we talk about um ways of reaching out to community; we talk about everything. It looks great on paper, but there's no action, there's no follow-up. (Luisa, Interview, November 18, 2013).

In terms of resident logic, taking action meant addressing immediate needs and taking action without, as Serena specified, “waiting for someone to give them something” (Serena, Interview, August 23, 2013). Taking action meant talking with neighbors, facilitating connections between neighbors, helping neighbors solve problems, and resident organizing. Thomas stated that he would talk to his neighbors and organize them to address issues before

the Initiative, but now he did not have time because he was in trainings. Serena stated in her interview that she supported a group of mothers to organize themselves.

Rochelle, another resident, explained her work with her neighbors. She explained that her ability to do this was enhanced by training she received through the initiative:

This [training] helped me talk with my neighbors; I almost know all of my neighbors around me, to spread the word about policies... I have organized *posadas*, for the community it's so people can get to know each other. We have organized a *posada* for the last three years in one of the neighbor's home. This neighbor also provides classes for the kids in the summer but it's also for parents and neighbors to get to know each other. If there is an emergency we can call on our neighbor. This is so that we can get to know each other; sometime years go by before you talk to your neighbor. There are times when people have not talked to their neighbor in twenty years, just a hello, but when there is a robbery or vandalism we connect with what is happening. This is communication and I have realized that [people are disconnected] here. Sometime you don't want to talk or they don't want to talk to you. (Rochelle, Interview, February 27, 2014; translated)

Residents faced the problems being discussed in the collaborative meetings in their everyday lives and wanted to start working to address these issues, such as affording food and rent, finding a job, and coping with the risk of deportation or losing one's home.

Immediate needs are a part of the long-term solution. In the *Roots and Branches* vignette in the exclusion chapter, Lawrence, a resident, articulated his reasoning for addressing more simple problems, ones located at the leaves rather than more complex problems at the roots of the tree:

If we have a simple problem... like police oversight, or after-school

programs... we can draw more people in and accomplish the roots a little easier rather than a major overhaul (*Roots and Branches* vignette, Chapter 1: Exclusion)

Both police oversight and afterschool programs are solutions that would help address issues that plague residents daily, as they experience police checkpoints and corruption in the local police department as well as a lack of afterschool options for their children.

It's Personal. For residents, the collaborative work and the goal of building a healthy community were personal. They were intertwined with the issues listed above, from raising their kids to worrying about the deportation of neighbors and family members. Even when the conflicting pulls between life and the work caused serious challenges, residents were committed to the work. Ruben, a resident and organizational representative explained:

[O]ne of the residents, ... got to the point where he was like I don't want money, I just want to participate, you know. I have all my family stuff, I have work, I have all this stuff to do, I have my kids. [0:24:31.4] But I still want to come to these meetings and come. Even if the meetings were like really [pauses] toxic at one point where they were just - residents were hating on the residents, they were hating on the orgs and they're not liking each other and it's just like feuds. (Ruben, Resident and Organizational Representative, Interview, September 26, 2103)

For residents, the collaborative work was not separate from their lives. It was *about* their lives; sometimes the challenges that brought residents into the collaborative were the exact challenges that kept them from participating. For example, collaborative members missed meetings because of personal or family health reasons, or because they had to go to court with their child; at the same time, they participated in the initiative in order to improve preventative health care services and racial profiling by the police. The main form of

community engagement, i.e. meetings, ironically often conflicted with residents' emphasis on family and community.

Residents also came in and out of the work depending on what was going on in their life. Margarita, a Central City Resident involved in CC-CCI, explained how she had been organizing in her neighborhood and city for many years, but sometimes would take breaks:

From there I just started um organizing with more stuff... [0:05:04.6] You know—like you said you end up hearing about this meeting like you get it, you know about that [laughs] and then you just get stuck and you keep on going to more and more things. [I] took breaks—took breaks here and there and then just um, kept on going after like um— just things happen. (Margarita, Interview, October 23, 2013)

Residents participated in the community change initiative in addition to their paid jobs and other personal commitments. Also, many had been “building healthy communities for decades” (Define and Discover field notes); so while the CCI was important, it was only one part of a longer, lifetime commitment and project to improve Central City. So residents sometimes prioritized personal work and life commitments over the CCI.

Residents and organizations related to the work differently. Residents did not create professional boundaries around work or the relationships they made through the work. So while this sometimes meant that residents missed meetings, left the initiative and then returned, and that this disrupted the organizational assumptions about how work got done, it also meant that the work expanded into their personal life. Residents made the work and the relationships within the work personal. As Luke described:

Some residents that have been here since the planning phase and at times I see them like down, completely down like they having financial issues, financial problems, they having family problems and you know but they're still

working hard here in this initiative, ‘because they believe that changing the community of [Central City], making it a better place, a safer place is going to give their children a future. And uh, them sharing all their struggles, what they’re going through, ... [0:53:00.4] Them inviting me to like, oh you know come to dinner with us you know. Just being - not just being uh, [pauses] as another member of this initiative, but more as friend now like... Like a friend of their family. (Luke, Organizational Representative, Interview, September 24, 2013)

For residents the boundaries of the work were fluid; people they worked with were their friends and family, or they became friends and were treated like family.

Listening to and integrating resident lived experience. Residents also made comments and took actions that signaled that the collaborative work required listening to and integrating resident lived experience. In the chapter on exclusion, I explain:

When residents shared their experiences, facilitators often did not know how to incorporate these comments into the conversation and dismissed these comments as being ‘off-topic’ or anecdotal. (Chapter 1)

Margarita witnessed organizations having a similar negative reaction to residents sharing their lived experience in meetings. She said,

And seeing just how people react when residents are there, being outspoken about stuff. They’re looked down on and they call like [...] or they’re just blocking work... And it’s like, really? Come on you wanted this to be [resident driven]—you’re having people that have never gone to meetings or they don’t know how to—how politics work. I’m sorry they don’t say it politely enough or they don’t say it correctly... And... It’s... It’s—it’s just in that... And I see that does more harm to community work or—or communities

that are already organizing sometimes than good... (Margarita, Central City Resident, Interview, October 23, 2013)

Despite facilitators' dismissal of residents' comments, residents continued to share their stories as they related to topics in the meetings, or if they had a pressing issue like a recent shooting that they felt the collaborative should address. Eventually, during the planning year, the resident narratives became an organizing mechanism to explain and to understand the Foundation's 10 outcomes. This did not mean that residents' comments were always welcomed, but as a resident explained,

So there were break out sections, there were different types of things that were happening and we will have... the residents out there pair up with somebody from an organization to introduce the next topic and discuss things and they have testimonials from residents to talk about the importance of getting engaged ... Some of the issues they had dealt with in their neighborhoods and, and you know that's kind of like generated like more like enthusiasm to get involved and come back and participate. [0:33:35.4] (Margarita, Interview, October 23, 2013)

At a Steering Committee meeting during the planning year, the facilitators, a group comprised of residents and organizational representatives, prepared composite narratives which described a resident's life and touched on all of the ten outcomes. Leticia, a youth resident, recalled one of the first meetings in which she was asked to share. Leticia recalled:

And I remember [the facilitators] asked me to prep like one thing like, something like that affects me in Central City like health wise. ... I had to speak in front of a whole bunch of people I didn't know. And um, yeah I remember talking about my Dad because he has diabetes and I was telling them about how ... I don't even know what it is and he doesn't know what it

is, but I know it's something big. (Leticia Interview July 9, 2013).

Residents consistently cited resident lived experience as important for the collaborative work. In the second empirical chapter, I described the inclusion of residents' lived experience into a street assessment form, through the addition of an open-ended question. The youth wanted this question included on the form in order to capture the "living" quality of the streets.

Margarita explained that because most residents' jobs or money were not dependent on their relations with the city, this sometimes allowed residents to speak their minds more openly. She said this was not the case for organizational representatives, who therefore reacted negatively when residents shared their opinions and experiences. Margarita's explanation provides one way of understanding the organization's point of view when they reacted negatively to residents' comments. At the same time, the residents intentionally and unintentionally brought their lived experience into the collaborative work, whether they shared a story about a recent experience with the police or advocated for an open-ended question to capture resident knowledge.

As Serena, another resident said:

Porque ellos son los que siempre tienen la razón. Ellos son los que tienen, los que saben como ver a nuestras comunidades. (Serena, Interview, August 23, 2013)

TRANSLATION: Because they're the ones [the community] that are always right. They are the ones that know how to see our communities.

During the planning year, residents persistently advocated for civic engagement and community empowerment, as well as immigration, to be added to the community plan. They felt that these issues were gateways to addressing the foundation's 10 outcomes, such as improved preventative healthcare services and community safety.

Luis, an organizational representative, explained how immigration became institutionalized in the governance structure of the collaborative:

[T]he community members... added the issue of immigration. So they created a chair for the immigration, make a seat at the table for the steering committee on immigration (Luis, Organizational Representative, Interview, September 3, 2013)

In the examples of added outcomes and representation in the Steering Committee, the integration of lived experience as a feature of the resident logic became visible and legitimized in these changes to the community plan and governance structure.

As residents and allied organizations worked to integrate issues as defined by residents into the plan and the collaborative work, residents concurrently worked on these issues outside the collaborative structure, because they could not wait ten years for systems or policy change. Thus, the foundation's requirements constrained the types of activities that would be funded. The residents, organizations and foundation all acknowledged that work would not stop after 10 years and that it would take longer to accomplish the community's goals. Nevertheless, the collaborative of residents and organizational representatives spent significant time and effort to create a 10-year plan and logic models that they and the foundation would not use. These logic models, discussed in greater detail below, were problematic for capturing the dynamic and nonlinear nature of collaborative work and residents' lived experience. Moreover, as described in the exclusion chapter (Chapter 1), the foundation initially said they could not fund the immigration outcome directly. Margarita described her work to address immigration related issues like deportation, explaining that she would

help families write letters to give rights of their children to other people in case they get deported. [...] like [0:09:28.3] not waiting for a system change,

but to actually go out there and help people ‘cause they’re getting picked—they were getting picked up every day you know. Those kids get lost, they—we lose you know, children and... and I don’t—I’m not the type to wait for long... you know we find solutions now (Margarita, Resident, Interview, October 23, 2013).

Margarita’s explanation relates to another feature of resident logic: in order to accomplish work, meet goals and address the communities’ needs, the collaborative needs to take action and address the immediate needs. The long-term time frame seemed to challenge these assumptions.

Distrusting & Monitoring Authorities. In general, residents and other collaborative members did not trust government to serve them. Collaborative members discussed the political environment in Central City as “us against them” (Mario, Organizational Representative, Interview, September 4, 2013; Luis, Organizational Representative Interview, September 9, 2013); this was a context in which one could not be adversarial towards politicians without ramifications. In Central City, council members were regularly reported to be involved in some political scandal. Residents and organizational representatives explained that resident histories and personal backgrounds played a role in the distrust of authorities. One resident, Serena, explained to me that this was consistent with her experience, the experience of indigenous people and cultures under Spanish rule in Mexico, and that of other residents, who had also grown up in Mexico with an oppressive government:

Y yo soy muy apegada a mi cultura. Específicamente a la, a las practicas indígenas. Por ejemplo el respeto.....[en] general a todo lo que tiene vida. Y el saber que a través de la historia nos invadieron y nos lastimaron... este, esos son dolores que traemos ya geneticaménte. ...Y eso cuando, cuando tu

entiendes porque tienes tanto enojo en contra del gobierno... y que fue en consecuencia a toda esa invasión...

TRANSLATION: I'm really close to my culture. Especially to the indigenous practices. For example, always show respect to anything alive and to know that throughout history we were invaded and we were hurt.....and those are our wounds that we've inherited, genetically .. And when you understand why ... you're so enraged against the government...it was a consequence of all this invasion] (Serena, Resident, Interview August 23, 2013)

There was also a population of Cambodian refugees in Central City. As an organizational representative explained, it was challenging for them to participate because it was against their cultural norms to be vocal. They, too, had a history of trauma and genocide.

Serena also captured the distrust toward the foundation and outsiders in general that was characteristic of residents of Central City and cities like it:

En nuestras comunidades no necesitamos que vengan y hagan un programa para que nos estudien ... porque nos van a estar estudiando ! Si no, nosotros, es de poder dejar que la gente ve un problema y la gente se sienta con la ... el conocimiento y el esfuerzo de organizarse solo. Y no tener que esperar que venga una organización o una fundación.

TRANSLATION: In our communities we do not need them to come and make a program to study us. Because they [organizations and the foundation] are going to be studying us! So no, it is being able to let the people [the residents] see the problems and feel ... the knowledge and effort to organize themselves. And not need to wait for an organization or foundation to come.

Many initiatives came and went in Central City, and as scholarship illustrates, a lack of presence in and familiarity with a community can hinder trust (Van der Pennen &

Schreuders, 2014), creating a background of distrust between residents and organizations. In the exclusion vignettes, I described the creation of a resident-only subgroup of the steering committee, because residents felt excluded from the Steering Committee discussion: “there are two conversations, one by the residents and one by the organizations.” The residents wanted to create a space where they could speak openly without the conversation being dominated by the organizations.

Another example of distrust was between community members and the police, as they tried to come up with strategies to make Central City safer. Luis, an organizational representative, explained distrust toward police and not feeling able to discuss safety in their presence. Luis explained:

I was one of the most vocal people that was fighting against institutions, from being there. Like the police department, like the school board, like the city. [0:04:54.3] Because I felt that if the [foundation] was truly trying to have systems to change, how are you going to discuss changing the wolf with the sheep if the wolf was in the same room as us sheep trying to develop a plan? You just cannot have that type of change with them. I just don't believe in—you can't—you know demand anything [pauses] to the powers that be... if the powers that be really wanted to change something, they would've changed it, because they are the powers that be. (Luis, Organizational Representative Interview, September 9, 2013)

Oliver, another resident, reported finding it difficult to recruit because residents “don't like to deal with the nonprofits” (Oliver, Resident, Interview, December 11, 2013).

Foundation Logic. Foundation representatives enacted many of the features of organizational logics, but there were also some specific features of foundation practice that were distinct. As explained in the literature review, foundations have a unique position in

U.S. society and a unique structure that is co-dependent on nonprofits. In my case, foundation representatives projected expectations onto selected sites based on forthcoming grants. For example, foundation representatives often assumed that everyone, residents and institutional leaders, could and should come to meetings to make decisions together. They also had formal requirements to ensure this, such as the collective impact work plan.

Also, the foundation as a gift-giving organization illustrated contradictions inherent in gift-giving (Mauss, 1954). The foundation promised the collaborative a lot of money, but before giving the various grants, they required that each site draft a plan. In other words, the foundation committed ten years of funding equaling hundreds of thousands of dollars, but before they distributed it, they required a large amount of unpaid work from recipients to create a plan that would fit the foundations rules. This foundation focused on improving health and wanted the plan to be driven by residents, and as described in previous chapters, residents' ideas often pushed the boundaries of health. So, despite the site's selection, the foundation's actions communicated that it was still unclear that Central City deserved the money.

The foundation's actions also seemed frequently contradictory. Sometimes foundation representatives gave sites the autonomy to be creative and verbally expressed support for this, but at the same time, they also told sites what to do. For example, the foundation provided some guidance for the use of the money through the 10 outcomes, as well as administrative requirements like work plans, reporting and grantee meetings. It was unclear where sites had autonomy and where they did not.

Often, when the foundation tried to give Central City autonomy, it was interpreted as unclear expectations. Given the nonprofit organizations' dependence on grants and their logic of wishing to please the funder as mentioned above, this resulted in heightened anxiety for some nonprofit organizations that worried about funding. It also fueled residents' hope,

suspicion and distrust of yet another initiative to come through Central City. In sum, the foundation executives wanted to learn as they go, but what was intended as openness or ambiguity by the foundation often felt like uncertainty for some organizations and residents. The contradictory nature of the foundation's actions foreshadows the next subsection of the findings section, which focuses on competing logics.

Providing, promoting and projecting. In an interview, a foundation representative summarized some of the main features of the foundation logic. First, the foundation promoted their vision for a process, which would bring together nonprofit and government leaders as well as espouse the resident-driven nature of the community organizing tradition. Malcolm, a foundation representative, explained that the foundation tried to bring together in theory two approaches to community change that conflicted in practice:

[S]ort of in a push to social change that where you bring together nonprofit and government people. You know they meet during the day, they use jargon and they try to work on let's say coordinating services, or wrap around—you know that's often what it is, right? So there's not really a space for residents in that context, right? [T]hey don't work together, they're not the same thing, you kind of get one or the other. And the organizing work can feed—can eventually lead to that kind of systems leader collaboration—it can go there. [0:11:06.3] And it needs to go there in order for change to actually get implemented on the ground. You know 'cause ultimately you need you know school district officials and city officials to be your partners and to work on implementation together. But the foundation kind of mucked it up by trying to do both together and that's why I think the planning phase was so confusing. (Malcolm, Interview, October 30, 2013)

He explained that the foundation also drew on the community organizing tradition and wanted the initiative to be resident-driven. He said that the foundation tried to put both approaches together, but it did not work. Thus, even though the foundation may have been well-intentioned in this approach, they took actions that imposed this model onto Central City and thus emphasized the foundation's authority (Flower, 1997). Malcolm reflected that if he could do it over again, he would suggest investing in existing work in the community, instead of imposing the foundation's vision of what the initiative should be.

Conditional Gift-giving. As mentioned above, the foundation's logic resembled some of the contradictions inherent in the practice of gift-giving, in that gifts are supposed to be one-directional transactions from giver to receiver with no predetermined expectations, but there are actually many explicit and implicit requirements on both sides of this relationship (Mauss, 1954). The foundation had explicit and implicit conditions that collaborative members were required to meet. Members had to attend certain meetings, come to foundation events when invited, fill out logic models, submit a community plan and address a selection of the outcomes. The term "conditions" does not imply that the requirements were malevolent, but acknowledges, like Agranoff (2012), that this is an organizational tradition and practice.

Foundations cannot lead, but they can convene, facilitate and guide. Implied in the conditions and expectations associated with foundation grants is that the foundation will provide their grantee with some guidance. As outlined above, explicit and clear guidance was not always the case in Central City. In a meeting with grantees from across the state, a representative from a funded site asked, "Can foundations lead movements?" Newman, a foundation executive, responded, "[F]oundations *can't* lead movements" (Field notes, October 15-16). He then provided examples of how foundations to facilitate movements:

[T]hey can provide resources, TA [technical assistance], and they can provide the glue, the space and the time. They can be partners, but they can't lead. There is always a tricky line about how activist and dictatorial they are prepared to be when building coalitions. (Field notes, October 15-16)

Newman recognized foundations' unique position. From the foundation's perspective, foundations are influential but cannot lead movements. Nevertheless, collaborative members often experienced the foundation's actions to impose, project, and provide guidance as leadership.

At certain points in the initiative, the foundation did effectively play a leadership role, providing guidance as a convener and facilitator when there was an impasse and collaborative members did not know how to move forward. In December 2009, the Central City collaborative still did not have a community plan (which included the logic model) despite the imminent deadline. The logic model confused members; many wanted more time, and felt stuck due to the diverse and divergent views on the various topics and uncertain as to how to move forward together. Richard, the local foundation representative, stepped in with a suggestion to elect a subcommittee to make a "plan to complete a plan," so that the steering committee could approve this plan (Lowerson & Feldman, 2012). Similarly, in a collaboration of collaborative representatives from across the state, representatives had diverse and divergent ideas of how to evaluate resident power and organizing. A foundation representative emphasized in a memo to all the representatives the need to bring together of different opinions but also to move forward. He wrote,

I would like to emphasize that what follows represents a way to get started.

Over time I fully expect our approach to this will evolve and deepen. As a way to get started I have sought to focus on an approach that I believe will give us important baseline data on the presence of resident organizing and which will

be concrete, straightforward and manageable for participants. (Archival Document, Malcolm, Memo, February 12, 2013).

Malcolm's words represent the foundation's belief that the foundation could take steps to move a group forward, and that the foundation had an interest in this. In the example above, the foundation communicated that they wanted to collect baseline data. The suggestions both gently steered the collaborative to accomplish their next step, whether it was drafting a plan or accepting a way to evaluate resident organizing.

Ambiguity. While the foundation sometimes provided guidance, this often happened *after* the foundation communicated unclearly by sending ambiguous directions and mixed messages to Central City Collaborative members. The foundation often did not explain their actions. Since the foundation brought many new actors together in the planning year, this period was a confusing experience for residents and organizations. It was not clear how grant-giving worked, and an organizational representative recalled that when he asked the foundation he was told:

[J]ust go to the meeting [but I thought,] Okay, how can I go to the meeting if I don't have enough resources to go on meeting, you have hundreds of meetings. Okay, 'cause like every day here [at my organization] I have to justify why are you spending all this time on [the Central City CCI]? ... you could be somewhere else ... meanwhile everyone else from the consultants and the facilitator [mumbles] and all that... You got to spend as much time having as many meetings that you can because in some way you're paid to be there, okay (Mario, Organizational Representative, Interview, September 4, 2013).

Another organizational representative, Lenny, felt the foundation's actions and intentions were unclear:

I'd like to know what the foundation plans to do—how much do they really want to spend on... the same question we had on day one. We don't know. Can we—what if I propose a motion and we passed it you know that I want the foundation to provide 250,000 dollars a year to create jobs in the city. [pauses] And we voted on and we communicated to them and there was a consensus around it. You think they would come up with the 250,000 dollars? [or would] we get some [...] oh well um we don't really have 250,000 we already spent this on this, we have to limit on this, you know... which is what I sense is really happening; is that they don't really have as much money 'cause they found out this whole methodology of they're stuck. (Lenny, Interview, September 5, 2013)

Illogical Logic. The logic model was a critical component of the initiative, and many examples of unclear and mixed messages revolved around the model itself. Notably, logic models are common requirement for most grant recipients and forms of technical expertise (Kaplan & Garrett, 2005). As Malcolm stated, the logic model was illogical:

[In]the planning phase ... asking you know folks to do these you know kind of formal logic models, it just doesn't really work in a community context. You know again, the language is problematic. The um, a more dynamic way to think of planning ... feedback as one kind of continuous loop. Other than concreting a plan, sticking it into a chart, say here's our plan, here's what we're gonna' do—you say here's how we're getting started. And then you're—you know you're constantly evolving your plan... [0:12:08.1] (Malcolm, Foundation Representative, Interview, October 30, 2013)

Bryant, a foundation executive, also mentioned the unclear and mixed messages. He explained that the foundation's approach was to "learn as they go." He reported that

people ask me, why can't you pick something and stick to it. Just find three things and do it for ten years. ...[T]here is a researcher that looks at all the countries in the world and he found ... that the countries that did the best, were the ones that could adapt, were flexible, that didn't need to adhere to certain doctrine. We hope that the Community Change Initiative reflects that ethos: we can't just be one thing and stay that thing for ten things, the world changes, relationship change... if we don't adapt we will fail ... [in this meeting] we are going to talk about ... what we have learned and how we have grown... (Field notes, October 15-16, 2013).

Despite commitments to adaptation and flexibility, the foundation required tools like the logic model which were implemented and used in ways that contradicted this “learn as you go” approach. At the same meeting where he made the statements quoted above, Bryant reflected on what the foundation had learned and how they have adjusted. He asked “how many of you have looked at Logic Model in past two year... I haven't.” This illustrated that sites, and even the foundation, saw the logic models as irrelevant or stifling, rather than enabling. The exclusion chapter highlights the residents' and organizational advocates' struggles to ensure that immigration made it into the logic model. More broadly, each site struggled with understanding what a logic model was—to the extent that perhaps this confusion would have warranted modification of this requirement.

Charity and Authority. The foundation's ability to *not explain* and send ambiguous directions and mixed messages derives from their position as both a charity and authority. Flower (1997) identifies this dual role of organizations that are responsible for reaching out, or aim to reach out to the community. In the context of the foundation world, this foundation was trying something new, and this ten-year initiative focused on policy and systems change was very novel. Most foundations have grant terms that average two to five years, and focus

on services and programs. Despite their progressive nature, however, the norms they espoused still did not make sense to some residents and organizations. Some organizations were used to more traditional foundation practices of clear predetermined expectations, and found it unnerving to be deprived of these.

The foundation was trying to be flexible, but given that they still occupied a position that determined whether or not certain people and organizations got funding, this ambiguity had both pros and cons. It allowed the foundation to adapt and extend deadlines or eventually incorporate emergent issues like immigration reform. At the same time, it prevented organizations from knowing what to do, and collaborative members thus felt a strong sense of uncertainty.

This ambiguity was especially problematic in terms of the foundation's commitment to resident-driven change. Serena reported that when she spoke with Newman, the foundation representative, he described the initiative as a boat, and the foundation was not sure where it would go but they just wanted to make sure it did not sink. She thought this would give residents the opportunity to lead, but her experience proved the opposite. Instead of the ambiguity providing freedom and flexibility, she was still told by her local representative that residents needed to ask for permission to take action. This also represents the inconsistency between foundation representatives in the home office or those that craft the principles, and those who implement them in local settings. The field officer, who is evaluated formally and informally by policy changes, tries to orchestrate these changes in the ways she or he knows best, which resulted in a persistent effort to maintain close control over collaborative members' actions.

Competing logics. In the previous section, I described the main practices that constituted the logics of each stakeholder group. Often, stakeholders outside the respective group were the ones to actually identify these practices, because they were opposed to these

practices. For example, practices such as *Sticking to the Agenda* did not make sense in the residents' logic. In this second and final section of my findings, I discuss how the various institutional logics conflicted and competed with one another and presented challenges for collaboration. I describe the disagreements that surfaced around actions, processes, and structures; these included disagreement on ideas of work, action, meetings, and expectations of each other.

Work. The definition of work was contentious. Some people were paid for their work or participation in the initiative, while others volunteered, and for others it was a combination. Organizations and residents were both grantees, but in different capacities: organizations received large grants, while residents received stipends to participate, in addition to sometimes receiving small grants, or larger ones if they were a part of an organization. At times, it was also unclear to organizations what work the foundation would fund.

There was also confusion because the collaborative and foundation wanted the work to be resident-driven, yet organizations were the entities actually funded to do the work, and residents were often left out of this work. During the first grant cycle, when the foundation distributed grants to organizations equaling hundreds of thousands of dollars, residents accused organizations of not doing work. Residents questioned what the organizations did with such large amounts of money, why they did not do more, and the progress made towards the creation of the independent resident structure.

The independent resident structure was a central feature of the Civic Engagement and Community Empowerment Outcome. The resident structure aimed to have resident representative at the levels of blocks, neighborhoods, precincts and the foundation intervention area. The purpose of the structure was to “engage and empower residents of the target area utilizing churches, neighborhood associations and organizations as resources,

without endorsing a particular group’s agenda and [to ensure] ensure equal decision-making influence of youth residents, adult residents, and organizations” (Archival Document, CC-CCI Plan Changes, PPT, May 25, 2010). A goal of the independent structure was to organize community residents in a way that would ultimately direct foundation funds, an alternative to the existing funder-community relationship in which communities are subject to the direction of foundation priorities. After the first two years of funding for the Civic and Community Engagement Outcome, residents were dissatisfied with the progress the organization had made with the money they had been given to help build the resident structure.

Hundreds of thousands of dollars held different meaning for the lives of Central City residents, the majority of whom survived on low-wage jobs, and some of who received small stipends for the CCI. For the organizations, it was also a lot of money, but they felt they *were* working very hard and were using the money in an effective way.

Lennon, a resident who was later hired by an organization, described this tension and accusations about “doing work” in the context of discussions about use of funds. He reflected that as an organizational representative,

I felt like I have been doing so much work [laughs] in my organization and yet I’m told—and the people are saying that the organizations are not doing things—and not being specific! ... It did feel like, ouch! I’m working my ass off [laughs]. (Lennon, Interview, September 18, 2013)

He stated that the funding resources had once brought organizational representatives and residents together, rather than created tension and accusations. He said:

[W]e had created this community that [pauses] was based on—that relied on the resources of the [CC-CCI] to call us all [together], to communicate with all of us, to convene all of us. [But] [a]ll of a sudden we lost that community. (Lennon, Interview, September 18, 2013)

Lennon situated the funding as a factor that brought people together, but as the initiative shifted from planning to implementation, the “community” was lost. He attributed this to not seeing one another and interacting, and a lack of clear goals once planning was over. He explained:

I think that was harsh too, not seeing the same people—not interacting with the same people, not being able to exchange as much—[0:12:02.6] as many ideas and being trained and really—... And then when, we started the implementation process [pauses] there wasn't a clear goal to it. Like... It... It's kind of blurry. ... at that point we're like—it was really nebulous [0:12:31.4]. I don't know [laughs] if there's a [plan]... It was like... Okay, we're done with the plan! Now what? [laughs] (Lennon, Interview, September 18, 2013)

Lennon described the shift to the implementation phase as a shift to business as usual. This meant that the foundation gave money to organizations, which divided residents and organizations, whereas previously, the funding had been the impetus for interactions between residents and organizations. Lennon explained that the implementation period stood in contrast to the residents' prior experience working with organizations during the planning period, when grants were not given in the typical fashion to single organizations. Instead, the foundation provided funding to a fiscal agent to support planning activities. Then, once implementation began, the foundation resumed their typical funding routine of soliciting proposals from organizations to meet the requests for proposals they derived from the community plan. The foundation's business-as-usual funding during the implementation period made organizations central and clarified part of their role: they would apply for funding, create logic models and carry out these plans. At the same time, residents could not apply for funding in the same way, so this shift made residents' role unclear and peripheral to

the implementation of the plan. This was especially the case during this transition to implementation, because the Steering Committee at this point had not established itself as a decision-making entity, nor had the collaborative decided on or set up the governance structure that would oversee the 10-year plan. Lennon's comments illustrate that funding, a resource identified in the exclusion chapter, could be productive in terms of bringing people together during the planning year, but also detrimental when it was used to reaffirm differences between organizations and residents, as described by Quick & Feldman (2014).

Funding became a feature of the collaborative work that negatively affected the relationship between the residents and organizations, as describe in the quote above by Lennon. To address this tension, residents set up visiting sessions with grantee organizations to audit the work of the organizations. The foundation manager also set up a committee of residents to review organizations' applications for funding in order to make the process resident-driven and appease resident concerns. However, these actions taken to repair the relationship between collaborative residents and organization resulted in a relationship based on monitoring and distrust. Work was defined and legitimated by who got grants, but at the same time, residents questioned the organizations' ability to do the work without residents, or without their interest in the independent structure in mind. The contention about work and funding damaged the relationships between organizational representatives and residents.

Work is personal. Another site for conflict between the organizational and residents' logic was the idea of work as personal and/or professional. For organizations, the initiative was their job, but nonprofit and public sector employees often choose those careers because they are committed to social change, and thus there is often a strong intrinsic motivation associated with their work (Valentinov, 2012). Nevertheless, residents had different stakes because they lived in Central City. Working on the initiative meant working in their community for their family and community, so when issues came up in the community or

family, these needed to be prioritized. I describe a related point below about prioritizing immediate needs as an important feature of residents' logic that conflicted with the foundation's focus on policy and systems change. Serena narrated the culmination of this conflict between personal life and collaborative work as the subject arose in a meeting:

Por ejemplo [durante] la junta del miércoles...una persona de [una organización], hizo un comentario... me dio entender este, los residentes eran irresponsables por no llegar a la junta... Y sin saber, asumir que es irresponsable por no llegar a una reunión ... no es justo. Porque ... por lo menos tres de las personas que no llegaron... Estaban en el hospital acompañando a sus esposos... Así que hizo tres casos de salud bien serios. Así que cuando escucho sus comentarios... me da mucho coraje. Porque nosotros estamos participando en una manera activa. Pero no dejamos de tener una vida. ...Y esos comentarios son los que empiezan a crear un poco de...[pausa]...incomodidad en los grupos.

TRANSLATION: for example in the meeting on Wednesday... one person from [an organization] made a comment that...he inferred that the residents were irresponsible for not coming to the meeting. And with out knowing...to assume that you are irresponsible for not attending a meeting is not fair. Because ... at least three of the people that did not attend ... They were in the in the hospital accompanying their husbands. These are there cases of serious health issues. So when I hear these comments, I get really angry because we are actively participating. But we don't stop having a life and those comments are the ones that start to create [pause] a tension in the groups. (Serena, Interview, August 23, 2013)

Serena's comment signals a difference between organizations and residents in the

initiative. For the former, the initiative and community development is a part of their job, so personal obligations, for them, were not a legitimate reason to not attend CCI commitments, but for residents the demarcation was different. CCI work came on top of their job, and the time they spent at the initiative took away from their personal and family time. Miguel, a youth organizer, likewise explained that with youth, their lives go on and working with youth in this mindset of “your life is [the focus of] the initiative, not the initiative is your life” is critical for effective youth organizing:

[Y]ou have to kind of get them to understand the issue and to really—not just to bring them along because they’re youth and you want to bring them along, but to actually have them understand the issue and to see what their point of view is. And ... they’re still youth. [0:03:35.9] So they’re relying on people to give them rides, or they have homework, or they do sports, or they wanna go hang out with their friends.” (Miguel, Interview, September 23, 2013)

Residents’ positions in the initiative were not the same as organizations’ and when these positions were assumed to be the same, it was not productive for the collaborative as it created tension between residents as seen with Serena and her steering committee colleagues. Youth, as Miguel described, had other obligations, as well as needs that were equally important to respect for them to be successful collaborative members.

This practice of *bringing in the personal* was often in conflict with organizational practice, which attempts to silo personal and professional lives. For example, residents would call meetings in their homes or go to other residents’ homes; in contrast, organizational representatives organized meetings in professional spaces. These ways of organizing meetings made sense given their professional position.

Organizational representatives recalled that the personal relationships involved were sometimes confusing and felt contradictory for them. David, an organizational representative,

felt that residents were yelling at him; as Lennon described above, the residents were angry with his organization for allegedly not doing the work, yet, at the same time, the residents would say, “but I like *you*, David.” For David, he was his organization. But residents had a different orientation—they saw him as a friend, and the organization as sometimes an enemy.

The various competing logics inherent in the multiple stakeholder contexts of Community Change Initiatives and community engagement, as described above, bring different assumptions to bear on what constitutes work, how work should be done, and how people should work together. From the residents’ point of view, work was not work if it did not engage residents or did not bring in the personal. For the foundation, the work was not work unless it focused on a policy or systems change. Organizations felt that they were working hard to achieve the aims of the outcome, as they continued to work according to their organizational strengths and missions which were oriented to civic and community engagement. But they did not prioritize the participation of collaborative residents or the independent resident structure, which was in conflict with the residents’ interpretation of work.

Meetings. Meetings were a site where many conflicts arose. Often, conflicts emerged over the number, organization and facilitation of the meetings. Many participants, at some point, commented that “there are too many meetings.” Roxanne, a resident and nonprofit representative, explained how she struggled to attend all the meetings:

I just know that those are things that need to be changed... but I just can’t make it to all the ... meetings. ... but... I’m down to do the work, like - some stuff on my own and then email it to people to help. And I wanna be clued in on what’s going on and I’ll show up and get a bunch of residents to show up at the council meetings when we need to be there, you know. (Roxanne, Organizational Representative, Interview, October 27, 2013).

Nico, an organizational executive, also reflected that he could not attend all the meetings, and that the community wanted to see action:

I didn't have the time to keep going with all the meetings and wanted to get the new folks caught up in the 2nd round. And we all got excited after the plan, and the community wanted to see some action taking place. But in going through that [planning] we underestimated effects and drain and makes us question and all [meetings] is important but which one should we go to. (Nico, Interview, September 4, 2013)

Residents and organizational representatives debated whether the meetings were productive. Often, meeting facilitators and organizers tried to stick to the meeting agenda, and thereby ended up excluding residents as described in the exclusion chapter. Moreover, residents and some organizational representative critiqued meetings as comprising too much process and not enough action.

Sticking to the agenda. Residents, as described in the exclusion chapter, expressed frustration that there was not enough time or space on the agenda for residents to discuss their lives. Meeting organizers and facilitators frequently tried to get through ambitious agendas at the expense of addressing a collaborative member's concern or suggestion. This represented a disregard for the experience and existing community change work residents and organizational representatives tried to bring in, the residents' lived experience of the issues at hand, or critiques of the process.

The *Roots and Branches* vignette demonstrated this larger pattern in the initiative consisting of organizers' efforts to *steer residents back to the agenda*, as in the case of Lawrence's suggestion to address the branch issue: the organizers steered away from this comment and back to the campaigns at the roots. When residents shared a lived experience related to the issue being discussed or an immediate community or personal need (i.e.

deportation of fellow parents or housing foreclosure), meeting facilitators often did not know how to incorporate these comments into the conversation, and dismissed these contributions as being “off-topic” or “anecdotal.” The rigidity of the agenda frustrated residents, Eduardo said: “stop being so strict with an agenda, we are talking about our lives and OUR community” (*More Than Statistics and Agendas Exclusion* vignette). At the same time, other residents pointed out that in addition to organizers deterring residents’ lived experiences from featuring on the agenda, residents often did even not feel comfortable sharing their ideas in meetings, let alone in the presence of authorities.

Margarita, a resident steering committee member explained:

[W]hen you have a—a person that’s of big position in the police department, people are not going to be so open about it. I mean you’re barely getting folks to talk [laughs]—you know to express themselves and be able to participate in meetings and now you want them to be outspoken in front of like deputy to the police (Margarita, Interview, October 23, 2013)

Margarita’s comments communicate that there were explicit actions to keep to the meeting agenda, but also that when a meeting was organized to include people in positions of power, this also prevented residents from participating and sharing their experience and changing the agenda in terms of the focus of the initiative. Margarita’s point relates to the issue brought up the vignette, *Creating Real Definition Of Safety*, in the exclusion chapter, in which it was unclear whether residents would have the opportunity to shape the issue of community safety before prioritizing it. This had consequences, as the definition of the policy problem affects the possibilities of solutions.

Action. Attending too many meetings created tension, disillusionment, and sometimes burn-out. For Thomas, going to too many meetings meant not having the time to organize his neighbors. He said that “all we [residents] do is go to trainings; we don’t do the organizing in

with our neighbors anymore because we are always at training.” I asked him about this in an interview, and he responded:

Too many meetings, I don't like it. We need action. ... The rules of each organization, I don't think they help the community. The plan may help but not the rules they have, I don't think so. I will give you an example. One of the rules or policies of [the] organizations is meetings, meetings, meetings.

(Field notes, Fall/Winter 2011)

Thomas said that the organizations and foundation believe “that people [resident and organizational representatives] *enjoy* being in ... meetings.” He explained that only the foundation could change the excessive number of meetings, because they had the money. Thomas names *attending meetings* as a part of the rules of the initiative and explains that these rules were set by the foundation, were enacted by the organizations, and served and favored an organizational logic, to have meetings to accomplish work and please the funder.

Valuing meeting attendance also created tension between residents and organizations and represented a discord in their logics. Meetings as a method of doing the work (Polletta, 2012) makes it seem as if those who do not attend are not doing the work. This reflected Roxanne's experience, as she wanted to be involved but could not attend all the meetings. Serena explained that organizations are expected to attend meetings, and that if residents do not attend or cannot attend they are assumed to be “irresponsible.” To Serena, not attending meetings did not mean she was not participating and actively involved. Serena exclaimed: “We are actively participating but we don't stop having a life and those comments are the ones that start to create tension in the groups” (Interview, August 23, 2013). Roxanne, the organizational representative quoted above, explained that if you didn't attend meetings, you could get left out, despite a desire to be involved and a commitment to the work.

This friction around the number of meetings also represents a conflict in the

interpretation of meetings as a form of action and participation for organizations, an interpretation not necessarily shared by residents. Luisa, a community organizer, was also frustrated by the number of meetings organizational representatives spent planning. She wanted to “move forward” and “take action,” not go to meetings—she could not accomplish her work by just going to meetings (Luisa, Interview, November 18, 2013). This conflict over assumptions about what constitutes action and how to organize and plan for community change exemplifies the conflict between organizational and resident logic. Yet meetings as a method of doing the work seemed unchangeable to Thomas; he said that only the foundation could change the number of meetings, because they had the money.

Participants were also torn, because they felt that if they did not attend, their ideas and interests would not be included; in addition, sometimes they were required by the foundation to attend meetings as grantees. They needed to be present to trust the process and ensure it was fair, as well as fulfill their role as a grantee. The organization of the initiative around meetings required and allowed residents to experience organizational logic from the inside. As Nussbaum (1986) writes, ““certain truths about human experience can be best learned by living them in their particularity. ... It ... needs to be apprehended ... through putting oneself inside a problem and feeling it” (Forester, 1999, note 13, p. 255). Notably, this organization of the initiative did not require that the foundation or nonprofits experience the residents’ point of view and be inside the problems as residents experience them, nor, as Nussbaum (1986) noted, to find ways to approximate this through stories and images to act as an extension of experience.

On the contrary, the way the initiative was set up often delegitimized residents’ actions, because the actions were not taken up by organizations, or were deemed not to count as policy and systems change. Maria, an organizational executive, explained how residents’ definition of action did not fit with in the initiative:

Action sounds more like my [read: resident] vision... When I am told to take action and [the collaborative] doesn't take action, so you only take action as Maria, a single resident, so they are like 'what is this?' (Maria, Interview, April 13, 2014)

Maria's statement above reflects residents' frustrations with the lack of action and abundance of process or meetings in the initiative. Residents faced the problems being discussed in these meetings in their everyday lives and wanted to start working to address these. This frustration existed in a context and history in which some organizations distanced themselves from being implicated in future action, based on residents' priorities. In the organizational logic, meetings were a valid form of action, whereas in the resident logic, meetings were a part of the work but the action consisted of talking with, supporting and organizing their neighbors.

Immediate needs. In addition to seeing the number of meetings as antithetical to action, residents also sometimes perceived the focus on systems and policy change in a similar manner. In the *Roots and Branches* vignette in the exclusion chapter, I describe how Lawrence suggested working on some more proximate issues, but then was told his ideas were not at the root of the problems, and the campaign and initiative were designed to address root problems. Residents wanted to see action and progress in addressing problems. The processes and requirements of the CCIs often stood in contrast to residents' idea of action

Logic model. The logic model, a visual depiction of action steps leading to an outcome, is another example of common organizational and foundation practice that did not fit the residents' logic. It was another example of a process that many collaborative residents felt distracted the collaborative from taking actions and addressing the urgent needs of the community. Yet it was also a major condition of foundation funding.

The logic model was also problematic because it did not convey the web of action and energy residents felt was necessary and possible in Central City. To address this, during the planning year, the collaborative members abandoned the format of the logic model because it was confusing and constraining; a foundation representative called it “illogical.” Instead, the collaborative decided to have conversations about the changes they wanted to see and the resources they had and needed to achieve those changes. The consultant hired to write the plan used the content of these conversations to reverse engineer the logic model—fitting the conversations into the logic model’s boxes and arrows.

The logic model’s framework was a main requirement of the initiative that symbolized the imposition of the foundational logic. At a convening of initiative sites in 2013, a Foundation executive mentioned the logic model and joked that everyone in the room rolled their eyes. The logic model could not capture the complexity and nonlinearity of the solutions necessary to address the web of problems (big and small, proximate and root) that converged in the everyday life of Central City residents. The use of logic models in community-based collaborative settings is known to be challenging (Kaplan, 2005). A major reason for these challenges is that logic models are illogical in terms of residents’ logic, and even from the perspective of some foundation representatives. Logic models make sense for organizational representatives, often because they have experience with them. But as seen in the creation of the collective impact outcome, when logic models are brought into a collaborative setting, even organizations needed the foundation to guide them; it even provided a model for language for the first draft. Therefore, the logic model as a linear visual for work was a mismatch for this collaborative community-based setting and the work needed there, which was dynamic and contained multiple co-existing and competing logics of practice.

Expectations. In cross-sector collaborations, diverse actors with varied experience

participate in initiatives and work together. As Bryson et al. (2006) state, conflict in collaboration settings “emerges from the differing aims and expectations that partners bring to a collaboration, from differing views about strategies and tactics [...] [to] attempts to protect or magnify a partner’s control over the collaboration’s work or outcomes” (p. 48). In Central City, this conflict emerged from the different interpretations and understandings of ideas of work and action, but also from the divergent expectations of different actors and the relations between them.

“Resident-led” approach infers organizations co-lead or follow. As mentioned, the initiative was meant to be resident-led, and residents wanted to take action. But as Serena and Maria explained, residents’ actions often were not supported. To Serena and Maria, resident-led means the foundation and organizations support and follow; it did not mean that residents were left alone or abandoned, but often this is how it was experienced. Montoya (2013) reported that after organizational representatives and residents had worked together to create the community plan for over a year, and had included outcomes focused on immigration reform and civic engagement and community empowerment, an organizational executive declared, “This is their plan, the community’s plan, and who are we to interfere with it” (S45). Montoya (2013) explained that some organizational leaders reported to “elected bodies or have super wealthy and conservative individuals on their organizations’ boards of directors” (S47). They used the rhetoric of citizen control (see Chapter 2; Arnstein, 1969) to try and absolve themselves of accountability for implementing the actions they co-designed with residents in the plan. So despite these organizations’ commitment to a variety of efforts for social good (health, housing), they operated and were structured in ways that countered resident-driven change.

Maria’s quote reflected similar moves by the foundation and organizations to distance themselves from residents as documented by Montoya (2013):

When I am told to take action and [the collaborative] doesn't take action, so you only take action as Maria, a single resident, so they are like 'what is this?' (Maria, Interview, April 13, 2014)

Her quote illustrates the foundation's messages to residents that they could take action, but that this would be the action of the individual, and would not imply that the collaborative would take on the action collectively as a part of their broader agenda.

This support for residents' ideas in principle, but not in action, also occurred with the independent resident structure. This resident structure was developed by residents and community organizers and was based on a model Serena had found effective when she lived in Mexico, but as previously described under the subsection on *work*, the creation and implementation of this structure was not prioritized. Serena reflected on the structure; she explained that the foundation approved the plan for the resident structure, but then the collaborative needed to ask the foundation for permission to take steps to create it. The actions the foundation *did* take to implement the plan involved funding organizations to carry out the work, but from the residents' point of view, after two years of funding, the organizations had not made any headway. At the same time, organizations acknowledged there was no resident structure and, after two years, realized it would take the whole ten years, if not more, to accomplish this. Organizations were frustrated with the residents' disappointment, because they judged the expectations to create the structure to be neither feasible nor fair, given what they had written in their work plans for the foundation.

A resident structure based on geography was an alternative to the existing model of resident organizing in Central City, in which resident organizing was clustered around organizations. The independent resident structure would have changed the interactions and relationships between residents, organizations and the foundation. Residents would no longer be the targets of intervention; instead, they would potentially assume the position of

constituting their own organization, applying for grants and implementing programs and advocacy campaigns. The resident structure could have upset conservative nonprofit board members, as Montoya (2013) posited. The structure was poised to render some of the current responsibilities of nonprofits irrelevant, as residents would then be direct recipients of grants and would no longer rely on organizations to be the middleman. Despite an organizational representative's description of her organization as in the business of "working themselves out of jobs" (May, Interview, December 20, 2013), the resident structure threatened to disrupt the status quo of the community—changing organization-foundation relationships and interactions around which many institutions (i.e. nonprofit sector), jobs (i.e. community organizers), and practices (i.e. meetings and agendas) had been built over many years. In other words, the foundation and organizations while committed to resident empowerment also had incentives to not take action.

The expectations for residents to lead and organizations to support or follow did not come to fruition. The way nonprofits are structured and the way they organized their work also made these expectations difficult to meet. In their description of the American nonprofit system, Heydemann & Hammack (2009) explain: "nonprofits fit into a larger institutional context dominated by profit-seeking firms that operate in markets, and in which a wide variety of federal, state, and local governments also play key roles. They must find their own funds and have a board that is responsible for its financial survival as well as ensuring the organization stays true its mission. Ideally, the logics of the internal organization fit well with logics of their external context" (p. 9). Based on this description, there is a chronic mismatch between the logics of American nonprofits and the legal, political and social contexts outside the United States. However, in this case, even inside the U.S., residents' ideas and actions conflicted with those of the organization and foundation. In the case of the resident structure and the participation of many residents, who were from Mexico, their logics were informed

by their experiences living in Mexico and other Central and South American Countries as well as by the legal, political and social context of these countries—for instance, as Serena explained, any opposition to authority (e.g. speaking out against the police) would not have been tolerated in their countries of origin.

Ambiguity and uncertainty. An important factor in the lack of clarity over expectations was the fact that the foundation consciously aimed to be ambiguous, in order to allow for flexibility and learning; but on their end, organizations and residents often experienced this as uncertainty. Feldman (1989) distinguishes the two, explaining that ambiguity exists when there are multiple answers associated with a problem, while uncertainty occurs when there is a possible answer, but there is a lack of information or other resources that prevent policy actors from attaining such an answer. Furthermore, Matland (1995) reviews the literature on goal ambiguity and finds that top-down policy approaches with ambiguous goals generally cause distress and uncertainty in downstream actors, organizations and residents. Despite the establishment of this relationship in the literature, the foundation created this situation in which they provided ambiguous goals, and organizations and residents experienced uncertainty. Moreover, the foundation often communicated ambiguity, but instead enacted certainty when residents suggested activities.

Roxanne's comments from the background section of this chapter sum up the resulting confusion. She acknowledged her own persistent confusion despite her education, privilege and access to many people in the initiative. The Foundation did not provide clear instructions on how to obtain funding, yet nonprofits rely on grants to provide salaries for their staff.

Organizations and residents were asked to come to meetings and participate in a time-intensive process that had unclear expectations. An organizational representative explained that organizations wanted clear guidelines, that it was offensive to him that these were not

provided, and that the foundation was expecting residents and organizations to just give a significant portion of their time (Mario, Organizational Representative, Interview, September 4, 2013). In this situation, a lack of guidelines was not liberating for him; instead, it was just another exercise of power by the foundation. These actions substantiated the unwritten rules of the foundational representatives' practices: that the foundation does not need to describe their process, and that moreover, despite being told it is a resident-driven initiative and ambiguous, residents feel that they actually need to ask for permission to take actions (Serena, Interview August 23, 2013)

The lack of clarity from the foundation was problematic for many collaborative members, because they were spending a lot of time and money on the process without a guarantee of funding, or indeed of any impact on Central City. Mario articulated this by asking:

Do we want to allocate staff time to an unclear process? Or do we go after funding from another foundation that has their guidelines posted on their website? You know what I mean? It's very clear like, we fund this, this and this, here's the process, here's the deadline, you know. (Mario, Organizational Representative, Interview September 4, 2013)

Thus, the way that the foundation was operating was in conflict with elements of the organizations' and residents' logic at times, particularly with regard to the need of organizations to get funding and the need of residents to take action and lead the initiative.

Discussion

In this discussion section, I present the implications of my analysis for the literature and practice of community engagement and cross sector collaboration. Specifically, I suggest the implications of these stakeholder logics for exclusion and inclusion. I also reconcile these findings with the literature on institutional logics.

Community engagement and cross-sector collaboration. A key proposition of cross-sector collaboration scholars Bryson et al. (2006) was that competing institutional logics pose a challenge for collaboration. My findings show that the competing resident, organizational, and foundation logics did indeed challenge actors' abilities to build legitimacy, leadership, and trust as well as manage conflict (Bryson et al., 2006, p. 50). By competing, I mean that residents' and organizations' respective actions and norms did not make sense to each other group as a way of accomplishing the initiative. Residents, organizations and the foundation struggled to see each other's actions as legitimate. For example, residents saw meetings as unproductive, and organizations saw personal issues as irrelevant. Yet for residents, personal issues were intimately tied to the impact the initiative would have on their personal lives. And for organizations, meetings were the normal way to accomplish their work, and reflected a professionalized approach to social change work (Polletta, 2012).

Competing logics also inhibited collaborative members' abilities to build or recognize leadership. The lack of direction from the foundation highlighted the lack of clarity over who was making decisions. The foundation and organizations communicated that they wanted resident-driven change, but then took actions to circumvent residents' full leadership and maintain their control over the content and process of decisions. Distrust of authorities was already a part of resident logic, and the foundation's ambiguity provided additional reasons for this distrust. This distrust was also compounded by an overall suspicion that organizations had not accomplished their work. This mismatch between the logics of residents, organizations, and foundations caused frustration and distrust, and hindered collaborative members' abilities to work together. Some organizations left the collaborative while other members burnt out, but overall, relationships were damaged and people were hurt. This resulted in the collaborative organization of retreats in the spring of 2014 to repair and heal relationships in order to continue to work together.

Agranoff (2012) acknowledges that collaborative activities require the recognition, working through or even working around of different agency or organizational traditions and practices. He writes that “[r]espect for the ‘other’ is not only highly valued, it is essential to ultimately moving an organization representative toward agreement” (p. 169). As alluded to in the findings and analysis, the Central City initiative often did *not* involve recognition, working through or even working around the conflicts between the practices that constituted the different stakeholder logics. When recognition did emerge, it was delayed, as in the case of the foundation eventually funding immigration reform or acknowledging the illogical nature of logic models. These institutional logics are fundamental to consider when working in multi-actor, multi-organizational and multi-cultural spaces.

In practice, recognition, working through or working around institutional logics can take many forms. King et al.’s (1998) work on citizen participation suggests “learning processes built on citizen empowerment and education, reeducation of administrators, and enabling administrative structures and processes that change the way citizens and administrators meet and interact.” Kellogg’s (2009) research suggests a need for spaces that allow for actors who espouse alternative positions to form a collective that would be able to stand its ground in the company of extant logics of organizational practice. In my case, this means that residents would have the space to develop their logic in the environment that favors organizational logics, in order to have the potential to rival the well-established professional logics of organizational and foundation representative. An instance of this took place in the planning year, when residents and organizational advocates met separately to address and eventually formulate issues of immigration reform and community engagement. These issues, once marginalized, were eventually central to the community plan and were later prioritized by the foundation. However, it is unclear whether this solution, deployed broadly, would foster legitimation and trust between actors and their respective logics,

because it would physically separate residents from organizations. Thus, these actors would remain siloed and not have opportunities to build relationships, create shared understandings and foster trust with one another.

This mismatch between the logics of residents, organizations, and foundations caused frustration, distrust, and hindered collaborative members abilities from working together, which also prevented inclusion and fostered exclusion. Once again, as stated in Chapter 2, inclusion involves making connections between people, across issues and over time (Feldman & Quick, 2011); and as explained in the exclusion chapter, exclusion involves preventing connections between residents and their ways of knowing, as well as their previous work. The practices that constituted the organizational logic (*meet deadlines, obtain funding, please the funder, stick to the agenda, and attend meetings*) conflicted with residents' logics. In organizational representatives' efforts to meet deadlines, obtain funding, please the funder and stick to the agenda, they prevented connections to residents, their knowledge and their previous work. As seen in the *Roots and Branches* vignette, sticking to the agenda prevented the connection to Lawrence's suggestion to address branch issues at the same time. The actions of the nonprofit representatives, while they were aimed at creating advocacy campaigns to address social issues, also communicated that their primary accountability was to the funder, in service of their organization. So while organizational representatives took actions that extended beyond profit maximization goals and espoused "community logic," these actions were not necessarily aligned with the resident logic.

Community/resident Logic. Community logic as a type of institutional logics is anchored in practice (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). It is defined by practices that focus on improving the status quo for those outside of the firm. While this logic may seem transferable to research in community engagement, a community logic is not identical to the logic of community residents. My case raises the issue of the logic of community residents in cross-sector

collaborations and community engagement processes. While most studies acknowledge that professionals and residents often come from different backgrounds and have different stakes in the game per se, few studies have drawn on institutional logics to understand and account for these differences (see Flower, 1997, and McPherson & Sauder, 2013).

Community is unlike other categories of logics (market, state or professional) as it is an institutional system whose definition is much more complex and contentious than the logics literature typically allows. Recent work by institutional scholars, Friedland, Mohr, Roose, and Gardinali (2014) demonstrates the ability of an institutional logic analytic to reflect the complicated nature of a concept like love or community. While these scholars focus on the institutional logics of love, the work of scholars such as Montoya (2013) and Lave and Wenger (1991) demonstrates that community is a dynamic concept created through practice. It is not an entity that exists outside a firm or organization to be patronized; instead, community is full of assets (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). Friedland et al. (2014) state that to understand love, “one must believe in it order to participate in it, to be the kind of subject who can organize his or her life around it.” As shown in the resident logic, the importance of residents’ experiences demonstrates this need to understand community from within, and highlights community logic as a moral commitment and as Minkler et al. wrote, as “a central value ... [in disciplines] that emphasize, in part, organizing and capacity building” (2012, p. 112). The resident logic also framed and focused on the community as full of assets, not deficits.

The resident logic, unlike the community logic, suggests that community is not homogenous. In my case, residents’ practices (*account for personal and family issues; share, listen and integrate resident lived experience, take action (not just go to meetings), and be skeptical of and monitor authorities*) resembled “community logic” in that there was a focus on improving the status quo for those who lived in Central City. The focus on personal and

family issues alludes to Polletta's (2012) description of structures of community organization based on kinship. The skepticism of authorities points to her discussion of activist-oriented approach to social change which "scoffs at community organizers' acceptance of 'piece-of-the-pie' politics" (Polletta, 2012, p. 199).

The resident logic suggested other ways of conducting collaborative work that convey a more complicated logic than that expressed by the "community logic." Residents' actions suggested that residents should lead the initiative, that the work was personal, not professional, and that they treated each other like family or friends. These actions signal modes of democratic practice that resemble those Polletta (2012) described as anchored in friendship and kinship, rather than coworkers and interests. Residents felt that collaborative work needed to prioritize family and personal issues beyond providing childcare. It also needed to legitimize residents' experiences and narratives as fundamental to defining and implementing policy problems and solutions. In this case, the resident logic resembles the family logic, in that the latter demonstrates that there are spaces in which bringing in the personal makes sense, and professional spaces are often places that exclude and delegitimize the personal.

Polletta's (2012) work demonstrates that democratic modes can take on the norms and assumptions of family and friendship relations, and that these also carry "implicit exclusions, hierarchies and inequalities" (p. 174). The evidence provided in this chapter does not support the entirety of her understanding of the family logic. Sometimes, the residents' desire to lead and direct the foundation suggested the desire to flip the hierarchy in an adversarial manner reminiscent of Arnstein's ladder, as discussed in the second empirical chapter. Comments from residents that they 'liked' an organizational representative but not their organization exemplifies the exclusions and inequalities of family or friend logic.

At the same time, residents and organizations recalled that the "resident-led" principle

meant that organizational and the foundation supported residents' ideas and would not abandon them as described by Montoya (2013). This resembles Polletta's (2012) alternative model of organizing which is based on Lugones and Rosezelle's (1995) use of the term "compañera." Polletta (2012) writes:

Compañera does not require the depth of emotional attachment and sympathetic communication that hermana and amiga require. 'Compañera connotes egalitarianism, but the egalitarianism is one of the companionship and participation in common political structure ... [T]he term does not connote unconditional bonding. The struggle is that about which the parties to the relationship are companions. So if someone ceases to be involved or interested in or betrays the struggle the relationship is at an end with respect to that person' (Lugones & Rosezelle, 1995, p 138, cited in Polletta, 2012, p. 174)

As Margarita explained, she and others come and go in the community work, whether it is because they had personal obligations or different interests. People can come and go and this is respected, not punished nor delegitimized, because it is not governed by the norms of professional, family and friendship relationships.

So a "community *resident* logic" in my case was more than acting in pursuit of the greater good, but it involved practices sometimes based on relations as family, friendship and compañeras. These practices were also not value-neutral or assumed to be benevolent, as is often the case with the term community (De Filippis et al., 2006; Joseph, 2002). As Polletta (2012) points out, democratic practice based on friendship and kinship can also be exclusive. Feminists in particular critique kinship for its patriarchal power dynamics (Polletta, 2012, p. 153; Weiss & Friedman, 1995).

As cross-sector collaboration and community engagement persists as a mode of

making policymaking more democratic as well as effective, the institutional logics literature also must take “the community” seriously as an actor or institutional system. My case draws on the logic of the community residents themselves, and builds on the rich literature on community and community engagement to justify an expanded theorization of the “community logic” to reflect the complicated nature of the system. As mentioned in the literature review, there has been much research on professionals and logics within organizations, but very little that theorizes community members as political and organizational actors who have their own distinct logic. To wit, Forester (1999) documented planners’ avoidance of community members because they did not represent a clearly circumscribed set of interests or skills. Based on the findings of this chapter, I suggest that dynamic theorizations of community (see Lave & Wenger, 1991; Montoya, 2013) could help expand current theorizations of “community logic” in which the community is a dynamic institution unto itself and “community logic” is not demonstrated by community members as targets of nonprofits’ goodwill or solely by actions for the social good.

Professionals who specialize in or are required to do community engagement require not only an understanding of community logic, but also the ability to bridge and to be fluent across multiple logics in order to be inclusive (Quick & Feldman, 2014). Yet as mentioned in the literature review, those tasked to engage the community often feel there is a lack of common language (Forester, 1989). Quick & Feldman’s (2014) work suggests that the role of this professional is to facilitate multi-directional translation and dissolve the boundaries between professional and layperson. This multi-directional translation assumes that both the professionals and the lay participants will engage in learning.

Philanthropic Logic. This chapter also contributes to the literature on philanthropic logics, which currently emphasizes the power dynamic of philanthropists through their role as gift givers. In my case, I found that these features were present, but in new ways, given the

changing trends in foundation work to focus on policy and systems, rather than service delivery. I found that the ideal of policy and systems change was imposed on nonprofits and residents. While the literature on philanthropic logics emphasizes the mismatch between American foundations trying to export their work abroad, the same mismatch can occur within state borders, as these new approaches to funding emerge and are dispersed. Moreover, as seen in my case, many U.S. cities are like Central City, and have large numbers of documented and undocumented immigrants. Thus, while the communities ostensibly exist within the same legal and political system as the funder, the actors also bring a lifetime of experience in other legal, social and political systems to bear on collaborative work. For example, Serena explained that many of the adult residents had grown up in South America, under governments that were not democratic, so being asked to participate in policy and systems change and work with government officials was not familiar to them. Dandekar and Main (2014) attest that many “new arrivals, whether documented or not, come from cultures without a tradition of public participation or face cultural and language barriers. Many of these communities experience social and economic marginalization which, in turn, have a negative impact on civic participation (Derr et al., 2013; Hum, 2010; Umemoto and Igarashi, 2009 cited in Dandekar and Main, 2014, p. 162). Dandekar and Main (2014) observe that most explanations for a lack of broad-based public participation in city-wide planning point to structural forces such as demographic and cultural changes. These arguments can be circuitous, actually blaming those who are marginalized for their own exclusion; as Flyvbjerg (1998) writes, this approach can exacerbate the very problem of lack of participation that it seeks to solve. A focus on the logics of practices reveals the friction between dominant, top-down, and historically American community engagement practices by philanthropists, and community engagement practices associated with different cultures or demographics.

Professional Logic. My case also reconciles the professional logic with continued and

expanded efforts to fund and focus on community building in Community Change Initiatives. As Community Change Initiatives and foundations focus upstream on community building, actions - attributed to the organizational logic and that reflect the professional nonprofit logic - maintain communities' dependency on nonprofits. In the literature, the professional logic has been likened to McNight's (1995) management of need, which he identified to be concurrent with the professionalization of medical and social services. As McNight (1995) suggests, in my case, organizational representatives took actions that drew on their insider knowledge of being a grantee, and thus promoted the value of their technical expertise (for instance, in the *Roots and Branches* vignette in the exclusion chapter, the community organizer corrected residents as to where campaigns should be placed on the tree). These actions did not connect with residents' assets, such as their lived experience or different approaches to organizing. As McPherson & Sauder (2013) explain, institutional logics are a tool to achieving goals. By looking at the practices that constitute the logics, it is clear that the organizational logics were used to outwardly achieve community goals, but prioritized goals associated with and that reinforced professional goals and logic.

If we consider the expanded understanding of "community logic" I suggest above, and the inclusion literature's focus on connections, it might be possible to enact a logic in which goals are co-produced. Kretzmann & McNight (1993) state that is possible for professionals to empower local residents by helping them develop the research skills, substantive knowledge, or both, to address community issues. In my case, I found that organizational actions to incorporate residents' assets, like those described in the second empirical chapter, demonstrate that collaborations and members with competing logics are capable of agreeing on actions, processes, and structures, or create new actions, processes and structures that make sense for both logics or organizational positions. Moreover, conflict between logics can be productive (Hardy & Phillips, 1998). For example, in *Creating*

Complete Streets, the inclusion of residents' lived experience made sense for both the youth and professionals. While planners could have excluded the residents' lived experience because it would have detoured them from their agenda and timeline by requiring the collection of more data and further collaboration, the inclusion of this information and the youth made visible some features of problems that the planners' methods missed.

As Swidler (2009), Forrester (1999) and McPherson and Sauder (2013) demonstrate, certain organizations or individuals are positioned and able to mediate institutional logics. Quick and Feldman (2014) similarly suggest, as mentioned above, that some professionals can translate across, align and decenter differences between professional and laypersons. In the case of *Complete Streets*, the planners and the youth both mediated logics. The planners mediated between the city and the youth, and the youth mediated between other residents and the planners. Fischer (1993) describes the ability of the 'expert' or 'professional' to become a

'facilitator' of public learning and empowerment. As a facilitator, he or she becomes an expert in how people learn, clarify, and decide for themselves (Fischer, 1990). This process includes coming to grips with the basic languages of public normative argumentation, as well as gaining knowledge about the kinds of environmental and intellectual conditions under which citizens can formulate their own ideas. It involves the creation of institutional and intellectual contexts that help people pose questions and examine technical analyses in their own ordinary (or everyday) language and decide which issues are important to them. (p. 171)

While all details of Fischer's (1993) description do not appear in the *Creating Complete Streets* example of inclusion, his description points out the possibility to create professional environments in which residents' stories and responses are engaged with, and inform, the current and next steps of the emergent collaborative and political work. *Creating*

Complete Streets did demonstrate this, as planners and youth created a policymaking space that took youth input seriously and allowed for the process and the content of the data collection to be co-produced.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I provided an institutional explanation for why collaborative work and community engagement is challenging, one that is grounded in the micro-foundations of institutional logics. Multiple logics exist in collaborations, and these multiple logics constrain and enable the actions, processes and structures involved, as well as their legitimacy. Institutional logics are enduring, often invisible, yet powerful forces that influence and shape possible collaboration and community engagement practices. While they are enduring, logics are not fixed but continuously socially constructed. This chapter unpacks the pieces of the main institutional logics at play in the Central City Initiative, and explains how and why collaboration and community engagement was so challenging at times, despite the commitment of organizations, residents and the foundation to a highly-participatory process. I also discuss the limitations of the existing “community logic” and provide evidence for more research on the logic of community residents, as they become integral policy actors.

Conclusion

Summary

Community engagement is an important phenomenon for both practitioners and scholars. As mentioned in the introductory background section, community engagement and local partnerships have a long history in the United States as critical features of efforts to address the challenges communities face. The Community Change Initiative in Central City is part of a recent statewide foundation-funded initiative that reflects a renewed national trend in neighborhood and place-based partnerships, initiatives, and policies.

For my dissertation research I spent four years participating, observing, and working with the Central City Change Initiative. From the first few meetings with the Central City Change Initiative, organizational representatives and residents communicated that community engagement and outreach was a priority for the funder, as well as for many of the participating groups, who often counted this priority as central to their organizational mission.

The purpose of this study was to understand (1) how community engagement is practiced within this community-based planning and policymaking initiative; (2) how exclusion has persisted despite efforts to be participatory; (3) how inclusion emerged in this collaborative and complex organizational setting; and (4) how the institutional logics behind these practices constrain and enable exclusion and inclusion. I investigated these four processes in order to understand the implications of community engagement practices for planning and policymaking practice.

In this dissertation, I contribute to community engagement scholarship and practice across the public policy, planning, public management and public health disciplines by

describing how and why inclusion and exclusion occur through rich descriptions of practices. I focus on practices to provide an explanation of community engagement that entails both structure and agency. To document practices, I conducted participant observation and recorded detailed observational data of community engagement processes. I also conducted interviews with collaborative members and collected archival documents. Through these methods, I developed a robust qualitative database that I then analyzed and present in three chapters. I provide rich accounts of community engagement, as recommended by Forester (1999), in order to help practitioners learn from the actions that preceded them. I answer my research questions by analyzing these rich accounts. In my first empirical chapter, I present my data in six short vignettes; in chapter two, I present one longer vignette, a case of inclusion; and in chapter three, I use the concept of institutional logics, from institutional theory, as a heuristic to analyze and to organize my analysis, using the words of my informants to scaffold my theorizations of the institutional logics at play.

In this final conclusion chapter, I synthesis and analyze the findings and conclusions made in the previous three chapters to extend understandings of engagement for planning, policymaking, and public management scholars and practitioners. I begin with a brief summary of the analysis of the three empirical chapters and identify key findings and conclusions.

In the first empirical chapter, I found that despite an overt commitment to engagement and efforts to be participatory, practitioners and residents enacted exclusionary practices. I discovered six exclusionary practices: (1) Preventing people from being part of a group, (2) Preventing people from taking a specific action, (3) Leaving out issues (important to residents), (4) Leaving out residents and their ideas, (5) Dismissing people's understandings of or approaches to problems, and (6) Disconnecting ongoing or pre-existing work or relationships. All of these exclusionary practices shared a common feature: they all

centered on the prevention of connections between different people, actions, issues, ideas, or understandings, or between previous relationships and current work.

Bringing together this analysis and the literature on inclusion (e.g. Quick & Feldman, 2011) and exclusion (e.g. Goodin, 1996), I developed a practice-based definition of exclusion as the prevention of connections, which inhibit different decision-making processes from emerging and the accomplishment of diverse outcomes. This practice-based definition of exclusion demonstrates that exclusion can be both process and outcome. For example, in the *Roots and Branches* vignette, exclusionary practices, such as *dismissing alternative understandings and approaches to problems and solutions*, affected the campaign selection process, and set a precedent for future collaboration and decision-making. Exclusion was also an outcome because the practice of *dismissing alternative understandings and approaches to problems and solutions* restricted the potential campaigns. Recall Quick and Feldman (2011) define inclusion as an orientation to the continuous creation of connections between people and issues and over time, and that one inclusionary practice is the co-production of processes and outcomes; Goodin's (1996) articulation of exclusion is fixated not only on the boundaries that keep people out as well as in, but *also* the policing of such boundaries. Policing the boundaries infers a kind of control over the movement across boundaries, as well as the creation of boundaries themselves. In Quick and Feldman's (2014) more recent work on boundaries, they articulate boundary practices that facilitate inclusion. My definition of exclusion establishes both a practice-oriented understanding of exclusion as well as what Quick and Feldman (2014) described as the *boundary practices* that exclude, or what Goodin (1996) called exclusionary *policing* practices.

My practice-based theory of exclusion is detailed further by my third key finding from my first empirical chapter. I found that the community engagement practices were exclusionary because they favored actors who had access to certain rules and resources,

conferring what I go on to describe as structural advantage. Often, these actors were organizational representatives. The rules and resources that constituted the structural advantages of organizational representatives allowed exclusion to endure even when organizational actors took actions to facilitate participation. Thus, actions that can create opportunities to participate can also enact exclusion; for example, a vote to prioritize three of the ten outcomes allows people to provide input on priorities, but does not allow all participants an equal chance to define what the outcome signifies. Therefore, exclusion involves both deliberate and inadvertent actions that exclude, as well as those intended to be inclusionary.

In the second empirical chapter, I found that actors could construct and use their structural advantages (rules and resources) to enact inclusion. Other research, often positivist, might deduce best practices, e.g. “residents should always seek to collect data with planners.” Instead, in my research, I conclude that inclusion means the *creation of conditions in which everyone’s assets can be incorporated and new actions, abilities and capacities are possible*; this can be accomplished and organized differently depending on the specifics of the context. Through this interpretation of inclusion, I expand Quick & Feldman’s (2011) definition of inclusion (see above) to include the role of structural advantage. I also expand traditional notions of community engagement as a mechanism to transfer decision-making power and control from government to citizens (Arnstein, 1969; Minker, Pies & Hyde, 2012, p. 110). Through my analysis of inclusion, I demonstrate the productive nature of power, which contrasts with other dominant interpretations of power as destructive or functional. Power and inclusion involve creating opportunities and new experiences of “power to” and “power with.” This generative view of power and inclusion counters the traditional community engagement discourse that focuses on who has “power over” whom, and a need to shift power from the “haves” to “have nots”—a view I argue still persists in many practices. I

demonstrate that this traditional view is incomplete and misses the potential of community engagement practices to create more reciprocal power relations. My conclusions also propose that there is not one single way to enact inclusion; instead, as Quick and Feldman (2011) explain, it is an ongoing accomplishment.

In the third and final empirical chapter, I identify aspects of the various institutional logics associated with each major stakeholder group (foundation, organizational representative, and residents) and find that these features often compete and conflict with one another, making collaboration challenging. Through the discovery and analysis of these logics, I found that there was a lack of literature on a citizen or resident logic. Research has been done on community logic, but this does not accurately translate to the residents I observed nor fully encompass the logics they conveyed in my data. Professional logic is well-addressed and clearly formulated in the literature and philanthropic logic also has a small, but established literature. Given the persistent and growing role of residents in the design, implementation and evaluation of city services and policymaking, this chapter begins to construct this logic of resident stakeholders. I also expand the philanthropic logic and find that existing understandings of this logic translate to the community-based and domestic foundations I study. My data helps expand the various logics to include assumptions about what constitutes action, leadership, and responsibility, which are fundamental and highly consequential features of organizational practice in cross-sector collaborations and complex organizational settings. For example, the entity responsible or accountable—the foundation or nonprofit—is often different from those who are impacted—residents. Thus, negotiation around what constitutes practices of action, leadership, and responsibility is interwoven with the different stakes the various actors have in the collaboration. Through this dissertation, my use of institutional logics makes visible and legitimate the friction between taken-for-granted and deeply embedded organizational practices. I also present a case for an expanded

definition of the various stakeholder logics, as well as for future research that investigates the relationship between institutional logics and practice theory.

Implications

When I proposed this project three years ago, I was interested in *how to practice community engagement more democratically and inclusively*. This interest grew out of my previous research, which indicated that the inclusivity of planning and policymaking was an underlying process whose importance cut across issues (e.g. health, transportation, economic development). I operated under the assumptions that the inclusion of the most impacted community members was important because their inclusion correlated with more effective and sustainable plans and policies (Green, 2008) and because these communities were often ignored and frequently socially and politically excluded. These two assumptions contradicted one another. Scholars and practitioners know that community participation and cross-sector collaboration is advantageous, and moreover, in California some form of participation was legally required in public processes; and yet, despite these factors, residents and organizational representatives acknowledged and experienced the exclusion of community residents. This puzzle motivates this dissertation and my broader research agenda.

A review of the literature and my own research affirm that community engagement is challenging, but failures to be inclusive are not fully explained by a mere lack of skill or intention. The literature on public participation acknowledges the resource-intensiveness of engagement processes (Bryson et al., 2013). Engagement requires more time, patience, and money in the short term than processes that proceed without the engagement of residents. The collaboration literature (see Bryson et al., 2006; Bryson et al., 2013) depicts the complexity of these challenges, including the role of competing institutional logics, which I highlight in this study. Inclusive management scholars Quick and Feldman (2011) demonstrate the

nuances of public engagement by distinguishing between inclusive and participatory practices.

In this conclusion, I discuss some collective findings and discussion for the dissertation as a whole. First, my use of practice theory and interpretivism demonstrates the possibility of new discoveries about long-standing and studied puzzles like exclusion and inclusion in planning and policymaking. Practice theory provides a methodological and theoretical framework that shows *how*, not just *that*, exclusion persists and inclusion is possible. The second finding is that power is at work in community engagement practices. Community engagement involved what Flyvbjerg (1998) would define as political practices, not only practices based on technical knowledge, skills or intentions. Thus community engagement involves multiple practices—practices that reify it as a normative and linear process, and also political practices demonstrate it is a power-laden process. In this dissertation, these political or power practices include the structuring of advantages and disadvantages. These practices demonstrate that community engagement is a process that involves power as the ability or capacity to take or to prevent action as well as the ability or capacity to *not* take action, as Flyvbjerg points out. This finding explains why community engagement is not a necessary and sufficient condition of inclusion. More simply, practitioners can follow community engagement processes and still be exclusive, and this dissertation demonstrates that this has to do with power and how it operates.

This research also finds that community engagement can be both a means and an end for community change. Framed by practice theory, this research provides an explanation of community engagement that entails both structure and agency. Moreover, everyone's agency matters for inclusion and exclusion, and logics often complicate the incorporation of everyone's resources. These three discussion points are interrelated: collectively, they

demonstrate that planning and policymaking processes are nonlinear, continuous, and involve multiple meanings. I discuss each point below.

Practice theory reveals the actions and constructs of practicing inclusion and exclusion. My use of practice theory, in concert with interpretivism, demonstrates the possibility of new discoveries about enduring empirical and theoretical puzzles like exclusion and inclusion in planning and policymaking. For instance, a practice analysis reveals not only that which was left out (e.g. residents' knowledge), but also that which was left *in* and privileged (e.g. a predetermined voting process) and the actions taken that made exclusion possible. Practice theory provides a lens to see taken-for-granted social phenomena like social structures (e.g. race and gender) or norms (community engagement is "good") as *processes* that are created, sustained, or reversed through practices. Therefore, this approach should be applied to other research in order to reveal novel findings about seemingly fixed social phenomena and persistent puzzles.

As the methods section states in the introduction to this dissertation, in interpretivist research, there are multiple truths or interpretations to be discovered in the world. Researchers pay close attention to participants' actions and words because these constitute interpretations of the social phenomena under study. The research process itself involves interpretation, an activity in which both the researcher and the researched are engaged. Interpretivists conduct their research to study phenomena of interest while endeavoring, as much as possible, to prevent the outcome being predetermined by existing ideas or hypotheses. Interpretivists capture extensive data, analyze them rigorously, and develop rich accounts of these data to convey their findings and their trustworthiness. Practice theory provides an ontological lens that considers both agency and structure, because structure and agency exist in an ongoing mutually constitutive relationship (Giddens, 1984).

Ponic and Frisby (2010) argue that most community engagement researchers conduct data collection using a predetermined and often narrow notion of inclusion or exclusion, as well as a predefined focus emphasizing either structure or agency. They demonstrate that an interpretative approach, along with a long-term data collection period, allow for new meanings of terms to emerge. In Ponic and Frisby's own research, this meant that patients themselves, who are often the targets of interventions, expanded the definition of inclusion. The authors described the process:

[P]articipants' experiences illustrated that inclusion was a multidimensional process that involved a dynamic interplay between structural determinants and individual agency. The women named multiple elements of inclusion across psychosocial, relational, organizational, and participatory dimensions. (Ponic & Frisby, 2010, p. 1519).

Ponic and Frisby (2010) explain that inclusion is multi-faceted and co-created by service providers and the "so-called" recipients. Their analysis of inclusion interrupts assumptions about inclusion to be an achievable or always desirable goal.

In this dissertation, through a focus on practices, I constructed a picture of what Gherardi (2006) describes as the continuous dialogue between structure and agency. I also expand Ponic and Frisby's (2010) work to understand inclusion and exclusion as concepts with multiple legitimate meanings. The use of a practice analytic—versus an agentic or structural analytic—reveals that inclusion and exclusion are both multi-dimensional constructs created through practices. For example, they are not explained *only* by agency, or *only* by structure, nor even by *both* agency and structure, because this assumes that agency and structure are discrete. Instead, a practice lens provides an explanation of inclusion and exclusion that *entails* both in a mutually constitutive relationship. In other words, inclusion

and exclusion are produced through practices that encompass the continuous interplay of agency and structure.

I analyzed participants' practices to understand constructs of practice, from which I discovered that the creation and prevention of connections, as well as the use and constitution of structural advantages, structural disadvantages, and institutional logics, all influenced whether practices were exclusionary or inclusionary. These discoveries help explain why inclusion might not work as a health promotion strategy (Ponic & Frisby, 2010) when those who are the target of the intervention are included but on disadvantageous terms. My discoveries were also a function of the interpretivist and grounded approach. I anchored my explanations in narratives from participants in their natural context. This allowed me to provide a window into structure, agency and context (Williams, 2003).

Power is always at work in community engagement practices. Community engagement is a power-laden process. Community-Based Participatory Research acknowledges power imbalances between researchers and researched and prioritizes the empowerment of research subjects (Minkler & Wallerstein, 2011). Policymaking (e.g. Bryson et al., 2013) and planning scholars (e.g. Healey, 1998; Forester, 1989) also acknowledge that collaborative processes require sensitivity to power relations. However, as noted in Chapter 2, community engagement, planning and policymaking practice often focuses on *power over*, concentrating on power shifts from the “haves” to the “have nots,” and may conflate power and authority (Jenkins, 2009). What is more, Flyvberg (1998) has pointed out that we often lack understanding of *how* power works.

Over the past decade and a half, scholars such as Boher and Innes (2002), Bryson et al. (2013) and Quick and Feldman (2014) have expanded the literature on the *how* of power in planning and public management. Boher and Innes (2002) discuss collaboration as a generator of network power. Quick & Feldman (2014) suggest that creating junctures across

boundaries between government experts and residents can shift some of the usual power dynamics between these two stakeholder groups. And Bryson et al. (2013) also suggest design measures like sponsoring public engagement processes and then using the sponsors' power to protect the participation process and to ensure that the results impact policymaking. This dissertation responds to Flyvbjerg's call and extends the recent literature by describing how power was used and constructed in community engagement practices. Fixed notions of power as something that some people have and others do not, and that community engagement serves to transfer from the haves to have nots, did not hold up to investigation empirically in this study.

Community engagement practices involve the use and creation of structural advantages and disadvantages, which consist of formal and informal rules, resources, and structures, and are varied and complex due to the wide range of actors involved. The Central City initiative brought together foundation representatives from the executive and management levels, representatives from local nonprofits and city agencies—usually the executive director and some staff participated—as well as adult residents, many of whom were immigrants from Mexico, and youth residents, many of whom were first- or second-generation Mexican American. Many of these organizations had previously worked together on other projects, funded and unfunded, including some that were funded by the same foundation. This diverse set of actors brought with them a large array of experiences, rules, and resources.

Rules and resources relate to inclusion and exclusion and constitute sources of power. This conclusion resonates with Jenkins' (2009) view that rules and resources are a way to track power. In my data, I found that residents could be excluded through authoritative resources (Giddens, 1984) such as the organization of social time and space through meeting agendas, invitations, and spaces. In the third empirical chapter, which focuses on institutional

logics, I highlight this resource, but I describe it in terms of the organization of work. Indeed, work was one of the main areas of conflict between logics; residents felt there were too many meetings and that these were not part of the action needed, whereas organizations planned and scheduled meetings to accomplish the work. The technologies available and used to produce the story and disseminate information about the initiative, such as the logic model or any other archival documents, were other examples of authoritative resources. In Lowerson and Feldman (2012) we describe an alternative technology consisting of a notetaking system that captured the visions and voices of residents in order to disseminate these discussions in meetings and inform the community plan. Giddens (1984) explains “the character of the information medium... directly influences the nature of social relations which it helps to organize” (p. 262). The rules and resources represented, in their use and construction, affected the social relations and power dynamics between residents and organizational representatives.

Power is a productive force in community engagement, planning and policymaking. This productive view of power challenges practitioners and scholars of community engagement—who tend to focus on “power over” and on power as a destructive or negative force—to consider and engage with other interpretations of power. Recall that the literature on power includes discussion of power as destructive *and* productive, negative *and* positive, and “power over”, “power with” and “power to.” My research demonstrates the multiple and varied instantiations of power (e.g. use of diverse rules and resources) as well as its productive nature. Power surfaces in forms such as the power to take new actions, the power to work together, or the power to prevent such actions or capacities. In terms of exclusion, power was enacted to prevent connections and thus stunted potential network power, or “power with.” In the second empirical chapter the planners used their resources, such as their authority over the part of the planning process, and youth used their resources, such as

expertise on community issues. This reflects Quick & Feldman's (2014) observation of boundary practices to affect power relations:

The privileged position of government experts to analyze and manage problems in the neighborhood was decentered by learning through residents' lived experience, permitting solutions to be designed with the benefit of multiple perspectives. Although some differences remained—such as public safety officers' unique authorities to make arrests—city officials diminished some of their usual stance of holding primary control and responsibility for managing the problems (p. 19).

Power as a productive force in community engagement means that power cannot be conflated with control or authority. These conclusions also imply that residents are active agents in the construction of power, not passive recipients as implied in the “power over” approaches. For instance, as described in the second empirical chapter, the abilities and capabilities of the planners and youth to take action and work together depended on power relations. Both the professionals and youth had new experiences of power and through these experiences they became legible to one another and able to work with another.

Power was also experienced as multiple (see Mol, 1999). Participants interpreted their experience of exclusion and inclusion in terms of their previous experiences. As the first empirical chapter on exclusion shows, preventing connections across time was exclusionary. Conversely, Quick & Feldman (2011) show that making connections across time can be considered inclusive. Residents' histories were diverse; some negotiated former experiences in which community or civic engagement was not acceptable. As the Community Based Participatory Research Literature attests, many residents had experienced numerous past instances of institutions coming in and out of their neighborhood, often in ways that exploited rather than partnered with residents. These experiences of exclusion have been brought

forward into the current work in resident's distrust of authorities and as residents are skeptical of the foundation's intentions. However, experiences of inclusion are also brought forward. For example, the resident structure, discussed by Serena in Chapter 3, began as a proposal in the community plan to build a neighborhood governance structure and resident leadership that was based on geographical units from the block level up to the city level. This was a model of inclusion that Serena had experienced previously, and brought into the Central City Initiative. Participants also negotiated their experiences of inclusion and exclusion across the initiative. In certain contexts, a participant experienced power to act (e.g. in the community engagement subcommittee), but in another, this power to act was constrained by logics (e.g. in the steering committee meetings). Participants used and wove in these experiences to make sense of their current work in the Community Change Initiative. These past and present experiences represented rules and resources that were used to enact inclusion and exclusion, and that multiplied, complicated, and made possible experiences of power.

As Flyvbjerg (1998) projected for planners, the complex nature of power in community engagement suggests that public policy professionals need to engage with power, because it is not possible for professional planners to train or plan their way to better community engagement practices relying on technical rationality alone.

Community engagement, planning and policy-making as a dynamic, nonlinear process. In the Central City Change Initiative, community engagement was both a means *and* end, not just a means *to* an end. The addition of the Community Empowerment and Civic Engagement Outcome was the result of the community engagement efforts of the planning year (Lowerson & Feldman, 2012). So while community engagement was the means to write in this additional outcome; it was also an end unto itself.

The accomplishment of engagement is an ongoing process. As participants enacted community engagement, these practices also established the constructs for practicing it. This conclusion that engagement is an ongoing process reflects a practice view of community (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and community as a verb (Montoya, 2009). In these views of community, communities are not the accumulation of actors. Actors are *of* the community, through the practices that get created. Thus, no-one can exonerate him or herself—despite strategic efforts to do so, as documented by Montoya (2013). Moreover, inclusion depends on all those who are the targets of inclusion, not only those paid or tasked to include residents.

As seen in the Second Empirical Chapter, a key part of inclusion was the creation of the conditions through which all actors learn, adapt and take new actions. The ongoing, rather than fixed-term nature of community engagement can also be seen in my description above of power as multiple. Community engagement and power are continuously being created and recreated through practice, and people's experiences of both are affected by previous practices. Therefore, community engagement, planning, and policymaking are not atemporal or ahistorical processes. As Matthews (2014) attested, planning processes often contain arbitrary 'start' and 'end' times, and in actuality, involve the engagement of the multiple histories and wide range of actors in an ongoing fashion.

The multiple experiences of engagement construct its meanings. Even though the planning process was participatory, exclusion persisted and collaborative members remained dissatisfied with the engagement of residents. In Lennon's interview, presented in the Third Empirical Chapter, he reported hearing from residents that organizers like him were *not* engaging residents despite feeling that he was working hard to improve community empowerment and civic engagement.

There is no set time for engagement to happen nor a set *way* to achieve engagement. As seen in the empirical chapters and literature (e.g. Nabatchi, Ertinger, & Leighninger,

2015) engagement has its impediments and facilitators. In the chapters, I identify practices that facilitate (e.g. creating opportunities for everyone's assets to be incorporated), practices that create impediments (e.g. preventing connections) and features of institutional logics (e.g. sticking to the agenda) that also hinder collaboration and engagement. As I translate these findings to practice, this means that there is no prescribed format for a meeting, community engagement event, or policymaking process that will make it participatory or inclusive; instead, there is an orientation toward actions that facilitate connections, create opportunities to include everyone's assets (Quick & Feldman, 2014) and, as Agranoff (2012) stated, to recognize and work through or even work around the different traditions and practices of the various stakeholders.

This dissertation demonstrates that in resident-driven initiatives, it is not enough to plan for resident engagement or confine it to the planning period. Instead, an initiative that is resident-driven represents a commitment to changing practice—specifically, changing the way collaborative members work together. As discussed in the empirical chapters, there are formal and informal rules and resources as well as institutional logics that hinder the accomplishment of resident-driven planning and policymaking. To some extent, residents remained the object(s) of organizational projects and the foundation's initiative. At the same time, Chapter 2's case of inclusion demonstrates the ability of planners and residents to change practices. The planners and the youth took new actions, learned from one another, changed their practices, and created new ones together. Other instances, such as the continued work on immigration despite a lack of support from the initiative at the time, demonstrates that the rules and resources and institutional logics may have required this work to move outside of the initiative temporarily, but that the conditions that required this work to be outside shifted or were later used differently to then bring immigration front and center in the foundation's work.

This insight that community engagement is both a means and an end builds on the literature that shows policymaking as an iterative process in which problems and goals are defined and refined throughout (Feldman, 1989). If professionals impose their own tools in their endeavors to ‘fix’ the problem, these professionals will fuel the historically-grounded distrust and suspicion residents have towards authorities, and risk further damaging the relationships that are so important to collaborative practice. Friedmann (2002) describes the problem in terms of maps, graphs, and statistics, but in Central City these took shape as statistics, logic models, and meeting agendas. Inclusive practices of community engagement illustrate small but important day-to-day victories that help build the relationships necessary for working together, but that are also vital for learning and addressing features of the institutional logics that hinder collaboration.

Community engagement as both a means and an end also disrupts common assumptions that community engagement is a discrete set of activities in the beginning, planning, or agenda-setting stages of policy initiatives (Blackwell et al., 2012; Kingdon, 1995); or that community engagement is simply a sub-process of planning and policy-making (Israel et al., 2005; Viswanathan et al., 2004). This assertion also challenges the view of community engagement as a mechanism to include community knowledge to provide context for the corresponding initiative (Kieffer & Reischmann, 2004; Steckler et al, 1993). These views of community engagement are incomplete and have diluted the transformational potential of community engagement.

My analysis of community engagement as practice, as both a means and an end, opens up the everyday instantiations of community engagement. These findings build upon the literatures on deliberation (Roberts, 2004), inclusive practices (Quick & Feldman, 2011) and dialogical research methods¹⁰ (Montoya & Kent, 2011), which provide tools and

¹⁰ Dialogical action refers to Paulo Freire’s (1993) widely read *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.

practices to build connections and dissolve the divide between professionals and residents and researchers and researched.

These connections between professionals and residents create opportunities for coproduction, as seen in the case of inclusion, as well as opportunities for engaging new forms of community, knowledge, and power, and reinforcing old forms. I draw on a practice view of community (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and on the idea of community as a verb (Montoya, 2009), in which community is both a means and an end. Viewing my data through this lens, it becomes clear that new forms of community arose when new practices were learned or created together. For example, the planners and youth expanded the community of data collectors when working on the Complete Streets Project. Old forms of community were reinforced when connections between people, issues and time are prevented. For instance, when professionals—organizational and foundation representatives—reinforced professional boundaries between themselves and residents in the *Roots and Branches* campaign selection activity. New forms of knowledge and knowledge-making, such as the street assessment forms, engaged multiple ways of knowing, which is a key feature of inclusion (Quick & Feldman 2011; Van Buuren 2009). Old forms of knowledge-making for Community Change Initiatives, such as the logic models, obviously privileged organizations that were familiar with such models.

Community engagement as both a means and an end also demonstrates that engagement is a nonlinear process, which when done inclusively can adapt and connect to emergent issues or ways of organizing. When organizational representatives tried to enact normative rules of organizational practice, such as creating and executing predetermined decision-making processes, this excluded residents and their ways of knowing. Furthermore, such rules can also confer an advantage to organizations and their goals (e.g. completing the agenda, selecting a campaign, accomplishing their work plan, and securing foundation

funding), and may also exclude residents and their goals (e.g. addressing urgent needs for their community).

In my concluding discussion for this dissertation, I have iteratively and cumulatively argued that practices are an important ontological lens to reveal new understandings of community engagement in planning and policymaking; that power is implicated in inclusion and exclusion and exercised through the use and construction of structural advantage and disadvantage (i.e. rules and resources); and that community engagement, and the planning and policymaking processes in which community engagement is often situated, are dynamic, nonlinear processes.

Limitations and Future Research

In this section, I discuss the boundaries and limitations of my research and their implications for my future research agenda.

Practices. In this dissertation, I demonstrate the impact of a practice lens to generate new insights into persistent and long-standing social problems. Inherent in the definition of practice is that practices are an ongoing accomplishment. A focus on practice means a view of social phenomena that entails both agency and structure. While actors are integral to understanding the actions that constitute practices, conclusions extend beyond the individual. Moreover, structures are also relatively important in a practice lens, but they constitute only part of the explanations found in my conclusions. For practitioners and scholars trained to explain a social phenomenon or develop an intervention by analyzing an entity or an individual, practices do not provide this as a possibility. Instead, practices require the practitioner and scholars consider *both* agency and structure. Practice theory provides a welcome alternative for scholars who wish to venture beyond the individual responsibility implications of an agency-focused approach and the fatalism of an overly structurally deterministic approach.

My focus on practice and the findings that emerge from this approach provide groundwork for future publications that analyze, make explicit, and demonstrate the contributions of the methodology itself. One specific feature of practice theory that I do not engage with directly, but could explore through future research, is the rejection of dualisms and the recognition of the inherent relationship between elements that have often been treated dichotomously (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011), such as inclusion and exclusion. While there is a small amount of research that acknowledges that these concepts are not dichotomous, and my dissertation research demonstrates that both are very nuanced, a focused analysis of this question is one of my immediate ideas for future research and publications.

Coproduction and community. This dissertation has focused on coproduction as a feature of inclusion, drawing on Ponic and Frisby's (2010) work in public health and Quick & Feldman's (2011) work in public management. In future research, I will develop the relationship between my findings and the scholarship on coproduction in the public management field. I will also reconcile my findings with the public management scholarship on coproduction in terms of the literature on coproduction from Practice Theory, e.g. Giddens' structuration theory (1984) and Science and Technology Studies scholars (e.g. Jasanoff, 2004).

In public management, coproduction is defined in terms of the provision of public services; it is "the critical mix of activities that service agents and citizens contribute to the provision of public services" (Brudney & England, 1983, p. 59). Scholars began developing coproduction conceptually in response to extant views of public managers/service providers as performers and as solely responsible for service provision and change (Whitaker, 1980). This view was inaccurate, firstly, because citizens are not passive recipients of government actions. Instead, citizens and residents are already involved in the coproduction of services, whether it is through requesting services—which communicates details to service providers on how to allocate resources—or through cooperation or noncooperation with activities requested by public officials (Osborne & Strokosch, 2013; Whitaker, 1980). The public management scholarship on coproduction highlights a perspective shift from the view that public employees are performers and citizens are consumers—often an adversarial relationship—to a potentially more cooperative, constructive and productive view of these actors (Sharp, 1980).¹¹ While this move acknowledges the relational nature of public service

¹¹ Sharp draws from Wildavsky (1979): "All the discussion of power and powerlessness - who originates, vetoes, or modifies policies - has avoided the subject of interactions within policies themselves. In everyday life, aren't postal patrons, doctors and patients, prisoners and parole boards, students, parents and teachers involved in policies? Yet direct modes of activity have not been considered as part and parcel of public policy but as what happens after the exciting parts are over. Citizenship in public policy (after the party is over, as part of everyday life) is our subject" (p. 253)

provision, the focus remains on *who* does the work, but does not do so in terms of practice theory. I have begun to explore coproduction through practice theory in a few conference papers (see Lowerson, 2013; Lowerson Bredow, 2015a; Lowerson Bredow, 2015b), in concert with other scholars interested in the intersection of practice theory and coproduction (e.g Feldman & Williams, 2013). In future publications, I will delve into this intersection and bring in a practice theory lens to identify the practices of coproduction.

In these conference papers, I also suggest expanding the coproduction scholarship by borrowing from the Science and Technology Studies (STS) view of coproduction. STS scholars are interested in the emergence and stabilization of new social phenomena, and in “how people recognized them, name them, investigate them, and assign meaning to them and how they mark them off from other existing entities, creating new languages in which to speak of them and new ways of visually representing them” (Daston, 2000; Dear, 1995; Pickering, 1995; Latour, 1993; 1988, cited in Jasanoff 2004, p. 5). I suggest in my third empirical chapter that these “new social phenomena” are practices, and I am interested in understanding the emergence of new practices, which allow people to work productively across logics (or languages) and create new ways of working together and visually representing such ways.

Bovaird (2007) describes a shift to coproduction as a normative move in which the users of services should be included in the delivery and management of the services that they receive. The normativity of his view of coproduction resonates not only with the Community Based Participatory Research literature’s and Arnstein’s view of community participation, but also with this dissertation’s expanded notion of inclusion and of community logic. My expanded notion of inclusion depends on the actions of those that are typically the targets of inclusion. Community logic or resident logic is under-theorized, especially given the central role and responsibility community members play in coproduction. I suggest that community

logic involves an orientation to community as practice. Again, since I draw on a practice view of community (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and community as a verb (Montoya, 2009) by using this lens in which community is both a means and an end, a community logic would entail opportunities to create new practices together, not just an orientation to the greater good. My future research will engage and reconcile these understandings of coproduction and community with my findings, which will advance understandings about the theoretical and empirical relationship between practice theory and coproduction.

Interdisciplinarity. As an interdisciplinary scholar, my interest and passion for community engagement originates from observations that multiple disciplines struggle to engage community residents in their work. While public problems implicate and require the involvement of multiple sectors, contributions to the academic literature usually align with existing disciplines. As I write my conclusion and consider the translation of my research into publications, the interdisciplinary nature of this research appears to be both a strength and a limitation.

In the introduction to this dissertation, I discuss terms from the public management, planning, and public health fields such as public engagement, public participation, and community-based participatory research. I draw on multiple disciplines and focus on the common struggle that scholars and practitioners face when trying to understand how to practice community engagement more inclusively in the pursuit of more democratic and effective public policies. By anchoring my research in the common struggle across multiple disciplines, my findings can speak across disciplines and thus have a larger impact.

In my future research agenda, this interdisciplinary nature will allow me to publish more proficiently and across multiple disciplines, but will also require translation and immersion into different disciplines for different audiences.

Scalability. My empirical findings may raise questions regarding scalability for those unfamiliar with practice theory or interpretivism. I describe in detail a number of micro-processes, from an individual meeting in which priorities were selected, to the overall management of the neighborhood-level initiative. The findings and conclusions from these descriptions derive their power and transferability, whether across scales or contexts, from the rich details and the practice that can, but does not necessarily emerge in different contexts.

The geographical boundaries of the initiative constitute another scale-related limitation, as brought up by participants. During the planning year and through implementation, collaborative members debated whether priorities and funded work should focus only on the hyper-local, given that the foundation anchored each initiative in a small geographical area. Questions like “does work on the city, regional, and even state level ‘count’ as legitimate work for this neighborhood-based initiative?” came up frequently. This question of scale begs an additional analysis of my data that would consider assumptions about scale in relation to stakeholder institutional logics. This question about scale also invites future comparison cases that look at similar processes of collaborative planning and policymaking efforts at the city, regional, and statewide scale.

Measurement. In this dissertation, I have not fully explored the implications of how to measure community engagement. Scholars and practitioners often evaluate community engagement as the number of community events held and/or the attendance at such events. Taking a practice approach suggests that community engagement can be measured by practices. In my future research, I aim to explore and develop concrete recommendations based on my findings for those who evaluate community engagement in planning and policymaking.

Autoethnographic analysis. My positionality is outside the scope of the dissertation but is an area for future research. During five years of fieldwork, I occupied different roles in relation to the initiative (intern, graduate student, local university representative, and evaluator). One way I frame my engagement, which I do not explicitly discuss in the dissertation, is as action research. Action research is an approach to research in which researchers engage in reflective practice (Schon, 1983) to collectively take social action and solve public problems (Lewin, 1944). In my dissertation, I do not focus my analytical lens on my own impact on the initiative. Thus, I aim to engage with the literature on autoethnography as well as work with my academic colleagues who also participated in the initiative in order to analyze our own practices. Autoethnography refers to writing about the personal and its relation to wider cultural, political, and social meanings (Ellis, 2004). It is a method of research that I would engage in post-hoc, going back to field notes and meeting notes with my colleagues in which we discussed, debriefed, and processed our own emotions, thoughts, and strategies as academics engaged in the initiative.

In sum, this dissertation research project produced a large dataset that can be analyzed to ask and pursue other questions. A few possibilities include: a focused analysis and discussion of inclusion and exclusion as duality, not dichotomy, and a further exploration of the relationship between institutional logics and practice theory. My dissertation research project also encourages exploration by academics who study and participate in these initiatives: do we also create and recreate the practices of inclusion and exclusion we seek to address? Another analysis I would like to conduct with my data focuses on governance. While I draw upon collaborative governance literature, this case provides rich material to explore practices of collaboration and new forms of governance.

Further research that focuses on comparable cases—at a local level or on a larger scale, predicated on some of the same issues or shared features, such as linear processes with

predetermined goals or competing logics of practice—would also help to expand some of the findings laid out in the dissertation. These could include other community change initiatives or foundation-funded projects, or even those specifically funded by the same foundation. I also will build on this research through cases of collaborations that do not have “residents at the table,” such as more elite collaborations between philanthropic or high-level public agency representatives. Issues of inclusion and exclusion resonate across formal and informal organizational and collaborative spaces, whether concerns for inclusion revolve around gender, disability, income, race, and other specificities. In a speech given by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. at Dartmouth college on May 23, 1962, he stated, “the basic thing about a man is not his specificity but his fundamental; not the texture of his hair or the color of his skin, but his eternal dignity and worth.” Drawing on his use of the term “specificity” I refer to common social structures like gender, race, ethnicity, and income as specificities around which inclusion and exclusion persist and need to be explored through a practice lens. As shown above, a practice lens is well-suited to explain how (Chapter 1 and 2) and why (Chapter 3) taken-for-granted social structures persist and are consistently associated with inclusion and exclusion.

This dissertation also brings up interesting questions that will guide my future research, such as the relationship between the expanded definition of community logic, which suggests features of accompaniment, coproduction, and the significance of this relationship for public management literature and practitioners. As stated previously, it is also imperative to understand how communities, organizations, and philanthropies, as well as academics, can monitor, evaluate, and measure using a practice lens.

References

- Abelson, J., Forest, P. G., Eyles, J., Smith, P., Martin, E., & Gauvin, F. P. (2003). Deliberations about deliberative methods: issues in the design and evaluation of public participation processes. *Social Science & Medicine*, 57(2), 239-251.
- Abers, R. (2000). *Inventing Local Democracy: Grassroots Policy in Brazil*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Abbott, A. (1995). Things of Boundaries. *Social Research*, 62(4), 857-882.
- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (D. Heller-Roazen, Trans.). Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Agranoff, R. (2004). Leveraging networks: A guide for public managers working across organizations. *Collaboration: Using networks and partnerships*, 62-102.
- Agranoff, R. (2012). *Collaborating to manage: A primer for the public sector*. Georgetown University Press.
- Agranoff, R. & McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Ahmed, S. M., & Palermo, A.-G. S. (2010). Community Engagement in Research: Frameworks for Education and Peer Review. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(8), 1380-1387.
- Alcoff, L. (1991). The Problem of Speaking for Others. *Cultural Critique*, 20, 5-32.
- Aleshire, R. A. (1972). Power to the people: An assessment of the community action and model cities experience. *Public Administration Review*, 32, 428-442.
- Alexander, C. (1979). *The timeless way of building*. Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Alford, R. R., & Friedland, R. (1975). Political participation and public policy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 1, 429-479.
- Alinsky, S. (1971). *Rules for Radicals*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Amin, S. (1976). *Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism*, trans. Brian Pearce. Hassocks, UK: Harvester Press.
- Armstrong, E. A. & Bernstein, M. (2008). Culture, Power, and Institutions: A Multi-Institutional Politics Approach to Social Movements. *Sociological Theory*, 26, 74-99.

- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216-224.
- Ashcraft, K. L. (1998). "I wouldn't say I'm a feminist, but...": Organizational micropractice and gender identity. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 11 (4), 587.
- Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., & Delamont, S. (2003). *Key Themes in Qualitative Research: Continuities and Change*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Aron, J. B. (1979). Citizen participation at government expense. *Public Administration Review*, 39(5), 477-485.
- Babcock, P., Vargas, A., Aron, N., & Christopher, G (1998). The Role of Foundations in Influencing Public Policy. *National Civic Review*, 87 (2), 117-126.
- Bardach, E. (2011). *Practical guide for policy analysis: the eightfold path to more effective problem solving*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S. (1962). Two Faces of Power. *The American Political Science Review*, 56(4), 947-952.
- Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S. (1963). Decisions and nondecisions: An analytical framework. *American Political Science Review*, 57(03), 632-642.
- Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S. (1970). *Power and Poverty: Theory and Practice* (Vol. 56). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Barnes, B. (1988). *The Nature of Power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Baumgartner, F. R., & Jones, B. D. (2010). *Agendas and instability in American politics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Beierle T C, Konisky D M, (2000). Values, conflict and trust in participatory environmental planning. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 19, 587 -602.
- Bennett, S. D. (1995). 'No Relief but upon the Terms of Coming into the House' —Controlled Spaces, Invisible Disentitlements, and Homeless in an Urban Shelter System. *Yale Law Journal*, 104, 8, 2157 212.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: a treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Betten, N., & Austin, M. J. (1990). Conflict Approach to Community Organizing: Saul Alinsky and the CIO. In N. Betten & M. J. Austin (Eds.), *The Roots of Community Organizing, 1917 - 1939*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Blackwell, A. G., & Comenar, R. (2000). *Community Building: From Local Wisdom to*

Public Policy. *Public Health Reports*, 115(2), 161-166.

- Blackwell, A. G., Thompson, M., Freudenberg, M., Ayers, J., Schrantz, D., & Minkler, M. (2012). Using Community Organizing and Community Building to Influence Public Policy. In M. Minkler (Ed.), *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health and Welfare* (3rd ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Bloemraad, I. (2006). *Becoming a citizen: incorporating immigrants and refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Box, R. C. (1998). *Citizen governance: Leading American communities into the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bracht, N., & Tsouros, A. (1990). Principles and strategies of effective community participation. *Health promotion international*, 5, 199-208.
- Brewer, R., & Grabosky, P. (2014). The Unraveling of Public Security in the United States: The Dark Side of Police-Community Co-Production. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(1), 139-154.
- Briggs, X. d. (1998). Doing Democracy Up Close: Culture, Power, and Communication in Community Building. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 18(1), 1–13.
- Brooks, A. C. (2002). Can Nonprofit Management Help Answer Public Management's "Big Questions"? *Public Administration Review*, 62(3), 259-266.
- Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 40-57.
- Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2001). Knowledge and organization: A social-practice perspective. *Organization Science*, 12(2), 198-213.
- Brudney, J. L., & England, R. E. (1983). Toward a Definition of the Coproduction Concept. *Public Administration Review*, 43(1), 59-65.
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2006). The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature. *Public Administration Review*, December (Special Issue), 44-55.
- Bryson, J. M., Quick, K. S., Slotterback, C. S., & Crosby, B. C. (2013). Designing Public Participation Processes. *Public Administration Review*, 73(1), 23-34.
- Booher, D. E., & Innes, J. E. (2002). Network power in collaborative planning. *Journal of planning education and research*, 21(3), 221-236.

- Booth, C. (1969) Charles Booth's London: A Portrait of the Poor at the Turn of the Century Drawn from His 'Life and Labour of the People of London'. Albert Fried and Richard M. Elman (eds). London: Hutchinson.
- Booth, G.W. (1890). In *Darkest England and the Way Out*. London: William Burgess Carlyle Press.
- Bovaird, T. (2007). Beyond Engagement and Participation: User and Community Coproduction of Public Services. *Public Administration Review*, 67(5), 846-860.
- Brewer, R., & Grabosky, P. (2014). The Unraveling of Public Security in the United States: The Dark Side of Police-Community Co-Production. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(1), 139-154.
- Brudney, J. L., & England, R. E. (1983). Toward a definition of the coproduction concept. *Public Administration Review*, 59-65.
- Bryson, J. (1988). Strategic planning: Big wins and small wins. *Public Money & Management*, 8 (3), 11-15.
- Burt, R. S. (2004). Structural Holes and Good Ideas. *American Journal of Sociology* 110(2), 349-399.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cabantous, L., Gond, J.-P., & Johnson-Cramer, M. (2010). Decision Theory as Practice: Crafting Rationality in Organizations. *Organization Studies*, 31(11), 1531-1566.
- Cardoso, F.H., & Faletto, E. (1979). *Dependency and Development in Latin America*, trans. M. M. Urquidí. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chambers, S. (2003). Deliberative Democratic Theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 6, 307-326.
- Cheadle, A., Senter, S., Solomon, L., Beery, W. L., & Schwartz, P. M. (2005). A Qualitative Exploration of alternative Strategies for Building Community Health Partnerships: Collaboration- Versus Issue-Oriented Approaches. *Journal of Urban Health*, 82(4), 638-652.
- Chen, J.M., & Hamilton, D.L. (2015). Understanding diversity: The importance of social acceptance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(4), 586-598.
- Christens, B. D. (2010). Public relationship building in grassroots community organizing: relational intervention for individual and systems change. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(7), 886-900.
- Clark, N. M., Lachance, L., Doctor, L. J., Gilmore, L., Kelly, C., Krieger, J., ... & Wilkin, M. (2010). Policy and system change and community coalitions: Outcomes from allies

- against asthma. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(5), 904-912.
- Clegg, S. R. (1989). *Frameworks of power*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clegg, S. R., & Haugaard, M. (Eds.). (2009). *The SAGE handbook of power*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clegg, S. R., Courpasson, D., & Phillips, N. (2006). *Power and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cockerham, W. C. (2005). Health lifestyle theory and the convergence of agency and structure. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 46(1), 51-67.
- Cohen, S. (1985). *Visions of Social Control*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Comprehensive Community Initiatives. (n.d.). Retrieved May 4, 2015, from <http://www.ccitoolsforfeds.org/>
- Cooke, B., & Kothari, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Participation: The New Tyranny*. London, UK: Zed Books.
- Cooper, C. A., & Nownes, A.J. (2003). Citizen Groups in Big City Politics. *State and Local Government Review*, 35(2), 102–11.
- Corburn, J. (2009). *Toward the healthy city: people, places, and the politics of urban planning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Crawford, A. (2003). 'Contractual Governance' of Deviant Behavior. *Journal of Law and Society*, 30(4), 479-450.
- Crosby, B. C. & Bryson, J.M. (2005). A Leadership Framework for Cross-Sector Collaboration. *Public Management Review*, 7(2), 177 – 201.
- Crosby, N., Kelly, J. M., & Schaefer, P. (1986). Citizens panels: A new approach to citizen participation. *Public Administration Review*, 170-178.
- Cupers, K. (2011). The expertise of participation: mass housing and urban planning in post-war France. *Planning Perspectives*, 26(1), 29-53.
- Dahl, R. A. (1961). *Who governs? Democracy and power in an American city*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dahl, R. A. (1986). Power as the Control of Behavior. In S. Lukes (Ed.), *Power*. New York: New York University Press.
- Dahl, R. A. (1989). *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dandekar, H., & Main, K. (2014). Small-town comprehensive planning in California: medial pathways to community-based participation. In Nick Gallent & Daniela Ciaffi (Eds.), *Community Action and Planning* (pp. 157-176). Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

- Daston, L. (ed) (2000). *Biographies of Scientific Objects*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Davidoff, P. (1965). Advocacy and pluralism in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 31(4), 331-338.
- Dawes, S.S., A.M. Cresswell, & Pardo, T.A. (2009). From “need to know” to “need to share”: Tangled problems, information boundaries, and the building of public sector knowledge networks. *Public Administration Review*, 69, 392-402.
- Dear, P. (1995) *Discipline and Experience: The Mathematical Way in the Scientific Revolution*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The Practice of Everyday Life* (S. Rendall, Trans.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- de la Blache, P.V. (1913) Des caractères distinctifs de la géographie. *Annales de Géographie* 22: 289-299 [297].
- DeFilippis, J., Fisher, R. & Shragge, E. (2006). Neither romance nor regulation: reevaluating community. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30(3), 673-689.
- DeLeon, P. (1992). The democratization of the policy sciences. *Public Administration Review*, 125-129.
- Delgado, G. (1994). *Beyond the politics of place: new directions in community organizing in the 1990s*. Oakland, CA: Applied Research Center.
- Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2000). The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6), 549-559.
- Derr, V., Chawla, L., Mintzer, M., Cushing, D. F., & Van Vliet, W. (2013). A city for all citizens: integrating children and youth from marginalized populations into city planning. *Buildings*, 3(3), 482-505.
- Dery, D. (1984). *Problem definition in policy analysis*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Dery, D. (2000). Agenda setting and problem definition. *Policy Studies*, 21(1), 37-47.
- DeSario, J., & Langton, S. (1984). Citizen participation and technology. *Policy Studies Review*, 3(2), 223-233.
- Diaz, D. (2005). *Barrio urbanism: Chicanos, planning, and American cities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- DiMaggio, W. W. & Powell, P. J. (Eds) (1991). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

- Domhoff, G. W. (2007). C. Wright Mills, Power Structure Research, and the Failures of Mainstream Political Science. *New Political Science*, 29(1), 97-114.
- Driscoll, A. (2008). Carnegie's community-engagement classification: intentions and insights. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 40(1), 38-41.
- Dryzek, J. S. (1996). Political Inclusion and the Dynamics of Democratization. *The American Political Science Review*, 90(3), 475-487.
- Durand, R., Szostak, B., Jourdan, J., & Thornton, P. H. (2013). Institutional Logics as Strategic Resources. In M. Lounsbury & E. Boxenbaum (Eds.), *Institutional Logics in Action*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Eisenberger, N. I., Lieberman, M. D., & Williams, K. D. (2003). Does Rejection Hurt? An fMRI Study of Social Exclusion. *Science*, 302(5643), 290-292
- Eley, G. (1990). Nations, Publics, and Political Cultures: Placing Habermas in the Nineteenth Century. Unpublished CSST Working Papers. The University of Michigan.
- Ellis, G., & Walton, S. (2012). Building Partnerships between Local Health Departments and Communities: Case Studies in Capacity Building and Cultural Humility. In M. Minkler (Ed.), *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health and Welfare*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1-29.
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Farrow, F. (2010). Response Essay. In Patricia Auspos Anne C. Kubisch, Prudence Brown, and Tom Dewar (Ed.), *Voices from the Field III: Lessons and Challenges from Two Decades of Community Change Efforts*. Washington, D.C. : The Aspen Institute.
- Fairtlough, G. (2005). *The three ways of getting things done: hierarchy, heterarchy and responsible autonomy in organizations*. Greenways, Dorset: Triarchy.
- Feldman, M. S. (1989). *Order without design: Information production and policy making* (Vol. 231). Stanford University Press.
- Feldman, M. S. (2004). Resources in emerging structures and processes of change. *Organization Science*, 15(3), 295-309.
- Feldman, M. S., & Almquist, J. (2011). Analyzing the implicit in stories. 2011. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Varieties of Narrative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

- Feldman, D.L. & Ingram, H.M. (2009). Making science useful to decision makers: climate forecasts, water management, and knowledge networks. *Weather, Climate, and Society*, 1, 9–21.
- Feldman, M. S., & Khademian, A. M. (2000). Managing for inclusion: balancing control and participation. *International Public Management Journal*, 3, 149-167.
- Feldman, M. S. & Khademian, A. M. (2004). Inclusive Management: Building Relationships with the Public. Center for the Study of Democracy. UC Irvine: Center for the Study of Democracy. Retrieved from: <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/7rp1985z>
- Feldman, M. S., & Khademian, A. M. (2007). The Role of the Public Manager in Inclusion: Creating Communities of Participation. *Governance*, 20(2), 305-324.
- Feldman, M. S., & Khademian, A. M. (2008). The continuous process of policy formation. *Strategic Environmental Assessment for Policies*, 37-59.
- Feldman, M. S., Khademian, A. M., Ingram, H., & Schneider, A. S. (2006). Ways of Knowing and Inclusive Management Practices. *Public Administration Review*, December (Special Issue), 89-99.
- Feldman, M. S., & Orlikowski, W. J. (2011). Theorizing Practice and Practicing Theory. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1240-1253.
- Feldman, M. S. & Pentland, B. (2003). Reconceptualizing Organizational Routines as a Source of Flexibility and Change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48, 94-118.
- Feldman, M. S., & Quick, K. S. (2009). Generating Resources and Energizing Frameworks through Inclusive Public Management. *International Public Management Journal*, 12(2): 137–71.
- Feldman, M. S. & Williams, B. (2013). Studies in Co-production: Investigating the Impact on Public Values & Noting the Implications for Public Management. Panel for the National Public Management Research Association Conference. University of Wisconsin. Madison, Wisconsin. June 2013.
- Feldman, M. S. & Worline, M. (2011). Resources, Resourcing, and Ampliative Cycles in Organizations. In G. M. Spreitzer & K. S. Cameron (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ferguson, A. F. (1977). Sin of Omission: Inaction as Action under Section 102 (2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. *Indian Law Journal*, LJ 53, 497.
- Finn, J. L., & Checkoway, B. (1998). Young People as Competent Community Builders: A Challenge to Social Work. *Social Work*, 43(4), 335-345.
- Fischer, F. (1990). *Technocracy and the Politics of Expertise*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fischer, F. (1993). Citizen participation and the democratization of policy expertise: From theoretical inquiry to practical cases. *Policy sciences*, 26(3), 165-187.

- Fischer, F. (2000). *Citizens, experts and the environment: The politics of local knowledge*. Durham, UK: Duke.
- Fischer, F. (2003). *Reframing public policy: discursive politics and deliberative practices: discursive politics and deliberative practices*. Oxford UK: Oxford University Press.
- Fischer F, & Forester J. (1993). *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W. L., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. London, UK: Penguin.
- Flower, L. (1997). Partners in inquiry: A logic for community outreach. In L. Adler-Kassner, R. Crooks, & A. Watters (Eds). *Writing the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in composition* (pp. 95-117). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (1998). *Rationality and Power*. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making Social Science Matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Flyvbjerg, B., & Richardson, T. (2002). Planning and Foucault: in search of the dark side of planning theory. In P. Allmendinger & M. Tewdwr-Jones (Eds). *Planning Futures: New Directions for Planning Theory* (pp. 44-62), London and New York: Routledge
- Follett, M. P. (1918). *The new state: Group organization the solution of popular government*. University Park, PAPenn State Press.
- Follett, M. P. (1940). Power. In H. Metcalf & L. Urwick (Eds.), *Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett* (pp. 95-116). New York: Harper.
- Forester, J. (1989). *Planning in the Face of Power*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Forester, J. (1999). *The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning processes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Foster-Fishman, P. G., Berkowitz, S. L., Lounsbury, D. W., Jacobson, S., & Allen, N. A. (2001). Building collaborative capacity in community coalitions: A review and integrative framework. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29(2), 241-261.
- Foucault, M. (1973). *The birth of the clinic*. London, UK: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction*. London: Allen Lane.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972 – 77*,

- ed. by C. Gordon. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Foucault, M. (1986). Disciplinary Power and Subjection. In Lukes, Steven, (Ed) *Power*. New York, New York University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 87-104). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (2003). *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975-76*. New York, NY: Picador.
- Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. *Social Text*, 25(26), 56-80.
- Fraser, H. (2005). Four different approaches to community participation. *Community Development Journal*, 40, 286-300.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- French, M. (1986). *Beyond Power: On Women, Men, and Morals*. London: Abacus.
- Friedland, R., & R. Alford (1991) Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell and P. J. DiMaggio (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* (pp. 232–263). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Friedland, R., Mohr, J. W., Roose, H., & Gardinali, P.(2014) The institutional logics of love: measuring intimate life. *Theory and Society*, 43(3-4), 333-370.
- Friedmann, J. (2002). *The Prospect of Cities*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Frye, M. (2007). Oppression. In P. S. Rothenberg (Ed.), *Race, Class, and Gender in the United States* (pp. 154-158). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Fung, A., & Wright, E. O. (2001). Deepening democracy: innovations in empowered participatory governance. *Politics and society*, 29(1), 5-42.
- Furnari, S. (2014). Interstitial spaces: Microinteraction settings and the genesis of new practices between institutional fields. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(4), 439-462.
- Gaber, J. & Gaber, S. (2007). *Qualitative Analysis for Planning and Policy: Beyond the Numbers*. Chicago, IL: Planners Press, American Planning Association.
- Gabris, G. T., & Simo, G. (1995). Public sector motivation as an independent variable affecting career decisions. *Public personnel management*, 24(1), 33-51.
- Galabuzi, G. E. (2004). Social exclusion. In D. Raphael (Ed.), *Social determinants of health:*

- Canadian perspectives* (pp. 233-251). Toronto, ON, Canada: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Garland, D. (2001). *The Culture of Control*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garland, D. (2001) *Mass Imprisonment: Social Causes and Consequences*. London: Sage.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *Description: Toward and Interpretive Theory of Culture The Interpretation of Culture*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geographic Information Systems (GIS) | How We Use Data in the Mid-Atlantic Region. (n.d.). Retrieved May 4, 2015, from <http://www.epa.gov/reg3esd1/data/gis.htm>.
- Gherardi, S. (2005). From organizational learning to knowing in practice. In S. Gherardi (Ed). *Organizational knowledge: the texture of workplace learning* (pp. 1- 44), London: Blackwell.
- Gherardi, S. (2009). Introduction: The critical power of the 'practice lens'. *Management learning*, 40(2), 115-128.
- Gherardi, S., Nicolini, D., & Odella, F. (1998). Toward a social understanding of how people learn in organizations the notion of situated curriculum. *Management learning*, 29(3), 273-297.
- Giddens, A. (1976). Classical social theory and the origins of modern sociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 703-729.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society*: University of California Press.
- Gittell, R. & Vidal, A. (1998) *Community organizing: Building social capital as a development strategy*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Gonzalez, E. R. (2006) Resident involvement in advocacy and consensus planning, unpublished PhD thesis, Irvine: University of California.
- Gingrich, L. G. (2008). Social exclusion and double jeopardy: The management of lone mothers in the market-state social field. *Social Policy and Administration*, 42(4), 379-395.
- Goodin, R. E. (1996). Inclusion and exclusion. *European Journal of Sociology*, 37(2), 343-371.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6): 1360-1380.
- Green, L. W. (2008). Making research relevant: if it is an evidence-based practice, where's the practice-based evidence? *Family Practice*, 25 (S1), i20-i24.

- Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (T. Burger, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hadden, S. G. (1981). Technical information for citizen participation. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17(4), 537-549.
- Hammack, D. C., & Heydemann, S. (2009). *Globalization, philanthropy, and civil society: Projecting institutional logics abroad*. Indiana University Press.
- HanleyBrown, F., Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2012). Channeling change: Making collective impact work. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 20, 1-8.
- Hardy, C. (1994). Power and politics in organizations. In C. Hardy (Ed). *Managing strategic action* (pp. 220-237), London, UK: Sage
- Hardy, C., & Phillips, N. (1998). Strategies of engagement: Lessons from the critical examination of collaboration and conflict in an interorganizational domain. *Organization Science*, 9(2), 217-230.
- Hardy, C., & Clegg, S. R. (2006). Some Dare Call it Power. In Clegg, S. R., Hardy, C., Lawrence, T., & Nord, W. R. (Eds.). *The Sage Handbook of Organization Studies* (pp. 622-641). London, UK: Sage.
- Harwood, SA. (2003). Environmental justice on the streets: Advocacy planning as a tool to context environmental racism. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 23(1), 24-38.
- Haugaard, M. (1997). *The constitution of power: A theoretical analysis of power, knowledge and structure*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hayward, B. M. (1995). The greening of participatory democracy: reconsideration of theory. *Environmental Politics*, 4, 215 – 236.
- Healey, P. (1997). *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Plans in Fragmented Societies*. London: Macmillan.
- Healey, P. (1998). Collaborative planning in a stakeholder society. *Town planning review*, 69(1), 1.
- Healey, P. (2003). Collaborative planning in perspective. *Planning Theory*, 2(2), 101-123.
- Herbert, C. P. (1996). Community-based research as a tool for empowerment : The Haida Gwaii diabetes project example. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 87(2), 109-112.
- Heydemann, S., & Hammack, D. C. (2009). Philanthropic Projections. In D. C. Hammack & S. Heydemann (Eds.), *Globalization, Philanthropy, and Civil Society*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hollander, J. A., & Einwohner, R. L. (2004). Conceptualizing resistance. *Sociological forum*, 19(4), 533-554.

- Holling, C. S. (Ed.). (1978). *Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management*. Chichester, NY: Wiley.
- Howard-Grenville, J. A. (2007). Developing issue-selling effectiveness over time: Issue selling as resourcing. *Organization Science*, 18(4), 560-577.
- Hum, T. (2010). Planning in neighborhoods with multiple publics: Opportunities and challenges for community-based nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 29(4), 461-477.
- Immergut, E. M. (1992). The rules of the game: The logic of health policy-making in France, Switzerland, and Sweden. In S. Steimo, K. Thelan, & F. Longstreth (Eds.), *Structuring politics: Historical institutionalism in comparative analysis* (pp. 57-89). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. .
- INCITE! & Women of Color Against Violence (Eds.). (2009). *The Revolution will not be funded*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Innes, J. E. (2004). Consensus Building: Clarifications for the Critics. *Planning Theory*, 3(1), 5-20.
- Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (2004). Reframing public participation: strategies for the 21st century. *Planning theory & practice*, 5(4), 419-436.
- Israel, B. A., Parker, E. A., Rowe, Z., Salvatore, A., Minkler, M., López, J., ... & Halstead, S. (2005). Community-based participatory research: lessons learned from the Centers for Children's Environmental Health and Disease Prevention Research. *Environmental health perspectives*, 1463-1471.
- Jasanoff, S. (1990). *The fifth branch: Science advisers as policymakers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jasanoff, S. (2004). *States of Knowledge: The Co-Production of Science and Social Order*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Jenkins, R. (2009). The Ways and Means of Power: Efficacy and Resources. In Stewart R. Clegg & Mark Haugaard (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Power* (pp. 140- 156). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Johnston, R. (1987). Theory and Methodology in Social Geography. . In M. Pacione (Ed.), *Social Geography: Progress and Prospect* (pp. 1-30). London: Croom Helm.
- Jones, R. (2010). The spatiality of boundaries. *Progress in Human Geography*, 34(263-267).
- Joseph, M. (2002). *Against the romance of community*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kabeer, N. (2005). *The search for inclusive citizenship*. in N. Kabeer (ed) *Inclusive Citizenship*, London & New York: Zed Books. –

- Kaplan, S. A., & Garrett, K. E. (2005). The use of logic models by community-based initiatives. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 28(2), 167-172.
- Kellogg, K. C. (2009). Operating room: Relational spaces and microinstitutional change in Surgery1. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(3), 657-711.
- Kelly, R. M. (1998). An inclusive democratic polity, representative bureaucracies, and the new public management. *Public Administration Review*, 201-208.
- Kieffer, E. C., & Reischmann, J. (2004). Contributions of Community Building to Achieving Improved Public Health Outcomes: The Aspen Institute for Community Change.
- King, C. S., Felty, K. M., & Susel, B. O. N. (1998). The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 58(4), 317-326.
- King, Martin Luther (1962). Towards Freedom Retrieved November 19, 2015, 2015, from <https://www.dartmouth.edu/~towardsfreedom/transcript.html>
- Kingdon, J. W 1995. Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies. Little Brown, Boston.
- Klinenberg, E, & Perrin, A. (2000). Symbolic politics in the information age: The 1996 Republican presidential campaigns in cyberspace. *Information, Communication & Society*, 3(1), 17-38.
- Klinenberg, E. (2002). *Heat Wave; a social autopsy of disaster in Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Knickman JR, Schroeder SA. (2000). Update from funders: the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. *Med Care*. 38, 781–784.
- Kretzmann, J. P., & McKnight, J. (1993). Building communities from the inside out (pp. 2-10). Northwestern University, Evanston, IL: Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Neighborhood Innovations Network.
- Kretzmann, J., & McKnight, J. P. (1996). Assets based community development. *National Civic Review*, 85(4), 23-29.
- Krumholz, N. (1994). Advocacy planning: Can it move the center? *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 60(2), 150-151.
- Kubisch, A. C., Auspos, P., Brown, P., & Dewar, T. (2010). Voices from the Field III: Lessons and Challenges from Two Decades of Community Change Efforts. Washington, D.C. : The Aspen Institute.
- Kubisch, A. C., Auspos, P., Taylor, S., & Dewar, T. (2013). Resident-Centered Community Building: What Makes It Different? *National Civic Review*, 102(3), 61-71.
- Kweit, M. G., & Kweit, R.W. (1981). *Implementing citizen participation in a bureaucratic*

- society: A contingency approach*. New York: Praeger.
- Labonte, R. (2004). Social inclusion/exclusion: Dancing the dialectic. *Health Promotion International*, 19(1), 115-121.
- Lamont, M. (1992). *Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper-Middle Class*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Larson, M. S. (1977). *The rise of professionalism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1950). *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*. New York, NY: Peter Smith.
- Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. (1988). The politics of explanation: an alternative. Knowledge and reflexivity: New frontiers in the sociology of knowledge. In Steve Woolgar (Ed) *Knowledge and Reflexivity, New Frontiers in the Sociology of Knowledge* (pp. 155-176). London, UK: Sage.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social-An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Laurian, L. (2004). Evaluating Plan Implementation: A Conformance Based Methodology. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70(4), 471–80.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.
- Lee, M. D. P., & Lounsbury, M. (2015). Filtering Institutional Logics: Community Logic Variation and Differential Responses to the Institutional Complexity of Toxic Waste. *Organization Science*, 26(3), 847-866.
- Leighninger, M. (2006). *The Next Form of Democracy: How Expert Rule is Giving Way to Shared Governance ... and Why Politics Will Never Be the Same*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Lejano, R. P., & Stokols, D. (2010). Understanding Minority Residents' Perceptions of Neighborhood Risks and Environmental Justice: New Modalities, Findings, and Policy Implications. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 27(2), 107-123.
- Lewin, K. (1944). The dynamics of group action. *Educational leadership*, 1(4), 195-200.
- Lindblom, C. E., & Cohen, D. K. (1979). *Usable knowledge: Social science and social problem solving* (Vol. 21). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lister, R. (2000). Strategies for social inclusion: Promoting social cohesion or social justice. In P. Askonas & A. Stewart (Eds.), *Social inclusion: possibilities and tensions* (pp. 37-54). New York: St. Martin's Press.

- Lofland, J., Snow, D., Anderson, L., & Lofland, L. H. (2006). *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Loewenstein, J. (2014). Take my word for it: How professional vocabularies foster organizing. *Journal of Professions and Organization*, 1(1), 65-83.
- Lowerson, V. & Feldman, M.S. (2012) Building Healthy Communities. Teaching Case. EPARCC. Syracuse University.
- Lowerson Bredow, V. (2015a). *Engaging Contradictions: Co-producing Local Policymaking*. Paper presented at the National Public Management Research Conference. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN. June 2015.
- Lowerson Bredow, V. (2015b). *Engaging Contradictions: Enacting Participation and Exclusion through Community-based Policymaking in Southern California*. Paper presented at the International Research Society on Public Management. University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK. March 2015.
- Lowerson, V., & Feldman, M. (2012). Building A Healthy Community (pp. 1-35). E-PARCC: The Maxwell School of Syracuse University.
- Lugones, M. & Rosezelle, P. A. (1995). Sisterhood and friendship as feminist models. *Feminism and community*, 135-45.
- Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View* (Vol. 1). Macmillan: London.
- Lukes, S. (2005). *Power: A Radical View*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Luxton, M. (2005). Feminist perspectives on social inclusion and children's well-being. In T. Richmond & A. Saloojee (Eds.), *Social inclusion: Canadian perspectives* (pp. 82-102). Halifax, NS, Canada: Fernwood.
- Lynd, S. (2012). *Accompanying: Pathways to social change*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.
- Macedo, S. (2005). *Democracy at Risk: How Political Choices Undermine Citizen Participation and What We Can Do About It*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Mack, K., Preskill H., Keddy, J., & Jhavar, M. K. (2014). Redefining Expectations for Place-based Philanthropy. *The Foundation Review*, 6(4), 6.
- MacNair, R. H., Caldwell, R., & Pollane, L. (1983). Citizen participants in public bureaucracies: Foul weather friends. *Administration & Society*, 14(4), 507-524.
- Majone G. (1990). Policy analysis and public deliberation. R Reich (Ed), *In The Power of Public Idea*, (pp. 157-78). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- March, J. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71-87.

- March, J. G., & Olsen, J., P. (2006). Logic of Appropriateness. In M. M. Martin Rein, Robert E. Goodin (Ed.), *Handbook of Public Policy*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Maréchal, G. (2010). Autoethnography. In Albert J. Mills, Gabrielle Durepos & Elden Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of case study research* (Vol. 2, pp. 43-45). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Marquis, C., & Lounsbury, M. (2007). Vive la résistance: Competing logics and the consolidation of US community banking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 799-820.
- Marquis, C., Glynn, M. A., & Davis, G. F. (2007). Community isomorphism and corporate social action. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 925-945.
- Matland, R. E (1995) Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: The Ambiguity-Conflict Model of Policy Implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 5(2),145-174.
- Matthews, P. (2014). Time, belonging and development: a challenge for participation and research. In Nick Gallent & Daniela Ciaffi (Eds.), *Community Action and Planning* (pp. 41-55). Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Mauss, M. (1954). *The gift: Forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies* (No. 378), trans. W.D. Halls. New York, NY: WW Norton & Company.
- McGuire, C. (2011). Transnationalizing Gangs: Expertise, Advocacy, and the Politics of Policymaking. (Doctoral Dissertation) University of California, Irvine, Irvine.
- McKnight, J. (1995). *The careless society: Community and its counterfeits*. New York: Basic Books.
- McKnight, J. L., & Kretzmann, J. P. (2012). Mapping Community Capacity. In M. Minker (Ed.), *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health and Welfare*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- McPherson, C. M., & Sauder, M. (2013). Logics in action managing institutional complexity in a drug court. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 0001839213486447.
- Merton, R. (1968). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Metzler, M. M., Higgins, D. L., Beeker, C. G., Freudenberg, N., Lantz, P. M., Senturia, K. D., et al. (2003). Addressing Urban Health in Detroit, New York City, and Seattle Through Community-Based Participatory Research Partnerships. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(5), 803-811.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 340-363.
- Mill, J.S. (1991 [1861]). Utilitarianism, in: J. Gray (Ed.) *On Liberty and Other Essays*.

Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Milward, H. B., & Provan, K. G. (2003). Managing the hollow state: Collaboration and contracting. *Public Management Review*, 5, 1-18.
- Minker, M. (1999). Personal responsibility for health? A review of the arguments and the evidence at century's end. *Health Education & Behavior*, 26(1), 121-140.
- Minkler, M. (Ed.) (2012). *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health and Welfare* (3rd ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Minkler, M., & Wallerstein, N. (1997). Improving Health through Community Organization and Community Building. In M. Minkler (Ed.), *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Minkler, M., & Wallerstein, N. (Eds.). (2011). *Community-based participatory research for health: From process to outcomes*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Minkler, M., Pies, C., & Hyde, C. A. (2012). Ethical Issues in Community Organizing and Capacity Building. In M. Minkler (Ed) *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health and Welfare* (pp. 110-129) New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Mirvis, P. H., & Hackett, E.J. (1983). Work and work force characteristics in the nonprofit sector. *Monthly Labor Review*, 3-12.
- Mol, A. (1999). Ontological politics. A word and some questions. *The Sociological Review*, 47(S1), 74-89.
- Molotch, H. (1976). The City as a Growth Machine. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 309-330.
- Montoya, M. (2009). The Community Knowledge Project: Community is a verb. Retrieved July 25, 2012, 2012, from <http://www.ces4health.info/find-products/view-product.aspx?code=MW54RCFH>
- Montoya, M. J. (2013). Potential Futures for a Healthy City: Community, Knowledge, and Hope for the Sciences of Life. *Current Anthropology*, 54(S7), S45-S55.
- Montoya, M. J., & Kent, E. E. (2011). Dialogical Action: Moving From Community-Based to Community-Driven Participatory Research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 21(7), 1000-1011.
- Morgan, E. (1984). Technocratic v. Democratic options for educational policy. *Policy Studies Review*, 3(2), 263-277.
- Mouffe, C. (1992). Feminism, citizenship and radical democratic politics. In J. Butler & J. W. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists theorize the political* (Vol. 369-384). London, UK: Routledge.
- Mouffe, C. (2002). For an Agonistic Public Sphere. In O. Enwezor, C. Basualdo, U. M.

- Bauer, S. Ghez, S. Maharaj, M. HNash & O. Zaya (Eds.), *Democracy Unrealized* (pp. 87- 97). Ostfeldern-Ruit, Germany: Hatje Cantz Publishers.
- Moynihan, D. P. (1969). *Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding: Community Action in the War on Poverty*. New York: The Free Press.
- Nabatchi, T. (2010). Addressing the citizenship and democratic deficits: The potential of deliberative democracy for public administration. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 40(4), 376-399.
- Nabatchi, T., Ertinger, E., & Leighninger, M. (2015). The Future of Public Participation: Better Design, Better Laws, Better Systems. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 1 – 11.
- Narayan-Parker, D. (1999). Bonds and bridges: social capital and poverty. *World Bank Publications*, 2167.
- New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) (2015). Carnegie Community Engagement Classification Retrieved December 2, 2015, 2015, from http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92
- Nicolini, D., Gherardi, S., & Yanow, D. (2003). Introduction: Toward a Practice-Based View of Knowing and Learning in Organizations. In D. Nicolini, S. Gherardi & D. Yanow (Eds.), *Knowing in Organizations: A Practice-Based Approach* (pp. 3 - 31). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Nicolini, D. (2013). *Practice theory, work, and organization: An introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford university press.
- North, D.C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Nowell, B., & Foster-Fishman, P. (2011). Examining Multi-Sector Community Collaboratives as Vehicles for Building Organizational Capacity. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 48, 193-207.
- Nussbaum, M. (1986). *The fragility of goodness: Luck and ethics in Greek tragedy and ethics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Nutt, P. (2002). *Why Decisions Fail: Avoiding the Blunders and Traps That Lead to Debacles*, San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- O'Connor, M., Denton, M., Hadjukowski-Ahmed, M., Zeytinoglu, I. U., & Williams, K. (1999). A theoretical framework for research on women's health promotion. In M. Denton, M. Hadjukowski-Ahmed, M. O'Connor, & I. U. Zeytinoglu (Eds.), *Women's voices in health promotion* (pp. 9-20). Toronto, ON, Canada: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- O'Leary, R., & Bingham, L. B. (Eds.). (2009). *The collaborative public manager: New ideas for the twenty-first century*. Georgetown University Press.

- O'Leary, R., & Vij, N. (2012). Collaborative Public Management: Where Have we Been and Where Are We Going? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 42(5), 507-522.
- O'Mahony, S., & Lakhani, K. R. (2011). Organizations in the shadow of communities. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 33, 3-36.
- O'Reilly, D. (2005). Social inclusion: A philosophical anthropology. *Politics*, 25(2), 80-88.
- Ogden, C. (2009). Means and Ends. Retrieved December 2, 2014 from <http://interactioninstitute.org/means-and-ends/>.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (1992). The duality of technology: Rethinking the concept of technology in organizations. *Organizational Science*, 3(3) 398-427.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2002). Knowing in practice: Enacting a collective capability in distributed organizing. *Organization Science*, 13(3), 249-273.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2007). Sociomaterial Practices: Exploring Technology at Work. *Organization Studies*, 28(9), 1435-1448.
- Orr, J. E. (1987). Narratives at work: Story telling as cooperative diagnostic activity. *Field Service Manager*, June, 47-60.
- Ortner, S. B. (1984). Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties. *Comparative studies in society and history*, 126-166.
- Ortner, S. B. (1995). Resistance and the Problem of Ethnographic Refusal. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 37(1), 173-193.
- Ortner, S. B. (2001). *Life and death on Mt. Everest: Sherpas and Himalayan mountaineering*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ortner, S. B. (2006). *Anthropology and social theory: Culture, power, and the acting subject*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Osborne, S. P., & Strokosch, K. (2013). It takes Two to Tango? Understanding the Co-production of Public Services by Integrating the Services Management and Public Administration Perspectives. *British Journal of Management*, 24, S31-S47.
- Osterlund, C., & Carlile, P. (2005). Relations in Practice: Sorting Through Practice Theories on Knowledge Sharing in Complex Organizations. *The Information Society*, 21, 91-107.
- Palumbo, R. (2014). The Dark Side of Health Care Coproduction: Health literacy as a requisite for the co-production of care. Paper presented at the Advances in Social Science, Management and Human Behavior.
- Pantazis, C., Gordon, D. & Levitas, R. (2006) *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Britain*, Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.

- Parekh, B.. (2002). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Parsons, T. (1964). *Essays in sociological theory*. New York: Free Press.
- Parsons, T. (1986). Power and the Social System. In S. Lukes (Ed.), *Power* (pp. 94-143). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Pennen, T. v. d., & Schreuders, H. (2014). The Fourth Way of active citizenship: case studies from the Netherlands. In N. Gallent & D. Ciaffi (Eds.), *Community Action and Planning* (pp. 135-155). Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Pentland, B. T., & Feldman, M. S. (2007). Narrative Networks: Patterns of Technology and Organization. *Organization Science*, 18(5), 781-795.
- Peterman, W. (2004) Advocacy vs collaboration: Comparing inclusionary community planning models. *Community Development Journal*, 59(3), 266-276.
- Petersen, D., Minkler, M., Vásquez, V. B., & Baden, A. C. (2006). Community Based Participatory Research as a Tool for Policy Change: A Case Study of the Southern California Environmental Justice Collaborative. *Review of Policy Research*, 23(2), 339-354.
- Phillips, A. (1993). *Democracy and Difference*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Phillips, A. (1995) Democracy and difference: Some problems for feminist theory In: Kymlicka, Will, (ed.) *The Rights of Minority Cultures* (pp. 288-302). Oxford University Press, Oxford, U.K.
- Phillips, N. (1997). Bringing the organization back in: A comment on conceptualizations of power in upward influence. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 43–47.
- Pickering, A. (1995). *The Mangle of Practice: Time, Agency and Science*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Polletta, F. (2012). *Freedom is an endless meeting: Democracy in American social movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Polletta, F. & Lee, J. (2006). Is Telling Stories Good for Democracy? Rhetoric in Public Deliberation after 9/11. *American Sociological Review*, 71(5), 699–723.
- Ponic, P. (2000). A herstory, a legacy: The Canadian Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch's Women's Program. *Avante*, 6(1), 48-61. Retrieved from <http://www.cahperd.ca/e/avante/index.htm>
- Ponic, P., & Frisby, W. (2010). Unpacking Assumptions About Inclusion in Community-Based Health Promotion: Perspectives of Women Living in Poverty. *Qualitative Health Research*, 20(11), 1519-1531.

- Powell, W. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. *Research in Organization Behavior*, 12, 295-336.
- Power, M. (1997). *The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Prewitt, K. (2009). Foreword: Social Science and Philanthropic Studies. In D. C. Hammack & S. Heydemann (Eds.), *Globalization, philanthropy, and civil society: projecting institutional logics abroad*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Prowler, D. (2007). Form foils function, San Francisco, CA: SPUR, Retrieved from www.spur.org/publications/articl/2007-01-01/form-foils-function.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Quick, K.S. & Feldman, M. F. (2009). Generating resources and energizing frameworks through inclusive public management. *International Public Management Journal*, 12(2), 137-171
- Quick, K. S., & Feldman, M. S. (2011). Distinguishing Participation and Inclusion. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 31(3), 272–290.
- Quick, K., & Feldman, M. (2014). Boundaries as Junctures: Collaborative Boundary Work for Building Efficient Resilience. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 1-23.
- Ranson, S., Hinings, B., & Greenwood, R. (1980). The structuring of organizational structures. *Administrative science quarterly*, 1-17.
- Reason, P., & Rowan, J. (Eds.). (1981). *Human inquiry: A sourcebook of new paradigm research* (Vol. 398, p. 3). Chichester: Wiley.
- Reddel, T. (2002). Beyond Participation, Hierarchies, Management and Markets: 'New' Governance and Place Policies. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 61(1), 50-63.
- Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5, 243-263.
- Reisch, M. (2002). Defining social justice in a socially unjust world. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 83(4), 343-354.
- Richmond, T., & Saloojee, A. (Eds.). (2005). *Social inclusion: Canadian perspectives*. Halifax, NS, Canada: Fernwood.
- Roberts, N. (2004). Public Deliberation in an Age of Direct Citizen Participation. *American Review of Public Administration*, 34(4), 315-353.
- Roberts, L. M., Spreitzer, G., Dutton, J., Quinn, R., Heaphy, E., & Barker, B. (2005). How to

- play to your strengths. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(1), 74-80.
- Romero, O. (1988). *The Violence of Love* (James R. Brockman, Trans.). San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Rose, N. (1996). The death of the social? Re-figuring the territory of government. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(3), 327-356.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2006). Is there Such a thing as “Evidence-Based Management”? *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 256-269.
- Rowe, G., & Frewer, L. J. (2005). A typology of public engagement mechanisms. *Science, technology & human values*, 30(2), 251-290.
- Ryan, K. (2009). Power and Exclusion. In S. R. Clegg & M. Haugaard (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Power* (pp. 348-366). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sabatier, P. A., & Jenkins-Smith, Hank C., eds. (1993). *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Saito, L. T. (2009). *The Politics of Exclusion: The Failure of Race-Neutral Policies in Urban America*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Schattschneider, E. E. (1960). *Semisovereign People*. New York: Rinehart and Winston.
- Schatzki, T. R. (2001). Introduction. In T. R. Schatzki, K. K. Cetina & E. v. Savigny (Eds.), *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory* (pp. 1-14). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schatzki, T.R. (2002). *The Site of the Social: A Philosophical Account of the Constitution of Social Life and Change*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Schatzki, T. R. (2012). A Primer on Practice. In Ronald Barnett Joy Higgs, Stephen Billett, Maggie Hutchings, Franziska Trede (Eds.), *Practice-Based Education* (Vol. 6, pp. 13-26). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Schneiberg, M. (2002). Organizational heterogeneity and the production of new forms: Politics, social movements and mutual companies in American fire insurance, 1900–1930. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 19: 39–89.
- Schneiberg, M., & Lounsbury, M. (2008). Social movements and institutional analysis. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (Eds.), *The handbook of organizational institutionalism*, (pp. 648 – 670). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Schneider, A. L., & Ingram, H.M. (2005). *Deserving and entitled: Social constructions and public policy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Schlozman, K.L, Verba, S., & Brady, H.E. (2012). *The Unheavenly Chorus: Unequal*

- Political Voice and the Broken Promise of American Democracy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Vol. 5126. New York: Basic books.
- Scott, J. C. (1985). *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scott, W.R. (1995). *Institutions and organizations*. , London/New Delhi:Sage Publications.
- Scott, W. R. & Davis, G. F. (2006). *Organization and Organizing: Rational, Natural and Open Systems Perspectives*,6th ed. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall. Chapter 1.
- Selsky, J. W., & Parker, B. (2005). Cross-sector partnerships to address social issues: Challenges to theory and practice. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 849-873.
- Sewell, W.H. (1992). Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(1), 1- 29
- Sharp, E. B. (1980). Toward a new understanding of urban services and citizen participation: The coproduction concept. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 14(2), 105-118.
- Sirianni, C. (2009). *Investing in democracy: Engaging citizens in collaborative governance*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Slagle, R. A. (1995). In defense of Queer Nation: From identity politics to a politics of difference. *Western Journal of Communication* (includes Communication Reports), 59(2), 85-102.
- Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, Gloria. (1998). Strategic grantmaking and community building." *National Civic Review* 87(2), 111-116.
- Smith, J. A. (1999). The Evolving American Foundation, Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Sector in a Changing America. *Indiana University Press*, 37, 37-38.
- Soss, J. (2000). *Unwanted Claims: The Politics of Participation in the U.S. Welfare System*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Steckler, A. B., Dawson, L., Israel, B. A., & Eng, E. (1993). Community health development: An overview of the works of Guy W. Stewart. *Health Education Quarterly*, Suppl. 1, S3-S20.
- Stone, C. N. (1976). *Economic Growth and Neighborhood Discontent: System Bias in the Urban Renewal Program of Atlanta*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: implications for clinical practice. *American psychologist*, 62(4), 271-286.
- Swan, J., Scarbrough, H. & Robertson, M. (2002). The Construction of “Communities of Practice” in the Management of Innovation, *Management Learning*, 33(4): 477–96.
- Swedberg, R. (2005) *The Max Weber Dictionary: Key Words and Central Concepts*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Swidler, A. (2009). Dialectics of patronage: Logics of accountability at the African AIDS-NGO interface. *Philanthropic projections: Sending institutional logics abroad*, 192-219.
- Takahashi, L. M., & Smutny, G. (1998). Community Planning for HIV/AIDS Prevention in Orange County, California. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 64(4), 441–56.
- Takahashi, L. M., & Magalong, M. G. (2008). Disruptive social capital: (Un)Healthy socio-spatial interactions among Filipino men living with HIV/AIDS. *Health and Place*, 14(2), 182-197.
- Tarrow, S. (1994). *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tett, L. (2005). Partnerships, community groups and social inclusion. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 27(1), 1-15.
- Thacher, D. (2009). The cognitive foundations of humanistic governance. *International Public Management Journal*, 12 (2): 261-86.
- Thomas, J. C. (1995) *Public Participation in Public Decisions: New Skills and Strategies for Public Managers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958-1990 1. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(3), 801-843.
- Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Tomlinson, B., & Lipsitz, G. (2013). American studies as accompaniment. *American Quarterly*, 65(1), 1-30.
- Tompkins, E., Adger, W. N., & Brown, K. (2002). Institutional networks for inclusive coastal management in Trinidad and Tobago. *Environment and Planning A*, 34, 1095-1111.
- Treloar, M. (2003). The Tyranny of Consensus. *Clamor*, 20(May/June), 38-40.
- Tritter, J. Q., & McCallum, A. (2006). The snakes and ladders of user involvement: Moving

- beyond Arnstein. *Health Policy*, 76(2), 156-168.
- Umemoto, K., & Igarashi, H. (2009). Deliberative planning in a multicultural milieu. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 29(1), 39-53.
- U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. (1979). Citizen participation in the American federal system. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). State & county Quickfacts: City, CA. Retrieved January 25, 2012, from <http://quickfacts.census.gov>.
- Uzzi, B. (1997). Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35-67.
- van der Velde, J., Williamson, D., & Ogilvie, L. (2009). Participatory action research: Practical strategies for actively engaging and maintaining participation in immigrant and refugee communities. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19, 1293-1302.
- Valentinov, V. (2012). Toward a critical systems perspective on the nonprofit sector. *Systemic Practice and Action Research* 25.4 (2012): 355-364.
- Valle, V. M., & Torres, R. D. (2000). *Latino Metropolis*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Van Buuren, A. (2009). Knowledge for Governance, Governance of Knowledge: Inclusive Knowledge Management in Collaborative Governance Processes. *International Public Management Journal*, 12(2), 208-235.
- Van der Pennen, T. & Schreuders, H. (2014). The Fourth Way of active citizenship: case studies from the Netherlands. In N. Gallent & D. Ciaffi (Eds.), *Community Action and Planning* (pp. 135-155). Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Vangen S. & Huxham, C. (2013). Building and Using the Theory of Collaborative Advantage. In R., Keast, M., Mandell and R. Agranoff (Eds.) *Network Theory in the Public Sector: Building New Theoretical Frameworks*, (pp. 51-67). New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Vigoda, E. (2002). From responsiveness to collaboration: Governance, citizens, and the next generation of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 62(5), 527-540.
- Viswanathan, M., Ammerman, A., Eng, E., Garlehner, G., Lohr, K. N., Griffith, D., & Whitener, L. (2004). Community Based Participatory Research: Assessing the Evidence: Summary. AHRQ Evidence Report Summaries. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 1998-2005. 99. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK11852/>
- Vobruba, G. (2000). Actors in processes of inclusion and exclusion: Towards a dynamic approach. *Social Policy & Administration*, 34(5), 601-613.
- Waddington, M., & Mohan, G. (2004). Failing Forward: going beyond PRA and imposed

- forms of participation. In S. Hickey & G. Mohan (Eds.), *Participation, from tyranny to transformation?: exploring new approaches to participation in development* (pp. 219-234). London: ZED Books.
- Wallerstein, I. (1979). *The Capitalist World-Economy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallerstein, N., & Duran, B. (2006). Using community based participatory research to address health disparities. *Health Promotion Practice*, 7(3), 312-323.
- Walker, J. L. (1966). A Critique of the Elitist Theory of Democracy. *The American Political Science Review*, 60(2), 285-295.
- Warren, M. R. (2001). *Dry Bones Rattling: Community Building to Revitalize American Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Walter, C. L. & Hyde, C. (2012). Community Building Practice: An Expanded Conceptual Framework. In Meredith Minkler (Ed.), *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health*. (pp. 78 - 90). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Weber, M. (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, M. (1986). Domination by Economic Power and by Authority. In S. Lukes (Ed.), *Power* (pp. 28-36). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Weeks, E. C. (2000). The Practice of Deliberative Democracy: Results from Four Large-Scale Trials. *Public Administration Review*, 60(4), 360-372.
- Weick, K. E. (1984). Small wins: redefining the scale of social problems." *American Psychologist*, 39(1), 40.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations* (Vol. 3). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Weiss, J. A. (1989). The powers of problem definition: The case of government paperwork. *Policy sciences*, 22(2), 97-121.
- Weiss, P. A., & Friedman, M. (Eds.). (1995). *Feminism and Community*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University.
- Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning as a social system. *Systems thinker*, 9(5), 2-3.
- Wenger, E (2003). Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems. In Davide Nicolini, Silvia Gherardi & Dvora Yanow (Eds.), *Knowing in Organizations: A Practice-Based Approach* (pp. 76 - 99). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Whitaker, G. P. (1980). Coproduction: Citizen participation in service delivery. *Public Administration Review*, 240-246.

- White, O. F., & McSwain, C. J. (1993). The Semiotic Way of Knowing and Public Administration. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 15(1), 18-35.
- Wildavsky, A. B. (1979). *Speaking truth to power*. Transaction Publishers.
- Wilensky, H. L. (1964). The Professionalization of Everyone? *American Journal of Sociology*, 70(2), 137-158.
- Williams, B. N., & Miller, M. (2013). *The Evolution of the Co-Production of Public Safety and Public Order: Local Applications & Resulting Implications for Public Management*. Paper presented at the National Public Management Research Association Conference.
- Williams, G. H. (2003). The determinants of health: structure, context and agency. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 25(3), 131-154.
- Williamson, O. E., & Ouchi, W. G. (1981). The Markets and Hierarchies and Visible Hand Perspectives. In Andrew H. Van de Ven & William F. Joyce (Eds.), *Perspectives on Organization Design and Behavior* (pp. 347-370). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Willis, P., & Trondman, M. (2000). Manifesto for "Ethnography". *Ethnography*, 5-16.
- Wolf-Powers, L. (2014). New York City's community based housing movement. In Nick Gallent & Daniela Ciaffi (Eds.), *Community Action and Planning* (pp. 217-236). Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Yanow, D. (2004). Translating local knowledge at organizational peripheries. *British journal of management*, 15(S1), S9-S25.
- Yanow, D., & Schwartz-Shea, P. (2006). *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Yates, G., & Saasta, T. (2013). The Why and How of Engaging Residents for Change. *National Civic Review*, 102(3), 35-41.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (Fourth Edition ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yu, H. C., & Abrazaldo, W. (2010). The California Endowment's Building Healthy Communities Initiative: Lessons from the Strategic Planning and Site-Selection Processes. Oakland, CA: Social Policy Research Associates.
- Zagofsky, T. M. (2013). *Civic Engagement Unbound: Social and Spatial Forms of Inclusion/Exclusion in Low-Income and Multiethnic Communities*. (Doctoral Dissertation) University of California, Davis, Davis, California.
- Zimmerman, A. D. (1995). Toward a more democratic ethic of technological governance. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 20(1), 86-107.

