WOMEN CREATING SOCIAL CAPITAL AND SOCIAL CHANGE:

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF WOMEN-LED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS

by

TRACY STEFFY

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Political Science in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York

2008

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in Political Science in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

4/29/08	Marilyn Gittell
Date	Chair of Examining Committee
4/29/08	Ruth O'Brien
Date	Executive Officer

Joyce Gelb

Irving Leonard Markovitz

Frederick Lane

Charles Price

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

WOMEN CREATING SOCIAL CAPITAL AND SOCIAL CHANGE:
A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS

by

Tracy Steffy

Advisor: Professor Marilyn Gittell

This dissertation explores the leadership and political influence of women through their participation in local community development organizations in the U.S. The research follows up on a Ford Foundation sponsored study that examined women's leadership in community development in the U.S. and identified among other thing, women leader's "holistic" and "comprehensive" definition of development as well as the significant gender, race and class-based barriers that they and their organizations face as they pursue development, and social and political change. It also found that while women were networked with other leaders and organizations, they lacked access to key funding and political networks. Because community-based non-profit organizations are a key means through which individuals and communities that face race, class, ethnicity and gender-based discrimination can call for economic, social and political change, it continues to important to understand women's community activism and leadership in these organizations. It is also true that in the U.S. these groups are relied upon to deliver

essential services, and housing and economic development that elsewhere might be the responsibility of the state. It is also critical to assess how, and under what conditions, women have or have not been able to meet the needs of their constituents through direct service provision and local development. Coming ten years after the original study, this research focuses on the legacy and success of individual women leaders, the trajectory of the organizations, and examines in depth the question of network and relationship building among the organizations, and between the organizations and local political leaders. In the ten years since the original study was completed, twenty percent of the groups are no longer in operation. In addition, women leaders indicate that securing adequate funding has become more difficult while at the same time the need in their communities has become more acute. Whereas women leaders had previously indicated that gender and race were key barriers, ten years later most saw access to adequate funding, especially for general operating support as the primary obstacle but only some considered gender to be an issue in access to funding.

For my mom and my grandma,

Karen Agamalian and Elinor Agamalian

who cheered me as I started on this path
but are not here to celebrate the completion of this project

and for my niece,

Elinor Peace Steffy

who inspires me to start the next one

Acknowledgements

With the customary acknowledgement that I alone am responsible for the content of this document, imperfect as it may be, I would like to thank the many people who have helped make the completion of this dissertation possible.

First, to the women across the country who participated in the first study and to those who responded to my survey for this follow-up, thank you for your invaluable contribution to this research. More importantly, thank you for your dedication to your communities and to the work that you do. Your commitment and perseverance motivates me to continue this work and compels me to do it better.

I am lucky to have had both support of, and intellectual challenges from, many strong women and nurturing men during the course of my graduate career, among them are professors, mentors, friends and family who at various times and in numerous ways helped to get me through this.

Most certainly I would not have reached this point were it not for the gainful employment provided by and the timely and frequent advice received from my teacher, boss, dissertation supervisor and mentor, Marilyn Gittell. As a Research Associate at the Howard Samuels Center, I learned how to ***do*** research and how to translate the issues that matter most to me into the research questions that I will hopefully spend the rest of my career exploring. Marilyn gets her students into the field right away so we can learn by doing. Through my experience working with her at the Center, I learned more than in all my classes combined. Thanks for that opportunity and for showing me that the things I care about have a place in political science. Most importantly, at a time when I was not

entirely convinced that a Ph.D. in political science was what I ultimately wanted, Marilyn with her characteristic blend of tough and even tougher love helped me figure it out and for that I will be forever grateful.

Marilyn and a number of others who have helped to keep me on this path have at times demonstrated more confidence in me than I had in myself and I hope to continue to live up to your belief in me. Joyce Gelb, who was one of my first professors in graduate school and who early on gave me a job doing a literature review for research she was conducting, has been a source of support right through to the end serving as the reader on my dissertation. Thank you for all that you have done over the years to help get me to this next exciting phase of my career.

Thanks also to the other members of my dissertation committee, Lenny Markovitz, Fred Lane and Charles Price, your comments and support have been invaluable. To Charles especially, thanks for coming all the way from North Carolina, just for the day. Each of you is a still all-to-rare example of a man who has no issues dealing with research by or about women. As a feminist, it's refreshing to be able to work with men like you. For me personally, you are all examples of the type of teacher, mentor and academic that I aspire to be. In the best sense of the words the three of you are truly gentlemen and scholars.

I would also like to acknowledge another professor and advisor, W. Ofuatey Kodjoe, who was the Executive Officer of the Political Science department when I began graduate school. Although he has left the Graduate Center and is now retired, I would not be here without his early and consistent support. Whether my issues were personal or

academic, his door was always open and he never failed to boost my spirits and help me to keep moving forward.

I would also like to acknowledge the support of a few key members of the Graduate Center's staff, Les Gribben, Vin Deluca, Jane Tartaro and Matt Schoengood, each of whom in his or her own way has made sure that I have been able to stay in school, stay financially solvent, remain relatively sane and ultimately to finish. I know that you are all happy to see me go (finally) but your genuine concern for my academic and personal well-being over the years is greatly appreciated.

To my friends and colleagues collectively known as the WKWAs: Jen Disney, Susanna Jones, Jocelyn Boryczka, Dorothy Benz, Ronni Greenwood, Dorinda Tetens, and Effie MacLachlan, thanks for your material and emotional support. Each of you in your own way is an inspiration to me. Thanks to those of you who blazed the path and provided the early examples of what post-dissertation life could be like, and thanks also to those of you who kept pace with me for commiserating to the end.

Thanks to my family who have put up with graduate school for long enough. First to my mom Karen, Grandma Elinor and Grandpa George who saw me start graduate school but are unfortunately not here to see me finish. I most certainly could not have done it without their unconditional love and enthusiastic support. They cheered me on as I overcome each hurdle and celebrated each accomplishment no matter how small. I am so sorry you are not here for this last one.

To my dad, Mike and sister Delcy who helped pitch with emergency copy editing at the last most critical moment, I am grateful for that and for all your support over the

years. To my dear niece Elinor who wants nothing more than my time and attention, I am happy to say that I finally have a little more for you now and I look forward that! Even though we are too far apart, I am very lucky to be part of Delcy and Elinor's wonderful Sacramento-based circle of friends and family. Sorry, Dad that I was a little late to understand your advice when you said not to go into Anthropology because there was no money in it. You didn't mean Anthropology per se but Academia in general. Oh well, too late now….

To the Cohens, Beth, Dave Emily and Ben, thanks for being another west-coast sanctuary and font of love and support. The number of times I have shown up on your doorstep emotionally and physically depleted over the years are too numerous to count. Thank you for always taking me in, restoring me and treating me as if the mere occasion of my coming to visit is cause enough for great celebration. Thanks for being there for me and for almost believing me every time I said I only had about two more years of school left.

To my friend Dorinda Tetens who I met my first semester in graduate school, thanks for taking me into your heart and your family. Our lives have paralleled each others in bizarre, sad and wonderful ways. Because of it, I have been able to share virtually everything that has happened to me during this time with someone who truly understands what I've gone through. I am so sorry that we've been through it, but I am grateful to have had your understanding and support. I look forward to this next positive parallel and to celebrating it with you.

To my dear friend Jan Bramlett, although I have missed you since you joined the west coast wing of my family and friends, I appreciate having been able to work through some of the emotional and psychological difficulties of grad school and writing a dissertation with you. Between you and my therapist, Semra to whom I also owe a debt of gratitude, we have covered a lot of difficult ground together. To Ron Nerio, my former roommate and long-time friend, thanks also for your confidence building belief in my abilities and for the time and support you so willingly give to your friends. I look forward to beginning at least some of the many exciting research adventures you've suggested for us. Thanks to all of you for your advice and guidance

To Effie MacLachlan, my one-time roommate and now best friend, I really can't imagine having done it without you. We have been there for each other through every exam, and now our dissertations. I am so grateful to have had you as an almost daily presence in my life during this time. You and your daughters, Delia, Tilda and Bele are a source of great joy in my life. I am so lucky to have been able to share the frustrations and triumphs of this process with you and to be able to count on your unflagging support and belief in me.

Finally to my dear husband, Abdul who has at times called this a "hesitation" instead of a dissertation, I know it's taken a while but, it is finally over. Thanks for your patience and your love. I know that you haven't always understood the academic calendar I've had to keep or just where in the "writing process" I've been at all times but thanks for sticking it out. I love you.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter One
Introduction

In the United States, community based organizations play a critical role in social service and development programs. In the absence of a more comprehensive welfare state, as exists in other western industrialized democracies, community based non-profit organizations are a primary mechanism through which many social services are delivered and physical and economic development is achieved. Social services such as child and elder care, after school programs and physical and economic development programs such as affordable housing, job training and local business development, that are more likely to be designed and run by government in many European countries, are primarily developed and delivered by some of the now more than 1.4 million non-profits in the U.S. (National Center for Charitable Statistics 2007).

The non-profit sector itself is widely varied and includes foundations, universities and hospitals, as well as relatively smaller locally based development, advocacy and service organizations. Federal, state and local policy makers have come to rely on such groups to develop and administer programs to meet the social and economic needs of communities. Through funding from federal and state grants and initiatives, along with foundations and other donors these smaller, locally-based non-profits have become an increasingly important element in local social service delivery and development especially since the Great Society programs of the 1960s.

One primary appeal of such community-based groups is that many are born of the collective actions of residents who come together around a particular need or concern in

their neighborhood or social group. They may also form among even more broadly defined local constituencies that share similar, values, needs and concerns. Local self-help fits within traditional American values of self-reliance and entrepreneurialism and has broad political appeal. For many, such an approach is the desired antitheses to state defined solutions to social and economic needs that European welfare states represent. Citizens in their neighborhoods, rather than far away government, are the expected and trusted source of new ideas and solutions to local problems. As John Gardner, founder of Common Cause describes,

> The [nonprofit] sector is a significant source of renewal. . . .The sector comfortably harbors innovators, maverick movements, groups which feel they must fight for their place in the sun, and critics and dissenters of both liberal and conservative persuasion. And it is from just such individuals and groups that one may expect emergence of the ideas that will dominate our society and our world a century hence (1981).

Non-profit groups may vary in the degree to which they are truly grassroots and participatory; they may be well-funded and powerful or poorly resourced and more marginalized. For many though, the idea of local community residents coming together to develop innovative solutions to their own problems is one that resonates with core American values.

Delivering key social services and promoting development are primary functions of many community-based non-profit development organizations, but they are not the sole tasks of such groups. Community-based organizations can also be a mechanism by which those who are economically, socially and politically marginalized can claim a stake in the political process and secure a share in the local economy and in the development process through organizing and advocacy. Although some community

based groups may focus exclusively on organizing or advocacy, many housing, development and service oriented non-profits combine development programs with advocacy and organizing for and among their constituents around issues that affect them.

In addition to being a vital and politically acceptable source of innovation, the non-profit sector has become and increasingly important contributor to the national economy, accounting for 5.2 percent of GDP (National Center for Charitable Statistics 2007). For many however, the ultimate importance of strong community associations is even more essential; a strong participatory associational life is considered the foundation of a thriving democracy. De Tocqueville famously marveled at the American habit of forming associations and saw it as a source of great strength for American democracy (1966). More recently, Robert Putnam (1995) has expressed concerns that in the U.S. there has been a decline of these civil society groups, with negative consequences for American democracy. At the same time, some American policy makers have seized on the idea of greater support for non-profits as a potential cure-all. President George H. W. Bush's "thousand points of light" and George W. Bush's "Faith-based Initiative" are two recent examples, although these groups appeal to both the right and the left. Community-based associations are valued because they offer local solutions for local problems, and suggest a limited role for government both in defining problems and establishing policy to address them.

Whether concerned about a perceived decline in participation in associations, or making an argument about the citizenship benefits of participation in such groups, for many, the existence of and participation in community based groups is essential not only

to the well being of particular communities or groups but also to the overall health of a democratic society as a whole. Putnam (1993, 1995, and 2000) in particular notes the importance of the role that local associations play; local associations build networks of trust that is the "social glue" that holds communities together and makes democracy work. Participation in associational life builds networks of norms and trust, or social capital that is necessary for a strong, well-functioning democracy. In his examination of social capital and associational life in the U.S., Putnam (2000) is alarmed by what he sees as a decline in participation in associations. During the same period for which Putnam identifies this worrisome decline in participation in local associations, trust and social capital in the U.S. (especially since the 1960s) there has been rapid growth in the number of community-based non-profit development associations. Putnam does not take this type of community based group into consideration. Instead, his research in the U.S. has focused on other kinds of associations including such groups as Kiwanis Clubs, the Knights of Columbus, the Parent Teachers' Association, many of which have experienced a decline in participation. This focus obscures the social capital building contribution of community based non-profit development, organizing and advocacy groups. These groups are increasing both in terms of their absolute numbers and individual participation in them.

With regard to the concept of social capital itself, Putnam's work has been criticized for failing to differentiate among groups in terms of the degree and quality of their contribution to creating social capital (Fiorina 1999; Cohen 2001; Cohen 1999; Young 2001; Arneill 2005; Stone 2001; Phillips 2002). His work has also been critiqued

for its failure to examine issues of gender (O'Neill and Gidengil 2005; Arneill 2005). Because it also overlooks the locally based community development groups that are so critical in the U.S. context, the contribution women make through their participation in these community development and advocacy groups has largely been obscured.

Although gender and development has been a major focus of scholarship in the international context, it has received little scholarly attention in the U.S. Further research is needed to examine the role of women in community based organizations, but also to contextualize these groups and women's participation in the larger gender and development discourse. Recent scholarship, from Putnam (2005) and others has begun to explicitly examine questions of gender and social capital and to examine women's participation in associations through the lens of gender and theories of civil society and social capital (O'Neill and Gidengil 2005; Arneill 2005; Lowndes 2005). In addition to the need to continue this research to further an understanding of women's leadership and participation there is also a need to further question the implications of pursuing development and social service provision through community based efforts. This approach to social and development programs may lack comprehensiveness and may contribute to the uneven distribution and availability of basic services and goods such has housing, education, child care, economic development and health care, that many consider necessary and essential, but it reflects the historically fragmented and charity-based approach to meeting these needs in the U.S. which is in keeping with American values which reject top-down, nationally defined and closely regulated social programs.

This current research is a follow-up to a project that examined women's

leadership and women-led community development organizations in the U.S for a study called, "Women Creating Social Capital and Social Change: A Study of Women's Leadership in Community Development Organizations," (Gittell, Ortega, Steffy 1999). That study, referred to from this point forward as the Women and Community Development Study (WCDS), was funded by the Ford Foundation and conducted by the Howard Samuels Center in partnership with the McAuley Institute and grew out of the two groups similar and complimentary research interests.[1] The WCDS was based on interviews with 141 individuals who were leaders of community development organizations, community development funders and practitioners, educators or local public officials involved in development. Interviews were conducted in nine sites across the U.S. by research teams from the study's two investigating partner organizations.

Research on race and gender in community groups by Gittell and Covington (1994) identified that when women are the directors and are more than 60 percent of the board, organizations are more likely to pursue programs that address the needs of women and families. Where women were absent from the boards and staff, community development organizations tended to pursue more traditional "bricks and mortar" and economic development paying little attention to how such programs included or affected women and families. The McAuley Institute, a women-focused, national intermediary funder of housing development organizations that are run by, or have programs that target

---

1 The Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center is a research institute at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. Established in 1983, The McAuley Institute was a national intermediary funder that supported community based organizations that focused primarily on housing development for women. The McAuley Institute closed in 2003, although its parent organization, the Sisters of Mercy continue to carry out similar charitable housing and economic development work.

women and families, was interested in exploring and more systematically documenting through research what they had come to understand about the "difference" in women-led development.

Gender and development is a significant field of research outside the United States, however, little research has been done that comprehensively explores gender and development, women's leadership and women-led community based organizations in the United States. The focus of gender and development scholarship has primarily concentrated on poor and marginalized women in the developing world. Western feminists, scholars and development professionals have faced criticism by women in developing countries for their ethnocentrism and failure to recognize the importance of local knowledge and expertise. At the same time poor and marginalized women in the U.S. have remained largely outside the gender and development research agenda and discourse. The women leaders and groups that were included in the WCDS are primarily based in communities and serve individuals who are economically, socially and politically marginalized. As such, these leaders and groups have much in common with women leaders and groups in the developing world and this project will attempt to contextualize this research within previous gender and development scholarship.

The Women and Community Development Study

Defining Development

The WCDS employed a broad and inclusive definition of development that allowed for the inclusion of a variety of groups that pursued programs of traditional

housing and economic development, as well as those which were defined most accurately as service, organizing and advocacy groups. In most cases, the groups included in the study pursued a combination of development, service, advocacy and organizing programs. Some groups were also concerned with programs that focused on individual as well as community or neighborhood development goals; programs that focused on building individual skills such as literacy, computer skills, economic literacy and home ownership, or leadership training were also considered part of development programs.

The WCDS utilized the terms community development organization (CDO) or the more broadly applicable community based organization (CBO) to refer to the non-profit community based groups selected for the study rather than the term community development corporation (CDC) which is most appropriate for only those groups specifically pursuing housing and economic development. Some of the groups included in the study have incorporated as CDCs; however, they do not conform to the narrow programs of economic and housing development that CDCs traditionally pursue. This research will employ the terms CDO and CBO interchangeably; the term CDC when used will refer only to those CDOs that are incorporated as such.

Research Questions

In broad terms, the WCDS sought examine the role of women-led community development groups; the way women leaders defined development, and their experience within the field (see Appendix B for the WCDS interview instrument). Interviews with women leaders were organized around several key themes including: women's leadership

style; understanding the organization and the local context; the experience and background of women leaders; the barriers women leaders and their organizations confront; and women leaders' understanding of development. The WCDS examined research questions at the individual, organizational and community levels and included:

- How do women leaders define community development?
- How do women-led organizations and programs reflect this definition? How do they set their priorities?
- What is women's leadership style? How do their organizations reflect this style? Do women leaders engage in collaboration, participate in networking, and encourage internal democracy and participation?
- What race, class and gender-based barriers and obstacles do women-led CDOs and their leaders face?

Findings of the Original Women and Community Development Study

The WCDS found that program and policy priorities in women-led groups reflected the needs of women and children and were "holistic" and "comprehensive"; that the organizational structure of the groups tended to be less hierarchical and more collaborative; and that women-led organizations were as concerned with the "process" as they were with the "outcomes" of development programs, and placed a strong emphasis on individual and community empowerment. The WCDS also identified some key barriers to effective women's leadership including marginalization from resources and power, the limited development of, and lack of access to, networks with funders and local

and state political officials, and the failure on the part of outside evaluators and funders to understand women-led organizations' definition of development and measures of success (Gittell, Ortega, Steffy 1999).

Programs and Approach to Development "Holistic" and "Comprehensive"

The term "holistic" was often used by the WCDS interviewees and reflects their understanding of pursuing programs and structuring organizations to reflect the needs of women, children and the entire community. For example, a women-led housing development organization would also be concerned with employment, childcare, healthcare, and other programs that the residents may need in order to be able to be successful renters or home owners and for their families to thrive. Leaders were as concerned with individual empowerment and advocacy as they were with community empowerment. It was not sufficient, therefore, "just" to build a house; women-led organizations were also conscious of developing the programs necessary to keep a family in the house. They used the term holistic to describe their view of the interconnectedness of the individual and community issues and their necessarily inclusive or "comprehensive" programmatic focus.

Process, Outcomes and Empowerment

Community and individual empowerment were terms often employed by women leaders to describe their work. While empowerment is a concept that many grassroots organizations are likely to cite as a priority, leaders from the WCDS were concerned with

individual empowerment in ways that were reflected in their programs and in terms of how they measure success. Empowerment is understood, following Bookman and Morgan, as "a process aimed at consolidating, maintaining, or changing the nature and distribution of power in a particular context" (1988 4), and following Seitz's idea that "empowerment is both a process and an outcome of collective identity and political praxis, resulting in capacity in thought and action to address the condition and position of marginalization" (1998 234). One micro-business program at a women-led and women-focused organization worked with women to develop skills but also self-esteem and leadership abilities. Although they generated ideas for, planned, and opened some small businesses, none were viable in the long term. If the only outcome measure was the number of businesses created, the program might be considered a failure. However, the women who participated in the program gained valuable practical experience that they were able to build upon. Going through the process and being able to experiment and ultimately fail, was a valuable learning experience that did not have dire consequences for women who can ill afford to lose what little they had on a failed business venture. The skills and lessons are transferable and process and the individual level outcomes were as important to the group as being able to count the number of businesses that were established.

Barriers

Women leaders identified a number of significant barriers to their work including both general organizational barriers as well as individual or personal barriers. They

identified general barriers that may CDOs face: lack of funding necessary for operational expenses, the sometimes overwhelming needs of the communities they serve, lack of access to information and the complexities of the funding process. In addition to those, when women-leaders considered obstacles that might be specific to women leaders and women-led organizations, they also identified personal, race, class gender, and cultural barriers. Women-leaders understood their definition of development to be a barrier. Especially in the banking and construction fields, women felt that they were not always viewed as competent or authoritative. Some even noted that, depending on the context, they might take a man along to a meeting with a funder or a builder to get around this issue (Gittell, Ortega Steffy 1999). Women of color identified that in some situations barriers were tied to race where at other times they were tied to gender.

Creating Social Capital and Social Change

Following Putnam's (1993) definition of social capital, the WCDS demonstrated that women and women-led organizations were creating social capital through the establishment and strengthening of networks and relationships among individuals and organizations. They were also pursuing a broad social change agenda that most traditional community development corporations (CDCs) did not. Conventional CDCs are more likely to pursue a specific program of physical and economic redevelopment, while paying less attention to advocacy and organizing. The WCDS found that women-led community organizations are likely to pursue broadly defined development programs that privilege locally identified priorities and that reflect the needs and concerns of

women and children. These organizations rarely focus on a single program area, but instead simultaneously address multiple issue areas such as housing, economic development, community organizing, advocacy, and social service delivery. Even those programs with a traditional development focus, such as housing or economic development, are designed with features that foster and strengthen community participation. Women leaders assigned equal value to physical and economic development and to individual and community empowerment. In addition, the importance of collaborative work, organizational participation in coalitions, and networking and relationship building among women leaders, organizations, and local political leaders also emerged as an important finding.

Women and Community Development Follow-Up Study 2007

Civil Society, Social Capital and Gender

This project seeks to further examine the implications of the WCDS and to examine new questions about organizational and leadership persistence and change. These questions will be explored within the theoretical debates about Civil Society, Social Capital, and Gender and Development. A gender perspective and other critiques of civil society and social capital, especially those which seek to question the limits of civil society will be of particular use to this project. These ideas will be explored in more depth in the following chapter, but they are introduced here to help map out the path of the questions and arguments that will be presented. Particularly in the United States, community based organizations are a primary mechanism through which vital social

services, education, housing and development programs are delivered. In other industrialized democracies, especially in Europe, many of these services and programs would be developed, supported and run by the state. In the U.S., it often falls to local non-profits to do what elsewhere government might do.

A key difference between the U.S. and Western European approach is the degree to which services and programs are comprehensive and equitably distributed. In the U. S for example, there is no national, comprehensive approach to the provision of child care. In many communities there is a shortage of affordable, quality child care. Many non-profit community groups are working to provide these services; however, the end result is a patchwork of available care and a wide range in terms of affordability and quality. This raises questions about the extent to and the conditions under which CDOs can and do meet the needs of their constituents. What are the possibilities and limitations of this approach in light of theories and critiques of civil society and social capital, and how might an understanding of gender development help us to understand women's leadership and women-led development efforts in the U.S.?

Civil Society

The importance of the "local" has a long tradition in democratic, feminist and American political thought. The relationship between local organizations, citizen participation and democracy has been a central theme in analyses of American democracy (de Tocqueville 1966; Putnam 1995; Ehrenberg 2001). For de Tocqueville, the emphasis on local democracy and America's propensity for local organization was a

key and unique strength (1966). Feminist scholars and scholars of community organizing and democracy have often identified the virtues of the local, such as the ideal that local government is more accessible and likelier to be the source of alternative agendas that challenge the political status quo. As Phillips argues, "a vibrant local democracy is a crucial component in any politics of innovation, for without its explorations, its experiments (and its failures), we may remain stuck with priorities as traditionally defined" (1996 129).

Much of the current attention to the role of community organizations and their contribution to democracy and participation is grounded in theoretical conceptions and understandings of civil society and its relation to creating "strong democracy" and healthy communities (Putnam 1995, 1993; Barber 1998). A vibrant flourishing civil society, for example, has been credited with toppling totalitarian regimes and revitalizing existing democracies, and the lack of a strong civil society has been identified as the difference between a well functioning participatory democracy and an underachieving, poorly functioning one (Putnam 1993).

Critics reacting to Putnam's conceptualization of social capital (1993, 1995, 2000) in particular, and to theoretical conceptions of civil society more generally, have sought to examine the role of groups in civil society more closely and to question some of the underlying assumptions about their contribution to democracy (Edwards, Foley and Diani 2001; Saegert, Thompson and Warren 2001). Putnam (1993) defines social capital as "features of social organization, such as the norms, trust and networks" that make coordinated social action possible. Until recently, Putnam failed to differentiate among

groups and some have questioned the different contributions of various types of groups in civil society to "making democracy work" (Eastis 2001; Stolle and Rochon 2001). Others have even suggested the possibility that some groups may have a negative impact (Young 2000; Cohen 2001). Still other critics have sought to reassert the importance of the role of the state, arguing that the cause of social change and social justice might, at least in some cases, be better served by, or might even necessitate, state action (Phillips 1996; Saegert Thompson and Warren 2001; Young 2000 Skocpol 1996). Some caution that civil society is not an entirely separate sphere that acts as a check on state excess and that we must pay attention to the ways in which the state and civil society are entangled (Saegert, Thompson and Warren 2001; Young 2000). Others argue that both an active government and a flourishing civil society are necessary. Tendler has identified this as the "synergy" that produces effective governance and policy outcomes (1997). And Naples describes how the state can sometimes even foster the development of community groups and spur activism through direct funding and support in local communities (Naples 1998a).

Many scholars have noted that women participate more actively in local groups, and that local politics have tended to be more responsive to them and to their ideas. Women have been central to locally-based reform movements, have been active participants in local groups (Naples 1998a, 1998b; Bookman and Morgan 1988; Marx Ferree and Yancey Martin 1995), and have been more likely to serve in elective office at the local and state level than at the national level (Darcy, Welch and Clarke 1994). Although women have embraced the local, feminist observers remind us that the local

may have limitations because there are times when "smaller is not always better; indeed when issues of social justice are involved, increasing the power and autonomy of the local community will often do more harm than good" (Phillips 1996 121). Furthermore, although women enjoy greater visibility and influence at the local level, the local may be devalued precisely because of the heightened presence and activity of women (Phillips 1996; Fraser 1996). Through their work in local groups, however, women are "reinvisioning the political," and making demands for change that ultimately challenge national and global, as well as local agendas. It is within this context that I propose to take up the question of the role of women's leadership in community-based organizations.

Gender and Development

More generally, this research is informed by, and contributes to, the scholarship on gender and development. This emphasis on the intersection of gender and community development in the United States addresses a significant lacuna. For the last 30 years, gender and development in developing countries has been an important subject for feminist, comparative and international relations scholars (Tinker 1990; Jacquette 1990; Snyder 1995; Sen and Grown 1987). But little of this research has explored gender and development in the context of Western capitalist societies (see Williams 2002 for a recent exception). Given the degree to which community organizations in the U.S. are formed by and address the needs of those who are marginalized on the basis of race, ethnicity, class and gender, an approach that evaluates its findings within the context of a gender

and development framework will contribute to a better understanding of women in community development in the U.S., and to a more expansive and nuanced understanding of women and development in general.

This research will also contribute to the growing but still limited body of literature about non-elite women's "grassroots" activism (Naples 1998a, 1998b; Marx Ferree and Yancey Martin 1995; Bookman and Morgan1988) and to an understanding of women's redefinition of "the political." Finally, it will contribute to a better understanding of what Naples has termed a "feminist democratic praxis" that is rooted in women's community work (1998b), and how, for poor and working-class women, "political consciousness is more a phenomena of relationships and connection than one of recognizing interests in the traditional individualistic sense. Through collaborative activity they engage in the democratic polity" (Ackelsberg 1988: 305).

Limits of Civil Society

For Putnam, strong civil society organizations create the "social capital" that is essential to "making democracy work" (1993). His study of Italian democracy, and his subsequent research on what he identifies as the "decline" of civic association and social capital in the United States (Putnam 2000, 1995), has spurred research and theoretical interest and engendered debate and criticism among scholars (McLean, Schultz and Steger 2002; Edwards, Foley and Diani 2001; Skocpol 1996; Skocpol and Fiorina 1999). Critics of Putnam's theory of the demise of civil society and the decline of social capital in the U.S. have pointed out that he may in fact be looking for evidence of civic

association in the wrong place (Skocpol 1996; Schudson 1996; Ehrenberg 1999). While the traditional membership associations that Putnam chooses to focus on, such as Rotary Clubs, the PTA and the Knights of Columbus may have declined, other types of organizations have flourished and new types of organizations have emerged that may even build social capital more effectively than those which he examines. Much of this analysis however, focuses on national level organizations and continues to ignore the study of groups at the local level. The community development organizations that are the focus of this research are examples of such vital but overlooked organizations.

Some scholars are critical of discussions of civil society and civic association and of Putnam's work in particular because they tend to obscure or minimize the role of the state and do not sufficiently explore the relationship between the state and civil society (Young 2000; Saegert, Thompson and Warren 2001). Phillips cautions that civil society can "become a code name for people assuming responsibility for their own lives" in ways which are unreasonable as the state assumes less responsibility for critical societal needs (2002 82). And, for Young, "[c]ivic activity cannot substitute for critical functions that state institutions have often fulfilled at least to some degree in twentieth-century democracies" (2000 189). The state may also be necessary to curb the influence of groups that may create social capital but are inward looking, exclusionary and that increase inequality, and therefore, do not promote justice (Young 2000; Phillips 2002).

In the American context, community organizations play an increasingly important role in social service provision and local development issues in which the state also has a keen interest and responsibility. Fostering stronger relationships between local

community organizations and government is important in part because communities alone do not have adequate resources to address existing, and in the case of women-led organizations, previously unacknowledged needs.

Women have mobilized to address the needs of their communities and have quickly realized that the inequality, marginalization and economic insecurity they confront have root causes that may be beyond their ability to address through "self-help," even as they implement innovative and successful development and social service programs. Theorists of democracy and civil society have made a case for both strong association and state action. Under these conditions it is important to investigate the relationship between the state and groups in civil society and the ways in which state and local policies may support, undermine, or be indifferent to community organizations.

Feminist, Women-led or Women-Focused Organizations

Although the organizations that are the subject of this study are women-led, this does not necessarily mean that they or their leaders are feminist. The distinction is important because only some of the leaders considered themselves or their organizations to be feminist. Although it is possible to analyze these groups and leaders from a feminist perspective, some of the leaders when originally interviewed went so far as to reject the idea that their community leadership could be seen as feminist. Despite the fact that their leadership and the work of their groups often challenged traditional expectations for women's participation, they were not always comfortable with the label feminist.

Within international gender and development discourse, distinctions are also drawn between women's organizations and explicitly feminist organizations. Groups may work to further the position of women, but may do so by pushing at the boundaries of culturally accepted norms, rather than seeking to entirely undermine them. Some women in the developing world are uncomfortable with the label "feminist" because of feminism's western origins and ethnocentrism. Here in the U.S. as well, not all women leaders were quick to embrace the label feminist even when their actions could be described as such. One faith-based leader in the south made the argument that she had only taken on this role because the men in her community had "abdicated their responsibility" to lead (Gittell, Ortega, Steffy, Interview 1997). Other leaders identified their work as fundamental to helping communities and families, but they did not embrace an explicitly feminist cause. The leaders of domestic violence shelters and several prominent CBOs offered a feminist assessment of the status of the development field and of the barriers they confront. But, some leaders surveyed said that they did not perceive gender to be a barrier or that the fact that they were women to have any particular bearing on their leadership.

Methodology

Site and Organization Selection for the WCDS

Early in the research design process for the original WCDS, the research team brought together a National Advisory Panel to consult regarding site selection and the identification of potential interviewee organizations and leaders. The Advisory Panel

was also asked to comment on the research protocols as they were developed by the team. In consultation with the Advisory Panel and the Ford Foundation, the Samuels Center and the McAuley Institute identified nine sites in which to conduct interviews. Sites were chosen that had the necessary concentration of women-led groups and to reflect regional and ethnic diversity and included both urban and rural areas. The nine sites selected for the study include seven urban and two rural areas: Boston; Chicago; El Paso; Houston; Oakland; Portland; Washington D.C.; the Mississippi Delta, which included Mississippi, Louisiana and Arkansas; and North Carolina which included Raleigh–Durham and the more rural areas of East North Carolina.

Organizations in each site were identified through reputational analysis utilizing McAuley's grantee lists, recommendations from the Ford Foundation and the Advisory Panel and groups identified from previous research at the Howard Samuels Center. Groups were selected for the study based on criteria established by Gittell and Covington (1994) that included having a female leader (Executive Director, Director, CEO, or manager) and a majority female board of directors, the desired threshold being 60 percent. The average gender composition for the boards of directors was 59 percent and 18 of the organizations had entirely female boards. In total, 115 groups were identified in the nine sites. Ninety-nine of these groups were women-led according to the criteria above. An additional 16 male-led groups were also identified (at least one in each site) where there was either a significant number of women on the board and staff, they had an innovative gender-focused program or they were a critically important group in the community. Additional background interviews were conducted in each site with individuals at key

intermediaries including local foundations and other intermediaries, local political or public officials and/or academics.

In addition to meeting the leadership criteria, organizations were selected to reflect a comprehensive definition of development which encompassed both physical and economic development as well as individual and community development. Therefore, the CDOs in this study include community development corporations, battered women's shelters and transitional housing groups, organizing and advocacy groups and other service providers as well as groups that combine several of these program areas. While at each organization, background materials including annual reports, research and other program material were gathered and basic organizational data (staff size, budget, and program information) were collected.

Once the interviews were completed and the preliminary findings were drafted, a focus group meeting that included at least one leader from each site and members of both research teams was held at the McAuley Institute. Additionally, a meeting with the Advisory Panel was held at the Ford Foundation and an annual women's development conference hosted by McAuley provided another opportunity for research team members and interviewees to discuss the findings before the final report was published.

Methodology for the Follow-Up Study

This current project returns to organizations and sites that participated in the WCDS to examine questions of organizational and leadership persistence and change and to revisit some of the findings of the original study. This follow-up study with women

leaders of community development groups in the U.S. will focus on the legacy and success of individual **women leaders** and the trajectory of the **organizations**, and will examine in greater depth the question of **network and relationship building** among the organizations, and between the organizations and local political leaders. This focus will enable me to further explore women's leadership in grassroots groups as well as the contribution of these civil society groups to local democracy. Specifically my research will question: **1)** the degree to which women-led organizations in civil society have been successful in building networks and relationships with local leaders; **2)** whether there has been leadership change and if so how this has effected organizational priorities and structure; **3)** the existence cause and impact of both internal changes (such as those in membership, board and staff, and in the level and types of participation) and external changes (such as fluctuations in funding, changes in the local political context, or the emergence of new local, state or federal initiatives); and **4)** the legacy of women's leadership to these groups and to the community.

My project's focus on networking grows out of some key findings from the original study. One such finding was the importance of horizontal networks to women-led community organizations and the high degree to which women-led groups fostered the development of networks through their collaborative work and participation in coalitions. A critical limitation that was identified in the original study was the underdevelopment, or lack of networks between women-led organizations and local political officials and funders. The conditions under which women-led organizations have been able to maintain existing networks and develop new ones is a central concern of this

research and is important because these networks can be "understood as the 'structural' elements of social capital" (Stone 2001).

The initial phase of the follow-up study involved contacting each group to determine 1) if it was still in operation and 2) what had happened to the leader who was interviewed ten years ago. Some background information on the organizations and local communities was collected during this phase. Internet, newspaper and other searches were also conducted in an attempt to locate leaders who were no longer with their organizations as well as to determine what had happened to the groups that were no longer operating.

In the second phase, surveys were mailed to the leaders of the groups which remained in operation (see Appendix C). Surveys were mailed only to the leaders of community based organizations; those who had been interviewed for the WCDS to provide local contextual and background data were not surveyed. A total of ninety-one surveys were mailed. After the initial mailing a reminder post-card was sent to each group. Subsequent to the initial mailing the survey was placed on-line (accessible only to the groups from the WCDS). For those leaders for whom I had current e-mail addresses, an e-mail was sent with instructions and a link to the survey. Those leaders for whom I did not have e-mail addresses were sent a letter by mail that included a link to the on-line survey and instructions. A total of twenty groups responded to the survey; eight by mail and twelve using the on-line survey.

Additional data on the organizations was gathered through available on-line sources such as annual reports and newsletters posted on-line or searchable data bases

such as IRS tax data for non-profits. Tax data in particular was used to confirm the closure of community based groups from the original sample as well as to determine the size of the budgets of the remaining organizations.

In the chapters that follow, the next addresses in more detail the literature on civil society, social capital and gender and development which guides this inquiry. In chapter three, the findings on organizational and leadership persistence and change are reported. Data from the survey are presented in chapters four and five; chapter four discusses the findings on program priorities, staff and funding; chapter five presents the findings on networking and collaboration among groups, and the key barriers that organizations and their leaders face. Finally chapter six offers some conclusions and reflections based on the data and analyses presented.

Chapter Two
Gender and Development, Civil Society and Social Capital

This research is informed by scholarship on civil society and social capital, participation in local democracy and gender and development. Although gender and development has been a major focus of scholarly interest since the 1970's, it has primarily focused on women in the developing world. In the west, feminist scholarship has often focused on women's political participation and has been less informed by gender and development scholarship than it has been by scholarship on democratic participation and local community organizing. The increasing economic and social marginalization of many women and their families in the U.S., over the last decade in particular, and the increasingly global factors that effect the economic and social status of women suggest that the discourse on gender and development and on women in community development and local politics in the U.S. increasingly overlap. One endeavor of this current research project is to further contextualize within the gender and development literature, the findings of the original WCDS research as well as the findings of this current study.

Another area of scholarship fundamental to this project is the literature on civil society and social capital. Following Putnam's definition of social capital, as "networks and norms that enable participants to act together effectively to pursue shared objectives" (1993) the WCDS argued that women were creating social capital and social change in their communities. To date, although there has been extensive criticism as well as an elaboration of his research on both social capital and civic associations, only recently has

a gender analysis of Putnam's work and its implications emerged (O'Neill and Gidengil 2005; Skocpol 1996; Gittell, Ortega Steffy1999; Arneill 2005; Schudson 1996). This research will add in particular to this scholarship, and will also respond to Putnam's (2007) most recent research that claims that diversity undermines social trust in communities. Civil society and social capital, and gender and development therefore serve as the key theoretical frameworks for this research.

Gender and Development

The subject of women in development has been an increasingly important focus of international scholarly research during the last 30 years and grew out of earlier theory and research on development. In the late 1950s and 1960's, the promotion of economic development in lesser-developed countries (LDCs) emerged as a central programmatic thrust of international organizations. Western-sponsored developmental aid programs were expected to help the LDCs begin to "catch-up;" these aid and development programs were largely "top-down" in nature and focused on bringing technological and scientific and other "advances" from the west to the developing world. From the vantage point of the West, lagging development in the Third World could be remedied through economic and technical aid; the developing world would "progress" as benefits trickled down to the poor.

By the 1970's, it was becoming evident that these programs had largely failed to produce expected development outcomes. It was also becoming increasingly apparent to many women scholars and activists in particular, that the programs that were supposed to

lead to better living conditions for all were having especially perverse effects on the lives of women. Mounting evidence revealed not only that women were not benefiting from these development strategies, but also that in some cases they were adversely affected by the development programs that were supposed to improve their living conditions (Tinker 1990; Moser 1993; Jaquette 1990). The impact of development programs on women, they argued, was simply not being considered. This alarming evidence of the unintended negative consequences of development programs for women caused some scholars to begin to examine more deeply the issue of women's roles in economic development.

Ester Boserup's study of development programs published in 1970 is widely credited with being the first to systematically examine the effects of international development programs from a gender perspective (Tinker 1990; Jaquette 1990; Moser 1993; Sen and Grown 1987; Snyder 1995). Boserup's analysis questioned the viability, efficacy and efficiency of development programs that did not specifically take into account the potential effects of these efforts on women's social and economic positions in their societies. As cash crop agriculture replaced subsistence farming and aid programs directed money and job creation exclusively toward men, women found themselves in an increasingly precarious economic and socially marginalized position. As Jacquette notes, Boserup's main contention was "that women's status in agricultural societies was positively correlated with their roles in food production and that as technologies advanced (and as *men* monopolized the more advanced technologies) women were increasingly marginalized from agriculture" (1990 54, emphasis in the original). The loss of status for women was also evident in urban centers as men moved into formal sector

employment while women were marginalized to the lowest paying formal sector employment and into jobs in the informal sector. Boserup's arguments provided a "political as well as an economic rationale for changing development policies,"(Jacquette 1990 54) which until that point had assumed that ultimately development efforts would benefit everyone in a given community.

Following Boserup's work and throughout the U.N.-declared Decade for Women from 1976 to 1985, scholarship on woman in development (WID) emerged as a key focus, particularly among western researchers, activists and practitioners. They called for greater inclusion of women in international development bureaucracies and in development programs (Staudt 1997; Jahan 1995). These efforts "put an emphasis on providing women with opportunities to participate in male-dominated and male oriented social and economic structure" but did not, at least initially, pose a direct challenge to the ideology underlying dominant development paradigms (Rathberger 1995 206).

Within this context, scholarly, practitioner and activist interest in WID grew. However, although western sponsored development efforts were increasingly led by, and targeted women, some women activists, practitioners and scholars, especially from developing nations, began to raise questions that challenged particular programs, prevailing approaches to development and the very meaning of development for women and for developing countries. If early efforts to address gender issues focused on moving women into development bureaucracies (Staudt 1997; Snyder 1995; Jahan1995) and increasing women's participation in programs at the local level by placing "women at the center," critiques of this approach argued that struggles over "feminizing" international

development bureaucracies largely missed the point. By simply fitting women into existing bureaucracies and programs, they argued, these efforts posed little challenge to the dominant development paradigms that were rooted in norms which perpetuated women's oppression. The western development model, whether led by women or men, was guilty of "stressing the individual rather than the community . . . and measure[d] progress of human beings and societies only in economic terms leaving out other human needs whether cultural, social, political or spiritual"(Bunch and Carillo 1990 75).

Although an improvement over previous development policies, women-led and women -focused development efforts that stressed inclusion and integration were ultimately problematic because they failed to take into account or reflect the needs, concerns, knowledge and experience of the very women these programs presumed to benefit. Feminist scholars and activists, especially those from developing countries, questioned not only development programs that are not designed and implemented by and for women, but also development programs which are imposed from abroad or do not come from "the bottom up" (Sen and Grown 1987; Bunch and Carillo1990). Because it relied on western conceptions of development, the WID approach was criticized as "not only hegemonic, but also running against fundamental values stressed by the women's movement: the need to listen to the disempowered along with a commitment to respect differences" (Bunch and Carillo 1990 75). This foundation would be the necessary basis of a new, more inclusive approach to development.

As an alternative to WID, the gender and development (GAD) school challenged the top-down development models and the assumptions about gender implicit in the

prevailing economic and development structures. The GAD school argued that it was necessary to understand gender-based barriers and constraints women faced. It saw "women as agents of change rather than merely as recipients of development assistance and stresses the need for women to organize themselves for effective political voice" (Rathberger 1995 206). Most importantly, it rejected any approach that promoted individual economic participation at the expense of the community and that ignored the need for broad societal (economic social and political) change, which some women-led groups were beginning to demand.

Women from developing countries began to move the discourse beyond considerations of the impact of programs on women or the inclusion of women in development bureaucracies, towards one that began with poor women who organized to pursue development according to their own vision and articulation of needs. One Third World women's group Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era (DAWN) asserted, "only by sharpening the links between inequality, development and peace can we show that the 'basic rights' of the poor and the transformation of the institutions that subordinate women are inextricably linked. They can be achieved together through the self-empowerment of women" (Sen and Grown 1987 82).

Many scholars, activists and practitioners, have broadened their focus, moving away from emphasizing a strategy of inclusion of women in development bureaucracies, toward a concern for the participation and empowerment of women at the local level. Their emphasis is based on the idea that "development theory and planning for women must exhibit greater sensitivity to difference and an awareness of multiple oppressions–

particularly race, class, ethnicity and gender–which define women's lives in the South (and minority women in the North)" (Parpart 1995 238). At its core, such an approach values the local experience, knowledge, organizing and activism of women in their various political economic and social contexts that have historically been considered a "barrier to development" by traditional development programs (Parpart 1995 229). When development programs were designed with technical precision by "experts," grassroots knowledge was often perceived to be a distraction that slowed progress. This early feminist critique of non-inclusive, top-down models of development has become more widely accepted by both gender and non-gender-focused development efforts. However, the discourse on gender and development continues to reemphasize the importance of women's economic, social and political participation as essential to development and to raise questions about the extent to which the necessary participation of women has been achieved.

Development, Participation and Empowerment

In the nearly four decades since Boserup's groundbreaking analysis there have been important changes in the thinking about women and development, moving from the idea of inclusion to an approach that views the empowerment and participation of local women as essential to successful development. Boserup's important insight, that economic development which does not explicitly include women could actually undermine women's economic, social and political status, has given way to a still more expansive view. This perspective holds that the prospects for achieving successful

development in general is itself hindered when women are not part of the development process at all levels (Kabeer 1994; Sen 2000). It has also come to be recognized that changes in women's social and political participation may also be necessary if development efforts are to be successful.

Feminist scholarship and women's activism have challenged dominant development paradigms. Empowering women to define and set the agenda and to participate at all levels of the community building and development process, has been central to the effort. According to Tinker:

> from its brief history, it becomes clear that there are many strands of women's rights bound up in the term women in development. The concept of ensuring women a fair stake in *economic development* carried with it the earlier ideas of legal *equality, education, employment* and *empowerment* (Tinker 1990 33, emphasis in the original).

This implies that women's economic status is linked to their social and political status in ways that may also require them to organize to press for widespread changes that can be difficult to achieve because of the ways in which they may challenge social and cultural norms.

Women's participation in the process of organizing change fosters a necessary sense of empowerment. As Tinker notes that "evaluations suggest that the simple fact of organizing is itself an empowering experience as women begin to share problems and to recognize they are not alone in their struggles to survive" (Tinker 1990 43). Organizing to address economic challenges becomes the basis for organizing to address the social and political roots of their marginalization. Participation in groups fosters empowerment. As Moser concludes:

> feminists. . . .recognize that fundamental changes for women cannot be based solely on increased income. Self-esteem plays and important role in women's potential to mobilize external strengths (such as wages, the persuasion of kin, community opinion). In addition, internal constraints (such as improving heath, education and income earning capacity) are also important in changing their situation.... The critical issue of increasing women's self-perception of their status and personal power has led to a focus on the role that the collective action of women's solidarity groups play. In the confrontation of the persistent reinforcement of inequalities, their activities are vital... (1993 27).

Kabeer identifies empowerment as an essential alternative approach to development emanating directly from the grassroots experience. This alternative approach is "based on close, face to face interaction between organizations and their constituencies so that the ideas and policies are shaped in the crucible of everyday practice rather than the upper echelons of remote and rule-bound bureaucracies"(1994 223). A focus on empowerment may require a longer and more complex process of identifying needs and designing and implementing programs because it requires the involvement of as many local stakeholders as is possible, not just "experts" and a few local officials or representatives.

The importance of empowerment and the participation of the local community at both the design and implementation phases of a program, have become more widely accepted by development practitioners (Esman and Uphoff 1984; Kabeer 1994; Freidman 1992, and for a mainstream example, see the *Inter-American Development Resource Book on Participation* 2005). Although empowerment has become a central theme of the development discourse it is clear that empowerment may mean different things to different constituencies. International NGO's and funders may talk about empowerment while continuing to hold on to set development agendas by attaching specific

requirements to funding or by making funding available for certain programs or groups but not for others. Increasingly however, the idea that development programs and their implementation must be grounded in grassroots, local knowledge has become more mainstream.

Development and Political Participation

Participation has become a key component of many development programs. But, early feminist critics of development argued that the thrust of efforts must be to change the development agenda so that it "gives women a stake in the political process" (Tinker 1990 53). Claiming a stake in the political process is critical because organizing and participation is key to overcoming the structural and cultural impediments to women. These barriers survived even as specific economic development programs proliferated. Thus many activist women at the local level recognized that economic development, advocacy, organizing and political participation are bound together. Recognition of that fact necessitates a new conception of development and a re-conception of methods of assessing development outcomes and program success. If programs are not participatory and are not grounded in the locally defined and expressed needs of women they will reproduce and exacerbate their economic, social and political marginalization.

More recently, thanks to "an increasing recognition among [the] international community of women's historic exclusion from structures of power, a global commitment has been made to redress gender imbalance in politics"(Bari 2005 1). But promoting women's participation in formal politics to date has had only limited success;

currently women's participation in parliament exceeds 33 percent in only twelve countries (to say nothing of women's participation in non-democratic countries). Nine of those twelve countries also score high in terms of measures of human development (Bari 2005), adding further weight to the argument that women's economic and social well-being is associated with their political involvement; indeed "women's enhanced participation in governance structures is viewed as the key to redress gender inequalities in societies" (Bari 2005 1).

The emphasis on the centrality of political struggle and the necessity of its local, national and global character is now shared by other non-gender specific development approaches that recognize that equitable and successful development will require the political participation of previously marginalized groups. The Alternative Development approach which arose in the 1990s, builds on gender and development scholarship. Similarly, it is characterized by a focus on empowerment and politics (Friedman 1992). It is ". . . an expression of militant civil society, [and] is political to the core. Its politics asserts universal human rights and the particular rights of citizens in given political communities, especially the rights of the people heretofore without voice, the disempowered poor, who constitute a majority" (Friedman 1992 vii). Alternative Development is consistent with, and echoes feminists' concerns about, inclusive, locally defined, participatory development, and recognizes that comprehensive political organizing and activism are necessary at all levels in order to achieve inclusive and lasting social change.

The local is the critical and fundamental starting point, from which wide-ranging arenas of activism and contestation become interconnected. Friedman explains that:

> These conflicts cannot be contained locally. They are likely to spill over into regional and national political arenas. A politics of claiming is inherent in an alternative development, which is always about the use of *common* resources (usually controlled by the state) and the removal of those structural constraints that help to keep the poor poor. If an alternative development is to advocate the social empowerment of the poor, it must also advocate their political empowerment (1992 7, emphasis in the original).

Alternative Development requires organizing, activism and political participation engaged with the state to create change. Alternative Development envisions a "grass-roots politics" and an active civil society but also demands a strong central state acting to promote space for local engagement. In Friedman's view, this "strong state" should act to implement policies but

> . . . is not top heavy with an arrogant and cumbersome bureaucracy; it is, rather an agile and responsive state, accountable to its citizens. It is a state that rests on the strong support of an inclusive democracy in which the powers to manage problems that are best handled locally have been devolved to local units of governance and to the people themselves, organized in their own communities (1992 35).

Democratic localism -- participation in local politics and policy making is necessary to create policy that is responsive to the needs and demands of all stakeholders (Gittell 1997). Women, like male stakeholders, must therefore be able to inform the creation of policy. Although Friedman's focus on the state's role is to remind us of its role in promoting or hindering economic equality, changes in women's status – economic, social and political— also depend on a more active and responsive state and the state's pursuit of equity in response to local organization and pressure. For individuals marginalized on

the basis of gender, race, ethnicity, or class an active and responsive state must be called upon to address claims of equity and justice (Young 2000).

Women and Development in the International Context and in the U.S.

For the most part, gender and development scholarship has focused on women in the developing world. Women in Western countries may most often be used as a point of (favorable) comparison in terms of their political and legal rights and participation or their social and economic status. U.N. and western development specialists have most often focused on issues of economic, political and social marginalization where they perceive the problem to be most egregious; this rarely includes their own back yards. Certainly, the social, economic and political status of women is far from uniform and varies both across and within the countries of the developed west. As Sen (2000) notes, economic development has not been sufficient to alleviate poverty even for those who live in developed countries and an examination of "problems" of development may be just as important for those in the west as it is for those the developing world. He argues for example, that economic and social groups such as the poor or African-Americans in the U.S. may have a higher income relative to their counterparts in the developing world, but that their actual standard of living and life chances may in fact be worse in comparison. Comparisons between the relative condition of some women in the U.S. and in developing countries are just as apt.

The relative material condition of women varies, however, despite living in a wealthy nation, women in the U.S. are socially, economically and politically

marginalized. In the U.S., the national poverty rate was 12.6 percent in 2005 (*U.S. Census Bureau*), but for African Americans the rate was 24.9 percent and for Hispanics, 21.8 percent. Poverty levels also varied regionally with pockets of poverty in the Deep South and Texas, for example, in excess of 50 percent, and a poverty rate in New York City of 20 percent. In some areas of Detroit, the poverty level is as high as 80 percent (Sugrue 1998). Furthermore, almost 18 percent of children under eighteen live in poverty, many as the result of living in a female-headed household. In addition, although they have the legal right to political participation, poor and minority voters in the U.S. face significant barriers.

Like their counterparts in the developing world, women have organized to confront their political and economic marginalization. Just as in developing counties women are organizing to create real and lasting structural changes to challenge the status quo through participation, democratization, community organizing and a strengthening of civil society and civic institutions. Not only are such efforts necessary to bring about improvements in economic conditions and greater social and political equity, they are also necessary if development efforts are to reflect the needs and concerns of local stakeholders.

Women are key actors in these development efforts both abroad and in the U.S. and their full participation will necessitate changes on many fronts: in decision making structures and processes, in articulation of objectives and agenda setting, in prioritization of strategies, in positioning of gender issues amidst competing emerging concerns and in building a mass base of support among both men and women. Agenda setting implies

leadership and women will have to play a proactive role. Only through a voice in decision making can women aspire to shape the objectives, priorities and strategies of development and start to transform the development agenda (Jahan 1995 126-127). This is as true for women in the U.S. as it is for women outside the U.S., who have traditionally been considered to be at the center of the debate over, and study of, gender and development.

Women-led Groups and Programs: Under-Funded and Undervalued

In both the U.S. and in the developing world, women's development efforts tend to be under-funded and undervalued. Despite the evidence of their necessity and effectiveness, the U.N. and other funding bureaucracies have often considered women-led and women focused programs to be outside the mainstream of development (Tinker 1990; Jacquette 1990; Snyder 1995; Jahan 1995; Kabeer 1994). Tinker notes that,

> since women-only programs have generally been small and underfunded and were widely perceived of as being welfare oriented by definition, they have remained outside the mainstream of national economic planning. Practitioners have documented that only when women's issues were integrated into regular development programming would such programs have either the prestige or the resources adequate to the task (Tinker 1990 39).

In the U.S. as well, even where women-led groups and programs have demonstrated their effectiveness, these groups and programs also tend to be under-funded and misunderstood by funders and intermediaries (Gittell, Ortega and Steffy 1999; Ostrander 1998). One study of women-focused organizations in the U.S. concluded that "finding support for any kind of activity targeted at women and girls, and finding support for organizing and

advocacy [that supports women and girls] in particular. . .are both especially challenging"(Ostrander 1998 37).

Once programs have been implemented, measurement of outcomes is often critical to securing future funding. Evaluations of the outcomes of development and other social programs in both the U.S. and abroad have also been problematic because they have often employed only limited measures of concrete outputs such as housing units or job creation, rather than utilizing other less tangible measures such as organizing, advocacy and empowerment. This is of particular concern from a gender perspective because some of the work of a group or the outcomes reported may not fit neatly into a quantifiable category. The cost-benefit analysis that is often the basis for the evaluation of many programs is highly constraining and can obscure some of both the costs and benefits to women.

As Kabeer notes, "economists recognize only those costs and benefits which can be given a market price...increases in productivity will count as a benefit but increases in autonomy will not; increases in the wage component of the project will count as a cost but the increase in the workloads of women as a result of the project will not" (1994 xvi). The challenge therefore, "is to conceptualize and measure the intangible goals of development – in particular, autonomy and equity" (Kabeer 1994 xvi).

Like their counterparts elsewhere, women in the U.S. have begun to argue that new standards of "success" must take into consideration the individual and leadership development, organizing and networking aspects of their work in addition to the more quantifiable outcomes of development programs. Such a change would require a

reexamination of what the process of development means in different contexts and for different people and ultimately must involve at every level of the process women of varying race, ethnicity and class perspectives. New understandings and measures of successful development would include an analysis of the processes and politics of development and the degree to which women participate in or are marginalized from it. Measures of increases in per capita income or in number of housing units built cannot take sufficient account of other fundamental issues of development including organizing, advocacy, networking and other community building efforts upon which women-led efforts depend.

To at least some degree, in every society women confront structural sexism. This marginalization results in large numbers of women being among the poor and those who are excluded from political and economic power. Internationally, lessons have been learned about the importance of supporting participation by and valuing the knowledge and experience of women. It has become more widely recognized that "the changing agency of women is one of the major mediators of economic and social change, and its determination as well as consequences closely relate to many of the central features of the development process" (Sen 2000 202). International development policies as well as financial institutions have recognized that women are a key source of potential for development and that women and women-led efforts must be funded directly because it is predominantly women who do the work. Although there is a strong tradition of women's community activism in the U.S., among funders, intermediaries and government officials in the community development field the lessons learned from the

examination of the participation of women in development internationally have yet to be fully understood.

The Women and Community Development Study recognized that women of color and poor women face gender, race and class based oppression which are often deeply intertwined. The findings of the WCDS also demonstrate that for women in the U.S., like their counterparts elsewhere, development means more than a simple economic calculation or quantitative measures of outcomes. Their understanding of development and community building includes empowerment, building confidence and self-esteem, and the creation of personal and organizational networks from which women draw support and which are the foundation of their organizing and development efforts. Such findings clearly resonate with the insights of scholars of women in development in the third world (Kabeer 1994; Bunch and Carillo 1990). Women in the U.S. value the empowerment and network building aspects of their work as much as the more traditional concrete economic outcomes of their efforts. At the same time, like their counterparts in the developing world, U.S. women's efforts to set the agenda and establish and measure the outcomes of their efforts have not always been recognized.

Civil Society and Social Capital

Putnam's (1993) analysis of Italian democracy in *Making Democracy Work*, in particular, is a jumping off point for much of the recent discussion of civil society, especially among scholars of community development and activism in the U.S., and has attracted considerable critical attention. Putnam's conclusion that the proliferation of

associations in civil society and the "social capital" they create strengthens democratic institutions and democratic culture leading to robust well-functioning democracies, has led to further research looking for evidence of social capital and its effects. In the community development arena, foundations and funders have seized upon the language and ideas emanating from the discussion of civil society and utilized building social capital as a central organizing theme for efforts to promote community development. Most recently, evaluations which examine where social capital is to be found, where it is lacking and how it can be strengthened, have begun to emerge.

In light of global trends toward democratization, Young (2000) notes that some have enthusiastically identified the role that civil society has played in everything from transitions to democracy especially from communist and totalitarian regimes in Eastern Europe to the end of apartheid rule in South Africa. In these transitions, opposition to ruling regimes arose from civil society, leading to regime changes without wide-spread violence. In addition, "many claim for civil society a central role in promoting democracy and social welfare under constitutionalist regimes as well. Civil society promotes trust, choice and the virtues of democracy" (Young 2000 155). While some have argued for a vital and essential role for civil society almost uncritically, others have recently begun to remind us to pay attention to the relationship between civil society and government and of the importance of the role of effective and responsive government institutions where issues of economic and social inequality are of concern.

Much of this scholarship explores civil society/government relations and the implications for democracy from various theoretical perspectives and pose important

critiques. But it is also important to consider civil society, democracy, associations and participation in the U.S. and to specifically consider women's leadership and activism in the context of race, ethnicity and class based marginalization. Among community development practitioners, foundations and other funders the language of the current discussions of civil society/government relations, permeates the community development discourse. In addition, a number of foundations and intermediaries have in recent years undertaken major initiatives focused on strengthening civil society through programs of "community asset building" and supporting local community organizations.[2] Key issues such as a consideration of associations and civil society in the context of inequality must be addressed. A discussion of civil society must also be concerned with issues of the gendered nature of civil society as well as the implications of marginalization based on class, race and ethnicity.

Although Putnam's work has attracted criticism, it has also prompted further examination of civil society, especially its implications for racially and economically marginalized comminutes. Importantly, as Saegert, Thompson and Warren remind us, "making use of social capital as an analytical construct requires a shift from the individual to the community as a unit of analysis for strategies to combat poverty. Social Capital is a collective asset, a feature of communities rather than the property of an individual" (2002 1). As the focus has shifted from individuals to communities and from what is lacking to a consideration of a community's strengths, there has been a re-framing of solutions that "suggest a shift toward seeing the poor as active agents in the

2 (see for example the Ford Foundation's initiatives on community asset building and organizing or the Aspen Institute's civil society projects)

betterment of their communities" opposed to previous approaches which focused primarily on enumerating a community's deficiencies (Saegert, Thompson and Warren 2002 1).

Putnam argues that associations in civil society strengthen democratic culture and institutions, but he has been criticized for failing to sufficiently differentiate and assess which organizations contribute more than others to the creation of social capital and a strong civil society. In *Inclusion and Democracy*, Iris Young (2000) begins to further define associations in civil society and to clarify their role in democratic practice. In her conceptualization, levels of associative activity are distinguished from one another, ". . . because the distinction shows that some kinds of association may not enhance democracy very much or help change those structures that inhibit capabilities" (Young 2000 162). Not all forms of association foster democracy equally and in fact, she argues, some forms which are not sufficiently outward focused and inclusive may actually inhibit democracy. Young identifies three levels of associative activity in Civil Society: private associations such as families, clubs, and religious organizations which she describes as "inward-looking and particularist"; political associations which ". . . aim to influence state policy formation or implementation" (2000 163); and civic association which are outward-focused and ". . .aim to serve not only members, but also the wider community. Civic associations claim to make some contribution to the collective life of the neighborhood, city, country and to world" (2000 161). Excessive private association, Young argues, could actually be harmful to democracy: "Too much private association relative to civil and political association... may weaken democracy and concern for social justice because

people and groups [in private associations] may care little for outsiders and indeed may be hostile to others"(2000 162).

Young also argues that Putnam's concept of associationalism and participation is too broad because it "appears to include a great variety of groups and activities from church groups to unions to reading the newspaper" (2000 162). A more focused examination, differentiating among associations as well as a better understanding of how inequality and marginalization affect civil society is necessary to more fully understand various types of associations' implications for democracy. Putnam's writing on American politics suggests a decline in organization membership and activism evidenced by a decline in traditional kinds of social organizations and associational activities, leading to an overall decline in social capital. He describes "bowling alone" as a shift from social and associational experiences to individual activity, thus diminishing social capital (Putnam 1995). Many critics of Putnam's conclusion regarding the U.S. experience, however, suggest that he underestimates new kinds of self help and social organizations, public interest groups and community development organizations. Putnam has also been criticized for a lack of sufficient class analysis and for knowing little about poor communities, and communities of color.

Feminists have raised questions about the gender implications of civil society. While some have, as Phillips (2002) argues, remained silent on the question of civil society or dismissed it as inherently problematic for feminism, others have been troubled by women's exclusion from civil society under traditional conceptualizations of family-state-civil society relations, and the exclusionary and discriminatory practices of some

groups which proliferate in civil society. Traditionally, the Hegelian division of family, state and civil society saw women excluded from both the state and civil society but more modern understandings of civil society have come to encompass the associational activity in which women often participate. Indeed women's participation in "non-state", "non-family" associations in civil society ". . .was hugely important to the development of nineteenth century feminism. . . . both historically and today, civil society can be said to be peculiarly important to the feminist project"(Phillips 2002 73). For many feminists there is a tension between the "independence for civil society as a relatively 'free space' for women's activism and collective self-discovery free from state regulation and government patronage," and the state's sometimes necessary power to "subject the associations of civil society to public norms of equality" to counteract the "deeply gendered character of many associations and the coercive nature of private–that is nongovernmental– power" (Rosenblum 2002 153).

Feminism may have an uneasy relationship with civil society. As Phillips argues however, according to modern conceptions, civil society is appealing to feminism for at least two reasons: first because the "feminist perspective is radically pluralist, and pluralism flourishes more readily in the associations of civil society than in either the family or the state. . . [and]. . . second [because] some of the associations that spring up in civil society have a looseness, even an indeterminacy, that makes them particularly hospitable to feminist politics"(2002 76-77). Because feminism is about "transformation and about articulating previously unheard voices, exposing previously unchallenged bias, and rewriting political agendas" (2002 77), civil society is where women can express

their needs and make demands for change. Ultimately civil society matters, Phillips argues, "because programs for radical change have to capture people's hearts and minds and cannot depend just on directives issuing from the state"(2002 79). In addition to the theoretical and historical evidence of the importance of the relationship of feminism and civil society, there is at least one other compelling reason for feminists to be interested in civil society: the simple fact that even given its limitations, from an empirical perspective, this is where women are active and organizing to create social change especially when they are marginalized.

Often lost in the current celebratory discussion of civil society is an acknowledgement of its limitations and a recognition that there remains an important (and at various times necessary) role for the state. Feminists, of course, have called upon the state to pursue equity polices which reflect their interests. While the state alone cannot be relied upon, "feminists have. . . been happy to seize any opportunities offered via equality legislation of affirmative action for promoting sexual equality"(Phillips 2002 79). It is clear that state action alone is not sufficient. As Phillips argues, feminists are,

> . . . more attuned than some other traditions to the power of culture in regulating social relations, they have also been acutely aware that strategies for change have to intervene on a number of levels. This is not necessarily (indeed rarely) discussed under the rubric of civil society, but it does have the effect of directing feminism away from an exclusively state-centric politics and highlighting the role of nongovernmental associations and groups (2002 79).

If feminism might appear to have a greater interest in civil society than in the state, it must also be recognized that there is also the conflicting concern raised by the "crucial problem with civil society: that it often operates to keep women out" (Phillips 2002 80).

Gender, Social Capital and the Limits of Civil Society

The concept of social capital and Putnam's arguments regarding its uses and its overall decline has been the subject of criticism. Feminist critics have suggested that by failing to examine social capital from a gender perspective, he may overestimate the contributions of progressive era fraternal organizations to building social capital and that his assessments have also failed to comprehend the differences in the way men and women (and others who are marginalized) may use social capital to different ends (see O'Neill and Gidengil 2005). A gendered analysis, such critics argue, would provide a more thorough understanding of the uses, benefits and limits of social capital, a better appreciation of how it can be fostered, as well as a more nuanced assessment of the status of social capital and civic associations in the U.S.

From a feminist perspective, as Lowndes argues ". . . empirically, the concept seems attractive for the attention it directs toward the intersection between community life and politics, toward informal as well as formal domains of political activity" (2005 215) which fits comfortably within feminist scholarship. The concept of social capital has the potential to highlight the social, economic and political relationships in which women participate, particularly at the community level. For a number of reasons however, research and "… measures of social capital have focused on groups and activities that may obscure the ways women participate and build social capital" (Lowndes 2005 215). Following Putnam's definition of social capital as the "features of social organization, such as networks, norms and social trust that facilitate coordination

and cooperation for mutual benefit" (1995 35-36), the WCDS, found that women leaders and women-led organizations were creating social capital in their communities. These findings to some degree belie Putnam's contention that in the U.S., social capital, and the civic associations that build it are in decline because the research focuses specifically on the activities and groups that Putnam has overlooked.

Putnam's negative assessment of the current status of social capital in the United States is based on what one feminist critic asserts is Putnam's assumption of a "mythical paradise from which we have declined" (Arneill 2005). Putnam cites the turn of the 20th Century as the key moment in the development of fraternal organizations in the U.S. He views these groups as central in the creation of social capital, but, as some critics have suggested, he fails to address some of the more negative aspects of these groups. As Arneill, argues,

> Putnam's underlying thesis is that the shift from the laissez-faire Gilded Age to the socially concerned Progressive Era was a *positive* development that brought about greater equality between the classes through 'non-political' or civic associations…. [but] … it is clear that these associations are indeed *political* rooted in the very powerful forces of exclusion and assimilation that inscribed individual lives along certain religious, cultural and gendered lines (2005 18, emphasis in the original).

Although these groups may have helped to build social capital among certain groups of white men, from a gender perspective, these fraternal organizations may reinforce gender, race and class divisions because "fraternalism from its inception is not simply about building social connections between men, but also about excluding women, and some racially defined men from the 'brotherhood'"(Arneill 2005 19). Such exclusion may undermine social capital for some as it builds social capital for others. Further still,

among marginalized groups, new social capital building associations may emerge in order to contend with, or even confront exclusion.

The focus on traditional, exclusively white male organizations tells us little of the activities of women and minorities (Skocpol 1996). Such an understanding is necessary to assess both the extent to which social capital is or is not in decline, and the ways in which social capital can be used by different groups in different contexts. Putnam's lack of a gender focus may also serve to skew his sample of associations away from the types of organizations in which women often participate (and build social capital). An assessment of his study of Italian democracy found, for example, "of the local associations considered by Putnam…, 73 percent were sports clubs whilst only 1 percent were concerned with health or social services" (Lowndes 2005 215). In addition to obscuring gender dynamics, Putnam's focus on such organizations in the U.S. may also direct attention to whites and the middle class obscuring poor and minority community activities, presenting an incomplete picture of associations and social capital.

Feminists have also been critical of Putnam's (2000) earlier implications that part of the erosion in social capital in the U.S. is due the fact that women, thanks to their increased participation in the workforce, no longer have the time to participate in social capital building local organizations such as the Parents and Teachers Association (PTA) or to host dinner parties and organize events. This argument fails to take into account new forms of association in which women might participate. Indeed while Putnam finds that women's participation in associations has declined at an even greater rate than men's, a study in Britain suggests that between 1973 and 1990 declines in men's

participation were in fact off-set by the increase of women's participation (Hall cited in Lowndes 2005).

In addition to critiques that argue Putnam's research may over look the types of associations and activities in which women tend to participate, feminists have also suggested that a gendered understanding of social capital is necessary in order to understand where and how women may build it and use it in ways that are different from men. As one critic observes, "men and women seem to have similar levels of social capital, but it appears that women are not spending their social capital on the formal political arena" (Lowndes 2005 230). Women may instead use social capital in less-formal ways. As Lowndes explains, women's social capital is used for "getting by rather than getting on;" they are "catalyzing informal activity in the immediate community, and to providing a resource for their own and their families' health and well being" (2005 230).

Women tend to participate most actively at the local level. A study of women and social capital in Britain found that "women's social capital appears to be more strongly embedded in neighbor-hood specific networks of informal sociability" and that "women's activity falls off as activity becomes more formalized and overtly political" (Lowndes 2005 228). Women's participation in formalized political activity may be limited both by their roles as care givers and by the tendency of "men to spend women's social capital in order to get ahead in the political realm" (Lowndes 2005 228). Similarly, the WCDS study that found women were building social capital and using it in their local communities rather than using it as a spring board for elective office and other formal

participation. Certainly their activities and their demands for economic and social change are political, but "there is evidence that women's social capital can support a different type of local politics, one that is rooted in trust and mutuality, and builds on informal community connections" (Lowndes 2005 234).

From a gender perspective, in order to study associations and social capital we must also ask questions about power and purpose. What types of associations are being created and to what end? How do these associations relate to others? Social capital may have a different value or purpose depending on who is using it and in what context it is being used:

> Social Capital, when you are in a position of power, is a largely positive thing aimed at solidifying trust and cooperation amongst the members of the already powerful groups and community at large. If on the other hand you lack power, than social capital will be used for very different purposes; those excluded from power often do not see their goal as *solidifying* the existing status quo but *challenging* the very premises upon which the community, including its boundaries and membership are defined (Arneill 2005 20 emphasis in the original).

Granoveter (1973) distinguishes between "bonding social capital" and "bridging social capital"; the former refers to networks of relationship within a group and the later refers to networks across groups (Gittell and Vidal 1998). Within a group, strong relationships, networks and trust may be a resource that can be used to challenge their exclusion. It may also be necessary, however, to build networks with groups outside an immediate community in order to achieve broader social or political change. A failure to include community based organizations, particularly those of women, minorities and the economically disadvantaged is necessary to fully assess social capital and civil society.

Young (2000) is critical of Putnam's and others' discussion of civil society and civic associations because she believes they tend to obscure or minimize the role of the state and do not sufficiently explore the relationship between the state, civil society and the economy. In her conceptualization, these elements of the social system serve to counterbalance each other. Young conceives of a strong, active and responsive state; a market and civil society with differing imperatives thereby leading them to check power where necessary. In addition, she is concerned that civic associations themselves are susceptible to hierarchilizing tendencies which they must guard against. Civic organizations must be independent and resist the coercive power of the state, though close association with state is necessary. The relationship between civil society and the state in a democracy is complex and in her conceptualization there is a clear role for the state and civic associations "...[C]ivic activity" she states, "cannot substitute for critical functions that state institutions have often fulfilled at least to some degree in twentieth-century democracies"(2000 189). State power is necessary, for example, to control markets because civil society is insufficient on its own to control them. State power is also necessary to direct economic development on a large scale and may also be necessary to curb the influence of inward, exclusionary social capital which increases inequality, and does not promote justice. Young ". . .argue[s] against those who suggest that civil society serves as a preferred alternative to the state today for promoting democracy and social justice. State institutions have unique capacities for co-ordination, regulation, and administration on a large scale that a well-functioning democracy cannot do without" (2000 156).

While state policies have been necessary to promote and enforce equality, the state can also have a detrimental impact on civil society. Some national policies have fostered or impeded the development of strong alternative civil societies. Diverse, active and effective organizations are necessary to encourage state action to promote and ensure social justice. As Saegert, Thompson and Warren note,

> social capital is not an alternative to providing greater financial resources and public services to poor communities. Rather, it constitutes an essential means to increase such resources and to make more effective use of them. This perspective differs from one that counterposes community self-help to government action (2002 2).

Fostering better functioning relationships between local communities and governments remains a critical project. Ultimately the resources of the state must be brought to bear in the community because the community alone will not have the resources to adequately address every need.

Positing an active role for the state – a responsive, participatory and effective state— should in no way preclude the flourishing of an equally rich participatory and effective civil society. However, a better understanding of the differences among groups is needed in order to differentiate the ways in which groups build or impede social capital, because it is the existence of the social capital created by groups in civil society create which is credited with strengthening democracy and communities. Empirical evidence is beginning to emerge that suggests that some organizations do more to produce social capital than others (Gittell 1997; Saegert, Thompson, Warren 2002; Stolle and Rochon 2001) and that not all organizations contribute positively to democratic culture. There is evidence that "some forms of social capital are highly exclusionary,

narrow in group orientation, or in other ways contrary to community well-being and the public good" (Saegert, Thompson and Warren 2002 7).

Increasingly the "dark side of social capital" has been acknowledged (Fiorina 1999; Cohen 1999; Arneill 2005). Greater emphasis must be placed on understanding the differences in the accumulation of social capital by different segments of society and especially how, and under what circumstances, they convert social capital to political and civic action. From a political perspective, this means understanding how organizations and groups of associations use social capital to achieve power and create social change.

In addition to the state, there are other influences on the development of local organizations which can effect the creation of social capital and influence the potential for political action. Intermediary organizations, an important part of civil society, are a key mechanism in the historical development and structure of local groups and their imprint on social change and social capital creation has not been adequately researched. Foundations, state and national associations, professional organizations and other not-for-profits have proliferated over the years, and we need to describe how they have influenced the development of social capital in local groups or whether they detract from its creation by their funding arrangements and agenda priorities. Funding by governments and foundations can encourage certain groups to organize and compete with each other, which can result in a lack or trust, undermining or discouraging potential networks for political and social action.

A focus on participation in associations, which differentiates between the types and purposes of such associations, is necessary to fully understand and evaluate civil

society's role in strengthening democracy. It is also necessary to evaluate and assess the degree to which community association translates into political action to attack the root causes of exclusion and poverty, which of course, do not lie solely in the local community. Action at the local level is fundamental, but connections at the regional and national level that promote action through networks among groups are also needed to achieve broad societal change. However, strategies to combat poverty and create change must be centered in the local community

> . . . since the local roots provide intimate knowledge, trust, and a respect for the diverse needs of communities. Cooperation finds and important foundation in the face-to face interaction, and in the socializing institutions that operate best at the local level. But effective strategies at the national level will also be necessary to generate power and change. Community is not limited to the local level, nor should it be (Saegert, Thompson and Warren 2002 12).

Networking among community activists can lead to large-scale political action. However, this resource remains underdeveloped and ". . . most community-building efforts with strong local roots lack much national coherence" (Saegert, Warren and Thompson 2002 12).

The connections between local social capital, local political action and its potential to help create more far reaching political and social change for marginalized communities is an area of analysis which demands further examination. Essential to an understanding and appreciation of the political role of local organizations in a democracy is an understanding of how groups engage in self-governance, promote participation and shared values and encourage the building of networks and pursuit of common purpose through discourse and civic action. It is clear that there is much to be refined and more

fully examined in the discourse on Civil Society and the role of associations at the local level. Efforts are beginning to be made to refine the concept of social capital, further define its importance to community building and democracy and to understand how and where social capital translates into political action (Stone 2001; O'Neill and Gidengil 2005). One important part of the analysis must be further examination the ways in which building social capital can translate into political power to change the underlying conditions of poverty. Building social capital is a strategy; it cannot be a replacement for effective government and strong institutions. The virtue of civil society is that

> the self-organization of marginalized people into affinity grouping enables people to develop a language in which to voice experiences and perception that cannot be spoken in prevailing terms of political discourse. At the same time civil activity autonomous from the state provides a base for social innovation and the provision of goods and services less dominated by profit imperatives than conventional private enterprises"(Young 2000 155).

Therefore, associations in civil society are therefore in a unique position to influence both private economic enterprises and government institutions.

This argument is made all the more relevant by Putnam's latest research that assesses the impact of diversity on social trust in the United States. In reporting his most recent findings, Putnam (2007) takes pains to defend the importance of diversity. This is primarily because his latest study that continues to examine social capital – how it has declined, where it is strong -- has revealed that social trust (a measure and expression of social capital) is strongest where communities are most homogenous. In other words distrust is high in diverse communities. Diversity has negative implications for trust, not only between different groups but also within groups: "diversity seems to trigger *not* in-

group/out-group division, but anomie or social isolation" (2007 149). People who live in diverse communities he says "appear to 'hunker down"; to pull in like a turtle" (2007 149).

What this portends for the future and for social capital is troubling because as a nation, indeed as a world, we are becoming more diverse. Immigration is increasing not just to the U.S. but also to the historically more ethnically homogenous states of Europe, and to areas beyond the U.S. and Europe as well. Putnam is also particularly concerned that given the current anti-immigrant sentiment in the U.S., his findings may be used to bolster claims for exclusionary, anti-immigrant policies. In presenting his findings Putnam makes three primary claims:

> Ethnic diversity will increase substantially in virtually all modern societies over the next several decades….Increased immigration and diversity are not only inevitable, but over the long run they are also desirable. Ethnic diversity is, on balance an important social asset…. (2007 138)
>
> In the short to medium run… immigration and ethnic diversity challenge social solidarity and inhibit social capital (2007 138).
>
> In the medium to long run … successful immigrant societies create new forms of social solidarity and dampen the negative effects of diversity by constructing new more encompassing identities. Thus the central challenge for modern diversifying societies is to create a new, broader sense of 'we' (2007 138-139).

Concerned that the only idea readers will take from the points above is that immigration and diversity undermine social trust, Putnam stresses the long-term positive effects of diversity including the idea that diversity is associated with greater creativity and problem solving. Immigration is also generally associated with greater economic

development in the "host" country and immigrants from the developing world have been necessary to meet labor needs in developed countries. Immigration has benefits for the "home" countries as well; remittances to the global south from the global north are a vital source of economic support to families of immigrants and to the national economies of developing nations. Therefore, increased diversity is not something to be rejected –even if that were possible— but it is something ultimately to be embraced as potentially beneficial to all parties to the process. The problem of course, is in getting to the "long-run" because his findings anticipate "short-run" troubles.

In the short run, Putnam finds that high levels of social trust are associated with high levels of racial and ethnic homogeneity in a given community. Thus, the areas with the highest levels of trust are places such as, North Dakota, New Hampshire, and Montana. Areas of racial and ethnic diversity such as San Francisco, Houston and Los Angeles exhibit low levels of social trust. Perhaps even more troubling in diverse communities trust declines across all groups; "Americans distrust not merely people who do not look like then, but even people who *do*" (2007 148). In contrast to the arguments of the "contact hypothesis" on the effects of diversity – that exposure to others who are not like us leads to greater tolerance— Putnam argues that his findings show that diversity instead leads to social isolation.

There are further potential negative consequences in that proximity to others who are different can also lead to conflict between different groups – the "conflict hypothesis" — further eroding individual's and groups' trust of others. Potentially, though, diversity can lead to increases and/or decreases in social capital, either positive or

negative, depending on the type of social capital in question. Conflict between groups may increase bonding social capital, or "in-group" trust, while decreasing bridging social capital, or trust between different groups. But Putnam reminds us the relationship between bridging and bonding capital is not necessarily inversely proportional, nor is bonding capital necessarily detrimental, indeed some bonding capital may be a necessary foundation for inter-group trust or bridging social capital.

Social capital, Putnam argues benefits communities and the individuals who live in them in a number of important ways. When comparing communities with strong social capital to those with weak social capital, Putnam argues that "…much evidence suggests that where levels of social capital are higher, children grow up healthier, safer and better educated, people live longer, happier lives and democracy and the economy work better" (Putnam 2007 138). Putnam now acknowledges that "not all networks have exactly the same effects: friends may improve health, whereas civic groups strengthen democracy," (2007 138) but, in normative terms, social capital is a good thing which benefits individuals, communities and society as a whole.

Putnam utilizes extensive survey data and even looks to others' measures of social capital but no matter what factors he controls for (socioeconomic status, age, and length of residence in the community) the negative relationship between diversity and social trust persists. The fact is that increased diversity is not only inevitable, it is currently a reality for most large communities in the U.S. Trust is, of course, a relationship— one that is usually established over time. So, given the negative effects of diversity in the short run, the critical question is how communities get to the "long-run" where trust

between groups is prevalent. Putnam recognizes that groups can facilitate trust building. They help take the isolated interests of the marginalized and the new bringing them into a larger community. His field studies suggest that

> . . . locally based programs to reach out to new immigrant communities are a powerful tool for mutual learning. Religious institutions - and in our era, as a century ago, especially the catholic Church – have a major role to play in incorporating new immigrants and then forging shared identities across ethnic boundaries. Ethnically defined social groups…were important initial steps toward immigrant civic engagement a century ago. Bonding social capital can thus be a prelude to bridging social capital, rather than precluding it (2007 165).

For new immigrants and others marginalized on the basis of race class or gender discrimination, such groups are still important. However, other community based non-profit development groups also help to build social capital, both within and between groups. As the Women and Community Development Study found and this research will continues to examine, marginalized populations build social capital through, networking, collaboration and organizing. Such groups are an important potential source of trust building and may help to mitigate the short term negative effects of diversity about which Putnam is concerned.

The Women and Community Development Follow-Up Study

Theory on Civil Society and social capital is an important framework for this research. From this perspective the WCDS identified the networking and collaboration of women leaders and the work of their organizations as creating vital social capital in their communities. But the study also identified gender-based obstacles that barred women from some networks, undermining their ability to build and use their social

capital in some circumstances. This follow-up study will continue to use the lens of Putnam's work, particularly in light of his most recent work on the relationship between trust and diversity. He continues to overlook the impact of community based development organizations that are the subject of this research. This research will provide further evidence of both the possibilities and limits of civil society and further highlight this subject that has not been fully addressed in Putnam's work.

This research will also employ a gender analysis. Feminist analyses and critiques of civil society and social capital and development will inform this inquiry and its findings will contribute to this discourse. In addition, placing this research in the context of gender and development scholarship serves to further emphasize the role of women-led groups in society and helps us to understand the constraints under which they operate. This research distinguishes between explicitly feminist groups and leaders, and those women leaders and groups that address the needs of women and girls and their communities as a whole, from a pragmatic perspective. A feminist analysis helps to explain why some women leaders themselves might reject the label feminist, while at the same time behaving in ways and doing work in their communities that fit comfortably with feminist practice. In addition, linking gender and development scholarship with research on women's development efforts in the U.S. helps to further clarify the "difference gender makes" in community development and the important contribution of this perspective to shaping development practice.

Chapter Three
Organizational and Leadership Persistence and Change

In 1997, interviews were conducted with the leaders of 115 community based organizations in nine sites across the country. Ninety-nine of those interviews were conducted at women-led organizations. An additional 16 interviews (at least one in each site) were conducted at prominent male-led organizations, but which also had a significant number of women in key positions on the staff and board. In those cases interviews were conducted with the women staff and board members and usually with the male leaders as well. Finally, another 26 background interviews were conducted with local foundations, public officials, local intermediaries, academics familiar with or a part of the local community development scene. The organizations at which background interviews were conducted were not considered for the purposes of assessing leadership and organizational change or persistence.

Twenty-three of the original 115 groups are no longer operational[3]. The two sites with the highest number of "lost" groups were the Mississippi Delta and Washington DC; each site lost five groups. North Carolina and El Paso lost the fewest, each site losing only one group. Before *Women Creating Social Capital and Social Change* was published in 1999, one male-led CDC, Big River Housing Development in Mississippi,

3 Initial attempts were made to reach each group by phone. Attempts were made to find contact and any other information via a web search, however, not all organizations have websites, and those that do or did have them do not necessarily update them frequently. Attempts were made to contact a local intermediary or other knowledgeable individual or group to confirm that a CBO had in fact ceased operating. Finally, using on-line data bases on charitable organizations from the IRS and others attempts were made to confirm the closure of the lost groups. Web searches revealed at least two groups that changed their names and three groups that had merged with others.

and one woman-led advocacy group, the Frederick Douglas Residents Council, located at a public housing project in Washington DC, had already closed. In addition to closures of groups there were other significant changes to the organizations including mergers between groups that affected three organizations and name and or mission changes as groups evolved and adapted to reflect new priorities.

Table 1
Groups Lost by Site

	Number of Groups 1997	Number of Groups 2007	Number Decrease
Boston	12	10	2
Chicago	13	11	2
Mississippi Delta	15	10	5
Houston	13	9	4
El Paso	8	7	1
North Carolina	11	11	0
Portland	13	10	3
Oakland	16	13	3
Washington DC	14	11	3
Total	**115**	**92**	**23 (20%)**

Types of Groups Lost

A wide range of CDOs were chosen for the WCDS that reflected a comprehensive and inclusive definition of development. Included in the original sample of groups were

a range of traditional housing and economic development-focused community development corporations (CDCs), service and advocacy groups, organizing groups, and groups that combined some or all of these programs. In addition, some of these women-led groups were explicitly gender focused or gender conscious, while other women-led groups were not. Each type of group is reflected in the number of groups that have ceased operating during the last ten years. Of the twenty-three groups that are no longer operational, two are from the sixteen male-led organizations that were included in the WCDS and twenty-one are from the group of ninety-nine women-led CDOs.

Table 2
Type of Groups Lost [4]

Gender Focused Development, Service or Advocacy	6
Traditional CDC	11
Comprehensive CDC	4
Service and Advocacy	2
Total	**23**

The groups that were lost include both male and women-led, advocacy and organizing, housing and economic development (both traditional and comprehensive CDCs), and

4 To categorize the groups that were lost, groups were divided by their primary characteristics and programs. Gender focused groups are those which were explicitly gender-focused and had housing, development, service, advocacy and/or organizing programs that targeted women and girls. I have divided the CDC category to reflect some basic differences between the CDCs in the original WCDS. By traditional CDC I refer to a CDC which is primarily focused on housing and economic development. By contrast a comprehensive CDC may be focused on housing and economic development but also service, advocacy and organizing reflecting the "comprehensive" and holistic approach of women-led groups. Service and advocacy groups in contrast, for the most part, do not focus on physical development.

service. CDCs, both traditional and comprehensive, whose numbers were the largest in the sample of CDOs, also represent the bulk of groups that have closed. A total of fifteen CDCs, two service and advocacy groups, and six explicitly gender-focused organizations have closed since 1997.

Community Development Corporations[5]

In Portland, the CDCs, Low-Income Housing for Native Americans of Portland (LIHNAPO), Housing our Families (HOF), and Franciscan Enterprise (FE) have closed. Although many CDCs serve poor communities, both LIHNAPO and HOF addressed the needs of some of the most seriously underserved communities including Native Americans, African Americans and low-income residents in Portland. In Houston, four CDCs have closed including, the Freedman's Town Association (FTA), Grater Park Place CDC, Sunnyside Up and Third Ward CDC. FTA was a group that worked to stem the tide of gentrification in a historic black neighborhood in Houston. Not only was this organization working to rehab housing and keep it affordable for working and middle-class African Americans, they were also working to preserve the cultural heritage of the neighborhood. The Delta Region also saw a significant number of CDCs close, including several comprehensive CDCs that were one of the few sources of vital programs and services in their communities.

---

5 Throughout this chapter, the actual names of the organizations and leaders are used. The information reported in this chapter is published and available either through the organization itself from annual reports and newsletters or is available on –line from other public sources. Later, in chapters four and five when survey data is reported, anonymity will be maintained.

During the last ten years, Portland lost three CDCs. Low Income Housing for Native Americans of Portland Oregon (LIHNAPO) closed in 2003. Franciscan Enterprises and Housing Our Families after first merging to form Albina CDC eventually closed in 2004. As a CDC which sought to develop and manage rental housing units, rather than sell the units, LIHNAPO struggled to contend with turnover and vacancy and ultimately lost some properties to bank foreclosures. Other properties in which the City of Portland was an invested partner were taken over by another organization severing Native Americans in Portland. That group plans to manage and operate LIHNAPO's housing units as well as develop additional housing for Native Americans. In this case the City of Portland was able to facilitate the expansion into a new area for one organization, even as LIHNAPO faltered.

In another neighborhood, the City's Bureau of Housing and Community Development along with other local intermediaries made an attempt to bring three other CDCs, Housing Our Families, Franciscan Enterprises and Sabin CDC, all working in North and North East Portland, together as one organization. Sabin declined, but Franciscan and HOF merged to form Albina CDC. After several years, the newly formed CDC also ran into problems managing its housing and sustaining the organization, like LIHNAPO, Albina lost some properties to foreclosure and chose to transfer its remaining properties to another CDC in the community, Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives (PCRI) which was also a WCDS participant. Sabin and PCRI continue to operate in NE/Portland Albina CDC has since closed.

Franciscan Enterprise, one of the partners that merged to form Albina CDC was a comprehensive woman-led CDC that in 1997 was redeveloping a substantial property that was to be its new headquarters. Franciscan's programs included affordable housing development, a tenant organizing and volunteer outreach program, and a child care project. Their housing project was focused on developing, maintaining and renting units rather than selling them in order to create a permanent source of affordable housing. By holding on to rental properties rather than selling units or buildings, Franciscan could ensure that the properties did not convert to market rate prices. Housing costs in Portland are affected by they city's Urban Growth Boundary, which limits urban sprawl, but also creates an artificial housing scarcity within the boundaries of the city of Portland, driving up the cost of desirable housing. Franciscan's housing units were rented to households with incomes 50 percent or less that the median income of the city of Portland. Franciscan also organized and supported a tenant's council and an outreach program to work to address tenants' individual and collective needs. A board development program also sought to recruit tenants to serve on the board of directors. The third major focus of their efforts was a child care project that centered on a Child Care Loan Fund to help providers expand or improve their businesses or to obtain training. The program also worked with child care business owners to develop business plans, establish or improve their credit and market their programs. The Child Care focus grew out of Franciscan's participation in a demonstration project with three other CDCs in Oregon that was sponsored by the National Educational and Development Law Center in Oakland

(another WCDS organization) and that sought to assess child care needs in communities and to design programs to meet them (Franciscan Enterprise Program Materials 1998).

Ten years ago, the WCDS noted the importance of a supportive local government and housing and redevelopment agencies. The North Carolina and Portland sites were both notable for local and state support of community development organizations and facilitating networking. In the case of LINHAPO and HOF and FE, the City of Portland was not able to prevent these groups from ultimately going out of business. They were able to minimize, however, the loss by assisting with the transfer of some of the housing portfolios of these groups to others, preventing the complete loss of much needed low-income housing. The real estate market can be volatile and nonprofits are not immune to these challenges. Both the city and local intermediaries' attempts to bolster struggling groups could not eliminate the internal and external challenges and pressures these groups confront, but they were able to preserve at least some of the low-income housing units by facilitating their transfer to stronger groups. At least two of the former directors of the CDCs that have closed, remain active in Portland community development efforts. Julie-Metcalf Kinney, former Executive director of LIHNAPO serves as a member of the Portland Development Commission's Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area Advisory Committee. Karen Voiss, the former Director of Franciscan Enterprises is now the Housing Services Coordinator of Tualatin Valley Housing Partners, which develops and rents affordable housing near public transportation in order to facilitate self-sufficiency for low and moderate income individuals and families.

Gender-focused Groups

The loss of the explicitly gender-focused group is of particular concern, because as research on gender and development and the findings of the WCDS demonstrates women-led efforts tend to be underfunded and under-valued. In addition, groups that do not explicitly focus on women and girls are less likely to design and implement programs that benefit women and girls (Ostrander 1998). Among the explicitly gender-focused groups that were lost are some of the more innovative such as The Family Day Care Training Project that worked with low-income women in public housing in Oakland. Smaller grassroots oriented groups, such as Women in Action, a group of low-income women who worked in the colonias in El Paso have also closed. Other groups such as Housing Opportunities for Women in Washington D.C., worked with a particularly difficult to reach population, homeless and homeless mentally ill women, to provide permanent housing rather than the more common temporary or transitional housing. Working with vulnerable or extremely needy populations can be complicated, expensive and difficult to maintain and these closures in particular supports this observation. Finally, the McAuley Institute, the women-focused development and housing funder that was a research partner in the WCDS has also closed.

The Family Daycare Training Project in Oakland was working with women in or near public housing developments or in the Enhanced Enterprise Zones[6,] to become licensed in-home day care providers. This project was geared toward creating much needed affordable and legal day care options in or near poor communities in Oakland, as

6 Enhanced Enterprise Zones are areas specially designated by local governments for targeted job and economic development. Businesses from a variety of industry sector are offered tax breaks and other incentives to open in the Zones in order to spur job and economic growth in depressed areas.

well as much needed income for women who would become the licensed providers. By becoming licensed providers, rather than informal providers of child care, the women would be eligible for support from the state for their in-home business. The families utilizing their services would be able to pay for them using the child care assistance funds for which they were eligible rather than pay out of pocket as they would for informal child care. State child care assistance funds cannot be used for informal or unlicensed child care arrangements. For the women in training to become providers, the project was partnering with a local community college to offer early childhood education credits based on the training they were completing. These credits could later be applied to an associate's degree or a certificate program if the women were interested and eligible.

Another innovative feature of the *Project* was that it also worked with the parents of children who were in the day care program. Programs for parents included, parent support groups, employment development such as resume preparation, interview skills training, referrals to community services, training and jobs, and transportation stipends. This organization was unique in targeting both child care givers and the parents using the services. Rather than establishing a day care center, the project sought to provide training for something many women in low-income areas were already doing out of necessity -- providing informal, in-home daycare. Brining these providers into legal compliance provided safer child care situations for children, access to more money and support form the state and benefits to the parents.

Housing Opportunities for Women (HOW) was established in 1983 in Washington, D.C. to provide permanent affordable housing for homeless women in the

DC metropolitan area. HOW's target population was single women who had previously been living in emergency shelters or transitional housing, and some low-income women in imminent danger of becoming homeless. Many of HOW's residents suffered from chronic mental illness and only about a quarter of their residents held jobs, most of which were part-time and low-paying. Unlike many emergency shelter or transitional housing programs that set limits on how long an individual can stay, HOW sought to provide a permanent, stable and safe place to live. Women lived communally in one of several properties owned and managed by HOW. Residents were connected to existing support services in DC. HOW received operational support from the McAuley Institute which provided administrative office space. Although HOW is no longer operational, one of their properties has become the Rachel Women's Center which provides emergency rather than permanent housing for homeless women.

Groups like HOW, The Family Day Care Training Project and Women in Action are examples of CDOs that were operating on low budgets and with very few staff members. HOW's programs were small, serving a few dozen women and the Family Day Care training Project was slightly larger serving a hundred or more people at a time including the trainees, and the parents of the children who used the services. Although they were among the smaller and less well-resourced groups, they worked exclusively with comparatively under-served, and difficult to organize populations, young women, poor women marginalized on the basis of language, poor women of color in public housing, and the homeless and the mentally ill.

Comprehensive CDCs

In areas such as Portland, Oakland and Washington D.C. there continue to be large numbers of community based organizations that may offer services, run programs and pursue both economic and housing development that to some degree replace what has been lost. However, in some communities, especially in the Delta and rural areas, there may not be multiple comprehensive community development groups, that can, when present have overlapping programs and missions.

The New Horizon Community Development Corporation in Fordyce Arkansas was profiled for the WCDS and was a model of comprehensiveness. The group, run by the Rev. Margaret McGhee focused on housing development and redevelopment, business and economic development programs, drug counseling and rehab programs, child care programs among others. With few other groups in the area, New Horizon had limited opportunities to partner and therefore developed these programs on their own to in order to meet the needs of the local community. New Horizon CDC has since closed although the original New Horizon Church and Rev. McGhee remain in Fordyce along with the New Horizon Day Care Center, the comprehensive and ambitions CDC closed in 2003. The loss of a group in a community where there may be few other groups to which residents can turn may be of even greater concern to community residents than in other communities than those with a "critical mass" of community based organizations.

Gender –Focused Intermediary Funder

The McAuley Institute. Although not counted in the overall tally of groups that went out of business in the last decade, there was another significant loss of a women's group related to this project, the McAuley Institute, a national, gender-focused intermediary funder also closed in 2003. The McAuley Institute was one of the research partners for the WCDS and was founded by the Sisters of Mercy in 1983. As an intermediary funder, McAuley tended to fund smaller or less well-established groups that may have been "under the radar" of other larger funders. In particular they supported housing and economic development groups that targeted the needs of women and families, many of which were also run by women. In addition to receiving development loans and grants from McAuley, the women-led groups could also receive technical assistance and other support. They were a unique funder in that they were exclusively focused on housing and economic development by and for women. McAuley organized an annual conference for several years on women's housing and development and gave out the "Courage in Community Award" to women leaders in an effort to raise the profile of women-led development efforts and of the McAuley Institute's own work and interests.

Through their experience in working with women-led and women focused groups, the McAuley Institute had identified that organizations led by and programs designed by and for women were "different." As in Gittell and Covington's (1994) research, they noticed that women's leadership seemed to make a difference on the types of programs that were pursued and the way in which the organizations defined development. The

Ford Foundation brought the Samuels Center and the McAuley Institute together to design a research project that could look comprehensively at gender and development in the United States. Although The McAuley Institute itself no longer exists, as part of the larger catholic charity organization, the Sisters of Mercy, the work of the McAuley Institute is not completely lost. Some of the Institute's programs and loan portfolio have been absorbed by other Sisters of Mercy charities and still others were sold or transferred to other groups. The closing of a national, specifically women-focused housing and economic development funder in the United States, however, surely comes as a loss to the groups that had benefited from their understanding of women-led and women-focused development. Although McAuley was small compared to many other funders in the areas of housing and development, because of its specific focus on women, they were one of the few that explicitly understood gender issues in the community development field.

Mergers

In three cases, CDOs from the original study merged with other groups. One of the mergers was between a group from the WCDS and an outside group, and two mergers were between groups, both of which were from the study. These mergers have been counted as a net loss of groups, but they are not necessarily a complete loss as some of the programs and staffs of the organizations have been incorporated into the remaining organization. One of the three mergers appears to be a merger of true equals— groups with slightly different but complimentary missions. The other two are mergers of somewhat less then equals, where a less well positioned group was absorbed into a

stronger group. Potentially, a merger can prevent the loss of programs and services that would result if one of the organizations went out of business and it may lead to a stronger more effective organization. Alternatively, there is no guarantee that in the newly combined group the programs, staff and organizational culture will remain intact. In fact there is a likelihood that they will not survive, especially if the merger was an effort to become more efficient and sustainable.

In Boston, two women-led, women-focused organizations of relatively equal prominence, merged in 2007. Both the Women's Industrial and Educational Union and Crittenton were founded in the 19th Century and the two groups joined to form the Crittenton Women's Union. Also in Boston, Boston Aging Concerns -- Young and Old United merged with another long-standing CDO in the neighborhood, Nuestra Communidad. In Washington DC, one of the male-led groups, Jubilee Enterprise of Greater Washington DC, merged with the Community Preservation and Development Corporation (CPDC). Neither Nuestra Communidad nor CPDC changed their name to reflect the merger, instead the groups were absorbed by the better-positioned partner.

In July of 2006, the merger between the Women's Industrial and Educational Union, founded in 1877 and Crittenton, founded in 1824 was completed, forming a new agency now called the Crittenton Women's Union. Crittenton was a service agency that focused on housing, education, workforce development and family and life skills support. The WEIU, which was one of the organizations in the WCDS, was an advocacy and service agency working with women and their families to gain economic self-sufficiency. WEIU's programs included job-readiness training and mentoring, small

business development and support, comprehensive transitional housing for battered women in addition to research and advocacy on behalf of women and their families. The merger combines the direct service programs of both organizations with the women and family focused advocacy and research of WEIU.

Although the WEIU is no longer an independent organization, the newly combined CDO will not only maintain its direct service programs, but may also be better able to support these programs through research and an increased influence on public policy as a result of the attention the new group now commands. Just prior to their merger, WEIU had conducted research on an economic self-sufficiency standard for Massachusetts. This research calculated the minimum wage necessary in Boston and other cities in Massachusetts to meet the needs of single people, one adult and a child, a family of two and a family of four. These hourly wages were more than three to five times the current minimum wage in Massachusetts (Crandall et. al. 2007). The study also pointed out that public policy efforts such as wage supports, housing supports, health care, child care and other benefits to working families are going a long way to filling the gap between the wages paid and the wage needed to meet all necessary expenses (Crandall et. al. 2007).

The Crittenton Women's Union has made this research and a subsequent report based on this work, *Hot Jobs: How to Live, Work, Thrive in Massachusetts*, the centerpiece of their publicity and policy advocacy campaign. *Live, Work, Thrive* has become an organizing theme. The research is available on-line as is a city-specific self-sufficiency calculator and other job-related tools. The research not only helps CWU to

target the needs of their stakeholders and clients more effectively. Also, producing their own research lends authenticity and authority to their advocacy.

The merger between Jubilee CDC of Greater Washington and Community Preservation and Development Corporation (CPDC) was completed in 2006 when Jubilee transferred control of the Howard Hill Apartments, a 43 unit complex, to CPDC. For Jubilee, a smaller, faith-based group which focused on housing development and renovation and academic and enrichment programs for youth, the merger with the larger CPDC was a merger of groups with complimentary missions. Compared to Jubilee, CPDC was a much larger group at the time of the merger and was focused primarily on development and housing. At the time of the merger, CPDC owned and managed 25 properties and operated more than 17 programs across Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia. According to CPDC:

> Consolidation marks the next step of the affordable housing industry for many smaller nonprofits. Doing so affords the opportunity to combine staff and expertise as companies move to scale. Equally important is that doing so also reduces the number of entities seeking financial support, bringing economy of scale to governments and foundations backing affordable housing and community development efforts (CPDC Organizational Materials 2007).

Mergers among for-profit companies often bring about staff lay-offs and consolidation, the specter of which is raised by the President of CPDC. Post-merger, CPDC planned to speak with constituents and funders in order to "evaluate the sustainability of these programs" (CPDC Organizational Materials 2007). Grassroots CDOs rarely refer to their organizations as "companies" nor are they overly concerned with creating "economies of scale" to make it easier for funders; instead programs start

from the ground-up with community defined needs setting the priorities. In the final evaluation, which programs are cut may depend on funding availability and staff advocating for programs to continue. The degree to which the Jubilee staff is kept on rather than let go, and blends with the CPDC staff may be important to setting the program priorities of the new merged organization.

Mergers, whether between for-profit companies or not-for-profits, may indeed produce "economies of scale" or reduce competition between groups over funding. But, for a truly grass roots, community based organization, depending on the organizational cultures of the groups that are merging, the community based nature of that group may be diminished. Certainly, solvency and sustainability are important to the survival of any organizations and may be encouraged by mergers of similarly focused groups. One thing that may be sacrificed as organizations "scale-up", however, is the values and priorities of the smaller community groups.

The WCDS found that women leaders found that women leaders tended to value community knowledge as well as, or even in lieu of technical expertise. Leaders place equal value on credential and community knowledge noting that they could teach someone the technical knowledge but that it was harder to teach the necessary community knowledge (Gittell, Ortega, Steffy 1999). The women-led groups were found to be less funding-driven, and more interested in pursuing programs based on community defined needs (Gittell, Ortega, Steffy 1999). Larger organizations as they become more "professionalized" may rely more on staff with credential and technical expertise, increasingly resembling for-profit organizations.

Organization Failure

During the last ten years, the number of non-profits in the U.S. has increased by more than seventy percent (Koss-Feder 2007). The non-profit sector includes universities and hospitals, research centers, religious congregations, foundations as well as the type of civic and community based groups that are considered here. These community-based groups are smaller and less well resourced than the endowed universities, foundations and hospitals with which they share non-profits status. By far the bulk of non-profits are in education and health care, with hospitals and primary care facilities alone accounting for 42.5 percent of non-profit revenue (National Center for Charitable Statistics 2007). Thousands of new non-profits form every year, but, just as it is in the for-profit world, not every new non-profit that incorporates and registers with the IRS, survives.

Although there has been substantial overall growth in the number of non-profits in the U.S., the National Center for Charitable Statistics reports that between 1997 and 2002, there was a 16 percent failure rate among all non-profits with tax exempt 501c3 or 501c4 status. The 16 percent figure represents the failure rate for all types and ages of non-profits. Community-based civic and development organizations account for a comparatively small number of non-profits in the U.S. but may also be a comparatively large percentage of organizational failures. Hospitals and Universities with large endowments and which are older are in a far less precarious economic position than community based groups that may survive only from grant to grant. There is also evidence that failure rates for start-up and younger non-profits are high, just as they are

for new for-profit businesses. Among for-profit businesses, fifty to sixty percent fail; only about one third surviving past five years (Koss-Feder 2007).

At twenty percent, the failure rate of organizations from the WCDS over ten years, is just five percent higher than the national average for non-profits failure calculated over five years. Five years appears to be a significant milestone for organizational persistence for both non-profit and for-profit businesses. Given this fact, it is not entirely unexpected to see that these groups have closed. It is difficult to trace the demise of all of these groups as some have left not only relatively few clues to the cause of their demise but also few traces of their previous existence. Certainly internal leadership and organizational factors as well as external pressures will have played a role. Lack of funding, competition from other CDOs, and internal organizational politics are issues for many groups, even those which remain. Leaders and staff may become overwhelmed by every day pressures as well as crises that arise. As one former non-profit director of a now defunct CDO noted the constant fund raising pressure and the demands of running the group "just became too much" (Survey 2007).

The pressure to securing continued funding for programs is a difficulty that many groups and leaders confront. Even more difficult is the pressure to secure general operating funds which include operating expenses and staff salaries. Many grants specify that the money must be spent on the programs, not the organizations, forcing many CDOs to find creative ways to ensure sustainability, turning to fee for service and other fund raising programs to cover non-program expenses. The rules of the funding environment can change unpredictably as well, forcing groups to change and adapt if they can.

One study of the impact of the 1996 Welfare Reform legislation on the failure rate of non-profit human service providers found that groups that were more than 20 years old and those that were youngest— less than five years old— were more likely to survive. Older groups were well established and able to weather changes, newer groups proved more flexible. In addition, emergency providers such as homeless shelters and food banks were 27 percent more likely to adapt and survive than "core providers" that ran programs such as job training and child care (Twombly 2001). In addition to the changes in federal, state and local funding programs with which CDOs must contend, they may also face changes in the funding priorities of Foundations, as well as fluctuations in the ability of individuals or businesses to contribute.

The case of the Freedman's Town Association in Houston, is a dramatic example of organizational failure that is the result of both external financial, and internal leadership issues. FTA filed for bankruptcy to protect itself from civil law suits that had been filed against the organization and Executive director, Gladys House. Three home owners who bought houses from the Association claimed the homes were sub-standard and had construction defects and failed to meet code. Each homeowner was seeking $99,000 in damages (Dawson 2002). On the eve of the trial, FTA filed for bankruptcy protection effectively ending the civil suits, and the claims of which were then referred to bankruptcy court. It is unclear to what extent at this point the litigation has been settled, but FTA does not appear to have reorganized or emerged from bankruptcy. Former executive director House, made an unsuccessful run for Mayor of Houston in 2005 where she receiving 4.2 percent of the vote. She has since returned to private business.

The Impact of Losing Groups

Although there is a proliferation of non-profit groups in the U.S., their distribution across the country is highly uneven. In a community or region with a high concentration of groups, the closure of one particular group among many may have few irresolvable consequences for the neighborhood and the constituency it served. Because of racially segregated living patterns in urban communities, groups tend to be organized around race and ethnicity, the loss of a key group may have local political and social consequences. The consequences of closing a group in a rural area however, may be somewhat more pronounced as there may be few other groups near by to compensate for the loss of services and programs previously provided. Not only might the next nearest community be miles away, the nearest CDO may be even further away. In some rural areas, especially where they majority of residents are poor or non-white, there is a limited infrastructure of community organizations. This is unlike urban areas, where you may find a "critical mass" or a concentration of CDOs.

Rural CDOs, because of their isolation, may be more comprehensive in their programming than they might otherwise have to be. With few or no organizations nearby with which to partner, a rural group may expand to meet the unmet community demand for programming. In predominantly minority, poor rural southern counties, for example, community groups may also confront a lack of effective state and local social services in their communities. One organization in Arkansas had programs that included housing development and rehab, economic and job development, child care, drug counseling and rehabilitation as well as education and other programs. It was the only group in the area

providing these services and programs and has since closed. Although Arkansas is better situated than some other southern states in terms of the distribution of non-profits and the level of their expenditures, there is a dearth of groups in this community and other rural areas with the capacity to step into the breach when one fails.

There is considerable regional variation in the distribution of non-profits across the U.S. The average number of groups per 10,000 residents is 10.2. New England has the highest concentration of groups with 15.4 groups per 10,000 residents. In contrast to the East and West, the Central South, which includes the states from the Mississippi Delta site, has only 7.8 groups per 10,000 residents. In addition to having fewer groups overall, groups in the South tend to spend less per capita that those in the North East. Non-profits in Mississippi for example, spend less per resident than any other state except Idaho and Nevada (The Urban Institute 2006).

The mergers, consolidations and closures that occur among for-profit businesses, can also affect non-profits. In addition, non-profits are not immune to business cycles, particularly if they rely on donations and or investment income. Although my sample is too small to be statistically significant, and I cannot determine if the groups that were lost have been replaced by other, perhaps even better CDOs. The demise of 20 percent in less than ten years is of concern because of the vital nature of the programs and services they offer, because of the critical needs of the communities they serve. Also of concern is the fact that smaller and more participatory groups may have a more difficult time sustaining themselves. Some of the larger, more established, professional housing and

health oriented non-profits have continued to grow, even though they may also have struggled to do so (Survey 2007).

Table 3

Distribution of Non-Profits in Selected Regions and States

Region	Organizations per 10,000 Residents	Expenses per Resident (in dollars)
United States	10.2	3,351
North East	12.4	5,167
New England	15.4	6,281
Midwest	10.6	3,518
West	10.2	3,088
South	8.8	2,588
Alabama	7.8	1,511
Mississippi	6.3	1,497
Louisiana	7.3	2,030
Arkansas	8.3	3,042

Source: The Urban Institute 2006

It may be, of course that the community needs that originally gave rise to the organizations have now been met and the group has simply run its course. It would, perhaps, be comforting to think so however the economic and social reality in the poor communities that most of these groups serve has become more difficult, not less during the last ten years: poverty, and extreme poverty rates have increased, the divide between rich and poor has become more pronounced, access to affordable housing, welfare

benefits, child care, health care and other services still demand the attention of non-profits in many communities.

Organizational Growth and Change

Given the number of groups that have closed and the somewhat dire predictions for the survival rate of newly formed community groups, it is notable that at least one new organization related to the WCDS has been established. Shortly after the WCDS research team visited El Paso, La Mujer Obrera made the decision to split their organizing and advocacy functions and their economic housing and development functions into two, separate but related independent non-profit organizations. El Puente CDC was incorporated in 1997 and operates several non-profit businesses including a day care center, a café and retail market, and a sustainable international trading company and a community daycare center. El Puente also provides support services for and runs a business incubator for emerging enterprises. The centerpiece of El Puente's current development efforts is a multi-million dollar shopping and cultural complex that will redevelop the depressed south central El Paso neighborhood. La Mujer in turn, continues its social, cultural and political advocacy and organizing around gender, labor and immigration issues.

Certainly many of the groups have changed to some degree during the last ten years but at least three have undergone program and/or mission changes resulting from a reconsideration of organizational and community priorities and changes in leadership. Neighborhood Pride Team in Portland has become Trillium Artisans. In Portland, Sisters

Impacting Real Issues Together has become Sisters in Action for Power. In Oakland, Jubilee West CDC has become the Universal Negro Improvement Association. Each group has experienced a change in mission and programs.

***Neighborhood Pride Team/Trillium Assets*.**

One of the CBOs was profiled in the original study was the Neighborhood Pride Team (NPT), a grassroots membership organization in the predominantly white, working class and poor neighborhoods of Brentwood-Darlington and Lents in Portland. Founded in 1994 NPT incorporated as a CDC in 1995 after a period of planning and neighborhood assessment. Following John McKnight's (1997) asset-based approach to community development which argues that the residents of low-income neighborhoods are better able to solve their own problems than outside experts, Molly Coley, the group's founding director, worked with a team of neighborhood women volunteers to do a door to door survey to assess both the existing community capacities and needs. The survey was funded with a grant from the City of Portland, and NPT was encouraged to incorporate as a CDC by other local CBOs and non-profit professionals. The original neighborhood survey identified that the community had a high high-school drop-out rate, underemployment and the need and desire among community residents to pursue economic self-sufficiency and self-employment in a way that would "gently draw out women from restrictive home environments and nurture their leadership" (Gittell, Ortega and Steffy 1999).

When NPT was interviewed for the Women in Community Development Study the group had only been in existence for about three years. Over the last ten years the organization has evolved and has even changed their name to reflect the current emphasis of their work and is now called Trillium Artisans. The organization has expanded one of the original areas of emphasis of the NPT, micro – enterprise and the development of small business support programs to encourage self-employment especially in the area of arts and crafts. NPT originally devised two primary programs, the Entrepreneurial Training Program (ETP), established in 1997 and Trillium Artisans (originally called Eco- Biz) established in 1999 (Trillium Organizational Materials 2007). These programs reflected the findings of the earlier asset inventory that had found a number of residents in the neighborhood who were artisans interested in the possibilities that selling their crafts could provide as well as others who were interested in starting small businesses. The EPT which was in the conceptual stages in 1997, and an arts and craft –focused program called Eco-Biz program, are the core efforts of the groups now known as Trillium Artisans. Trillium Artisans provides retail spaces, wholesale accounts and assistance with distribution and a web-site and catalog for low-income artisans to sell their goods. Although they are developing a fee-for-service program for other artisans the "primary goal is to help low-income artisans increase their craft business income and build sustainable micro-enterprises" (Trillium Organizational Materials 2007).

Although Trillium is not exclusively woman-focused, the majority of its current artisans are women and the group continues to be woman-led. Trillium has moved beyond NPT's earlier neighborhood focus and is open to artists from across the city who

work with recycled, reclaimed or vintage material and objects and who earn less than 50percent of the median income for the Portland Metro area (Trillium Organizational 2007). There is an approval process and products must pass a review panel. Once approved, artists have access to a number of services including: small business counseling, product development counseling, credit card processing, access to computers, opportunities to sell merchandise on line and in the store, and access to a members only "peer network of fellow artisans" who "send out referrals for shows, grants, awards and sales venues" (Trillium Organizational Materials 2007). The group also offers some opportunities to do piece work completing Trillium Design products.

Trillium is currently funded by the city of Portland as well as by the Oregon Arts Commission, the National Endowment for the Arts and has other foundation support. In 2004-05, Andrea McCloskey, Trillium's executive director, participated in the Artisan Sector Learning Cluster, a Kellogg Foundation-funded project of the Association for Enterprise Opportunity. This organization promotes micro-enterprise as poverty alleviation and development strategies. Over the course of its thirteen-year existence, NPT has evolved, become more specialized, attracted major donors, while remaining committed to sustainability and supporting income generation through entrepreneurship for low-income residents in Portland. Although entrepreneurship is the dream of many, the reality is that starting a small business is a precarious endeavor, especially for those with little start-up capital, little business expertise and no safety net to fall back on. Trillium helps to provide that safety net.

Although Trillium remains committed to the values that the Neighborhood Pride Team had at its inception, the organization's growth and development has led them to concentrate their efforts on an individual focused micro-enterprise development model. This model resonates with the entrepreneurial spirit of American capitalism and it is also an increasingly promoted development strategy in developing nations. As Servon (1999) notes, micro-enterprise can be particularly tricky in the U.S. In addition to potential pit-falls such predominantly the high failure rates of new businesses, the U.S. lacks a significant "grey market" that fosters these businesses in developing counties. Tax codes and extensive regulation make it difficult for small business start-ups to succeed.

Trillium's current efforts are a significant departure from The Neighborhood Pride Team's original efforts. In 1997 Molly Cooley defined NPT's main focus as "community organizing centered on building relationships and empowering women" (Gittell Ortega Steffy 1997 69). NPT prioritized leadership development, and its programs included, a job bank, a neighborhood skills exchange, information referral and it ran a 22 week training program on developing a home business. Although it remains committed to alleviating poverty Trillium has significantly honed NPT's earlier efforts.

SPIRIT/ Sisters in Action for Power

Sisters Impacting Real Issues Together (SPIRIT) was founded in the mid-1990s with support from the Center for Third World Organizing in Oakland, another WCDS organization. SPIRIT is a multi-issue membership organization for low-income women and girls of color. SPIRIT began with a door to door survey in North and North East

Portland that identified employment, education, affordable housing and safety as key issues. SPIRIT defined its mission as "developing and supporting the leadership of low-income women, and women and girls of color through collectively identifying and taking on issues and institutions that impact out lives" (SPIRIT Program Materials 1997). The group works on race, class and gender issues and focused on self-esteem, and sexual harassment. An early program targeted the Portland Public School system to establish a district-wide reporting system to prevent and document violence against girls.

SPIRIT evolved into a group now called Sisters in Action for Power (SAP) and the current Executive director is a 23 year old woman who has been member of the organization for 10 years. She joined SPIRT when she was 13 and was part of its leadership development program. The program requires a multi-year commitment from the girls who participate. Leadership development continues to be a focus and SAP recruits young women between the ages of 11 and 19 to become members and participate in its leadership training program. The girls complete training in eight key areas, among them are: fundraising, public speaking and civic involvement (SAP Program Materials 2007).

One of SAP's major organizing and advocacy efforts included a three-year campaign to reduce student's costs of traveling to school. After the city did away with most free school bus service, students had to bear the cost of riding Portland's public transit system, Tri-Met. Tri-Met established a "fareless square" in Downtown Portland that benefits many who live and work downtown, but most students are traveling outside the fareless zone. SAP pressured the school and Tri-met and the school system to

provide reduced fare passes for students and free passes for students who qualified for free or reduced meals at school (Haley 2002).

SAP has received national recognition for its work and has received funding from groups such as the Ms. Foundation. The group's comprehensive leadership program that has been a part of the organization from the start has borne fruit not only in terms of programs and campaigns but also in terms of the organization itself. Three women who are graduates of the leadership program now head the organization. Terenie Faison, 23 is the executive director, Chirece Olugbala, 20, is a Staff Organizer and joined SAP when she was 14. Courtney Jones, 19 is also a staff organizer and joined the group when she was 12. Leadership development and recruitment is often a complex issue for groups to address. SAP's leadership program empowers young women and develops skills that are immediately put to use it its organizing activities. What started as an organizing project by the Center for Third World Organizing in Oakland has evolved and been entirely taken over by the young women who participated in early programs.

Jubilee West CDC/ Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA)

Jubilee West in Oakland was a prominent group led by a former Mayor of Berkeley, California, Gus Newport. Jubilee is currently led by Brother Ayinde, who has previously served as a board member of the East Bay Asian Local Support Corporation (EBALDC), which is also one of the organizations from the WCDS. Jubilee is now called the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) is part of the West Oakland Community Collaborative (WOCC). The WOCC was founded in 2001 to build the

capacity of community organizations in West Oakland and to improve the social and economic conditions and the political participation of residents. Also, part of the Collaborative is the Women's Economic Agenda Project, another woman-led group from the WCDS. In 2004, the WOCC ran a voter registration dive that succeed in adding more than 3500 new voters to the rolls and increased the use of absentee ballots. During the last ten years, UNIA has reorganized and taken on new collaborative projects. The WOCC that involves other WCDS organizations is evidence of continued and new networking.

Leadership Change and Stability

Of the 92 groups that remain from the WCDS, more than half have new leaders. Forty-five percent of all groups had the same leader they did ten years ago. Thirty-six of the remaining 78 groups that were originally women-led had the same leader. Groups in Oakland and North Carolina had the least turnover in leadership. Eight of the eleven

Table 4
Leadership Change

Same Woman	36	40%
Same Man	5	5%
Woman to Man	10	11%
Man to Woman	3	3%
Woman to Woman	31	34%
Man to Man	7	7%

N92

leaders in North Carolina originally interviewed for the study are still in charge of their organizations, including seven women and one male leader. In Oakland seven women who were interviewed for the WCDS continue to serve as the executive director of their organizations. At only thirteen of the organizations was there a change in the gender of the executive director. Ten previously women-led organizations now have a male director, and three previously male-led groups have a female leader. At one originally male-led group, after the death of its founder and long-time leader, a woman was initially hired as Director, but she was replaced within a year by a man.

It was more often the case that women leaders were replaced by men. Given the fact that there were far more women-led than male-led groups in the original sample this may be expected. The replacement of women leaders by male leaders occurred at CDOs that were women-led but which were not women-focused. At a couple of the large, more traditional CDCs, long-time women leaders were replaced by men. Women-focused and gender conscious organizations such as domestic violence shelters, or advocacy or development groups that defined its mission in terms of gender, remained women-led. Many of the changes in the gender of the leadership, both from male to female or female to male leaders are recent. Executive directors of CBOs often hold their positions for many years. It is therefore difficult to assess the immediate impact recent gender changes have had on these organizations and their programs.

Women leaders for the most part do not see their jobs as directors of community organizations as stepping stones to political or other careers (Gittell, Ortega and Steffy 1999). Their commitment to their organizations and to their community is deep and

passionate. Therefore it is not entirely surprising to see that forty percent of the leaders were interviewed in 1997 are still directing their organizations given the number of women leaders in the original study. Jobs in community development come with long, irregular hours, relatively low pay. The almost continual concern for raising enough money to maintain the organization can lead to burnout. Many leaders find creative ways avoid it. When contacted for this research the leaders of at least two organizations were on sabbaticals. Such sabbaticals may be offered by foundations and other local funders.

Organizations in Washington DC had the highest rate of turnover. Seven of the ten DC groups had new executive directors. Boston, Houston and Chicago also had turn-over of greater than fifty percent. In North Carolina and the Delta about thirty-six percent of the leaders are new. Oakland had the lowest rate of leadership turnover at only twenty-seven percent. Leadership turnover is not necessarily a goal to which organizations aspire neither is it necessarily a negative outcome. Certainly having a long-term executive director can lend stability to an organization and may attract positive attention from funders and local politicians. Long tenures, however, do raise questions of leadership development and what will happen to the organization in the long run. Organizations can be deeply connected with the founding director, or a long-time executive director making the eventual transition difficult, especially if it is one that is not planned for.

In some cases, leadership of an organization was taken over by a long-time staff member. In one of these cases in Washington D.C. leadership transferred from a woman to a man who had served on staff for more than ten years. At another organization in the

south, leadership transferred from a woman to her daughter, Fannie Corbett, turned over the leadership of Wilson Community Investment Association to her daughter, Barbara Blackston. Ms. Corbett continues to work for a local service agency and is a member of the North Carolina Initiative's board of directors. At two organizations, leadership was transferred to a younger generation. But, in both case the new leaders were long time members of the organizations that they took over. At Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiatives in Boston, although the organization remains male-led, the new director is in his twenties and was earlier part of the youth organizing committee. As noted earlier, at Sisters in Action for Power in Portland, the executive director and lead organizers are women in their late teen and early twenties who are themselves a product of the leadership development program of the organization.

Leadership development and transition can be difficult issues for organizations of the type considered here. A commitment to leadership development and recruitment and training from within can foster continuity. Alternatively, the departure of a founding director can lead to a change in the overall direction of a community based group as it did at Neighborhood Pride Team, now known as Trillium Artisans, which has significantly redefined its mission since the departure of its founding director. Several women leaders noted that the community development field itself has become increasingly feminized, with both positive and negative consequences in terms of wages and working conditions. However, without a conscious commitment to women's leadership an women's development programs, there is no guarantee that leadership by women or women-focused programs will be sustained.

Where did the Women Leaders Go?

In total, counting both the leaders whose organizations closed and those groups where leadership changed hands, sixty-three leaders whom we interviewed were no longer with the same organizations ten years later. It was possible to identify what has happened to forty-four of the women leaders who are no longer the directors of their original organizations. Most of the former leaders that could be located had moved on to other local, state or national non-profits. At least two leaders have retired, two have founded new non-profit consulting firms and another founded a for-profit consulting business. Four leaders have returned to or moved to private for-profit businesses.

Table 5

Where the Leaders Have Gone [7]

Private Business/Consulting	5
Founded a New Non-Profit	2
Other Local Non-Profit	14
State-wide or National Non-Profits	10
Retired	3
Deceased	3
Political Office	3
Other	5
Unknown	18

[7] The total number of leaders that have changed is actually 63, two more than the 61 organizations with new leaders. At two groups where interviews were conducted two leaders. At those groups neither of the interviewees remains in a leadership position there.

Only three leaders from the WCDS have moved from the non-profit sector into politics; a fourth made an unsuccessful run for office and is now in private business.

The whereabouts of 18 of the original interviews are currently unknown but of the 43 who have been located, the majority, has gone to work in other locally, state-wide or nationally-based non-profits and one founded a new non-profit.[8] A total of 24 leaders continue to work in non-profits, fourteen in locally based non-profits, nine in state-wide or national non-profits and two founded their own non-profit organization to work with other non-profits. Of the leaders who remain in the non-profit world some of the regional and national organizations that they have moved into include: Oxfam; Catholic Charities; The National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy; Fannie Mae Foundation and the Rand Gulf States Policy Institute.

Two new non-profits were founded by the former leaders of WCDS groups, one by a male leader from the WCDS and the other by a woman. Tina Moore, founding director of the Pyramid Community Development Corporation in Houston, left to organization and founded the I Am Pleased Center. Her new group works with other non-profits as a consultant. After his organization, Jubilee Enterprise, merged with another group in D.C, Robert Boulter the group's director subsequently formed Faithworks. Faithworks works with other faith-based community development groups providing technical assistance with project development and planning, organizational development and training as well as assistance with acquiring and managing funding.

[8] Two leaders work with locally-based non-profits but have moved out of the areas in which they previously worked. One leader moved from Boston to California, and another leader left the Mississippi Delta and is now with a group in Minnesota.

JoAnn Kane, the former director of the McAuley Institute, one of the research partners in the WCDS is now the Vice-president of Faithworks.

Only three leaders left the non-profit sector to work in for profit businesses. Of those, one leader of a housing-focused CDC now works in real estate where she is the principle broker at a major firm. Another leader who formerly served as the Director of a now defunct CDC has since formed her own for-profit consulting and planning firm that works with other local non-profits on planning, grant writing, organizational development and project development. She also worked with a local religious school to design a program in faith-based community development at a local religious college.

The WCDS and other research has found that women community development leaders were not likely to use their development work as a stepping stone to political office, unlike their male counterparts. The findings of this research continue to support this conclusion. Women leaders were far more likely to continue to work in community development than to seek office, take a position in a public agency or even to move into the private sector. In fact, one of the background interviewees from the WCDS, Sue Perry Cole, moved from a position in the North Carolina State Department of Economic and Development to a job as the director of the North Carolina Association of CDCs.

Only three leaders originally interviewed for the WCDS have successfully entered politics. One of those three has since left politics and currently works as a consultant for non-profits. A fourth leader now working in the for-profits sector also made an un-successful bid for elective office. In North Carolina, Cynthia Brown, who was head of Southerners for Economic Justice when she was interviewed in 1997 for the WCDS, won

a seat on the Durham City Council. She later made unsuccessful bids of the State Legislature and for the Senate. Ms. Brown also later served as a member of the Greensboro Truth and Reconciliation Commission, which examined racially charged demonstrations and shootings in Greensboro in 1979 (Greensboro Truth and Reconciliation Commission). She also founded the Sojourner consulting group which works with non-profits.

In Houston, Ellen Cohen who has been working with The Houston Area Women's Center in various capacities since 1980, becoming its executive director in 1991 is retiring from that position at the end of 2007. She is currently serving as a member of the Texas State Legislature. Pat Dowell-Cerasoli, formerly the director of Mid-South Planning and Development, a now defunct non-profit in Chicago, has become an Alderman for the City's Third Ward.

It was most often the case that leaders moved on to other locally based groups in or near the community in which they were working. For example, when Franciscan Enterprises in Northeast Portland closed, Karen Voiss its director moved on to another housing CDC, Talutian Housing. In El Paso, a leader from one WCDS group replaced the leader of another WCDS group after she left to direct a new CDO. In El Paso, Joanna Gullien, who was originally interviewed when she was the Coordinator of the YWCA Home Ownership Program has replaced Rose Garcia as Director of the El Paso Collaborative for Community and Economic Development. Rose Garcia in turn, has become the executive director of Tierra Del Sol Housing Corporation which serves counties in Texas and New Mexico and is also incorporated to do business in Arizona.

The group that was founded in 1974 specializes in housing and economic development along the U.S. – Mexico border, one of the poorest and most under-served areas in the U.S. Also in El Paso, Carmen Felix formerly of the South-side low-income Housing Development Corporation has moved over to El Puente CDC.

Gus Newport, the former Director of Jubilee West CDC in Oakland, former Mayor of Berkeley, and former director of Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiatives in Boston, among other things has become a Senior Associate at the Urban Strategies Council, which was also one of the WCDS groups. Newport is also a Senior Consultant to the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Technical Assistance Resource Center. Also in Oakland, Noa Mohlabane, who ran the Family Day Care Training Project, has continued her work as an organizer and activist in the Bay area. She works with Bay Area Sisters and Allies, which is part of a national organization called Be Present. Both groups focus on organizing and community building among women of differing race, ethnicities and ages.

Laurie Holmes formerly of Elizabeth Stone House in Boston, is now at Harbor Communities Overcoming Violence (HarborCOV). At HarborCOV she continues her work in domestic violence prevention and recovery and linking that recovery to individual economic development for women. HarborCOV's programs, not unlike Elizabeth Stone House, are comprehensive and involve emergency shelter, transitional housing but also self esteem and skill building leading to economic sufficiency. Ms. Holmes has also continued her research and advocacy work, publishing a report on developing comprehensive programs.

All but four of the leaders that were able to be located have remained in the same general community in which they were working ten years ago. One leader from Boston has relocated to California where she is now working in education as a director of development at a charter school. Another leader from the Delta region has relocated to Minnesota where she is the now the director of a local housing and economic development group. Two leaders that were connected to the Center for Third World Organizing remain affiliated with that group but have moved on to new positions. Rinku Sen who was CTWO's director has since published a book on community organizing and has taken a job as the director of the Applied Research Center in New York. Sandra Davis, who went to Portland to organize SPIRIT as part of a CTWO organizing effort, has since returned to California where she now serves as the director of CTWO's board. She is also a program associate with the California Endowment.

Also among the leaders that have been accounted for, three have passed away. Patricia Crowley, founder and executive director of Deborah's Place, a domestic violence and transitional housing shelter in Chicago passed way at the age of 92. Another founder and long-standing director of a community development group in Washington DC, Lloyd Smith of Marshall Heights CDC also passed away. Finally, Irma Perez, founder and Director of the Sparks Housing Corporation, a development group that worked in the colonias along the El Paso border, passed away in 1999 at the age of 50. All three organizations have weathered the passing of their founding executive directors. Ms. Perez was replaced by a male leader at Sparks, Mr. Smith was briefly succeeded by a

female executive director before she was in turn replaced by a male director. Patricia Crowley, had retired and been replaced by a woman before she passed away.

Three other leaders have retired from their positions. One long-time leader, Lou Ann Frederick, formerly of Arlington Housing Corporation in Virginia and was replaced by a male leader. As noted earlier, Ellen Cohen, director of the of the Houston Area Women's Center since 1990, is retiring from her position at the end of 2007. She was also elected as a representative to the Texas State assembly in 2006 and will continue to serve as a representative. Starting at the organization as a volunteer board member in the 1980s, Cohen has served as its director for 17 years. Under her leadership, the Women's Center had grown from a 45 bed shelter to a state of the art shelter serving up to 120 women and children at a time, with an annual operating budget of over $8 million dollars.

Of the three leaders in the "other" category, the experience is quite disparate. One leader who was formerly the director of a domestic violence shelter, is now part of the Love Botswana Outreach Mission in Botswana where she currently lives. Ruby Buck, the former leader of a group in Mississippi lost her job and was subsequently convicted of misappropriating federal AmeriCorps grant funds and filing fraudulent records. She was sentenced to 41 months in Federal prison (Corporation for National and Community Service, Office of the Inspector General 2002). Ms. Buck's case, although dramatic was however, a notable exception.

The majority of the leaders who are no longer with the same organization have gone on to work for or to found other community groups. Most remain in the same community, only four leaders have moved out of the city or state to work for other non-

profits. Two leaders have moved from directing a locally-based non-profit to working for a state or nationally focused non-profit as directors of programs or departments in the area in which they previously specialized. In the DC area, two women leaders have moved on from their positions to larger more national focuses non-profits. Olive Idehen Akhibge, formerly the Director the Coalition of Non-Profit Housing Developers in Washington D.C., is now the Director of Housing Initiatives at the Fannie Mae Foundation. Angela White-Narian, former Director of Neighborhood Housing Services, has become the Director of Housing Services for Catholic Charities. Both women were replaced by men in at their previous organizations.

Conclusion

Community-based organizations play an important role in neighborhoods as service providers, affordable housing and economic developers, organizers and advocates for the marginalized and underserved. Given expected failure rates for non-profits it is not entirely unexpected that 20 percent of the groups have been lost during the last ten years. However, it is precisely because of whom these groups serve and what they do that raises questions about the degree to which these organizations can be relied on in the U.S. to address critical areas of social and economic policy. Not every community or neighborhood has a well-functioning community based group and not every groups is equally effective. The distribution of groups across the country and within communities does not always reflect local need.

Many of the leaders of community development organizations, either remained in the same positions they held ten years ago, or they had moved on to new positions within the non-profit community development field. Most have not sought to use their work in community development as a stepping stone to political office but remain committed and connected to the work they have been doing, in many cases, for more than a decade. In all, twenty three organizations closed causing leaders to lose their jobs. An additional thirty-eight groups went through a leadership change. Whether leaders remain the directors of the organizations they led ten years ago, or they have moved on to others groups, few have left the non-profit development sector for the more lucrative, for-profit sector. In addition few leaders have left non-profits to enter politics or to take positions with intermediaries or public agencies. Most of the leaders originally interviewed ten years ago, remain in the non-profit sector working in communities.

Chapter Four
Programs, Staff and Funding

The WCDS employed an expansive and inclusive definition of development in order to identify a broad cross section of groups for the study. Included in the original sample of organizations were "traditional" housing and economic development focused CDCs, domestic violence shelters, advocacy and organizing groups and groups that combined approaches and programs. The sample also included groups that were explicitly gender-focused and those which were not. Groups in the study were varied in terms of the size and age and included smaller less well-resourced groups as well as larger groups with multi-million dollar budgets and groups ranging in age from several decades old to less than five years old. Finally, groups were identified in nine sites cross the country provide a regionally diverse selection of organizations. Respondents to this survey include a similar cross section of groups both in terms of purpose and size and regional diversity.[9]

The WCDS sought to examine both the activities and experience of women leaders and their organizations. Data was gathered during in-depth interviews and questions were asked following several broad categories and themes including: staff and budgets, programs, leaders' definition and understanding of development, networking and collaboration, leadership style and obstacles or barriers that leaders faced in their efforts. Data on programs, participation, networking and collaboration as well as leadership style revealed that, following Putnam's (1993) definition of social capital,

[9] Surveys were returned from seven of the nine original sites. No groups from North Carolina or Washington D.C. responded to survey, however, research was conducted to obtain an overall update on the groups in each of these sites.

these community based organizations were building social capital that was critically important for the socially, economically and politically marginalized communities they served. One cautionary note however, was that although women leaders and groups were networked with other, many lacked access to key political and funding networks. Many felt they faced gender, race, ethnicity and class based barriers. Distinguishing between bonding capital, close ties among groups or individuals within a community and bridging capital, ties with groups and individual's outside one's groups or community (Putnam 1993, Gittell and Vidal), women-led groups were more likely to enjoy the former rather than the latter. This lack of access to funding and political networks, especially in relation to what women leaders perceived as male leaders' greater access was considered an obstacle.

This current research revisits the original research themes of programs, staff, budgets, collaboration, networking and barriers to assess what if any changes have occurred and why. Have organizations grown or struggled? Have they been able to maintain or grow their programs? Have community needs changed-- if so, how? What barriers, if any do women leaders currently identify? Do they continue to find that gender is a significant obstacle? How has the community development field changed during the last ten years?

The experience of these organizations has important consequences for the communities in which these groups operate. The U.S. relies heavily on private non-profits to address much of the social policy that elsewhere would be more directly the responsibility of the government. In the U.S. the bulk of affordable housing

development, childcare, eldercare and other social services and programs, local economic development is done by community-based, non-profit groups that are funded through a combination of sources that include federal, state or local grants, foundations, and private donors. Changes in funding, networking, community needs, may have a significant impact on both on the organizations and their constituents. Whether or not there is affordable housing in a neighborhood, for example may be contingent on whether or not a particular group was able to secure a grant for it, not whether or not there is a need for it.

As noted in the previous chapter about twenty percent of the organizations that were a part of the WCDS no longer exist. Those that remain have undergone a number of significant budget, program and staff changes. In addition, as will be discussed in chapter five, ten years later, although some women-leaders still perceive there to be gender based obstacles to their work, by far the barrier women leaders most often identified was more gender-neutral. Most identified difficulties in acquiring adequate funding as the most significant obstacle. Furthermore, they did not perceive this lack of funding to be the result of a gender-based lack of access, but instead reflected more general concerns about the overall lack of funding for community based non-profits and coupled with the increasing unmet need for affordable housing, economic development and social services, such as affordable day care and health care in their communities.

This chapter will discuss survey findings on programs, staffing and budgets and begins with brief profiles of the survey respondents.

Profiles of Survey Respondents

For the WCDS, the participants were identified although individual quotes were not attributed without permission. Elsewhere in this dissertation, the names of group and leaders have been used because the information discussed was publicly available. For this follow-up study, respondents were assured anonymity. Survey respondents have been assigned a pseudonym for the discussion of the survey findings. Budget data was compiled from a public, searchable IRS tax database which makes the annual tax returns of non-profits available on-line. Budgets are reported for the most recent year available, most often for fiscal year 2005 or 2006. These records indicate the annual budgets and full tax returns are posted on-line that also indicate the organization's total assets. These assets are primarily commercial and residential real estate holdings or business owned and operated by the groups.[10]

Northeast Women's Development (NWD)

Northeast Women's Development is a gender-focused housing and development organization. NWD's annual budget for the fiscal year (FY) ending in 2006 was just under $1 million. In addition, NWD had total assets of approximately $1.8 million. NWD's projects include: construction of permanent affordable housing, construction of transitional housing for homeless families, technical assistance and project management services to other groups developing affordable housing and financial literacy and

10 Assets based on real estate holdings were reported before the sub-prime mortgage crisis began to effect property values. Groups with mortgages on properties or which own properties that have lost value as a result of the overall decline in property values may experience a significant decrease in their total overall assets in some cases.

management education programs for people with low incomes. The group emphasizes partnership and collaboration with other regional groups to achieve their development goals. NWD remains woman-led although there was a leadership change six years ago.

Oakland Community Health Services (OCHS)

Oakland Community Health Services is a woman-led, although not explicitly women-focused, health services organization. Through its senior center, health care center and other offices, OCHS provides services including health screening and elder care in addition to advocating for patients' rights and greater access to health services. OCHS also offers citizenship classes and assistance, and referrals to additional heath and legal services. A major source of funding comes from state and federal contracts to administer programs. OCHS had an annual budget of $5.5 million for FY 2006 and assets in excess of $6 million. OCHS continues to be led by the same woman who was interviewed for the WCDS.

Portland Neighborhood CDC (PNCDC)

Established in the early 1990s, PNCDC rehabilitates, develops and manages affordable rental housing. In addition to building rental units, the group develops and rehabs single and multi-family homes for affordable home ownership. The CDC also offers support services for low-income home buyers in addition to support services for residents of their rental complexes including access to emergency food and household provisions, vocational training, assistance with job searches and referrals to other needed

services. The organization is also part of a regional effort to improve the quality of and access to child care and to provide opportunities for registered child care providers to further develop their skills. The group manages two networks of child care providers and offers referral services for parents seeking child care. PNCDC's budget for FY 2006 was $1.2 million, and the group has assets totaling more than $7.5 million. PNCDC is has been led by the same male director for the last fifteen years.

Chicago Women's Homeless Shelter (CWHS)

The Chicago Women's Homeless Shelter provides short-term, transitional and long-term housing for homeless women. CWHS also offers a variety of supportive services to address the numerous issues with which many homeless women struggle. These issues include, among others, mental illness and depression, poverty and joblessness, criminal records or a lack of education and skills that present a barrier to employment. The programs offered represent a comprehensive approach to addressing homelessness that goes beyond simply providing a temporary shelter. CWHS runs a learning center which helps women identify interests and abilities and to further develop necessary employment skills. Assistance with job placement is also available. Finally the organization runs a socially responsible business that provides financial support for the organization. It employs current and former tenants offering an opportunity for artisans to sell their work and for employees to gain work experience. CWHS had a budget of $ 3.1 million for FY 2006 and total assets of more almost $4 million. CWHS's

executive director has held this position for the last three years but has more than 20 years experience working with the group.

Delta Development Funding Associates (DDFA)

DDFA is a regional intermediary funder in the Delta that focuses on supporting individual, local and regional economic development, education reform and increasing opportunity and other efforts that support families. DDFA funds projects directly, provides assistance and training, and works to support networking and collaboration among community groups. In addition, DDFA works to attract and leverage funding in the region in pursuit of a number of initiatives including a faith-based leadership initiative, an individual development account (IDA) program and education and community development initiatives. DDFA has one of the largest budgets of the survey respondents, at $13 million for FY 2005 and has total assets of over $16 million. Male-led at the time of the WCDS, the group has recently transitioned from a male to a female leader.

Houston Community Housing and Development (HCHD)

Founded in the early nineties, HCHD is a women-led CDC that works primarily on housing development. Since 2000, the group has developed more than 300 rental units and more than 60 single family homes for purchase. HCHD also works to rehab vacant homes in the community and to preserve historic homes and buildings. The primary service program the organization runs is a home buyer education and counseling

program. Recently HCHD has supported local economic development efforts including a program to showcase local artists and they established an environmental initiative to use environmentally sound "green" construction. HCHD's annual budget for FY 2005 was over $500,000. From 2003 to 2006 the value of HCDC's asset properties increased from just under a million dollars to more than $2.5 million.

El Paso Latino Development Corporation (EPLDC)

El Paso Latino Community Development Corporation is a women-led, women-focused comprehensive economic development organization. Recognizing the economic struggles of Mexican-Americans and Mexican immigrant workers EPLCDC, focuses its development efforts on promoting opportunities for these displaced and underserved communities. The group's projects include the development of retail and office space for socially responsible businesses as well as the management of several socially responsible businesses including several that target the Latino community. In addition, EPLCDC runs a bi-lingual education and development program that offers classes to help build the language skills of workers with Limited English Proficiency. They also offer computer training and other classes to assists displaced workers. The training center's programs also strive to develop community leadership and support local entrepreneurship. For FY 2004, EPLDC's annual budget was almost $800,000 and they reported total assets over $1.3 million.

Portland Affordable Housing Development Association (PAHDA)

Although PAHDA is a major developer of both affordable rental units and homes for ownership, the organization is committed to maintaining ownership and management of a large portfolio of rental units to ensure that they remain affordable rather than transiting to "market rate" rents. Since its founding in the early eighties, the group has developed over 1,000 units in addition to acquiring other existing units and continues to develop homes for rent and purchase. The group has recently incorporated "green" construction into its new developments. In addition to its extensive development projects, PAHDA runs a number of service and referral programs for its residents. These include financial literacy classes for adults and counseling for residents, youth programs, a variety of workshops and classes, as well as referrals to other programs, services or organizations to assist residents. PAHDA also offers an innovative assistance program for home owners who are seniors or persons with disabilities in need of help with repairs to their home. For FY 2006, PAHDA had a budget of $5.3 million, and listed real estate assets of approximately $18 million.

Texas Domestic Violence Shelter (TDVS)

TDVS was founded in the late seventies and had grown to become one of the largest shelter facilities in the state. The group provides and emergency crisis shelter for women and children as well as long-term housing, counseling and children's services. The expansion of programs and services recognizes that "clients now have many barriers to their self-sufficiency – addiction, mental health issues, poverty" (Survey 2007). In

addition the group does policy advocacy and offers training on domestic violence issues. For FY 2005, TDVS had a $2.5 million annual budget, and listed almost $800,000 in assets. The executive director has been in her position for more than twenty years.

Houston Neighborhood CDC (HNCDC)

Established in the late eighties, HNCDC is a traditional housing and development-focused organization. Its work is centered on commercial and residential development with most service programs geared toward home ownership counseling and assistance. In addition to home ownership classes HNCDC offers down payment assistance to low-income home buyers and workshops on foreclosure prevention. The CDC manages a neighborhood focused website that helps residents connect with other community services and events. HNCDC has an annual budget of approximately $3million with real estate assets of almost $6.5 million.

Oregon Arts and Development (OAD)

Founded in the mid-nineties, OAD is among the smaller groups in this study, an annual budget under $200,000. The group has weathered some recent transitions and has narrowed its focus. OAD now concentrates its attention primarily on supporting economic development for local artists and artisans and is concerned with job training, business development and living wage issues. The organization does not currently report any significant assets.

Boston Women's Advocates and Services (BWAS)

BWAS is a comprehensive women-led and women centered housing, development, service and advocacy organization. With a focus on helping women and families achieve economic self-sufficiency, BWAS's programs target several key areas including education, emergency homeless shelter and services, workforce development and policy advocacy and research on issues of women's and family self-sufficiency. Recognizing the importance of education in achieving self-sufficiency, BWAS has a program that offers alternatives to high-school and helps women earn a GED. For women and families in crisis, BWAS offers emergency shelter and assists those in need with finding permanent housing. Under its workforce development efforts, BWAS offers career counseling, skill development, computer literacy and personal mentoring. The final component of BWAS efforts is in the areas of advocacy and research to support their initiatives. With this effort BWAS hope to help frame the debate on key policy issues. For FY 2006, BWAS's budget was $10 million and the groups listed assets of more than $7 million.

South Boston Community Development Corporation (SBCDC)

Women-led, although not exclusively women-focused SBCDC's programs and organization target the needs of an ethnically diverse low-income constituency. The core of SBCDC's programs is affordable housing and commercial development coupled with strong community organizing and leadership development programs. Residents in

SBCDC's rental housing are encouraged to develop their own initiatives and programs. Technology centers have been established in the residential complexes where technology training classes are held and community residents can find assistance with job searches, creating resumes and other job search needs. Senior and youth programs and other resident initiatives have also been established. SBCDC is committed to community participation and constituent-driven organizing that includes parent/school and youth initiatives in addition to advocacy and organizing around low-income community economic issues. Another element of the group's program is a small business loan fund that makes direct loans to individuals, the majority of whom are minorities and/or women. SBCDC is a key example of a comprehensive and participatory CDC. For FY 2005 SBCDC had an annual budget of just under $2 million and listed assets totaling $15 million.

Southeast Chicago Housing and Development Association (SCHDA)

Founded in the early 1980s SCHDA is a comprehensive neighborhood based housing and development organization. The organization's director listed more than a dozen program areas as "top priorities" including housing and homelessness, poverty, political empowerment, women's rights, gay and lesbian rights and youth programs among the top ten. SCHDA is currently partnering with several other neighborhood groups on advocacy and policy campaigns for affordable housing, alleviating poverty and the development of a more responsive community planning process. SCHDA currently has a budget of just over $600,000 and assets worth almost to $6 million dollars.

Delta Neighborhood Services (DNS)

Among the smaller groups in the study, DNS's current top program priority is emergency and family services. DNS provides support to meet families' basic needs including clothes, food and other goods and services that go directly to the poor. DNS has programs that focus on business development and job training, youth leadership development and education and they have recently added housing and homelessness to their program concerns. DNS was founded in the 1970s and currently has an annual budget of just over $211,000 and listed assets of $213,000.

El Paso Community Service and Development Association (EPCSDA)

With one of the largest budgets and staff of the organizations in the study, EPCSDA works city-wide to provide service programs such as child care and after-school youth programs. In addition, the association provides shelter services and low-income temporary housing. EPCSDA also has an innovative and extensive home ownership program providing counseling and other assistance to low-income home buyers. For FY 2005 the Association had an annual budget of just over $30 million and assets of over $20 million.

Chicago Development Partnership (CDP)

Incorporated in the early 1980s during a period of high job loss and unemployment in the city, CDP's primary focus is economic and commercial development to create jobs and viable commercial real estate development. CDP's

programs include both new construction of commercial property and the rehabilitation of existing buildings and businesses. In addition, CDP's workforce development programs offer skill building programs, search assistance for job seekers, and applicant referrals and other assistances for potential employers. For FY 2005, CDP had a $1.5 million budget and listed assets of $1.3 million.

Boston Women's Shelter and Development (BWSD)

In addition to offering emergency domestic violence shelter services, supportive housing for families in distress and transitional housing, BWSD's work also focuses on advocacy, and economic development for poor women. Gender focused, feminist, participatory and inclusive, BWSD's programs are also concerned with individual social and political empowerment as well as economic independence and stability. BWSD offers family support and counseling services as well as economic development programs for individuals and a training program the aim of which is to work to encourage participation in the community economic development process. For FY 2005 BWSD had a budget of $1.6 million and listed assets of $1.4 million.

Chicago Neighborhood Services (CNS)

CNS is a neighborhood housing and education focused development and advocacy organization serving a poor, predominantly African-American community in Chicago. Over the last several years however, the group has struggled and is currently going through reorganization. Previously woman-led, the organization has not employed

an executive director since 2003. The current annual budget is just $5,000 but the organization still has assets of $1.1 million.

El Paso Community Development Partners (EPCDP)

EPCDP is a woman-led housing and economic focused development organization that targets Latinos, immigrants and the working poor in El Paso. Recently EPCDP has transitioned from working primarily as an intermediary to designing and running its own business and housing development projects and programs which currently target Latinos, immigrants and the working poor. For the fiscal year ending in 2005, EPCDP had a budget of $413,000 with total assets of just under $1 million.

Organizational Data

The organizations which responded to follow-up survey included a broad cross-section of groups similar to that of the WCDS. Eleven of the groups are housing and economic development-focused, three of the groups are domestic violence shelters, four groups are explicitly gender-focused, economic development and advocacy groups, one is local/regional an intermediary funder, and one is predominantly focused on immigration rights, advocacy and health.

Table 6
Type of Community Organization

Type of Group	Number	Name of Groups
Housing and Economic Development (CDCs)	11	Portland Neighborhood CDC, Houston Housing and Development CDC, Portland Affordable Housing Development Association, Houston Neighborhood CDC, Oregon Arts and Development, South Boston CDC, South East Chicago Housing and Development Association, Delta Neighborhood Services, Chicago Development Partnership, Chicago Neighborhood Services, El Paso Community Development Partners
Domestic Violence and Homeless Shelter (Shelter, Prevention Advocacy)	3	Chicago Women's Shelter, Houston Domestic Violence Shelter and Services, Boston Women's Shelter and Development
Gender-focused Development and/or Advocacy	4	North East Women's Development, El Paso Latino Development Corporation, Boston Women's Advocates and Services, El Paso Community Services and Development Association
Regional Intermediary	1	Delta Development Funding Associates
Immigrant Service and Advocacy	1	Oakland Community Health Services
N 20		

The groups ranged in size from one with a budget of about $5,000 (although with over $1million in assets) to groups with multi-million dollar budgets. Twelve groups had budgets of a million dollars or more and three groups had budgets in excess of $10 million dollars. In terms of organizational assets, sixteen of the groups had assets in excess of $1million dollars and nine of those had assets of more than six million dollars. For housing and economic development groups real estate holdings make up the bulk of

Table 7
Groups by Size of Budget

Under $100,000	1
$100,000 – $250,000	2
$250,000 – $999,000	5
$1 million to $1, 999,999	3
$2 million to $2,999,999	3
$3 million to $6 million	3
$10 million or more	3
Highest	$30,000,000
Lowest	$5,000

Source: National Center for Charitable Statistics,
Non-Profit tax data IRS form 990

Table 8
Groups by Total Assets

Less than $100,000	1
$200,000 to less than $1 million	2
$1 million to less than $2 million	5
$2 million to less than $4 million	2
$4 million to less than $6 million	1
$6 to $7 million	3
$7 to $8 million	2
$15 to $20 million	4
Highest	$20 million
Lowest	$10,000

N 20 Source: National Center for Charitable Statistics,
Non-Profit tax data, IRS form 990

these assets. This is especially true for groups that develop or redevelop affordable rental units. In order to ensure the rental units remain affordable many groups retain ownership of the buildings and manage them. Some groups may also have small investments or run related businesses that contribute to the organization's overall income but usually comprise a smaller portion of organizational assets when compared to real estate.

Staff

The staff of the groups from the WCDS generally reflected the demographic composition of the neighborhoods they served. Women leaders were likely to hire community residents and to value their "local knowledge" and experience over specific credentials. For the current study, groups were asked what changes there had been to the staff of their organizations in the last ten years and to identify the primary reason for those changes. Fourteen groups indicated that there had been significant changes in the size of their staff; eight of those groups indicated that there had been an increase in staff size and six groups indicated that they had cut staff over the last ten years.

For the groups that indicated that they had made cuts, five indicated that they had made staff cuts in specific programs. Two indicated that they had cut entire programs and the staff associated with those programs. Two groups indicated that they cut both program and non-program related staff, and two groups indicated that the staff cuts had been primarily administrative. One group that cut administrative staff explained that cuts had come about through streamlining the organization and administrative staff to be more efficient. They indicated that there had been no loss in "essential services" but admitted

that the grant writing process had become more difficult with fewer staff because it takes up so much of staff members' time. This group was the organization with the smallest overall budget and has only two staff members at the present time.

Table 9
Changes in Staff Size

Overall Increase	8	Delta Development Funding Associates, Houston Domestic Violence Shelter, Oakland Community Health Services, Portland Housing and Development, South Boston CDC, El Paso Latino Development Corp., Boston Women's Advocates and Services, Houston Housing and Development
Overall Decrease	7	Woodlawn Housing and Development Corp. Oregon Arts and Development Houston Neighborhood CDC Delta Neighborhood Services Chicago Neighborhood Services Chicago Women's Shelter Chicago Development Partners
Stayed about the same	4	El Paso Community Development Partners El Paso Community Services and Development North East Women's Development Portland Neighborhood CDC
N 19		

Reasons for Cuts

A primary reason that groups had to cut staff was due to budget constraints. Of the six groups that indicated they had cut staff, four said that the cuts were due to budgetary concerns. This was true of two groups with budgets over $2.5 million as well as for one with a budget of less than $250,000. One group that currently has an annual budget of less than $5,000 indicated "politics" as the primary reason for the staff decrease but it appears that the "political" issues may have also affected the budget, which in turn led to the need to cut all staff. This organization still exists in name and continues to

have significant assets but it remains to be seen if it will be able to rebuild or if it will be forced to hand off its assets to another group and close.

Reasons for and Areas of Increase

Eight of the groups indicated that they had increased the size of the staff during the last ten years. These groups have experienced growth in terms of the programs, services and/or housing units they manage and have added staff both for specific programs and administrative needs a result. Portland Affordable Housing Associates manages a portfolio of over $18 million in low-income and affordable rental units indicated that with every new building or program added, staff must be must be added as well. The director of South Boston CDC a housing and development focused group in Boston said that since 1995, her group has gone from owning and managing 300 housing units in their real estate portfolio to owning and managing over 1,000 as of 2007. During this period they have doubled the size of their staff from 12 to 24. The organization has been able to add staff in key areas that are not necessarily tied to a specific housing or economic development project. Staff increases have been in a number of areas including "in organizers (5), specialty services staff (2), development staff (5), small business and home lending team (3), finance staff (3), administrative staff (3) [and] fundraising staff (2)"(Survey 2007). The CDOs director added that there has been growth in all areas of the organization noting that "fundamental growth comes from an organizing perspective, finding and cultivating talented staff, and leadership that focuses on integrating organizing with development and building power"(Survey 2007).

For some other groups the addition of new programs or the expansion of the organization's mission brought with it the need for additional staff specific to programs or administration. One group that has added several key non-profit businesses as part of an effort to expand and become more sustainable has added "management and grant writing staff to support the new businesses" (Survey 2007). In addition, this group has added research on its own programs and approach to development and advocacy work based on that research. Staff members at this organization are therefore not only tied to specific economic or "bricks and mortar" development projects but also to research and advocacy.

One of the groups that was part of a merger increased staff as a result. Although one of the executive directors left the group, the newly restructured organization retained staff members and programs, unlike many mergers among for-profit companies which often cut staff in the name of efficiency. Another group with increased staff noted that the staff growth had primarily been in the area of administration and grant writing, two areas which can take up a considerable amount of time. The quest for funding is constant and the need to document the use and outcomes of that funding to the granting agencies is often extensive. With many groups receiving grants from multiple foundation, intermediary, federal, state and local sources, the administrative tasks associated with this funding can be time consuming and complicated.

Executive Director's Time

Directors were asked to indicate the top three areas on which they spend most of their time. When leaders were interviewed for the WCDS they noted that although rewarding, the nature of the demands of their work often left them (and their staff) over-loaded and worried about burn-out. There is little indication that the pressure on the staff has lessened. More than half of the leaders indicated their staff had decreased or stayed the same. Leaders continue to express concern about the constant pressure to secure funding coupled with the demands of complying with grant-makers reporting requirements.

Thirteen of the directors indicated that administration was one of the areas on which they spent the most time. Seven leaders indicated that grant writing and management and community relations were areas that demanded a significant amount of their attention. Only two leaders indicated that policy advocacy was among the top three. The leader of one relatively well-funded and well-staffed organization in Boston said that she spent time a lot of her time on collaborative work and raising awareness among fundraisers prior to the grant writing stage. She spent part of her time on "external 'tree shaking' for money, …[to build]alliances to get things done…. Internal operation management is run by [the] COO [Chief Operating Officer] and department heads [but] I am still heavily involved in some real estate projects, especially at the risky start up phase" (Survey 2007).

Table 10
Allocation of Executive Director's Time[11]

Grant Writing and Management	7	Houston Housing and Development, Delta Neighborhood Services, Houston Neighborhood CDC, El Paso Latino Community Development, North East Women's Development Association , Delta Neighborhood Services, El Paso Community Development Partners
Programs	6	Portland Neighborhood CDC, Houston Housing and Development, Delta Neighborhood Services, Houston Neighborhood CDC, Delta Development Funders Association, South Boston CDC
Policy Advocacy	2	Oakland Community Health Services, Chicago Housing and Development Association
Board Relations	2	Boston Women's Service and Advocacy, Chicago Women's Homeless Shelter
Donor Relations	3	Boston Women's Service and Advocacy, Chicago Women's Homeless Shelter, South Boston CDC
Organization Administration	13	Houston Housing and Development, Boston Women's Service and Advocacy, Chicago Women's Homeless Shelter, Delta Neighborhood Services, Houston Neighborhood CDC, El Paso Latino Development Corporation, El Paso Community Service and Development Association, Portland Affordable Housing and Development Association, Oregon Arts and Development, Texas Domestic Violence Shelter, Chicago Development Partners, El Paso Community Development Partners, Chicago Housing and Development Association
Community Relations	7	Houston Neighborhood CDC, El Paso Community Service and Development Association, South Boston CDC, Oakland Community Health Services, , Texas Domestic Violence Shelter, Chicago Housing and Development Association, Development Funders Association
Staff Management and Development	6	Portland Neighborhood CDC, South Boston CDC, North East Women's Development Association, Chicago Housing and development Association, Oregon Arts and Development, Portland Affordable Housing and Development Association
Other: Collaboration	1	South Boston CDC

N 18

[11] One organization has no staff and no current programs, another organization has an organizational model in which there is no executive director and the staff shares the responsibility for all program and administrative areas. Leaders were asked to indicate the top three areas on which they spent the most time.

Six leaders indicated that they spent significant time on staff management and development. Executive directors of smaller groups must handle areas that the directors of larger groups are able to delegate to other staff, particularly in the areas of grant writing and day to day administration. Directors of larger groups can spend more time on board, donor and community relations. The director of one of the largest groups indicated that she spent much of her time on programs in addition to community relations. Only one leader added that she devoted a significant amount of time to collaboration. Leaders were asked about collaboration in a separate question; however South Boston CDC's director was the only leader to indicate that she spent a significant amount of her work on it. Her organization is in a community with a number of other strong community based groups and where there is a significant infrastructure to support collaborative efforts.

Programs

Directors were asked to identify their top program priorities. They were also asked to note any major changes during the last ten years to their organization's program priorities and the reasons for those changes. As identified in the WCDS programming decisions were driven primarily by community need rather than by the priorities of funders. Affordable permanent housing and local economic development continue to be top concerns for the majority of organizations. As the WCDS noted, women leaders are comprehensive in their approach and it was not unexpected to find that leaders continue to focus on multiple program areas. The Director of Southeast Chicago Housing and

Development Association identified and ranked thirty separate program areas as priorities for her group. For most, the programs leaders selected may not be an exhaustive list but instead reflects only those which are currently most pressing. That having been said, after omitting the one organization that currently has no programs and the organization which ranked all thirty as priorities, the average number of program priorities is just over six.

Table 11
Number of "Top" Program Priorities

0 programs	1 Group
2-4 programs	6 Groups
5-9 programs	8 Groups
10 or more programs	3 Groups

N18

The directors identified a wide range of program priorities from traditional housing and economic programs to immigrant rights, youth development, women's rights, and political empowerment. Among the top priorities the women leaders most often cited were those related to affordable housing and development. Twelve leaders cited affordable permanent housing as a top priority and six leaders indicated that sheltering the homeless was a top concern. Affordable permanent housing programs included both rental units as well as home ownership. Homeless shelter programs also focused both on temporary shelter as well as more long term transitional housing.

Leaders who indicated housing and economic development as top priorities were also likely to include areas such as organizing, leadership development and training and

women's rights as top programmatic concerns as well. They recognize that the solutions to many of these concerns are linked. One leader of a domestic violence shelter for example, not only identified shelter and related services but also permanent housing and job training as key program priorities.

The next most often cited as a top program priority was neighborhood economic and business development. Thirteen leaders said that development was a primary concern. The ways in which that development is pursued varied considerably among the groups. At least two CDOs had microenterprise programs to support the development of small, individually owned businesses. Other groups had loan and skill building programs and business incubators to "grow" new businesses. Finally one group was working to build and sustain socially responsible businesses as well as to create a large-scale development to house these and other businesses.

Only two groups, Boston Women's Advocates and Service Association and Portland Neighborhood CDC specifically mentioned political empowerment as a top priority. The former is a women-focused advocacy and service organization and the later is a male-led housing and development focused CDC. One other leader from Boston identified organizing as a top priority. During the last ten years this organization has continued to grow and pursue both large and small scale development projects despite the changing funding climate. This director identified "affordable housing development, economic development (including real estate, and small business lending) and organizing to build local and regional power with/by youth and adults—these are co-equal and key to a three-legged stool" (Survey 2007). Although it may not have made it into the top priorities of

more than a few leaders, elsewhere in the survey a number of leaders did acknowledge organizing and empowerment as important components of their work.

Leaders were asked to identify whether or not there had been any major changes to the organization's programmatic focus during the last ten years. The leaders of seven groups, including three housing and economic development focused CDCs, one domestic violence shelter, one comprehensive development, service and advocacy group and two gender-focused groups indicated that there had been no significant changes. The leaders of twelve organizations, however, cited a number of major changes and highlighted the reasons for those changes.

The leaders of two organizations whose primary function had been as intermediaries said there had been significant changes to their group's focus. The local intermediary, El Paso Community Development Partners, made the decision to function as an independent economic and development group rather than as an intermediary because, "sustaining the primary functions of a local intermediary (providing technical assistance and core operating support) is not feasible in the current philanthropic climate" (Survey 2007). Rather than providing assistance and support to other organizations to facilitate local collaboration and development, the group has shifted focus to fund and manage more of its own development efforts.

Table 12
Top Organizational Priorities Identified by Directors
(Number of Groups)

Homelessness (shelter)	Woodlawn Housing and Development, Delta Neighborhood Services, Houston Domestic Violence Shelter, Boston Women's Shelter and Development, Chicago Women's Shelter
Affordable Housing	Southeast Chicago Housing and Development Association, El Paso Community Development Partnership, Chicago Development Partners, Portland Affordable Housing and Development, South Boston Community Development, Northeast Women's Development, Houston Neighborhood CDC, Delta Neighborhood Services, Chicago Neighborhood Services, Houston Housing and Development, Portland Neighborhood CDC, Chicago Women's Shelter
Neighborhood Economic, Business Development	Southeast Chicago Housing and Development Association, Delta Development Funding Association, Chicago Development Partners, South Boston CDC, El Paso Latino Development Corporation, Houston Neighborhood CDC, Houston Housing and Development, Portland Neighborhood CDC, El Paso Community Development Partners, Chicago Development Partners, Oregon Arts and Development, Delta Neighborhood Services
Poverty/Living Wage/ Economic Literacy	Delta Development Funding Associates, Delta Neighborhood Services, Boston Women's Advocates and Services, Oregon Arts and Development, Northeast Women's Development
Leadership Training and Development	Delta Development Funding Associates, Delta Neighborhood Services, El Paso Latino Development Corporation
Domestic Violence (Shelter, Prevention and Services)	Houston Domestic Violence Shelter, Boston Shelter and Development, El Paso Community Services and Development
Job Training and Skill Building	Houston Neighborhood CDC, Oregon Arts and Development, Delta Neighborhood Services, Boston Women's Advocates and Services, Chicago Women's Shelter, Portland Affordable Housing and Development
Education	Delta Neighborhood Services, Boston Women's Advocates and Services, Chicago Neighborhood Services

Table 12 continued

Women's Rights	El Paso Latino Development Corporation, Boston Women's Advocates and Services
Childcare	El Paso Latino Development Corporation, Rose CDC
Political Empowerment	Boston Women's Advocates and Services, Portland Neighborhood CDC
Youth organizing/Development	Northeast Women's Development, El Paso Community Services and Development
Community Organizing	South Boston Community Development Corporation
N 19	

Another regional intermediary funder noted that the organization had "refocused" and "adopted a more programmatic approach" rather than primarily supporting other groups (Survey 2007). These changes came "at the behest of the board" as well as because of "changes in community needs, new state and local initiatives and new foundation initiatives" (Survey 2007). This group has not given up its role as in intermediary funder entirely, but has adapted its approach to that role and created new programs and initiatives as a result.

A number of leaders identified program changes that can as the result of changes in community demands or needs. One leader of a domestic violence shelter cited multiple interrelated issues that limit "clients'" ability to be "self-sufficient: addiction, mental health issues, poverty. We build programs…in these fields" (Survey 2007). The leader of another large housing and development organization described the addition of new financial literacy, skill building and home repair programs as being "brought about by changes in community needs and demands." The director of Delta Neighborhood Services described how her group expanded its programs to include housing adding it to the group's understanding of "basic needs." She noted that changes in community demands meant that the group had to "do more to support…basic needs; we provide food through our pantry, clothes through our thrift store, housing is also a basic need for families and children to strive and survive" (Survey 2007). Some neighborhood-based groups also expanded their scope to be city-wide rather than exclusively locally based in response to community demands.

Funding limitations are not always decisive because women leaders are often willing to pursue programs that address community needs regardless of funding availability (Gittell, Ortega, Steffy 1999). Still, it is an important factor. Some leaders identified both changes in community needs and demands as well as changes in the available funding as playing a role in program changes. At one group, "the program used to emphasize gaining skills and networking… and three years or so ago the priority shifted to access markets for the members… the goal being [getting] dollars in their pockets" (Survey 2007). This reemphasis was the result of "increased funding availability for [a] new program, [and] cuts in funding, [and] changes in community demands and needs" (Survey 2007). In this case, new state, local and foundation initiatives were identified as supportive of the new programs. Another leader identified changes in community demands as well as new concerns among board members as bringing about program changes. As a group which had predominantly focused on immigration and health advocacy for one ethnic community, Oakland Community Health Services has expanded its focus. OCHS's Director explained that "we embarked on a diversity initiative to expand /diversify board, programs and staff to other ethnic groups…" (Survey 2007). As a result the organization has redefined its constituency and expanded its program offerings. To meet the needs of new stakeholders, the group has had to increase its staff.

Changes in funding such as when new funds or initiatives become available or when cuts reduce availability can make supporting specific programs challenging. One leader of an economic development focused group simply noted that when increased

funding became available for job training, the organization was able to create a new program. The leader of another group that had previously run programs in economic literacy for women noted that the group has

> moved away from direct service delivery of economic literacy programs. [We] have developed a curricula turning it into a 'training of trainers approach' and [we] disseminate [it] to service providers…it became significantly more difficult to sustain adequate levels of funding for a relatively small constituent base (Survey 2007).

Still another leader cited changes in funding, in the board's priorities and in community needs as paying a role in the addition or elimination of some programs. In particular she described new local, state and foundation initiatives, and cuts in some federal funding as well as "initiatives that we and others have created for such things as smart growth" as driving the program changes (Survey 2007).

Funding

Funding is a concern for most non-profits. It is particularly difficult for organizations to secure funding when they are pursuing unique or innovative programs which challenge funders' expectations. Even when programs are successful the internal structure of foundations and their funding cycles can be a constraint. Major foundation funding cycles almost guarantee that groups cannot expect long term access to funding for basic programs. Groups generally cannot expect to receive grants from the same sources for the same programs year in and year out. It is sometimes possible to receive renewable grants over a few years, but foundations often expect new ideas and initiatives, even when existing ones may be successful (Gittell, Ferman and Price 2006).

Further complicating matters is the fact that foundation and other grant initiatives are likely to be "top-down" efforts rather than determined by local needs. Compounding the funding problem still further is that what many local organizations most need is general operating support – money to pay staff, rent office space and cover the expenses necessary to keep the doors open. This however, is the type of funding groups are least likely to receive as foundations and other funders often require grants to be spent directly on programs.

For this study, women leaders were asked to consider several questions related to funding. First they were asked to consider the overall funding climate and the sources of funding they consider to be the most and least reliable. They were also asked to consider the ease with which they are able to secure funding for a variety of different organizational and program areas and to name the one thing for which they have the hardest time raising funds.

Overall Funding Climate

Leaders were asked to assess the current overall funding climate for non-profits. All of the leaders indicated that the funding climate was generally difficult either because there is less money available, because there was more competition for the funding that is available or because there was increased competition for a fewer resources. The general negative perception of the funding climate held true even for groups that indicated that they had acquired new funds and for groups at all budgets levels. Neither of the two organizations with the largest annual budgets – $30 million and $13 million— was

immune to funding worries and indicated that that there is increased competition for less funding. Each of these groups also has assets in excess of $20 million and $17 million respectively, from which they are able to generate a substantial income. The organization with the largest budget also generates income from memberships and fee for service programs. Neither the assets nor the fees and membership dues were enough to alleviate worries about the declining availability of, and greater competition for funding. Even for the leaders of these groups, each of which had specific staff dedicated to identifying and securing funding, the task of fund raising can be daunting despite being well-positioned to attract resources.

Table 13

Leader's Assessment of Funding Climate

Funding Climate	No. of Groups	Name of Group
Improving	0	
Declining (less money available)	4	El Paso Community Development Partners, Chicago Development Partners, South Boston CDC, Chicago Neighborhood Services
Becoming More Competitive	5	Oregon Arts and Development, Houston Housing and Development, North East Women's Development, Delta Development Funders Association, Boston Women's Advocates and Services
Declining and More Competitive	10	Chicago Women's Homeless Shelters, Chicago Housing and Development Association, Portland Neighborhood CDC, Houston Neighborhood CDC, El Paso Latino Development Corporation, Texas Domestic Violence Shelter, Delta Neighborhood Services, Portland Affordable Housing and Development Associates, Oakland Community Health Services, El Paso Community Services and Development Association

N 19

The director of South Boston CDC, an organization with a multi-million dollar budget and over $10 million dollars worth of assets described the funding picture as being in flux. Increases from some funders were being offset by decrease from other sources. SBCDC sought to expand their funding base by establishing their own fundraising gala. The director notes that "we still raise about $1million dollars a year from fundraising, outside of our net income from our properties…and real estate development… but with much more effort and requiring more staff fundraising time. [There are] fewer large federal grants…fewer banks make donations. [There have been] some larger grants from foundations but no guarantees. More has to come from [our] internal gala" (Survey 2007). Not every group has the means to host their own fund raising events, nor do all groups have a local donor pool large enough to support such efforts. Fundraising events sponsored by local groups are also susceptible to the overall economic climate. However, many community groups are seeking ways to become more self-sustaining as funding sources become less reliable.

Overall the leaders present a picture of a fluctuating, competitive and insecure funding climate. Even groups with long histories and proven track records can find it difficult to sustain their organizations. Some seek to create their own funding streams through fees for service programs or establishing their own business enterprises to generate income. However, given the populations these groups generally serve, this can prove challenging. During economic downturns individuals and businesses may have less money to donate or they may simply be less inclined to donate when there is

economic uncertainty. Few leaders indicated that donations were among the most reliable sources of revenue.

Groups with significant real estate portfolios and rental income may also face particular challenges. Community groups that develop and manage rental units usually do so to keep rents low. Managing and attending to the up-keep of these units can be costly. In addition, these groups may also offer services and target programs to meet resident's needs which also require funding.

Securing Funds for Specific Needs

In addition to assessing the overall funding climate for CDOs, women leaders were asked to rate how easily they were able to obtain funding for specific program and organizational needs. Ten years ago for the WCDS many leaders indicated that securing general operating funds for the day to day running of the organization was often difficult, even when grants were available for programs and projects. Survey respondents again noted the difficulty in securing general operating support. They also noted a lack of support for organizing and collaboration.

Other than for "Participating in Coalitions" most leaders indicated that they had either "some difficulty" or "great difficulty" in obtaining sufficient funds in five of six key areas indicated on the survey. In terms of maintaining necessary staff levels, ten leaders indicated that they had "some difficulty" and seven indicated that they had a "hard time" securing sufficient funding. Only two leaders indicated that they were able to maintain the necessary or desired staff levels with ease. Both of these women were

leaders of groups with large budgets and staffs. In contrast, the smaller and mid-sized organizations had more difficulty with funding for staff.

Sixteen of nineteen leaders indicated that they had either "some" or "great" difficulty securing sufficient funding for general operating expenses. This is not entirely unexpected, as it was a key concern of the CDO leaders ten years ago, and has been identified as an issue in other studies of non-profits (Chetkovich and Kunreuther 2007). It is often easier to find funding for specific projects than it is to find operating expenses. Even so, the funding picture was not much better for groups when it came to securing funds for programs. Seventeen groups indicated that they had either "some" or "great" difficulty securing funding to offer the programs needed in their communities. A few leaders indicated that they had been forced to cut entire programs when they lost or could not secure funding. Even well-established groups with straight forward housing and economic development programs indicated difficulty in securing funding. Some groups noted that there is growing need as in their communities as economic conditions worsen. Maintaining or expanding programs to meet this demand can be challenging.

Table 14
Ease or Difficulty in Securing Funds
(Number of Groups)

How easily are you able to obtain sufficient funds to	Easily	With Some Difficulty	With Great Difficulty	Not a Priority
Maintain Necessary or Desired Staff Levels	**2**	**10**	**7**	___
Cover General Operating Expenses	**3**	**8**	**8**	___
Offer the Programs Needed	**2**	**12**	**5**	
Engage in Community Organizing	**3**	**4**	**6**	**5**
Do Advocacy Work	**2**	**5**	**6**	**5**
Participate in Coalitions	**8**	**3**	**5**	**3**

N 19[12]

Somewhat surprisingly, the El Paso Latino Development Corporation, a one well-established women-led and women-focused group that has extensive development, organizing, advocacy and service programs indicated that they had great difficulty raising funds for all the areas listed above. Despite the group's overall success, and the comprehensive nature of their work, the organization still faced significant fund raising challenges. In particular, this leader identified "finding funds to build core infrastructure support and to do genuine development work in a community that has been systematically marginalized, versus small project funding" as a key challenge. The

[12] Although twenty responses were received, some leaders skipped or declined to answer some questions. In these instances total responses will be either 18 or 19 depending on the question..

entrenched, long-standing social, economic and political issues which this particular community faces required, in her estimation, more than a small project-by-project approach.

The one organization that indicated it could easily obtain funds to offer the programs needed. Oregon Arts and Development has significantly altered its mission and programs offered during the last ten years. OAD has become less comprehensive and more targeted in its approach, in contrast to the findings of the WCDS that found women-led organizations were more comprehensive in their approach. This group was one of the least well-resourced groups and currently indicates that engaging in advocacy and organizing was not a priority for the group. Ten years ago advocacy and organizing were central to its mission. Indeed when the group was first founded, organizing and a door to door community survey to determine community needs, was the initial effort of the group long before any specific economic development or other programs were established. Today the group has moved away from organizing, advocacy and other programs previously central to the group's mission and now focuses almost exclusively on microenterprise development. Although the organization is still run by a woman and works with a majority of women artisans the group is no longer exclusively neighborhood focused and it has moved away from some of its earlier women-centered programming and advocacy.

Groups were split on the ease with which they were able to raise funding to do advocacy, organizing and to work in coalitions. Five groups indicated that community organizing was not a priority; another five indicated that advocacy work was not a

priority and three indicated that participating in coalitions was not a priority of the group. Two groups indicated that none of the three areas were a funding priority. The leaders of seven groups indicated that they easily found funds to participate in coalitions, while the leaders of eight other groups said they found funding for work in coalitions either with difficulty or great difficultly.

Raising Funds

Leaders were asked to identify the single area for which they had the hardest time raising funds. Twelve leaders stated that general operating expenses as their most pressing fundraising challenge. Four groups indicated that securing funding for low-income housing development was the most difficult challenge. Among these four groups are two which have been highly successful in developing low–income housing and two which have been somewhat less so. One of the successful housing groups indicated that they also had difficulty obtaining funds for the service and tenant support programs they offer. Another leader of an organization with a small budget said that her group had no particular funding deficiencies but she noted that, "when we ask we receive funding but sometimes don't take the time to ask" (Survey 2007).

Table 15

Most Difficult Funding Challenge

General Operating Expenses	South East Chicago Housing and Development El Paso Community Development Partners, Houston Domestic Violence Shelter South Boston Community Development Corp. Northeast Women's Development El Paso Latino Development Corporation Houston Neighborhood CDC Delta Neighborhood Services Chicago Neighborhood Services Houston Housing and Development, Chicago Women's Shelter
Low-Income Housing/Housing Development	El Paso Community Development Partners Portland Affordable Housing and Development Association Houston Neighborhood CDC Houston Housing and Development
Business Development/lending and assistance	Chicago Development Partners South Boston CDC Southeast Chicago Housing and Development Association
Social and Health Services	Portland Affordable Housing and Development Association Oakland Community Health Services El Paso Community Services and Development
Community Organizing	Houston Housing and Development Portland Neighborhood CDC
Foreclosure Prevention	Houston Housing and Development
Program Oversight and Outcome measurement	Boston Women's Advocates and Services
Housing Repairs and Replacement	Houston Domestic Violence Shelter

N 19

One women- led and focused housing and development organization described the biggest challenge as a combined on that included, “Raising funds in seeking out new development opportunities and partners with which to work”(Survey 2007). A leader of a comprehensive domestic violence shelter indicated that securing funding for the repairs to and replacement of the housing they provided for women and their families was the most problematic. Funders may be willing to support the development of a shelter or the establishment of a new program but the long-term, less glamorous up-keep and maintenance of these facilities was less appealing to donors. Some groups may turn to donors or fee for service programs but for some, donations were among the least reliable sources of funding.

Faith-based Funding

Although a number of faith-based groups already receive Federal funds and other government grants to run programs and administer services, the Bush administration’s Faith-based Initiative was touted as major new source of funding for community based organizations. It promised $8 billion to be directed to faith-based community organizations. Overall, little money has been devoted to the initiative and some have questioned the Bush administration’s commitment to community based organizations in general as well as to the Faith-based Initiative itself (Sullivan 2005; DiIluio and Kuo 2008).

The CDO leaders, some of whom identify their groups as faith-based, were asked whether or not the Faith-based Initiative had had an impact on their funding. Fifteen of

the leaders indicated that the Faith-based Initiative has had no impact at all. The director of Portland Neighborhood CDC went so far as to call it "a sham" (Survey 2007). Of the four groups that indicated they had benefited in some way from the initiative, the overall positive impact for three of the groups was minimal, and one group indicated that the initiative had negative impact. Of the three groups that received funding related to the initiative, only one was actually an explicitly faith-based group. The others received funds through their participation in coalitions with other faith-based organizations. One group indicated that they had participated in a capacity building program sponsored by a local intermediary that had received funds. Another leader indicated that her group had received funding but that it had little impact overall:

> We have gotten small grants from some faith-based coalitions handling those funds. It has only helped a little, but worked with some crime coalitions and youth alliances. No substitute for the old HUD Drug Elimination Grants, which used to give us $200,000 to $250,000 a year for youth programs, policing, technology training and job linkage" (Survey 2007).

Finally, another leader said that she felt, "it has diminished our opportunities to get funding as we are not faith-based but we are community based so the attitude is that we should be satisfied with the smaller amounts available…rather than competing for other funds" (Survey 2007).

So far, the Faith-based Initiative has had only limited impact on the women-led groups. Many non-profit groups are rooted in communities of faith and are already participating in federal state and local funding initiatives. The faith-based groups in the WCDS are committed to community development without promoting a narrowly defined religious agenda. At the same time, progressive faith-based organizations have

recognized for themselves that appealing directly to communities of faith can be an important source of financial support and human capital in the form of volunteers.

A number of groups describe what appears to be an overall lack of commitment on the part of the current administration to funding community based efforts in general. At least one leader noted that funds from a faith-based initiative have not been adequate to compensate for the decreases in federal programs from which they previously received grants. Initially the proposal for faith-based funding for community groups generated both excitement and concern. The program itself had a difficult time initially as several advisors on the initiative resigned, questioning the administration's commitment to funding faith-based groups. It appears however, that the Bush administration has largely lacked a commitment to funding many community-based efforts faith-based or otherwise.

Reliability of Funding Sources

Directors were asked to consider the reliability of various funding sources and to identify which sources they could count on from year to year. Each type of funding was considered reliable by some and unreliable by others, suggesting that individual leaders cultivate a unique variety of sources to maintain consistent funding. No one combination of funding sources is reliable for every group. Three groups identified all funding sources as equally unreliable. No leaders identified all funding sources as equally reliable. For every source except donations, an equal number, or more leaders found the source of funding to be the "most reliable." In particular, four leaders identify local

Table 16

Funding Reliability

	Most Reliable	Least Reliable
City/local	South Chicago Housing and Development Association, Chicago Development Partners, Oregon Arts and Development, El Paso Community Services and Development	El Paso Community Development Partners, Houston Domestic Violence Shelter and Services, Oakland Community Health Services
State Gov	South Chicago Housing and Development Association, Houston Domestic Violence Shelter and Services, Oakland Community Health Services, Boston Women's Advocates and Services	--
Federal Gov	El Paso Community Development Partners, Houston Domestic Violence Shelter, Oregon Arts and Development, El Paso Community Services and Development	Oakland Community Health Services, Portland Affordable Housing and Development Association, Chicago Neighborhood Services
Foundations	Delta Funding Associates, , Houston Domestic Violence Shelter, Oregon Arts and Development, Houston Neighborhood CDC, Portland Neighborhood CDC, Houston Housing and Development	El Paso Community Development Partners, Southeast Chicago Housing and Development Corp, Oakland Community Health Services, Northeast Women's Development
Fees for Service	El Paso Community Development Partners, Oakland Community Health Services, Portland Affordable Housing Development Association, El Paso Community Services and Development, Portland Neighborhood CDC	Houston Neighborhood CDC
Membership Dues	Oakland Community Health Services	El Paso Community Services and Development
Donations	Oakland Community Health Services, Boston Women's Advocates and Services	Chicago Development Partners, Houston Domestic Violence Shelter, Oregon Arts and Development, Houston Neighborhood CDC, Boston Women's Shelter and Development, Houston Housing and Development
All Equally reliable	———	
All Equally Unreliable	Delta Development Funding Associates, Delta Neighborhood Services, Chicago Neighborhood Services	———

N19

sources, five leaders identify state sources and four leaders identify state and federal funding sources as the "most reliable." The largest number of leaders identified foundation funding as the "most reliable." Only two leaders cited donations as the "most reliable" and four leaders cited them as the "least reliable." Membership dues were not a major source of funding for groups; only one leader indicated dues were among the most reliable sources of funding and one leader indicted that this was among the least reliable. Dues can be an important source of building commitment and participation, but given the fact the community based development groups considered for this research generally serve poor and marginalized populations, they are unlikely to be a large enough source of support to cover major program and organizational expenses.

Leaders were in little agreement about which sources of funding were most reliable. Three groups found all sources equally unreliable. Particularly for groups that are engaged in health care or in providing services to vulnerable populations such as the elderly, children or the mentally ill, contracts with various levels government and different agencies are essential. Government funding to support housing and economic programs is also important, although they may be a shrinking part of the funding puzzle for some groups.

Individual and business donors were the only sources that more leaders identified as unreliable, than reliable. Foundation funding can be problematic because it can be tied to a specific initiative or short-term goal of a foundation and may therefore be limited. Fees for services and membership dues are only a limited part of the funding picture for most groups. Although groups may be increasingly concerned with achieving self-

sufficiency, options for most groups are relatively limited. An organization may operate a non-profit business to generate revenue, or it can manage rental housing units. Each of these approaches has limitations; businesses may not always generate sufficient revenue and programs to support tenants may offset income gained through rents. Likewise, membership dues even for groups with a strong membership base are unlikely to generate large amounts of revenue given the limited incomes of most groups' constituents. Even for the leader of group with the largest membership base, membership fees and fees for service were identified as the "least reliable" sources of revenue.

Certainly there is variation among the organizations in terms of their ability to attract funding. It might be comforting to think that every deserving and effective organization was able to consistently secure the funding it requires, but this is rarely the case. Leaders expressed that they lacked sufficient funding to address the needs of their communities from year to year. Leaders and staff devote increasing amounts of time to secure funding not only to run vital programs but also just to keep their group staffed and running. In many communities, non-profits provide the essential services and programs including day care, affordable housing development, business and economic development and others. If these groups are to be able to deliver the services and programs that residents require, the ability of these groups to find reliable sources of funding is essential. This is especially important in an economic and political and economic system that relies on CDOs to be a primary vehicle, through which services, development and housing programs are delivered in communities.

Chapter Five
Community Organizing, Networking, Collaboration and Barriers

Community Organizing

Community organizing has reemerged as a focus of foundations and others who may have previously been reluctant to explicitly promote or directly fund community organizing. Because of their experience during the Great Society Programs of the 1960s some foundations became hesitant to fund programs that may have been considered too political. Furthermore, in order for a non-profit to maintain its tax status (both the granter and grantee) it cannot directly engage in partisan political activity, including political organizing, endorsing a candidate or supporting a partisan campaign. The activities of non-profits have come under heightened scrutiny because of increasingly polarized domestic politics in the U.S.

For some funders and groups the line between community organizing and what might be interpreted as unallowable partisan activity was too unclear to risk jeopardizing the group's non-profit tax status. In addition to such fears, for some in foundations the reluctance to fund organizing may be based on the fact that

> the values, perspectives and experiences of the vast majority of foundation board members and staff who develop foundation policies and practices are not focused on issues of power in our society. More precisely they have refused, or been very reluctant to fund organizations that explicitly seek to build the power base of the poor so they can affect and change the public policies and private market forces that create and sustain social and economic inequality (Allen 1998 1).

A new definition of community organizing is emerging and funders and groups at both the national and local level have begun to more explicitly engage in organizing.

Gittell, Price and Ferman have identified an emerging definition of organizing that is "…less reliant on single actions and more centered on building relationships, as well as networks that lead to new, deeper relationship and collaborations on policy issues and negotiations more directed toward policy outcomes" (2006 268). One example of renewed interest in organizing at the foundation level is the Ford Community Organizing Initiative. Beginning in 2000, the Ford Foundation funded and initiative that allocated a $1 million in each of three sites over three years. The funds were granted to a local intermediary in each site that was responsible for re-granting to local groups (Gittell, Ferman and Price 2006). One primary goal was to solidify networks and collaboration at the local level. In other areas, community organizing efforts are also becoming more prominent. In Boston, for example, the Boston Women's Fund has created a community organizing institute to support organizing around issues for women and girls. Groups must still remain non-partisan but organizing is an increasingly important program component for many CBOs.

Although there is renewed interest and activity around organizing, from the perspective of CBO leaders, it remains an under-funded program. Most leaders indicated that they did not have adequate funds or a dedicated staff person to do organizing even though they were inclined to do so. Even without dedicated funding however, leaders often found a way to incorporate organizing into their efforts.

Ten years ago, the WCDS identified that many women-led groups were engaging in community organizing even when they didn't have funding for it. At that time, many leaders considered it an essential part of their work. The leaders surveyed for this project

continue to engage in organizing even though they may have few financial resources to support these efforts. Leaders were asked to assess to what degree community organizing was a priority for them. Fourteen leaders indicated that community was a priority of at least some importance to their organization.

Table 17
Importance of Community Organizing

Is Community Organizing a Priority?	
No, CO not a priority	4 groups
CO is somewhat or moderately important	5 groups
CO is very important	4 groups
It's a priority but don't have funding and staff to do it now	5 groups
N 18	

Only three leaders however, indicated that they had one or more paid community organizers on staff. One leader in Boston described her strong commitment to organizing in this way,

> organizing is one of our three 'strategic legs'. Coming from that background, I insist that we organize before, during and after development. We have 5 organizers –working with tenants, youth, crime collaborations, and [another] coalition. It changes everything" (Survey 2007).

She credits organizing as contributing to the success of development projects and advocacy campaigns. She also feels that it helps to attract funding. Another leader who described community organizing as "somewhat important" said, "the community organizing we do is related to the work we do with our tenants (over 1000) who primarily live in one part of our community" (Survey 2007). Other leader of a service-focused

CDO in Texas said that they had "developed a partner CDC. [The] Agency has a public policy committee with a staff liaison" (Survey 2007) whose work is geared toward organizing.

Table 18
How Organizing is Done

Paid Organizers on Staff	3 groups
Built into Job	9 groups
Built into Programs	7 groups
Volunteer organizer on staff	1 group

N 19

Five groups indicated that community organizing is a priority but they currently "don't have funding and staff to do it." These groups were not entirely deterred however; four of these five groups found ways to incorporate community organizing into the work of the organization. One group in Houston had a volunteer community organizer on staff, and other groups also chose to write organizing into the job descriptions of staff members.

Of the four groups that said community organizing was not a priority, two are comprehensive domestic violence shelters, and two are groups that had previously focused on organizing but have since moved away from it as the organizations redefined their missions. One group has transitioned from being a local intermediary to a group that now pursues its own development projects. The other CBO was a neighborhood economic development and advocacy organization for which organizing had been central to its mission. The group has subsequently focused on small business development and

support for low-income residents and has moved away from engaging in community organizing. For most groups however, community organizing remains or has become an increasingly important focus even if there is limited funding to support it.

Networking and Collaboration

One of the key findings of the WCDS was that women leaders were networked and engaged in collaborative work with other local organizations and leaders and were "creating social capital" in their communities. There were however some concerns regarding the types of networks to which women leaders had access. Although they may have been well connected to other leaders—especially other women leaders in their communities— many said that they lacked access to key political, business or funding networks (Gittell, Ortega and Steffy 1999). For this survey, leaders were asked which if any networks they were currently a part of, whether or not they met regularly with the leaders of other local groups, and whether or with whom they collaborate. They were also specifically asked to assess their relationship with state and local political leaders and with local funders. For the purposes of this research networks and collaboration are considered a measure of social capital. Successful participation in them can help to build trust and strengthen ties within local communities.

Only two groups indicated that they were not part of an organizational, leadership or issue-related network either at the local, state or national level. Five leaders indicated that they were part of at least one network. The other ten leaders said that they were involved in multiple networks, including local, national and statewide networks.

Table 19
Network Participation

Number of Networks	No. of Groups	**Type of Network**	No. of Groups
No Networks	2[13]	City/Local Only	5
1	5	State Only	2
2	3	City/Local and State	4
3	2	City/Local, State, National	3
4	1	National Only	2
5 or more	4		
N 17		N 16	

One group in Boston listed ten different local, national and state networks in which they participate. Two groups, one in Oakland, and another in Texas listed five networks of which they were members. The type of networks groups are involved in include leadership, funding, policy and development sector organizations such as local associations of CDCs, among others.

Half the groups indicated that they were a part of city or both city and state networks. Two groups indicated that they were only involved in state level networks and two others listed only national network participation. One of the groups that listed being part of only a national network was from the Delta region. In rural area there are fewer opportunities to network compared to some of the other urban sites in this study. The physical distance between groups in rural areas can be a barrier to network building. In

13 Boston Women's Advocacy and Services and El Paso Latino Community Development Partners indicated that they were not officially part of any networks.

addition remaining race or class marginalization in some regions can also be an obstacle to inclusion in key networks.

Connections among leaders at the local level can be an important resource for groups, especially in neighborhoods with a large number of groups such as in Boston or Chicago where groups may be in competition for funding and projects. In Portland where the city's urban growth boundary (UGB) effectively limits the amount of available property for development or redevelopment, networking and collaboration helps overcome what could be a source of competition among groups. The UGB is also factor in driving up the cost of housing and development projects, making local groups efforts to maintain affordable housing all the more critical. Formal and informal personal and working relationships help to diffuse potential conflicts when multiple groups in Portland "go after" the same property. In other sites as well, long standing relationships among leaders not only led to successful collaboration, it also provided a source of support for leaders who felt marginalized in other areas.

When asked if they met with local community leaders on a regular basis, ten leaders indicated that they met with others "formally" and "regularly." Eight leaders indicated that they met with other community leaders regularly but on an informal basis. Only two indicated that they met with other leaders only infrequently. None indicated that they did not meet at all. The leader of one organization in Chicago indicated that she relied on both formal and informal relationships with other neighborhood leaders. Another leader form Texas echoed this sentiment. She said that she met with other groups and leaders "all the time, formally, and informally, regularly and irregularly. We

are always identifying more opportunities to build strength at the small, neighborhood, regional, state and even national level" (Survey 2007).

Table 20
Networking with Local Leaders

Leaders say they network:	Number of groups
Formally and Regularly	10
Informally and regularly	8
Very infrequently	2
Not at all	0

N 20

Importantly, most leaders said that they no longer perceived that they are excluded from more formal political and funding networks. Leaders were asked to consider how networking relationships may have changed during the last ten years. They were asked to assess these changes both in terms of relationships they had with other leaders and the networking relationships among groups. Only two leaders indicated that networking with local leaders and other groups had declined in the last ten years. Another indicated that networking with leaders in her community remained at the "same low level." More than half the leaders felt that there had been little change (either positive or negative) in their networking relationships with other organizations. These leaders considered networking to have remained primarily at the "same moderate level." Two leaders, one in El Paso and one in Portland indicated that both their organizational and leadership networking relationships had decreased.

Table 21
Relationships with Other Groups

Stayed at Same High Level	North East Women's Development
Stayed at Same Moderate Level	Chicago Women's Shelter, Houston Neighborhood CDC, Chicago Development Partners, Portland Neighborhood CDC, Delta Development Funding Associates, Houston Housing and Development, El Paso Latino Development Corp., Portland Affordable Housing and Development, Oakland Community Health Services
Same Low Level	____
Decreased Slightly	El Paso Community Development Partners
Decreased to Large Extent	Oregon Arts and Development
Increased Slightly	Boston Women's Advocates and Services, Delta Neighborhood Services, South east Chicago Housing and Development
Increased to a Large Extent	El Paso Community Services and Development, South Boston CDC, Houston Women's Shelter

N19

Six groups indicated increased networking with other organizations and leaders. Most of those saw increase in both areas. Two groups indicated improvements in one area but not the other. One leader of a domestic violence shelter in Houston indicated that networking among groups had increased to a large extent but that networking with other leaders had remained low. The WCDS study had found that networking among domestic violence shelters was strong and it seems that this continues to be the case. For another leader of a CDC also in Houston, the opposite was true, networking with other

leaders had increased but she indicated that networking among groups remained at the same moderate level.

Table 22
Relationships with Other Leaders

Stayed at Same High Level	Northeast Women's Development, Oakland Community Health Services
Stayed at Same Moderate Level	Chicago Women's Shelter, Portland Neighborhood CDC, Chicago Development Partners, Delta Development Funding Associates, Houston Housing and Development, El Paso Latino Development Corp. Portland Affordable Housing and Development
Same Low	Houston Domestic Violence Shelter
Decreased Slightly	El Paso Community Development Partners
Decreased to Large Extent	Oregon Arts and Development
Increased Slightly	Houston Neighborhood CDC, Boston Women's Advocates and Services Delta neighborhood Services, Southeast Chicago CDC
Increased to a large extent	El Paso Women Services and Development, South Boston CDC

N19

When interviewed for the WCDS a number of leaders said they felt they lacked access to, or relationships with elected officials, some even went so far as to say that male-led groups had better access. They described local business and politics as an "old boys club." In the Delta region and in Texas in particular, women leaders were quick to point to race-, ethnicity- and gender-based marginalization as a barrier. They recognized that gaining political access and recognition was a vital part of the community

development process. There seems to have been at least some progress during the last ten years in terms of leaders' relationships with local political officials. Leaders were asked to consider the strength of their relationship with local and state elected officials and how supportive they felt those officials were of their work. The majority of leaders indicated a moderate or very strong relationship with elected officials and most considered elected officials to be moderately or very supportive of the CDOs efforts. The findings indicate that these networks have strengthened over time.

When leaders assessed these networking relationships, two of the women-led and women-focused organizations indicated that elected officials were not very, or only somewhat supportive of their efforts. It may be that networking with elected officials has improved for more traditional (although women-led) development groups but that obstacles remain for community based development organizations that are explicitly gender -, race- or class- conscious. However, the fact that for the most part organizational leaders felt that their relationships with state and local leaders were strong and that these leaders were supportive of their work is evidence of an improvement over earlier findings.

Leaders were asked to identify the specific ways in which elected officials helped their organization. Most groups listed more than one way they had received support. Seventeen groups said that at a minimum, they had no trouble reaching elected officials by phone. Even a leader who indicated that she had little or no relationship with, or support from elected officials said she could reach officials by phone and they were willing to discuss community needs and concerns. More than half the groups indicated

that elected officials had gone beyond being responsive to phone calls or attending events, to actually helping groups to acquire funding.

Table 23

Strength of Relationship with and Support from Elected Officials (Number of Groups)

Strength of Relationship with State and Local Elected Officials

	No relationship	Not Very Strong	Somewhat	Moderately Strong	Very Strong
Local Officials		1	3	5	9
State Officials	1		3	10	4

Supportiveness of Elected Officials

	Not at All	Not Very	Somewhat	Moderately	Very
Local Officials	1	1	1	5	10
State Officials	1	1	3	5	8

N18

Table 24
Type of Support from Elected Officials

Type of Support	Number of Groups
Help In Acquiring Funding	11
Help To Promote, Publicize Activities	8
Takes Phone Calls From ED	16
Supports Networking Among Leaders	7
Supports Networking Among Groups	5
Attends Meetings And Events When Asked	13
Available To Discuss Community Concerns	14
Offers Little Or No Direct Support	0
Other: Provides Letters Of Support:	1
Other: Assists In Acquiring Land For Future Development	1

N18

Finally, leaders were asked to reflect on how their relationship with elected officials at the state and local levels may have changed over time. Three leaders, two from Chicago, and one from Portland said they felt that their relationships with local officials had declined. One Oakland leader felt that local relationships had improved but that relationships with state official had declined. Four leaders indicated that local relationships had improved, but only one leader considered relationships with state official as having improved. The rest of the leaders indicated that little had changed at the state or local level. They said that relationships between community leaders and elected officials for the most part remained at the same moderate level.

Table 25
Change in Relationship with Elected Leaders

	Local	State
Improved Somewhat	Houston Housing And Development Delta Neighborhood Services	Houston Housing and Development
Improved a lot	Oakland Community Health Services	
Declined Somewhat	Oregon Arts and Development, Southeast Chicago CDC	Oakland Community health Services
Declined a lot	Chicago Development Partners	
Same Moderate	Chicago Women's Shelter, Portland Neighborhood CDC, El Paso Community Development Partners, Delta Development Partners, Northeast Women's Development, El Paso Latino Economic Development, Houston Domestic Violence	Delta neighborhood Services, Chicago Women's Shelter Portland Neighborhood CDC, El Paso Community Development Partners, Chicago Development Partners, Boston Women's Advocates and Services Delta Development Partners, Northeast Women's Development, El Paso Latino Economic Development, Houston Domestic Violence
Same High	Neighborhood CDC, El Paso Community Services and Development, South Boston CDC, Portland Affordable Housing and Development Associates	Neighborhood CDC, El Paso Community Services and Development, South Boston CDC, Portland Affordable Housing and Development Associates, Delta Neighborhood Services
Same Low	NONE	Oregon Arts and Development

N 19

Collaboration

Collaboration is one way for groups to leverage resources and attract the support of funders. Collaborative work, however, is rarely easy. Participating groups may have different visions for the final outcome and there can be internal power struggles and ego-driven conflicts among participants. Equitable division of resources among the partner organizations may also involve delicate negotiations. Despite these potential pitfalls, the women-led groups of the WCDS often engaged in collaboration. Collaboration may rely on existing networks and relationships, or it can be fostered by local leaders, intermediaries and/or funders. Successful collaborative efforts can help to build and strengthen social capital in addition to leading to hoped for development outcomes.

Collaboration can be especially effective between and among groups with complementary missions or where a group is expanding into program areas in which they have little or no expertise. For example, a housing and development group interested in offering child care for its residents can partner with a childcare group rather than starting a program of its own. Leaders were asked about how often they pursued collaborative projects and with which type of groups they collaborated most frequently and most effectively. All of the leaders indicated that they were involved in at least some collaborative work.

Table 26
Frequency of Collaboration

Infrequently	Sometimes	Often/as much as possible
None N 18	6 groups	12 groups

Table 27
Collaboration by Type of Group

	No. of Groups that Indicate They Collaborate
Community Based Service	18
Housing and Development	11
Churches	6
Schools	9
Women's Groups	5
Unions	2
Hospitals	2
Health Advocacy	1
Race , Ethnicity, Immigrant Advocacy	4
Youth and Recreation	2
Libraries	1

N18

Almost all of the leaders cited more than one type of group with which their organization collaborates. The average number of types of organizations that leaders said they collaborated with was 3.8. Two organizations listed eight different types of groups with which they have successfully collaborated. All of the groups indicated that they partnered with community based service groups and more than half said they worked with other housing and development groups. Half the organizations said they partnered with schools. Only five leaders said that they worked with other women's groups. Of those five, three were leaders of explicitly gender-conscious organizations. One leader in

Portland added collaborations with local government and national intermediaries as important collaborative partners.

The social capital building potential of community groups is twofold; it can promote both "bonding" and "bridging" social capital (Gittell and Vidal 1998). Locally based groups build trust and relationships among group members. As groups work with others in coalitions that extend beyond their immediate neighborhood, networks and relationships can grow still further. Interventions by local intermediaries or national foundations that specifically support collaboration or networking can also help foster the development of these relationships.

Successful networking and collaboration can both create social capital. As leaders and groups work with each other repeatedly and over time trust can grow. It is also possible that leaders and groups can have negative experiences with network or collaborative partners that might undermine trust and cause leaders to turn away from collaboration. However, the extent to which these groups continue to collaborate rather than to isolate themselves from other groups –especially in the midst of a competitive funding environment— suggests that at collaboration has been a positive experience for many leaders.

Barriers

Ten years ago for the WCDS women leaders were asked to reflect on any obstacles they may have faced in their work including gender-, race-, ethnicity- and class-based barriers. At that time, many women leaders felt that gender played a significant

role in the obstacles they confronted. Leaders perceived their relationship with bankers and other members of the business community or funders as particularly problematic. These individuals were usually men who might assume that the women were not knowledgeable or technically proficient. In particular, women leaders who were worked in housing development said that they had a hard time with the male-dominated construction field. Women leaders said they felt men considered them to be less competent than their male counterparts. Women of color also noted that context made a difference; at times they faced gender-based opposition. At other times, race or class may have been the primary concern. The key to their ultimate success was to negotiate these multiple barriers.

In this survey leaders were again asked to think about and identify any barriers or obstacles they may confront. They were specifically asked to reassess the question of gender-based obstacles. Ten years later, the primary and most pressing obstacles that women leaders identified were not necessarily related to gender. In fact, some leaders went so far as to identify gender as a positive factor for their organization and leadership. They suggested that in some ways the non-profits sector has become more receptive to women's leadership. Leader's views on the question of the role gender plays were more nuanced. Some leaders of groups with a strong gender consciousness did express that they continue to face gender-based resistance but that it was no longer as overt as it once was. As the director of Portland Affordable Housing Development Associates noted, gender does still make a difference because, "it is still a male dominated, sexist world. It is just more subtle than before which can make it harder to address" (Survey 2007).

Another leader of a health services organization in Oakland described her experience in this way:

> I have definitely had to 'prove' myself since my predecessor was male and well respected. I believe it is not until I 'open my mouth' that people can see I am not just another 'pretty face' but actually have a brain. [But] I have not faced any egregious situations because of my race or gender (Survey 2007).

A leader from Mississippi acknowledged that there were gender-based barriers but said, "I can deal with the obstacles I face as a woman-leader; what I find hard is how to deal with the obstacles faced by a small non-profit" (Survey 2007). Others however, still identified gender as well as race and ethnicity based obstacles as a concern. The leader of a gender-focused group in Texas, said that,

> Yes, we clearly see that we receive less funding and political support at a local and state level because we are a[n]… immigrant women's organization, and therefore not a priority within the 'good old boys' network that exists in political circles….So we face gender, race and class discrimination and the situation has not improved; in fact it has gotten worse, because basically conservatives think the problem of our community's marginalization is unfortunate but irresolvable (Survey 2007).

Another leader from Portland noted that overall, women have become more prevalent in the community and this has had both a positive and negative impact. The feminization of community development has led to "lower salaries, less benefits, [which] are the problems, [but] other than that, [the] businesses [we deal with] are women dominated, so having a women-led organization is a benefit" (Survey 2007).

Eight leaders of women-led or gender-focused groups indicated that they did not face gender-based opposition to their work. Time and experience has helped to overcome issues even with elected officials with whom women-leaders had previously identified

having a more difficult time. The director of Houston Domestic Violence Shelters told us she did not feel gender was an issue "because I have a long history at the agency, I have no problem with my community, state and federal level folks" (Survey 2007). Another leader also acknowledged improvement was based on women's participation in community development over time: "thanks to our community predecessors, a foundation has been built by the non-profit community based organizations to set the tone for advocacy and leadership for women and minorities and low-income people" (Survey 2007). A leader in El Paso identified that being a women-led group was a positive factor both in terms of the clients they serve and their interaction with other leaders and groups. She explained:

> I believe that the fact that we are a women's organization has helped us to serve our target populations. Being women-led is perceived as positive in social services that are directed to women. As advocates for women and their families, the community looks to our agency to serve those most in need in areas of child care and credit counseling. In our community being a woman led organization has not been a barrier (Survey 2007).

Another leader of women-focused development organization in Boston described Massachusetts as a state that "has often been a state where female leadership of organizations has not hindered the organizations' ability to succeed. That has been my experience as well across two non-profit organizations in the state" (Survey 2007). One leader suggested that the fact there more "women in corporate world to invite on board" demonstrated another positive change for women in community development over the last ten years (Survey 2007).

Table 28
Most Significant Barriers

Overall Lack Of Funding	Chicago Women's Homeless Shelter, Houston Neighborhood CDC, Portland Neighborhood CDC, EL Paso Community Development Partners, Chicago Development Partners, Oregon Arts and Development, Boston Women's Advocates and Service, North East Women's Development, El Paso Latino Development Corp., Texas Domestic Violence Shelter, Delta Neighborhood Services, Portland Affordable Housing and Development Associates, Oakland Community Health Services, Chicago Housing and Development Association
Lack Of Funding For General Operating	Chicago Women's Homeless Shelter, Portland Neighborhood CDC, EL Paso Community development Partners, Oregon Arts and Development, Boston Women's Advocates and Services, Delta Development Funders Association, El Paso Latino Development Corporation, Texas Domestic Violence Shelter
Lack Of/ Less Than Others Access To Local Elected Officials	Chicago Development Partners, Delta Neighborhood Services
Lack Of/ Less Than Others Access To State Elected Officials	Delta Neighborhood Services
Too Little Recognition For You/Your Group's Work	Chicago Development Partners, Houston Housing and Development, North East Women's Development, El Paso Latino Development Corporation, Delta Neighborhood Services, Chicago Housing and Development Association
Too Little Access To Leadership Support Networks (Leader Isolated)	North East Women's Development, Delta Neighborhood Services
Too Little Access To Organizational Support Networks (Org Isolated)	Delta Neighborhood Services
Funders And Others Lack Understanding Of Community Needs	Chicago Women's Homeless Shelter, El Paso Latino Development Corp, Oakland Community Health Services, Chicago Housing and Development Association
Funders Make Overly Burdensome Demands On Grantees	Portland Neighborhood CDC, Chicago Development Partners, Oregon Arts and Development, Avenue CDC, Boston Women's Advocates and Services, El Paso Community Services and Development Association, North East Women's Development, Texas Domestic Violence Shelter, Portland Affordable Housing and Development Association, Chicago Housing and Development Association

Table 28 continued

Funders/Evaluators Have Unrealistic Or Different Expectations For Program Outcomes	Houston neighborhood CDC, Oregon Arts and Development, Boston Women's Advocates and Services, Delta Development Funders Association, Northeast Women's Development, Texas Domestic Violence Shelter, Chicago Housing and Development Association
Funders Underestimate Expertise:	Chicago Development Partners, North East Women's Development, El Paso Latino Community Development Corp., Delta Neighborhood Services, Portland Affordable Housing and Development Associates
Lack Of/Less Than Other Access To Local Business Networks	El Paso Community Development Partners, Delta Neighborhood Services
Lack Of, Less Than Others' Access To Foundations	Oregon Arts and Development, North East Women's Development, El Paso Latino Community Development Corp, Delta Neighborhood Services, Chicago Housing and Development Association
Contractors And Others Underestimate Expertise Or Abilities	Houston Neighborhood CDC, El Paso Latino Community Development Corp, Delta Neighborhood Services
Intermediary Orgs Complicate Local Funding/Development Environment	Houston Neighborhood CDC, Portland Neighborhood CDC, EL Paso Community Development Partners, Boston Women's Advocates and Services

N 19

Few leaders explicitly agreed with the idea that gender was the, or even, a primary obstacle. A number expressed the idea that there has been an overall improvement for women in the community development field. Those leaders who did identify gender as an issue were for the most part, leaders of gender-focused and gender conscious organizations, rather than simply women–led groups. More often, women leaders identified multiple barriers that many community development groups and leaders may confront including such things as a lack of access to funding or the lack of recognition for their work. Gender may not be the primary barrier identified by leaders, but for those groups and leaders who work in and serve in politically, economically and socially marginalized communities significant barriers do remain.

Sixteen groups cited an overall lack of funding as the most significant barrier. Eight groups also said that finding funds for general operating expenses was a key barrier. The search for funding is virtually constant with little guaranteed from year to year. When asked to identify the greatest obstacle she and her organization faced, one leader said, the "lack of funding—always looking for different support and funding. We have a grant writer and assistant that continually looks for opportunities" (Survey 2007). The director of Delta Neighborhood Services described her greatest obstacle as an "overall lack of funding and access to people with money and power and how to connect to them" (Survey 2007).

The director of Northeast Women's Development identified the funding process itself as problematic. Most funders work on an annual cycle, but housing development projects can take a couple or more years to complete. She notes that insuring that there are sufficient funds to complete the project requires a recognition that

> affordable housing development is a multi-year process. Our organization [must] carefully navigate the early steps of the process to ensure the fiscal viability of the organization until developer fees are released at the conclusion of the project. We set aside operating reserves for fees that are received and try to secure foundation funding for our early stage work (Survey 2007).

No single grant will cover the expense of all phases of the project. Having the appropriate funds at the right time is essential. The director of another housing-focused CDC in Houston noted that "land and construction costs[are] increasing, [which] makes it difficult to meet our goals, and keep housing affordable" (Survey 2007). Another issue which may cause financial concerns for some housing developers is the impact on property values from the sub-prime mortgage collapse. Developers who own and

manage rental properties may see the value of their rental holdings, as well as the value of properties that are currently in development for sale decrease substantially.

Although many leaders considered a general lack of funding an obstacle, a few offered a more thorough gender-, race- and class- based analysis of the nature of the obstacles they faced. The obstacles were political, economic, and social and required a comprehensive program of organizing, activism, and media outreach to educate funders and politicians about the issues and potential solutions. One leader in Texas offered the following assessment of the barriers she and her organization faced:

> The greatest obstacle to our/my work is the lack of understanding in the U.S. (political leaders, governments, funders, media) of the need for investment in genuine development efforts to address systemic underdevelopment and injustice in marginalized communities. There is a project based mentality and a charity based mentality driving policy and funding decisions, plus the idea that poor communities aren't worthy of/don't need investment at the same levels as mainstream communities and programs. To overcome this, we combine advocacy, community organizing, media work, and our program work, to try to demonstrate what can be done and needs to be done, and challenging funders and policy makers to support it (Survey 2007)

Two other leaders also identified politics and a lack of social investment as key barriers. One director said that "politics [and a] lack of funding for social services and have[ing] to play politics and constantly asking for money from appropriate sources over and over" made it difficult to do her work. Another leader of a housing development organization said that there are "huge problems related to the lack of services for low-income people with addictions, mental illness and other disabilities. This results in a tenant base that has high needs and no effective service delivery program" in place to address those needs (Survey 2007). Social services and referrals for tenants therefore has

become an important, if costly, component of this group's housing development programs.

Women's Leadership and Change During the Last Ten Years

Women were asked to again consider what if any difference they felt their leadership made and how the development field had changed in the last ten years. One leader at an explicitly feminist organization clearly articulated the assessment of many women from the WCDS,

> We are a women's organization, and I am a woman, and we definitely have a different organizational and leadership style and culture. We are holistic in our approach, rather than project or funder driven, we are rooted in community where we understand we are dealing with four generations of the family and community. We build in flexibility to work responsibilities and schedules because we know that we have to work with the integration of work, family and community (Survey 2007).

Another leader identified women's leadership as "… more 'in tune' with the community development and the needs to empower individual and groups to effect change" (Survey 2007). Another leader who acknowledged that some gender issues remained, despite serving more than 15 years as the director of her organization, described her approach in this way:

> You must be organized and efficient whenever you are trying to mobilize an effort, do your homework, and be prepared. Try not to alienate but instead collaborate, identify your allies and help each other out, share resources when you are able and always take the highroad" (Survey 2007).

In their assessment of how the community development field has changed in the last ten years, a number of leaders felt that there have been at least some positive changes. One director said that "overall it has gotten better," while the director of

another group pointed to the fact that "there are more women minority and low-income persons involved" as a sign of progress (Survey 2007). Another leader indicated that increased community participation and local government support for community groups had facilitated communication and networking. In her estimation,

> our community has seen an increase in community involvement in the community development process, some of that is required by federally and state funded programs in the way of public hearings etc. The city has developed a strong system of neighborhood associations which have become a powerful voice in local government processes. These groups have also served as useful forums for agency communication and partnership with the neighboring community (Survey 2007).

Other leaders had reservations about the increase in the number of groups leading to increased competition among them for funding and other support. One leader was concerned about what she saw as a trend toward increased professionalization of staffs and organizations that can undermine local knowledge and the lived experience of a community. An increased reliance on professionals and on technology can further marginalize communities and groups who do not have the same level of access. As one leader from Texas described,

> the field has continued to become more "professionalized" where the wisdom of daily living and experience is less and less valued which puts marginalized communities which don't have access to the 'professionals' and whose own accumulated knowledge is not valued are therefore at a more and more of a disadvantage for funding, technology and expertise. There [has to be] a profound commitment to investing in truly community based strategies and groups to have a long term commitment to 'development' rather than charity and project based initiatives (Survey 2007).

Again, this statement echoes concerns that were raised in the original WCDS. Finally, one leader disagreed that there has been any major change. In her assessment "the field

of community development has not changed. It has an implicit and explicit goal for people, through collective efforts, to achieve a better life" (Survey 2007). Certainly many of the leaders who pointed out changes that have occurred would also agree with her assessment.

Organizational Profile: Feminist Community Development

La Mujer Obrera (The Woman Worker) is a 26 year old group in El Paso, Texas that remains a model women-led, women-focused comprehensive economic development and social change organization. Its programs and approach link issues such as human rights, women's empowerment, and social activism to improve both the social and economic conditions of the community. LMO was born out of a union organizing drive, which although successful, failed to initially address gender issues (Marquez 1995 68, cited in Gittell, Ortega and Steffy, 1999). LMO gained national attention when Mexican garment workers staged a hunger strike and chained themselves to their sewing machines. Since that time, LMO has grown, spawning a sister, development-focused organization, El Puente CDC, but it continues to focus on the intersections of gender, race, ethnicity and class based marginalization. LMO combines community organizing, social activism and advocacy, leadership development and education with innovative economic development strategies. As the El Paso – Juarez border struggles to deal with the impact of NAFTA, a globalizing economy, and immigration and border security issues, LMO continues to organize around immigrant and labor issues, worker rights and development from a gendered perspective.

Since NAFTA was enacted, thousands of manufacturing jobs have been relocated to countries that pay lower wages than in the U.S. The loss of many jobs that were held primarily by Mexican immigrant women has had a profound effect in border communities. In El Paso, unemployment and under employment has increased as has the poverty rate in the colonias along the border. The El Paso-Mexico border area remains among the nation's poorest regions. LMO works to build opportunities for the Mexican immigrant women who've entered the ranks of displaced workers, and fights to improve the wages and conditions of those who are employed.

The current immigrant and security debate has both intensified and perhaps misdirected national attention. As LMO notes, "a key question for Hispanics in the U.S., is not just amnesty or legalization, but what kind of life will the more than 26.8 million Americans of Mexican heritage have in the future? Where is our place in "smart growth"? We certainly have been paying the price for the existing plans" (LMO Program Materials 2007).

When the WCDS team met with LMO in 1997, they were, like many social change oriented groups, working to balance and sustain both the economic development focus of their organization and the political and organizing focus of their work. Recognizing that that there was a significant need for economic development to assist displaced workers and revitalize their communities, LMO formed EL Puente CDC to directly address women's economic development and the physical and economic redevelopment needs of South Central El Paso. During the last seven years El Puente has established several socially responsible businesses, including: *Café Mayapan*;

Mercado Mayapan; *Lum Metik*, a socially responsible international trading company that works with sustainable, fair-trade women's cooperatives in Mexico; *Uxmal,* an apartment complex in the South-Central barrio; and *Rayito del Sol* a day care center established in 2000, that provides affordable daycare to the community. In addition to the development of these businesses, El Puente also supports workers with bilingual on-the-job training and access to technology and enterprise development (El Puente Program Materials 2007).

In 2006 for their 25th anniversary, LMO/El Puente announced their "Plan Mayachan" (Oasis in the Desert), which is a multi-year effort reflecting their social and development goals. The Plan includes:

1) The Mayachen Mercado, Cultural Plaza, Museum and Media Center

2) The Center for Bilingual Development and Social Enterprise (CDBSE)

3) Revitalization of the South Central Barrio of El-Paso (La Mujer/El Puente Program Materials 2007)

The Mayachen Mercado which is set to open in 2008, is a 40,000 square foot retail and office complex that will be housed in a revitalized warehouse in South Central El Paso. Mayachen will include several larger business including the Mercado Central and Mercado Popular, micro-enterprises and other small businesses, a U.S.-Mexican cultural heritage center and museum, a media center, the Center of Bilingual Development and Social Enterprise and the Lum Metik Trading Company (El Puente Program Material 2007).

La Mujer and El Punete are separate but sister organizations linked by common goal and a common understanding of the complex social and economic needs of their constituents, Mexican immigrant women and their families. Their gender and class analysis leads to a commitment to the social and economic empowerment of women and to socially responsible and sustainable development. LMO is focused on organizing and advocacy for the alleviation of poverty and the effects of globalization, women's empowerment, workers rights, human rights, responsible development, political access and participation. It is too simple to identify LMO as the political community organizing, advocacy and social change organization and El Puente is the economic development group because their mission and purpose are by definition mutually supportive. Together La Mujer Obrera and El Puente reflect women's broad comprehensive understanding of development and social change. The programs and activities of both groups reflect the material needs (jobs housing, economic development), the political concerns (empowerment and access to the political process) and the cultural and social needs of the community as defined by the immigrant Mexican women workers of the South Central El Paso community.

One innovation of LMO and their plan Mayachen that is particularly compelling is the Center for Bilingual Development and Social Enterprise (CDBSE). The central focus of the CDBSE is a worker education and training center that focuses on the leadership development, language, and technical skills building necessary for workers with limited English proficiency. The center however, goes beyond the direct training and skill development of individual workers. The CDBSE also includes a program of

research and analysis so that the group can themselves collect data on effective job training and skill building programs, and on developing and sustaining socially responsible businesses from the unique perspective of Mexican immigrant working women. The CDBSE's program includes:

> Bilingual Development Innovation Center to develop and demonstrate strategies in labor market analysis, curriculum development, professional development of trainers, teaching methodologies, information management, assessment and evaluation systems appropriate to assist Limited English Proficient community members, especially women, to build their skills through work-centered vocational training programs that also integrate learning in language, literacy, basic skills, technology, leadership and entrepreneurialism.
>
> Social Enterprise Innovation Center, to develop and demonstrate the strategies, systems and resources needed to assist women to establish, operate and grow social purpose businesses and micro-enterprises, as market-based strategies for achieving economic justice.
>
> Women's Institute, to develop and demonstrate the strategies and resources needed to help build the capacity and experience of Mexican immigrant women in the diverse skills and critical analysis they need to engage in the community-building process (El Puente Organizational Materials 2007).

As a women-led and women-centered development association, El Puente employs a sophisticated and nuanced feminist and gender and development analysis of the issues and their program goals. They have adopted a strategy that will not only help the group become more self-sustaining but will also provide jobs and economic opportunity in their community. These jobs will provide a living wage and non-exploitative working conditions. In addition to modeling the economic change they call for others to adopt, El Puente has also embarked on a

research effort to help shape the terms of debate and that will support their advocacy and organizing agenda.

Conclusion

Community based organizations continue to play a vital role at the local level. In this regard little has changed in the ten years since the WCDS was completed. There have, however, been both encouraging and disconcerting changes for leaders, their organizations and for the community-based non-profit sector as a whole. These changes help to illustrate the positive role of locally based community organizations as a foundation of a participatory civil society. They are also illustrative of the limits of an approach to development that relies on such groups in the absence of more comprehensive and coordinated state efforts to address social policy and economic development and to support these civil society groups.

Ten years ago the WCDS found that women leaders and their organizations were creating social capital and social change; that they defined development comprehensively and inclusively; and that they employed an approach to development that challenged accepted gender norms. It also found that there were significant barriers that women-leaders and their organizations confronted, including gender, race and class based obstacles. Ten years later, especially with regard to gender–based obstacles, there is evidence that some of these barriers have lessened. But, it is also true that some barriers remain. In particular, financial obstacles that are the result of insufficient funding and a growing need for programs and services in poor and marginalized communities have become increasingly significant. Leaders were critical of what they saw as an insufficient commitment of resources from foundations, government and the private sector. They

also identified complicated grant application, management and reporting procedures as constraining and excessively burdensome.

Within the context of research on civil society the findings of this study suggest that there are limits to what these civil society groups may be able to achieve alone. The research also further elaborates the role that community-based development organizations play in building social capital. It also points to the potential for shared understanding between international scholarship on gender and development and research on women and community development in the U.S. Finally, in light of Putnam's (2007) recent arguments about how diversity undermines trust in communities this research also suggests that CBOs may serve as a social capital and trust building mechanism within communities over time and points to possible avenues of further research to further elaborate this process.

Organizational Persistence

The non-profit sector in the U.S. on a whole is strong and accounts for 5.2 percent of the gross domestic product and 8.3 percent of the wages and salaries paid in the U.S (National Center for Charitable Statistics 2006). Despite this growth, there are few guarantees of organizational success or persistence. Similar to the for-profit sector, the failure rate among start-up non-profits is about 20 percent. In both sectors, the critical threshold seems to be five years; many groups and business fail during the first five years. But, if a CBO or business can survive beyond that its prospects for longevity improve. When a for-profit company fails it represents the loss of private investors'

money and certainly a loss of livelihoods, both for the business owner and her employees. Presumably though, this failure is the result of market competition which demands efficiency and allows only the best to survive. Other businesses may be better positioned to offer the same or even better goods and services to meet demand. In the non-profit sector, however, the consequences of failure may raise different concerns.

For community-based non-profits, the "products and services" they offer especially to the poor and marginalized who are their primary constituents, tend to be basic or essential, such as housing, child care or even food. Certainly non-profits whose leaders are incompetent or inefficient will not survive. Non-profit failure however, raises questions about the impact of and reasons for failure. It also illustrates the potentially troubling implications of an over-reliance on local self-help in order to meet the basic economic and social needs of citizens in the absence of a comprehensive effort to support CBOs' ability to develop and run programs. Non–profits may fail not because a lack of demand for their "product" but in part because of the limited availability of funding, competition among groups and because the programs they run tend not to be self-sustaining and require new grants on a regular basis.

Another concern is that not all communities have non-profits that can successfully attract the funding necessary to address local needs. The uneven distribution of effective community based non-profit development groups across the states and within communities, raises the issue of equity. Whether or not there is affordable housing or daycare in a given community may depend on whether or not a viable CBO has been established there. Grassroots organizations can be difficult to form and even harder to

sustain. Producing a successful foundation or federal grant application can be a daunting task, and even groups that have experienced success may find fund raising a difficult and time consuming task. The existence of pressing needs for social services and economic development at the local level does not guarantee that a community organization will be in place to address these demands.

It is also important to contextualize the existence or failure of CBO's. In communities where there may be dozens of other community based groups that run similar programs, or that may be able to absorb the programs or properties of the organizations that have failed, there may be few immediate concerns. But, to the extent that an individual community group is participatory and articulates a community's interests, it can be a significant loss. The complete closure of a groups or even limitations brought on by financial difficulties may have an even more pronounced effect in rural areas or a more isolated neighborhood where there isn't a proliferation of community based organizations that may be able to step into the breech.

One organization from the Delta region, for example, was cited as a model in the WCDS for its programmatic comprehensiveness. The group no longer exists even though the community needs remain. The group's efforts included: reducing poverty, building affordable housing, providing child care and education programs, and running drug and alcohol counseling among other programs. In communities where there are other CBOs another group may take over the program portfolios or housing projects of a failed group as was the case with some organizations in Portland. In the more rural communities where organizations have failed, programs and services are still needed but

it is not clear who will continue to provide them. Further research will be necessary to determine the full impact in communities where such organizations "go out of business." What is clear however is that such failures highlight the potential limitations of addressing the basic physical and social needs of a given community primarily through the mechanism of community non-profits in the absence of government and private funders' policies that foster organizational persistence or greater direct service provision.

Limits of Civil Society

Another limitation of relying on community based organizations to provide essential services and pursue housing and economic development is that these needs are often in excess of a non-profits' abilities to meet them. It is not that these groups don't achieve remarkable results; many of them do. However, the root causes of deteriorating economic and social conditions at the community level may be beyond the scope of what locally based groups can effectively address on their own. Local, national and global economic factors shape the economy and demographic composition of local communities. Community-based groups are often innovative and capable organizations. Even so, they have not been able to address all of the economic and concerns within their neighborhoods much less fundamentally alter the national and global economic forces that shape conditions at the local level.

One illustrative example is the effort of community based housing development groups in Chicago to address the issue of affordable housing. The Chicago Re-hab Network's directory lists hundreds of groups all working in the affordable housing field.

This list is not exhaustive and no doubt there may be dozens, even hundreds more groups involved not only in building new and rehabbing existing housing stock as well as addressing issues such as homeless and transitional housing needs. Despite the hard work and undeniably good intentions of these groups, collectively they have not been able to solve this issue completely nor can they realistically be expected to. As in any other community, Chicago's housing policy involves private sector, government and community actors who may be coordinated in their efforts at times, or who may work at cross purposes at others.

Portland is another community in which locally based non-profits are thoroughly engaged in developing and maintaining affordable housing. In part because of its Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) which was enacted to limit "sprawl" in the metropolitan area, housing availability and affordability has become an acute concern. Although the UGB is a factor, private real estate interests also shape the local housing market. Community based groups are committed to maintaining affordable housing in the city but it can be a daunting task given the powerful interests involved. The competition among non-profit groups not only for funding, but also for the increasingly few available potential sites for development within the city would be more of a concern were it for the fact that city government and local intermediaries help foster collaboration among groups. Such collaboration can be an effective tool to diminish competition. The development process is on-going and the demand for affordable housing continues to grow. At the same time private developers continue to seek more profitable ventures. The relationships among these key stakeholders must be continually renewed and maintained.

Both Chicago and Portland are examples of the fact that CBOs cannot go it entirely alone. Groups compete for limited resources and may or may not work effectively to maximize mutual success. The further involvement of government and private interests may also be necessary. Within this context, community based groups can work to ensure that they have a voice in the process and help to set the agenda but they cannot control the entire process themselves.

Barriers

Ten years ago when interviewed for the WCDS, women leaders identified several key barriers to their leadership. These included a general lack of understanding or appreciation on the part of elected official and funders, for their definition of and approach to development, gender- , race- and class-based exclusion from key political and funding networks, as well as more general barriers that many in the non-profit development field face. In particular, some women leaders identified a tendency on the part of men in the financial or construction fields to undervalue or discount their abilities or experience. Others pointed to personal and cultural barriers to participation such as when taking on work that forced them to step outside expected cultural norms. Some women had to overcome even their own husband's resistance to working outside the home. Some leaders noted the ways in which race-, class- and gender-based barriers intersected. One African-American woman, for example, described having to confront and navigate the complex resistance from the largely white male local funding and political community (Gittell, Ortega, Steffy 1999).

A number of leaders across the country also noted the "feminization" of the community development field in the U.S. that has resulted in wages and a general under-valuing of women-led development efforts. In addition, they also said that the long and sometimes irregular hours necessary to do their work effectively could sometimes lead to "burn-out." Even as they acknowledged the barriers they faced, women were quick to add that they largely overcame these obstacles, confronting or ignoring them as they did what they needed to do anyway.

I expected to find that gender-based barriers would remain a significant concern. The findings of this research however, suggest that women leaders now view gender-based barriers as less of an obstacle. For some, the issue of gender has become more nuanced; it may remain an underlying factor, but leaders no longer view it as the most pronounced obstacle. Previously, some leaders perceived gender to be the primary basis of their exclusion from key networks or the reason for opposition to their work. Few women singled out gender as a major barrier for this current research. A couple of leaders even went so far as to indicate that gender had in fact become an asset in a field increasingly dominated by women.

This current research indicates that women leaders' main preoccupation is now with an overall lack of funding. In particular they note the specific lack of funding for general operating support for their organizations. They were now instead concerned with what they saw as increased competition for a decreasing pool of money. Some leaders who identified as feminists and/or were directors of organizations that were specifically gender-conscious did identify continuing societal gender inequity as a

concern. Even these leaders however did not perceive gender to be a major obstacle preventing access to key funding or political networks. Instead most of the leaders indicated that in fact they had experienced improved access to and increased participation in such networks.

Complicating the funding picture is the fact that most public grants and foundation funding guidelines preclude the use of these grants for operating expenses. Thus, even when organizations may be able to secure grants for programming they may still have difficulty simply keeping the doors open and a staff in place. The funding process itself also absorbs considerable staff time and energy and at times may yield only limited returns. Some might consider that such competition improves efficiency and weeds out weaker organizations. This could be of relatively little concern if it weren't for the fact that when groups can't secure funding, basic social services and community needs go largely unaddressed. Leaders have become increasingly concerned with finding ways to make their organizations self-sustaining. It seems unlikely that most will be successful in this effort due to the costly nature of the programs they run and the poorly resourced communities they serve.

Networking and Collaboration

Another indicator of progress with regard to a gender-based obstacles was the fact that while women leaders previously said that they felt they were marginalized from key funding and political networks, ten years later, most indicted that they were better integrated in these networks. The sense of marginalization that some women leaders

experienced has decreased over time and given way to increased participation in these key networks. As leaders gain more experience, and as their organizations have grown some have become more important "players" on the local scene. Women leaders indicated they enjoy greater access particularly at the local level and noted that local political officials supported their work. They could rely on local officials to promote their organization's efforts and to assist in securing funding. An additional ten years experience of working in the local community and further opportunities to work with local elected officials and business leaders has helped to build relationships and solidify networks which are the basis of social capital. These findings suggest that it may be important to continue to examine how such community based groups contribute to building social capital building social capital over time.

Collaboration among groups is another factor that helps build networks of trust within a community. Ten years ago, the WCDS, found that women's leaders efforts to work collaboratively was important to social capital building in their communities. This current research indicates that collaboration continues to be important. Many leaders said that they engaged in collaborative projects with other groups frequently and as much as possible. Foundations and intermediaries have begun to emphasize collaboration to help insure the overall success of programs as they have increasingly incorporated Putnam and others' ideas about civil society and social capital into their approach. Partnering on projects often makes financial sense for groups where their missions overlap and where program expertise differs.

The Limits of Civil Society

There are numerous options for improving the economic and social status of the poor and marginalized. The first, and perhaps least likely at the moment in the U.S. would be a greater direct involvement on the part of government in social service provision and housing and economic development. Federally funded child care, available and affordable to all, greater subsidization of affordable housing construction particularly in urban centers where property values and rents are particularly high, a single-payer national health service, and an expansion of the food stamps program (both in terms of making it more generous and accessible) would go a long way toward addressing the needs of the poor. Although there are a number of proposals to expand health care coverage among contenders in the 2008 presidential race, there is little enthusiasm for a massive expansion of the currently meager welfare state in the U.S.

Certainly federal, state and local governments currently have an important role both in funding and in defining social and development priorities. In 2004, federal funds accounted for just nine percent of the total revenue of non-profits (National Center for Charitable Statistics 2007). Community groups may receive grants or partner with government to administer services. This is particularly true with regard to health care. But, CBOs are also often responsible for meeting needs that go unaddressed by government programs. For example, one leader from Mississippi indicated that her group had begun to focus even more heavily on service provision and had expanded their food pantry because food stamps and other federal and state benefits were insufficient to meet some of the most basic needs of poor residents in her community (Survey 2007).

Federal, state and local government could expand their role in direct service provision, however, another option would be for government to increase social spending in key areas. Current spending that is already channeled through community based organizations could be increased and grants could be made available to more groups. The public sector is, however, only one partner for non-profits. National and local intermediary funders, could also play a role by working to support local collaboration and networking efforts.

National, state and local funders play an important role in determining what does, and does not get one at the local level. Changes at these institutions could also help to support the efforts of CBOs. Altering funding cycles, re structuring foundation initiatives, and the rules and restrictions on how grants can be spent, easing reporting requirements and other features of the granting process that effect local organizations' abilities to offer needed programming. Few funders make grants to the same organizations on a multi-year basis making it difficult for organizations to plan long-term.

Community needs such as child care, health care or housing are long-terms issues requiring a consistent funding commitment. Funding availability can change year to year. A lack of available funding dedicated to organizational support complicates the picture still further. Paradoxically, there is an expectation on the part of government and foundations that community based groups will do the work of providing services and pursuing development, but there is little funding dedicated to ensuring that these groups are sufficiently staffed and can remain financially secure from year to year.

Consequently, leaders cited a lack of general operating funds as a significant obstacle. Dedicated funding for general operating expenses is necessary both in order to realistically to expand the capacity of community based organizations and to help ensure organizational persistence where they are most needed.

Gender and Development

> There are. . .pervasive indications of culturally neglected needs of women across the world. There are excellent reasons for bringing these deprivations to light and keeping the removal of these inequalities very firmly on the agenda. But it is also the case that the limited role of women's activity afflicts the lives of *all* people–men as well as women, children as well as adults. While there is every reason not to slacken the concern about women's well-being and ill-being, and to continue to pay attention to the sufferings and deprivations of women, there is also an urgent and basic necessity, particularly at this time, to take an agent-oriented approach to the women's agenda"(Sen 2000 191).

In *Development as Freedom,* Amartya Sen (2000), looks specifically at "women's agency and social change" and calls attention to the fact that although the focus on women in development has grown exponentially, in many ways women's vital role in development in their communities has yet to be fully appreciated. He argues that there is a compelling need to address the gender based marginalization of women both for its own sake but also in recognition of the central role women play not only in the well-being of their families but also in the economic and social development of their communities and societies as well. Despite a sustained period of global economic expansion, the overall standard of living for those at the bottom has in fact decreased (Sen 2000, Kim et. al. 2000).

The benefits of global economic growth have failed to "trickle down," to the world's poor who face increasingly bleak realities.

In the international context, Neoliberal economic policies, in particular Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP) have been directed at promoting long term economic development, often with draconian short-term consequences. SAPs and austerity plans have had a disproportionally negative effect on women and children because they often require states to decrease spending on health care, education and general social welfare, and often promote export oriented agricultural and industrial production at the expense of domestic subsistence needs. As Kim et. al., remind us, ". . .short-term harm for people living on the edge of survival involves more than petty inconvenience. . ."(2000 389). SAPs have led to increasingly constrained access to health care, education, and other basic necessities. But, the long term gains promised in the name of short-term sacrifice, have largely failed to materialize. Perversely, this has often prompted new rounds of cuts and restrictions with further negative consequences for poor women, and for their families and communities.

Increasingly, in the international context, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and local community groups are being relied upon to take a primary role in development. Even so, this has not always benefited women in the long term. For years,

> analysts [have] urged that women be given greater access to resources. . . . Pilot projects showed that women could increase their productivity when provided with small amounts of credit, training and technology. However these promising demonstrations were not enlarged into nationwide programs. Instead . . . most women's access to resources declined as a result of economic crisis and structural adjustment (Schoepf et. al. 2000 119).

There is a growing international consensus around the idea that development programs which not only involve but are designed and led by local women in their communities are essential to ensure that their needs are met and that their families and communities thrive. There is also a growing agreement that improving the economic security of women and their communities is tied to increased political participation and to changes in the social and cultural norms that marginalize women. While some feminists in the U.S. may have been focused on the marginal economic status of women abroad, there may be reason to turn their attention to the increasingly precarious economic status of women in their own country.

In the United States, conservative economic policies that have centered on tax cuts that have predominantly benefited the most affluent citizens and corporations. Spending cuts in domestic and social programs and decreased regulation of corporations have undermined the economic security of the middle class and further marginalized the working class and poor. As in the developing world, free markets and cuts in social spending have been promoted as the key to improving economic growth. For the poor and working class in the U.S., the combined result of these policies have had negative consequences similar to those experienced by the poor in some parts of the developing world.

The marginalization of women, especially women of color, and increasing poverty rates, even as record levels of economic growth in some sectors have been achieved, is a story from the developing world that resonates with recent experience in the United States. In the U.S., while those at the top have prospered, poor women and

their families have seen their real wages –often already below the poverty line— decrease, their access to health care and education be further constrained, and their well-being increasingly threatened. Access to adequate housing, healthcare, daycare, education, and a living wage income remains a pressing concern for a significant part of the population despite almost a decade of economic growth the U.S. Recent recessionary trends, time limits on access to public assistance and increased unemployment have begun to exacerbate these problems.

The erosion of the social safety net for the poor as a result of recent welfare reform in the U.S., has left poor women and their children are in a precarious economic and social position. The 1996 Welfare reform has been succeeded in moving women off welfare rolls, but it has not been as successful in reducing poverty. The number of those receiving public assistance has decreased precipitously but many former welfare recipients who are now working have not experienced a significant improvement in their standard of living (Alberding 2006). Many former welfare recipients work low wage jobs and lack access to adequate affordable housing, health care, child care and education. They are now part of a fast-growing sector, the working poor. In many communities women are organizing to challenge this reality.

Both internationally and in the United States development is a major concern of researchers, policy analysts, development practitioners and of local groups struggling to cope with the effects of poverty. Despite decades of evidence from an international perspective that development projects should focus on and include women not only to prevent their marginalization, but also because of their vital role in production, women

and women-led organizations continue to have limited access to necessary development resources.

Examinations of poor women in the developed and developing world have often been exclusive of each other. However, by examining the conditions of women living in the colonias in Texas, the Mississippi Delta or some of the impoverished urban neighborhoods in the U.S. where women-led community development efforts are taking shape, the connections become apparent. The discourse on women and development internationally has moved from one which focused on the inclusion of women in development to one which challenges prevailing assumptions about existing models of development. A decade ago Parpart argued that "we are at a crossroads . . . new voices are entering old debates and changing the terms of our understanding"(1995 239) of gender and development. She argued that we must begin to incorporate "new knowledge" and "new understandings" of development based on local knowledge. Calls to include new voices in development policy debates and to refocus the ways in which development is pursued and evaluated continue. Like their counterparts in developing countries, some women leaders in the U.S. expressed a concern that evaluators still fail to understand development programs and outcomes in terms of gender.

Women play a key and under-recognized role in the community development efforts everywhere. Sen asserts that, "nothing, arguably is as important today in the political economy of development as an adequate recognition of the political, economic and social participation and leadership of women" (2000 203). This I would argue is just

as true for women in the U.S. and in some other parts of the developed world as it is for women in the developing world.

Appendix A

Organizational and Background Interviewees and Their Organizational Affiliations by Site

Boston, Massachusetts

Boston Aging Concerns, Young and Old United, Inc. (BAC-YOU)
Janet Van Zandt, Executive Director

Boston Foundation
Prentice Zinn, Program Associate

Boston Women's Fund
Jean Entine, Executive Director

Community Economic Development Assistance Corporation (CEDAC)
Charleen Regan, Senior Program Manager

Community Education for Economic Development
Elizabeth Stone House
Laurie Holmes, Coordinator

Dorchester Bay Economic Development Corporation
Jeanne Du Bois, Executive Director

Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiatives
Roz Everdale, Director of Organizing
Che Madyun, former Board President

Fenway Community Development Corporation
Ellen Caraccilo, Director of Development
Carrie Dalrymple, Resident and Family Coordinator

Madison Park Community Development Corporation
Danette Jones, Executive Director

Nuestra Comunidad Development Corporation
Evelyn Friedman-Vargas, Executive Director

Project Hope
Sr. Margaret Leonard, Executive Director

Quincy-Geneva Housing Corporation
Marilyn Sanchez, Office Manager
Pearl Plange, Clerk of Board of Directors
Claudia Owumi, Director of Resident Services
Mary Knight, former Board Member
Zaida Vides, Coordinator of Girls Leadership Program

Shelter, Inc.
Susan Duley, Executive Director
Women's Educational and Industrial Union
Mary Lassen, Executive Director

Women's Institute for Housing and Economic Development
Jean Kluver, Executive Director
Lynn Peterson, Development Specialist

.

Chicago, Illinois

Austin People's Action
Cynthia Williams, Executive Director

Bickerdike Redevelopment Corporation
Joy Aruguete, Executive Director

Chicago Foundation for Women
Christine Grumm, Executive Director

Joyce Love, Program Director, Executive Director's Roundtable

Chicago Women in Trades
Lauren Sugerman, Executive Director

Claretian Associates
Donna Drinan, Executive Director

Deborah's Place
Patricia Crowley, Executive Director
Audrey Thomas, Assoc. Director for Programs

Development Corporation North
Dorothy Gregory, Board Member, Neighborhood Capital Budget Group and Development Corporation North

Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)
Andrew Mooney, Program Director

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
Susan Lloyd, Director of Building Community Capacity, Program on Human and Community Development

Mid-South Planning and Development Commission
Pat Dowell-Cerasoli, Executive Director

Mujeres Latinas en Acción
David Sinski, interim Executive Director
Marta Cerda, Board President
Neusa Gaytan, Youth/Family Coordinator

South Chicago Neighborhood Housing Collaboration
Cindy Larson, Executive Director

The Resurrection Project
Rose Dominguez, Board Member
Susana Vasquez, Research Development Director

Southeast Chicago Development Commission
Lynn Cunningham, President

Southwest Women Working Together
Shelley Crump, Executive Director

Woodlawn Development Associates
Juanita Burris, Executive Director

Woodlawn East Community and Neighbors (WECAN)
Mattie Butler, Executive Director

.

Delta Region: Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana

Big River Community Development Corporation
Sharon Johnson, Executive Director
Marks, Mississippi

Delta Research Education and Development Foundation (DRED)
Vickie Robertson, Executive Director
West Memphis, Arkansas

Communities Collaborating for Economic Development, Cheneyville, Louisiana
Mordessa Corbin
Gilbert, Louisiana

First American Bank
Cindy Ayers-Elliott, Chairman and CEO
Jackson, Mississippi

Foundation for the Mid South
George Penick, President
Sherrie Pugh, Program Officer
Jackson, Mississippi

Greater Greenville CDC
Torris Purnell, Housing Development Manager
Greenville, Mississippi

Hope Center
Flodene White, Director
Cullen, Louisiana

Mississippi Action for Community Education
Ruby Buck, Executive Director
Greenville, Mississippi

New Horizon Community Development Corporation
Rev. Margaret McGhee
Fordyce, Arkansas

Nellie Johnson Village
Sr. Gus Griffin and Sr. Angela Susalla
Tunica, Mississippi

Northeast Louisiana Delta Community Development Corporation
Benita Young, Housing Coordinator
Tallulah, Louisiana

Northern Mississippi Leadership Project, Women's Leadership: Tunica, Walls, Hernando and Holly Springs
Helen Love, Hernando Organizer
Hernando, Mississippi

Outreach Community Services
Georgia Gaines, President
Lake Providence, Louisiana

Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation
Dianne Williams, Senior Program Officer
Little Rock, Arkansas

Sacred Heart Southern Mission
Morgan Billingsly, Director of Housing Services
Sr. Marianne Guthrie
Patricia Hines Center for Neighborhoods
Walls, Mississippi

Tallahachie Housing
Rochella Cole, Housing Director
Webb, Mississippi

Voice of Calvary Ministries
Lee Harper, Executive Director
Jackson, Mississippi

We Care Community Services
Rose Bingham, Administrator
Vicksburg, Mississippi

.

El Paso, Texas and surrounding colonias

State Representative Norma Chavez
El Paso

El Paso Collaborative for Community and Economic Development
Rose Garcia, Executive Director
El Paso

Lower Valley Housing Development Corporation of El Paso
Nancy Hanson, Executive Director
Fabens

La Mujer Obrera
Maria Flores, Coordinator
Cindy Arnold, Economic Development Coordinator
Refugio Arrieta, Chair, Board of Directors
El Paso

Meadows Foundation
Dee Pascal, Senior Program Officer
Dallas

Organización Progresiva de San Elizario
Daniel Solíz, Construction Specialist
Angel Gonzalez, VISTA Supervisor
Linda Banuelos, VISTA Volunteer
Sofia Milo Carillo, VISTA Volunteer
Martha Gomez, VISTA Volunteer
Maria Ortiz, VISTA Volunteer
Magda Salido, VISTA Volunteer
Estella Velasco, VISTA Volunteer
Irma Villa, VISTA Volunteer
Graciela Acosta, VISTA Volunteer
San Elizario

Southside Low-Income Housing Development Corporation
Carmen Felix, Executive Director
El Paso

Sparks Housing Development Corporation
Irma Perez, Executive Director
El Paso

University of Texas at El Paso
Center for Sustainable Neighborhoods
Public Policy Research Center
Department of Political Science
Prof. Patricia Fredericksen
Sandra Sanchez
El Paso

Women in Action
Belen Germán, Coordinator
San Elizario

YWCA Home Ownership Center
Joanna Guillén, Coordinator
El Paso

YWCA Teen Pregnancy Program
Mary Lacey, Coordinator
El Paso

.

Houston, Texas

Avenue Community Development Corporation
Mary Lawler, Executive Director

The Bridge Over Troubled Waters, Inc.
Linda Madeksho, Executive Director

De Madres A Madres
Sylvia Castillo, Executive Director

Dubuis Fund
Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, Houston
Barbara Aires, SC, Coordinator

Fifth Ward Community Redevelopment Corporation
Kathy Flanagan-Payton, Executive Director

Freedmen's Town Association, Inc.
Gladys House, Executive Director/Founder

Greater Houston Urban Redevelopment Corporation
Andrea Cooksey, Executive Director

Greater Park Place Community Development Corporation
Antonia Cahn, Executive Director

Houston Area Women's Center
Ellen Cohen, Executive Director

Houston Endowment
Donald Shepard, Grant Officer

Northwest Assistance Ministries
Rebecca Mathis, Executive Director

Pyramid Community Development Corporation
Tina Moore, Executive Director

Sunnyside Up Community Development Corporation
Rick Dyson, Executive Director
Toni Lockett, Assistant Direcetor

Third Ward Community Development Corporation
Marvalette Fentress, Executive Director

Woman, Inc.
Marion Fischer, President

.

North Carolina

Down East Partnership for Children
Henrietta Zalkind, Executive Director
Rocky Mount

The Women's Center of Wake County
Jean Williams, Executive Director
Raleigh

Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation
Gayle Williams, Executive Director
Winston-Salem

North Carolina Department of Commerce
Susan Perry Cole
Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Community Development
Raleigh

North Carolina Hunger Network
Shirley McClain, Executive Director
Raleigh

North Carolina Institute for Minority Economic Development
Andrea Harris, Executive Director
Raleigh

Passage Home
Jeanne Tedrow, Executive Director
Raleigh

Rocky Mount/Edgecombe Community Development Corporation
Joyce Dickens, Executive Director
Rocky Mount

Self-Help
Kate McKee, Associate Director
Durham

Southerners for Economic Justice
Cynthia Brown, Executive Director
Durham

Warren Family Institute
Cathy Lawrence, Executive Director
Warrenton

West Greenville Community Development Corporation
Barbara Fenner, Executive Director
Greenville

Wilson Community Improvement Association
Fannie Corbett, Executive Director
Barbara Blackstone
Wilson

.

Oakland, California

Asian Health Services
Sherry Hirota, Executive Director

Bridge
Carol Galante, CEO

Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency (BOSS)
Boona Chema, Executive Director

Center for Third World Organizing
Rinku Sen, Co-director

Community Economic Development Agency Elissa Brown, Title XX Program Manager

East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation
Lynette Lee, Executive Director

Enhanced Enterprise Community Community Economic Development Agency Margie Ellis, Board Member
Njelela Kwamilele, Policy Board Co-chair
Barbara Montgomery, Board Member
Queen Thurston, Board Co-chair
Kathy Washington, Board Member

Family Day Care Training Project
Noa Mohlabane, Director
Gloria Alexander, Program Coordinator
Laura Jimenez, Monitor, Childcare program
Elvira Sanchez, Assistant Administrator
Lanetta Moore, Participant
Jacari Ford, Participant

Evelyn and Walter Haas Jr. Foundation
Diana Bermudez, Program Officer

Jubilee West
Gus Newport, Executive Director

La Clínica De La Raza
Jane Garcia, Executive Director

National Economic Development and Law Center
Jan Stokley, Manager, Childcare Project

National Latina Health Organization
Luz Álvarez Martínez, Executive Director

Narcotics Education League
Regina Chavarin, Executive Director

Oakland Chinese Community Council
Corinne Jan, Executive Director

Spanish Speaking Citizens Foundation
Rosario Flores, Program Manager

Spanish Speaking Unity Council
Arabella Martinez, Executive Director

University Avenue Housing
Susan Felix, Executive Director

Urban Strategies Council
Maria Campbell-Casey, Executive Director

Women's Economic Agenda Project
Ethel Longscott, Executive Director

.

Portland, Oregon

Bradley-Angle House
Jeannie LaFrance, Outreach Program Coordinator

Oregon Community Development Training Institute
Portland State University, College of Urban and Public Affairs
Prof. Patricia Rumer, Director of Community Programs, School of Extended Studies

Franciscan Enterprises of Oregon, Inc.
Karen Voiss, Executive Director

Housing Our Families
Alberta Simmons, Founding Member, Board of Directors

Low Income Housing for Native Americans
Julie Metcalf, Executive Director

Neighborhood Partnership Fund
Kathy Kniep, Program Officer

Neighborhood Pride Team
Molly Cooley, Executive Director

Oregon Coalition Against Domestic & Sexual Violence
Margaret Brown, Executive Director

Portland Community Reinvestment Initiative
Maxine Fitzpatrick, Executive Director

Recreation, Education, Access, Community Housing (REACH)
Dee Walsh, Executive Director

The Rose
Jennifer Nielsen, General Manager

Sabin Community Development Corporation
Diane Meisenhelter, Executive Director

Sisters in Portland Impacting Real Issues Together (SPIRIT)
Sandra Davis, Executive Director

Technical Assistance for Community Services
Kay Sohl, Executive Director

.

Washington, D.C.

Arlington Housing Corporation
Lou Ann Frederick, Executive Director
Arlington, Virginia

Building Futures
Kathryn Stephens, Executive Director
Julia Moran Morton, Housing Specialist

Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation
Karen Kinney, Program Officer

Coalition of Nonprofit Housing Developers
Olive Idehen Akhigbe, Executive Director

Martha Davis, Consultant

Frederick Douglass Resident Council
Brenda Graham, President

Hannah House
Margaret Bush-Ware, Executive Director
Roxanne Murray, Program Director

Housing Opportunities for Women
Nancy James, Executive Director
Mary O'Melveny, Board President

Jubilee Enterprise of Greater Washington
Louise Stoner Crawford, Program Director
Sheila Royster, Director of Community Management
Robert Boulter, Executive Director

Manna, Inc.
Rozanne Look, Director of Housing Development

Marshall Heights Community Development Organization
Lloyd Smith, Executive Director
Ruth Dyson, Vice Chair of Board
Aretha Frizzell, Treasurer
Natalie Greene, Recording Secretary

Miriam's House
Carol Marsh, Executive Director

Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc. of the National Capital Area
Angela White Narain, Executive Director

New Columbia Community Land Trust
Pamela Jones, Executive Director

Vietnamese Resettlement Association
Kim Cook, Executive Director
Falls Church, Virginia

Wider Opportunities for Women
Lina Frescas Dobbs, National Executive Director
Bernadette Gross, Local Program, Nontraditional Skills Specialist,
National Literacy Project Consultant

Appendix B

Original Women and Community Development Study Interview Instrument (1997)

Interview Instrument
Women and Community Development Study

The interviews will help us answer broad questions such as:
What effect do women have on community development?
What are the major barriers for women controlling CDOs?
Once women are in control, what are the major barriers to implementing policies for women and children?
What differences do women-run CDOs exhibit?
Are they more sensitive to the community?
What are the factors that encourage women to take leadership?

I. Organizational Profile
Objective: To gather basic information about the CDO, including programs, representation, and organizational barriers.

Materials to be compiled prior to the interview:
Background Information
Organization, Name, Title, Address, Phone.
Mission statement and informational pamphlets
Budgets
Board Meeting Minutes
Annual Reports
Funding information: What percentage of funding is from state, city, federal, and foundations respectively?

Staff, Board, and Membership/Service Population Data
Get number, gender, race, ethnicity, and length of service of staff members and board members.
Same information for organizational membership, if it is a membership organization.
(If printed materials not available before interview, obtain during interview.)

Interview Questions:

Organization Service Area and Population
What are the boundaries of the area that you serve?
What are the boundaries of this neighborhood?
What is the gender/ racial/ethnic breakdown of the population you serve/work with?

History of Organization
What is the mission of the organization?
What year was it founded?
Why was it founded? Who founded it?
Are the founders still involved? If not, why not?
Has the organization changed its mission since its inception?

Programs
Has there a change in your programmatic focus over time? Why did the change take place?
How do you determine which programs to do?
What are your program areas?
(Get descriptions of programs and details on quantifiable outputs).

Housing: number of units built or rehabbed? (Visit sites). Is it enhanced housing?
Economic development: amounts lent, number of business helped or created?
Community organizing: types of campaigns, results, numbers of people involved?
Child care: how many children served, quality of care?
Job training: how many people trained and in which areas? How many people placed in jobs? Any idea how long they stay employed, follow-up system?
Counseling/Referrals: approach and number of people counseled?
Housing Advocacy: activities, numbers of people helped, and/or litigation won?

Programs Targeted to Women
Are any of your programs targeted towards women? Why or why not?
Which programs?
How were the decisions to target programs to women made? (board, staff, CEO).
Are these programs a priority?

Do your programs target any other particular groups? Which groups?
How do you determine which groups?

Community Organizing
Do you do community organizing? How do you do it?
Do you do tenant organizing? Do you do advocacy? In which areas?
What does community empowerment mean to you?
Which of your programs would you consider most important in empowering the community?

CEO
(Note gender, race, age)
How long have you been with organization?
How were you hired? (By the board, by the staff, by the community, by the former director)
Promoted from within or hired from outside?
What is your previous experience? (Activist, social worker, manager/administrator, other)
Where did you go to school? (Note level of education)
Do you live in the live in community, and if so how long have you lived here?

Board
How are board members appointed? Any restrictions? (e.g. foundation diversity requirements)
How many women are on the board? How many women of color?
What is the background of the board members? (race, ethnicity, professions)
Do they live in the community?
How often does the board meet? Do they meet during the summer?
How many members usually show up? Are they the same members each month?

Staff
Who hires the staff?
How many women are on staff?
How many have college degrees? Live in the community?
How many volunteers work here and what is their gender?

Funding
If you had sufficient funding, what would be your priorities?

II. Collaboration and Leadership Style
Objective: To ascertain level of internal democracy, models of leadership, and any barriers to women's participation and leadership in NDOs.

Participation
How does the community participate in determining the priorities of the organization?
Specifically, how are the community residents involved in each of your program areas?
Is there a community resident leadership development component in any program areas?
Does the organization recruit, develop and train new leadership?
How are opportunities for leadership identified within your organization and in the community?
Does the NDO provide training for residents?
How has this NDO increased community participation?
How do you draw out and encourage potential women leaders from the community? What about within your organization?
What kind of programming would assist women in learning to work collaboratively?
How do you encourage leadership by people of color?
Does your group do any multi cultural or multiracial projects?
Are there bilingual materials available for community residents?

CEO
How is the NDO's policy initiated, approved, implemented, and evaluated?
(Is it a hierarchical or collaborative model? Note any innovative management models)
What is the relationship between the board, board chair, and CEO?
On what do you spend most of your time? (Policy, administration, budget, external relations)
Does it make any difference to your leadership that you are a woman?

Board
Has there been any change on the board since inception?
At what point did you notice a change?
(If the board changed from mostly male to more than half female) Did you notice any differences?
(If not answered in detail before) Does the board appoint the CEO? Or is that person elected by membership? Or some other way?
Has the board ever removed a CEO? Why?
How active is the board in the NDO generally?

Staff Collaboration
How often do you have staff meetings?
What kinds of decisions are staff members involved in?
Do staff members ever propose programs?
Do your staff members work in collaboration or individually?

III. Individual Change
Objective: To report personal changes experienced by women leading and participating in NDOs, including any obstacles faced.

Personal History and Networks
What is your family background?
Which organizations were you involved with before this one?
Do you belong to other community groups?
Are you personally active in a political party? (not as an NDO representative)

What is your motivation in working for this organization?
What does community development mean to you?

Have you experienced any personal changes before or after becoming CEO of this organization? What do you think caused these changes?
Do you think you make a difference to your community? Why?
What, in your opinion, motivates women to change?

IV. Local Context

Objective: To describe the environment the NDO functions in, particularly in terms of the presence of coalitions of NDOs, the availability of funders and intermediaries, and the degree of political support or opposition to their work.

Neighborhood

What would you identify as the neighborhood's most important problems/needs?
How have the needs/issues of women in your community changed over the last 10 years?

How would you describe relations between the different racial and ethnic groups in your neighborhood?

NDO Networking

Do you work in collaboration with other organizations on any programs?
Who works with you well and who doesn't?
What types of groups do you work with?
(community based service organizations, development organizations, hospitals, churches, schools, libraries, sports clubs, PAS, recreation centers, health advocacy, youth clubs, women's groups, immigrant groups, labor union locals, racial and ethnic groups?)
Are there any lists or directories of organizations in your neighborhood?

Was there a specific event such as a community struggle for better city services or an incident in one of the schools that resulted in your NDO cooperating with one or several of the other neighborhood groups?
Was there an event that resulted in conflict between your NDO and neighborhood groups?

Do you meet formally or informally with the leaders of other NDOs or of CBOs?
Do you think community leaders are divided?
Do they form alliances?
Which leaders do you think form alliances of this type?
Are there any groups which are left out?

Networking with Political Officials and Agencies

Which governmental offices/agencies are in the neighborhood?
What is the organization's relationship with political representatives? (Note elected officials)
How supportive do you think elected officials are of your work? How do they show support? (Help with funding)

Coalitions

Are there any NDO networks or coalitions in the city? Neighborhood?
Are there any issue networks or coalitions?
Who created the networks?
Were intermediaries involved in creating the networks?
Are there any women's coalitions in your neighborhood or city? Which ones?
Does your NDO work within networks or coalitions to change city, state, or federal policy?
Was foundation funding the catalyst for these coalitions?

Funding
What are your major sources of funding?
How much does funding influence your programmatic choices? For example, if funding is removed for a particular program, do you stop the program?
In general how much do you think NDOs are influenced by funders and intermediaries?
(Thoughts on LIST, Enterprise, local foundations etc.)
Is funding influenced by the gender or race of the CEO or board members?

V. Barriers

Organizational Barriers
What would you say are the obstacles that you face as an organization?
Are there new obstacles that weren't there ten years ago?
Where do difficulties occur in your external relationships? With banks, mayor, local agencies?
(When applicable) Does your organization experience particular difficulties because it is women-led?

Barriers to Collaboration and Leadership
What obstacles to collaboration has your organization encountered?
What about barriers to leadership development?
Have there been obstacles to collaboration or leadership development that you think were particular to women?

Individual Barriers
What personal barriers have you faced as an NDO leader?

Network Barriers
Are there barriers in funding because you are women?
Are there barriers in outreach to government agencies and elected officials?
Any barriers in contact with LISC or Enterprise?
What about contact with women's organizations?
Are there barriers in your contact with the community because you are women?
Are there barriers in forming or working in coalitions?
What about in working with universities?

Future Directions
What suggestions would you make to help overcome the barriers to women's involvement and leadership in community development?
Is there anything else you want to tell us that we haven't asked you?

Appendix C
Follow-Up Study Survey Instrument (2007)

Women and Community Development Leadership Survey

Name of Organization:_____

Executive Director

1) Gender _____ Male ____ Female

2) How long have you been with the organization? _____

If you have been with the organization 10 years or more, please go to question 5

3) If you were hired within the last ten years, do you know why the previous director left?

____ Took job with another community organization ____To work in private sector
____ To work for a public agency ____To enter politics ____ Retired
____ To work for City/State/County government
____ Other: _____
____ Don't Know

4) How were you hired?

____ by the board _____ chosen by constituents
____ by the former director _____ promoted from within _____hired from outside
other_____

5) What is your previous work experience?

_____ Activism _____Social work _____Manager/administrator in public agency
_____ Business/Corporate _____ Entrepreneur _____ Education ____ Healthcare ___ Childcare
_____ Community Development _____ Other _____

6) Have you participated in any community development or technical assistance training programs such as those sponsored by foundations or non-profit groups?

Please list the programs you have attended:
_____

7) What is your primary motivation in working for this organization?

8) On what do you spend most of your time? (List the top three)

____Grant Writing
____Grant management
____Programs
____Policy Advocacy
____Board Relations
____Donor Relations
____Administration
____Community Relations
____Staff Management and Development
____ Other _____

Programs

9) As the Director, what are *your* program priorities? (Select all that apply and rank in order with 1 being the top priority. Assign programs you feel have equal priority levels the same number.)

_____ a. Alcohol, tobacco, drug reform
_____ b. Business development
_____ c. Children's rights/advocacy
_____ d. Child care
_____ e. Civil rights
_____ f. Cultural preservation
_____ g. Disability rights
_____ h. Domestic violence
_____ i. Education
_____ j. Bi-lingual education
_____ k. Economic development
_____ l. Environmental justice
_____ m. Gay/Lesbian/Bi/Transgender
_____ n. Homelessness
_____ o. Housing (permanent)
_____ p. Shelter (temporary housing)
_____ q. Job training
_____ r. Language rights
_____ s. Leadership training/development
_____ t. Living wage
_____ u. Neighborhood development
_____ v. Poverty
_____ w. Public transit
_____ x. Political empowerment
_____ y. Racial justice
_____ z. Voter education /registration
_____ aa. Welfare/public assistance
_____ bb. Women's rights
_____ cc. Workers' rights
_____ dd. Youth development/leadership
_____ ee. Immigration/immigrant rights
_____ ff. Other (specify):_____

10) Have there been any significant changes in your program priorities the last 10 years?

____ No [Skip to question 11]
____Yes Please Note Key Changes and/or New Programs

_____

_____

_____

11) What are the primary reasons for these changes?

____ Increased funding availability for new programs
____ Cuts in funding
____ Changes in community needs or demands
____ New Foundation initiatives
____ Change in Board's priorities
____ Local Business initiatives
____ Local/State initiatives
____ Other: Please Describe_____
_____

12) Are any of your organization's programs targeted towards women?

_____ No (Skip to question 15)
_____ Yes

13) How were the decisions to target programs to women made?

_____ Community/constituent pressure or need
_____ Board pressure
_____ Staff concern
_____ Executive Director
_____ Special funding initiative from a foundation
_____ Special funding from a donor
_____ Funding initiative from state or local government
_____ Other:_____

14) Have the needs/issues of women in your community changed over the last 10 years?

____ No/Don't know
____ Yes Describe briefly: _____
_____
_____

15) Do your programs target any other specific groups?

_____ Youth _____Immigrants _____ African Americans _____ Latinos
_____ Asian Americans _____Native Americans _____ working poor
_____ Welfare recipients _____Other:_____
_____
_____

Community Organizing

16) Is community organizing a priority for you?

___ No or not very important *(Skip to question 18)*
___ It's a priority but we don't have funding, time or staff to do it right now *(Skip to question 18)*
___ Somewhat Important ___ Moderately Important ___Very Important

17) How does your organization currently engage in community organizing?

_____Paid community organizer on staff _____volunteer community organizer on staff
_____Built into job description of various staff members _____ built into programs
_____Other (explain) _____
_____
_____

Board/ Staff

18) To what degree does your board influence program and staffing decisions?

Programs: ____Not at all ____Somewhat ____ Moderately _____ To a Great Extent
Staff: ____Not at all ____Somewhat ____ Moderately _____ To a Great Extent

19) Over the last several years has the board (check all that apply)

_____ become more active
_____ become less active
_____ the activity level has stayed the same
_____ made efforts to recruit new board members
_____ increase the number of community residents
_____Increase racial and ethic diversity
_____Increase the number of women

20) Over the last several years have there been any major changes to your staff?

a) ____Overall Increase ____Overall Decrease ____ Stayed About the Same

b) In what areas have the cuts or increases occurred (specific programs, grant writing, management, etc.)?

c) What is/are the main reasons for these changes?

Funding

21) Have there been any significant changes in funding opportunities in the last several years? (mark all that apply)

____ New City/local funds ____ Cuts in City funding
____ New Federal funds ____ Cuts in Federal funding
____ New State funds ____ Cuts in State funding
____ New Foundation Initiatives ____ Cuts/Changes in Foundation funding
____ Increase in Donations ____ Decrease in Donations
____ No Changes ____ Other:_____

22) Has President Bush's faith-based initiative had any impact on your group's funding?

_____ No
_____ Yes Describe:_____
_____
_____

23) Please list any new funding initiatives that have been the most beneficial during the last 10 years (Foundation Initiatives, local, state or Federal programs or funds):

24) Which as been most reliable and which has been the least dependable source of funds? (Indicate MOST and LEAST)

_____ Foundations _____State and local businesses _____ State Government
_____ Federal Funds _____ Local/City Government _____ Membership Dues
_____ Donations _____ Fees for services _____ All equally reliable
_____ All equally unreliable

25) How easily are you able to obtain sufficient finds to

	Easily	**With Some Difficulty**	**With Great Difficulty**	**Not A Concern or Priority**
Maintain necessary or desired staff levels	____	____	____	____
Cover general operating expenses	____	____	____	____
Offer the programs needed	____	____	____	____
Engage in community organizing	____	____	____	____
Do advocacy work	____	____	____	____
Participate in coalitions	____	____	____	____

26) For what program or organizational areas do you have the hardest time raising funds? Do you feel you lack funding for a particular program or organizational need?

27) Generally how would you describe the funding climate (state, city federal, foundation, private donations) over the last several years?

_____ Improving (more money available)
_____ Declining (less money available)
_____ Becoming More Competitive (more groups competing for about the same amount of money)
_____ Declining and More Competitive (more groups competing for less money)

28) How much does funding availability influence your program decisions?

_____ Not at all, we decide on what programs are needed and then seek out funds
_____ Somewhat _____ A moderate amount
_____ Funding availability drives most programmatic/organizational decisions

Participation

29) Over the last several years how has the community participated in determining the priorities of the organization?

____Community Surveys ____Membership on the Board ____ Serving as Paid Staff
____Community Meetings ____ Focus Groups ____Community participation is minimal
____Other: _____

_____

30) Has the level or quality of community participation changed significantly over the last several years?

Increased Somewhat	Increased A Great Deal	Stayed About the Same	Decreased Somewhat	Decreased A Great Deal
____	____	____	____	____

31) Over the last 10 years has your organization (check all that apply)

_____ had a community resident leadership development component in a specific program area
_____ recruited, developed and/or trained new leadership

_____ provided development training for residents
_____ provided organizing or advocacy training for residents
_____ increased community participation
_____ identified and encouraged potential women leaders from the community
_____ identified and encouraged potential women leaders within your organization

Networking

32) Are you currently a member of any community associations or networks (neighborhood, city, state, or national)?

___No ___Yes:

_____

_____

_____

_____

33) Do you meet with the leaders of other neighborhood development, service and advocacy groups in your community?

_____ Formally and regularly
_____ Informally and regularly
_____ Very infrequently
_____ Not at all

34) Do you work in collaboration with other organizations?

Do Not Collaborate	Infrequently	Sometimes	Often/As much as possible
____	____	___	____

35) With which types groups do you collaborate most successfully?

____ community based service organizations
____ hospitals
____ schools
____ sports clubs,
____ health advocacy
____ women's groups
____ labor union locals
____ development organizations,
____ churches
____ libraries
____ recreation centers,
____ youth clubs
____ immigrant groups
____ racial and ethnic advocacy groups

36) Over the last 10 years would you say networking with other organizations and community leaders has increased, decreased, or stayed the same?

Organizations

_____ Stayed at the same high level
_____ Stayed at the same moderate level
_____ Stayed at the same low level
_____ Decreased slightly
_____ Decreased to a large extent
_____ Increased slightly
_____ Increased to a large extent

Leaders

_____ Stayed at the same high level
_____ Stayed at the same moderate level
_____ Stayed at the same low level
_____ Decreased slightly
_____ Decreased to a large extent
_____ Increased slightly
_____ Increased to a large extent

37) To what extent do you or your organization have a working relationship with state and local political officials?

	Not at all	Not very Strong	Somewhat	Moderate	Very Strong
Local	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
State	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

38) How supportive do you think elected and other public officials are of your work?

	Not at all	Not Very	Somewhat	Moderately	Very
Local	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
State	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

39) If at all, how do elected and other public official support you and your work?

____ help in acquiring funding
____ help to promote, publicize activities
____ takes phone calls from Executive Director
____ supports networking among leaders
____ supports networking among groups
____ other_____
_____
_____

____ attend meetings and events when asked
____ available to discuss community concerns
____ offers little or no direct support

40) Over the last ten years would you say your relationship with city/county and state officials has

	Improved Somewhat	Improved A lot	Declined Somewhat	Declined A lot	Stayed at Same high level	Stayed at same Moderate level	Stayed at same low level
Local	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
State	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Barriers

41) What, if any, would you say are the main obstacles that you face as a leader and in your work? (Check all that apply)

_____ Overall lack of funding
_____ Lack of funding for organizational support
_____ Lack of / less than other's access to foundation networks
_____ Lack of/ less than other's access to local business networks
_____ Lack of/ less than other's access to local elected officials
_____ Lack of/ less than other's access to state elected officials
_____ Too little access to local organizational support networks (organization isolated)
_____ Too little access to leadership support networks (leader isolated)
_____ Too little recognition of work you /your organization does
_____ Funders and others lack understanding of community needs/concerns
_____ Funders/evaluators have unrealistic or different expectations for program outcomes
_____ Funders underestimate your expertise and experience
_____ Funders make overly burdensome demands of grantees (reporting, site visits, etc.)
_____ Funders, evaluators pay too little attention to grantees
_____ Contractors and other professionals underestimate your expertise or abilities
_____ Intermediary organizations complicate local funding/development environment (for example, they compete for funding, impose values, take credit for accomplishments)
_____ Others _____
_____
_____
_____ Don't currently face any particular obstacles to my work

42) What if anything, do you feel is the greatest obstacle to your work?

43) For women-leaders:

a) Ten years ago, although they were quick to note that they overcame the obstacles they faced, women leaders identified significant **gender, race, ethnicity and class-based barriers** to their work. Do you feel your organization experiences particular difficulties because it is woman-led? Have you noticed any improvements, has anything become more difficult for you or your group?

b) Does it make any difference to your leadership that you are a woman?

44) How do you feel the community development field has changed over the last 10 years for women, minorities and low-income people? What suggestions would you make to help overcome the barriers to their involvement and leadership in community development that may persist?

Optional

Additional Comments

If there is anything I haven't asked or you'd like to add please do so below or attach additional pages.

Contact Information. For a much deserved thank you and copy of the final project.

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

_____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Thank You, for your time, your insights and for your invaluable contribution to this project.

Bibliography

Ackelsberg, Martha A. 1988. "Communities, Resistance, and Women's Activism: Some Implications for a Democratic Polity." In *Women and the Politics of Empowerment,* ed. Ann Bookman and Sandra Morgen eds. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Ackerly, Brooke. 2000. *Political Theory and Feminist Social Criticism.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ahern, Patricia, Paul Nuti and Julia M. Masterson. 2000. *Promoting Gender Equity in the Democratic Process: Women's Paths to Political Participation and Decisionmaking.* The International Center for Research on Women and the Center for Development and Population Activities. Http://www.icrw.org.

Alderbring, Ellen. 2006. "Its Time for the Next Step in Welfare Reform." Http://www.joucefdn.org/News/NewsDetails.aspx?newsid-143.

Allen, Henry. 1998. "Organizing, Power and Public Policy: One Foundation's Road to Supporting Community Organizing." Shelterforce Online. Http://www.nhi.org/issues/101/allen.hmtl

Andersen, Margaret. 1983. *Thinking About Women: Sociological and Feminist Perspectives*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Arneil, Barbara. 2005. "Just Communities: Social Capital, Gender and Culture," in Brenda O'Neill and Elisabeth Gidengil eds., *Gender and Social Capital*. New York: Routledge.

Barber, Benjamin. 1998. *A Place for Us: How to Make Society Civil and Democracy Strong*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Barber, Benjamin. 1984. *Strong Democracy.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bari, Farzana. 2005. "Women's Political Participation: Issues and Challenges," paper prepared for the United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women Expert Group Meeting. http://www.un.org/womenwatch.

Belenky, Mary Field, Lynne Bond, and Jacqueline S. Weinstock. 1997. *A Tradition That Has No Name.* New York: Basic Books.

Berndt, Harry Edward.1977. *New Rulers in the Ghetto: The Community Development Corporation and Urban Poverty.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Berry, Jeffery. 1999. "The Rise of Citizen Groups." In *Civic Engagement in American Democracy,* eds. Theda Skocpol and Morris Fiorina. New York: Russell Sage.

Blumberg, Rae Lesser, Cathy A. Rakowski, Irene Tinker, and Michael Monteon, eds. 1995. *Engendering Wealth and Well-Being: Empowerment for Global Change.* Boulder CO.: Westview Press.

Bookman, Ann and Sandra Morgen, eds.1988. *Women and the Politics of Empowerment*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Boserup, Ester. 1970. *Women's Role in Economic Development.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Bunch, Charlotte and Roxanna Carillo. 1990. "Feminist Perspectives on Women in Development," In *Persistent Inequalities: Women and World Development*, ed. Irene Tinker. New York: Oxford University Press.

Burt, Ronald. 1992. *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Caiazza, Amy, and Robert D. Putnam. 2005. "Women's Status and Social Capital in the United States." Journal of Women, Politics, and Policy 27 1/2 (October 2005): 69-84.

Chambers, Simone, and Will Kymlicka, eds. 2002. *Alternative Conceptions of Civil Society.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Chetkovich, Carol and Frances Kunreuther. 2006. *From the Ground Up: Grassroots Organizations Making Social Change.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Chodorow, Nancy. 1978. *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Cohen, Cathy. 1999. "Social Capital, Intervening Institutions and Political Power." Presented at the Ford Foundation Conference, Social Capital in Poor Communities: Building and Utilizing Assets to Combat Poverty, New York, NY.

Cohen, Cathy. 2001. "Social Capital, Intervening Institutions, and Political Power." In., *Social Capital in Poor Communities, eds.,* Saegert, Thompson and Warren. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Cohen, Cathy, Kathleen B. Jones and Joan Tronto eds. 1997. *Women Transforming Politics.* New York: New York University Press.

Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital and the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (S): 95-120.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment.* Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Community Preservation and Development Corporation. Undated Organizational Materials. Http://www.cpdc.org.

Corporation for National Community Service. 2002. Http://www.cncsig.gov/PDF/InvestigatiotiveRelease/PAJan02.pdf.

Crandall, Susan, Daphne Hunter, Jonathan P. Latner, Navjeet Singh. 2007. "Hot Jobs Good Wages: How to Live, Work, Thrive in Massachusetts." Crittenton Women's Union. Http://www.liveworkthrive.org.

Darcy, R., Susan Welch and Janet Clarke.1994. *Women Elections and Representation*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Davis, Angela Y. 1981. *Women Race and Class*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Dawson, Jennifer.2002. "Community Non-Profit Files for Bankruptcy in Wake of Law Suit." *Houston Business Journal*. November 8. http://www.bizjourna;s.com/houston/stories/2002.

de Tocqueville, Alexis. 1966. *Democracy in America.* New York: Harper and Row.

DiIluio, John and David Kuo. 2008. "Is the Faith-based Initiative Working?" *The New York Times.* January 29.

Disney, Jennifer and Joyce Gelb. 2000. "Feminist Organizations 'Success': The Sate of U.S. Women's Movement Organizations in the 1990s." *Women and Politics,* 24 (4): 39-76.

Eastis, Carla, 2001. "Organizational Diversity and the Production of Social Capital: One of these Things is Not Like the Other." In *Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective,* ed., B. Edwards, M. Foley and M. Diani. Hanover, NH: University of New England Press 2001.

Edwards, Bob, Michael Foley and Mario Diani eds. 2001. *Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective.* Hanover New Hampshire: University of New England Press.

Ehrenberg, John. 1999. *Civil Society: The Critical History of an Idea*. New York: New York University Press.

Elizabeth Stone House. Undated. Program Descriptions. http://www.elizabethstonehouse.org.

Esman, Milton, and Norman Uphoff. 1984. *Local Organizations: Intermediaries in Rural Development.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Ferree, Myra Marx and Patricia Yancey Martin, eds. 1995. *Feminist Organizations: Harvest of the New Women's Movement.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Fiorina, Morris. 1999. "Extreme Voices: The Dark Side of Social Capital." In *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*, eds., Theda Skocpol and Morris Fiorina. New York: Russell Sage.

Fisher, Robert. 1984. *Let the People Decide: Neighborhood Organizing in America*. Boston: Twayne.

Fraser, Elizabeth. 1996. "The Value of Locality." In *Rethinking Local Democracy*, ed. D. King and G. Stoeker New York: Palgave Macmillan.

Friedman, John. 1992. *Empowerment: The Politics of Alternative Development.* Cambridge MA: Blackwell.

Gardner, John. 1981. *Self –Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society*. New York: Norton.

Garry, Ann and Marilyn Pearsall. 1989. *Women, Knowledge, and Reality: Explorations in Feminist Philosophy*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Gergen, Mary and Kenneth J. 2003. *Social Construction: A Reader.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gilkes, Cheryl Townsend. 1988. "Building in Many Places: Multiple Commitments and Ideologies in Black Women's Community." In *Women and the Politics of Empowerment*, eds., S. Bookman and A. Morgan. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a Different Voice*: *Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gittell, Marilyn. 1980. *Limits to Citizen Participation*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Gittell, Marilyn, Barbara Ferman and Charles Price. 2006. *Assessing Community Change.* The Howard Samuels Center, The Graduate School and University Center, CUNY.

Gittell, Marilyn, Isolda Ortega and Tracy Steffy. 1999. *Women Creating Social Capital and Social Change: A Study of Women-led Community Development Organizations*. The Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center, The Graduate School and University Center, CUNY.

Gittell, Marilyn, Kathe Newman and Isolda Ortega. 1997. *Building Civic Capacity: Best CDC Practices*. The Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center, The Graduate School and University Center, CUNY.

Gittell, Marilyn, Sally Covington and Jill Gross. 1994. *The Difference Gender Makes: Women in Neighborhood Development Organizations*. The Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center, The Graduate School and University Center, CUNY.

Gittell, Marilyn, Jill Gross and Kathe Newman. 1994. *Race and Gender in Neighborhood Development Organizations.* The Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center, The Graduate School and University Center, CUNY.

Gittell, Marilyn, and Nancy Naples.1982. "Activist Women: Conflicting Ideologies." *Social Policy* (Summer): 25-27.

Gittell, Ross and Avis Vidal. 1998. *Community Organizing: Building Social Capital as a Development Strategy.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Granovetter, Mark. 1973. "The Strength of Weak Ties Hypothesis." *American Journal of Sociology* 78(6):1360-80.

Greensboro Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Http://www.greensborotrc.org.

Grootaert, Christiaan. 1998. "Social Capital: The Missing Link?" Social Capital Initiative Working Paper No. 3. The World Bank.

Haley, Kathleen. 2000. "Sisters Acting UP: Meet the Sisters in Action for Power." September, 11. Http://www.alternet.org/story/9753

Hall, Peter. 1999. "Social Capital in Britain." *British Journal of Political Science*. 29 (3): 417-61.

Hirsch, Marianne and Evelyn Fox Keller, eds. 1990. *Conflicts in Feminism.* New York, NY: Routledge.

hooks, bell. 1990. *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics.* Boston: South End Press.

Holmes, Laurie. 1998. "Sowing CEED Establishing Community Education for Economic Development." The 1998 Richard Schramm Paper on Community Development. The Lincoln Filene Center at Tufts University. Medford, MA: Tufts University.

Honig, Emily. 1996. "Women at Farah Revisited: Political Mobilization and its Aftermath Among Chicana Workers in El Paso, Texas, 1972-1992." *Feminist Studies* 22 (2): 425-452.

The Inter-American Development Bank Resource Book on Participation. Web publication. http://www.iadb.org/exr/english/policies/participate/forew.htm

Jahan, Rounaq. 1995. *The Elusive Agenda: Mainstreaming Women in Development.* London: Zed Books.

Jaquette, Jane. 2001. "Women and Democracy: Regional Differences, Contrasting Views." *Journal of Democracy* 12 (3): 111-125.

Jaquette, Jane. 1990. "Gender and Justice in Economic Development." In *Persistent Inequalities,* ed. Irene Tinker. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kabeer, Naila. 1994. *Reversed Realities.* London: Verso.

Kaplan, Temma. 1997. *Crazy for Democracy.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Kaplan, Temma. 1982. "Female Consciousness and Collective Action: The Case of Barcelona, 1910-1918." *Signs: Journal of Women and Society*. 7(3):145 -166.

Keane, John. 1998. *Civil Society: Old Images, New Visions*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kim, Jim Yong, Joyce V. Millen, Alec Irwin and John Gershman eds. 2000. *Dying for Growth: Global Equality and the Health of the Poor.* Monroe ME: Common Courage Press.

King, Desmond and Gerry Stoeker, eds. 1996. *Rethinking Local Democracy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Koss-Feder. 2007. "Want to do More Than Just Write a Check? Create Your Own Non-profit Organization," *Time*, March, 29. Http://www.time.com/magazine/article/0,9171,160486808.html.

La Mujer Obrera. Undated Program Materials. Http://www.mujerobrera.org.

Lemann, Nicholas. 1994. "The Myth of Community Development." *The New York Times Magazine*. July, 9, 27-31, 50, 54, 60.

Lowndes, Vivien. 2005. "It's Not What You've Got but What You Do with It: Women, Social Capital and Political Participation." In Brenda O'Neill and Elisabeth Gidengil eds., *Gender and Social Capital*. New York: Routledge.

Mainsbridge, Jane 1997. "Does Participation Make Better Citizens?" *Civnet Journal*. 3 (Aug.-Sept) Http://www.civnet.org/journal/issue3.

Markovitz, Irving Leonard. 1998. "Uncivil Society, Capitalism and the State in Africa." In *Civil Society and Democracy in Africa: Critical Perspectives*, ed. Nelson Kasfir. London: Frank Cass.

Marquez, Benjamin. 1995. "Organizing Mexican-American Women in the Garment Industry: La Mujer Obrera." *Women and Politics.* 15 (1): 65-87.

Marchand, Marianne H. and Jane L. Parpart.1995. *Feminism Postmodernism Development.* New York: Routledge.

Mead, Molly. 1993. "Worlds Apart: Missed Opportunities to Help Women and Girls." Lincoln Filene Center. Medford, MA: Tufts University.

McLean, Scott, David Schultz and Manfred Steger. 2002. *Social Capital: Critical Perspectives on Community and Bowling Alone.* New York: New York University Press.

Millen, Joyce, Alec Irwin and Jim Yong Kim. 2002. "Conclusion: Pessimism of the Intellect, Optimism of the Will." In *Dying for Growth: Global Equality and the Health of the Poor, ed.* J.Y. Kim, J.V. Millen, A. Irwin and J. Gershman. Monroe ME: Common Courage Press.

Mission and Philosophy. Neighborhood Pride Team, undated organizational materials. Portland, OR.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres, eds. 1991. *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism.* Bloomington and Indianapolis IN: Indiana University Press.

Molyneux, Maxine. 1986. "Mobilization Without Emancipation? Women's Interests, State and Revolution in Nicaragua," in *Transition and Development: Problems of Third World Socialism,* ed. Richard R. Fagen, Carmen Diana Deere, and Jose Luis

Goraggio. New York: Monthly Review Press and Center for the Study of the Americas.

Moser, Caroline. 1993. *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice and Training.* New York: Routledge.

Moss, Rosabeth Kanter. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation.* New York, NY: Basic Books Inc.

Moss, Rosabeth Kanter. 1972. "Some Social Issues in the Community Development Corporation." In *The Case for Participatory Democracy: Some Prospects for a Radical Society*, ed. G. Benello and D. Roussopoulos. New York: The Viking Press.

Naples, Nancy. 2003. *Feminism and Method: Ethnography Discourse Analysis and Activist Research.* New York: Routledge

Naples, Nancy. 1998a. *Grassroots Warriors: Activist Mothering, Community Work and the War on Poverty.* New York: Routledge.

Naples, Nancy, ed. 1998b *Community Activism and Feminist Politics: Organizing Across Race Class and Gender.* New York: Routledge.

Naples, Nancy and Manisha Desai. 2002. *Women's Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics*. New York: Routledge.

National Center for Charitable Statistics. 2007. Http://www.nccs.urban.org.

O'Neill, Brenda and Elisabeth Gidengil. 2005. *Gender and Social Capital.* New York: Routledge

Ostrander, Susan. 1998. "Funding Women's Community Nonprofit Social Change Organizations." Women's Progress: Perspectives on the Past, Blueprint for the Future, Fifth Women's Policy Research Conference, June 1998, Washington, D.C.

Pardo, Mary. 1995. "Doing for the Kids: Mexican American Community Activists, Border Feminists?" In *Feminist Organizations: Harvest of the New Women's Movement,* ed. M. Marx Ferree and P. Yancey Martin. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Parpart, Jane L. 1995. "Deconstructing the Development 'Expert': Gender, Development and the 'Vulnerable' Groups." In *Feminism Postmodernism Development,* ed. M. Marchand and J. L. Parpart. New York: Routledge.

Pateman, Carole. 1989. *The Disorder of Women*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Perry, Stweart E. 1972. "A Note on the Genesis of the Community Development Corporation." In *The Case for Participatory Democracy: Some Prospects for a Radical Society*, ed. G. Benello and D. Roussopoulos. New York: The Viking Press.

Pierce, Neil R, and Carol F. Steinbach. 1987. *Corrective Capitalism: A Report to the Ford Foundation.* New York: Ford Foundation.

Pietila, Hilkka, and Jeanne Vickers.1990. *Making Women Matter: The Role of the United Nations*. London: Zed Books.

Phillips, Anne 2002. "Does Feminism Need a Conception of Civil Society?" In *Alternative Conceptions of Civil Society,* ed. S. Chambers and W. Kymlicka. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Phillips, Anne. 1996. "Feminism and the Attraction of the Local." In *Rethinking Local Democracy*, ed. G. King and R. Stoeker. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Portney, Kent and Jeffrey Berry. 2001. "Mobilizing Minority Communities: Social Capital and Participation in Urban Neighborhoods." In *Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective,* ed. B. Edwards, M. Foley and M. Diani. Hanover New Hampshire: University of New England Press.

The Productivity Commission. 2003. *Social Capital: Reviewing the Concept and its Policy Implications*. AusInfo, Canberra, Australia. Http://www.pc.gov.au.

Putnam, Robert. 2007. *E Pluribus Unum*: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century: The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30.2 (June 2007): 137-174.

Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster

Putnam, Robert. 1995. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital," Journal of Democracy. 6 (Summer): 65-78.

Putnam, Robert. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rathberger, Eva. 1995. "Gender and Development in Action." In *Feminism Postmodernism Development,* eds. M. Marchand and J. L. Parpart. New York: Routledge.

Reese, Laura and Gary Shields. 1998. "Faith-Based Development: Economic Development Activities of Urban Religious Institutions." Presented at the American Political Science Association Conference, Boston, MA.

Rosenblum, Nancy L. 2002. "Feminist Perspectives on Civil Society and Government." In *Civil Society and Government*, eds., Nancy Rosenblum and Robert C. Post. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Rowbotham, Sheila. 1992. *Women in Movement: Feminism and Social Action*. New York: Routledge.

Sacks, Karen Brodkin. 1988. "Gender and Grassroots Leadership." In *Women and the Politics of Empowerment* eds., S. Bookman and A. Morgen. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Saegert, Susan, Phil Thompson and Mark Warren, eds. 2001. *Social Capital in Poor Communities.* New York: The Russell Sage Foundation.

Schoepf, Brooke, Claude Schoepf and Joyce Millen. 2000. "Theoretical Therapies, Remote Remedies: SAP's and the Political Ecology of Poverty and Health in Africa." In *Dying for Growth: Global Equality and the Health of the Poor*, eds. J.Y. Kim, J.V. Millen, A. Irwin and J. Gershman. Monroe ME: Common Courage Press.

Schudson, Michael. 1996. "Unsolved Mysteries, The Tocqueville Files: What if Civic Life Didn't Die?" *The American Prospect* 7 (25). Http://www.prospect.org.

Seitz, Virgina Rinaldo. 1998. "Class Gender and Resistance in the Appalachian Coalfields." In *Community Activism and Feminist Politics*, ed. Nancy Naples. New York: Routledge.

Servon, Lisa. 1997. *Reconstruction Urban Poverty Policy: Alternative Credit, Poverty Alleviation and Economic Development in U.S. Inner Cities.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

Servon, Lisa. 1999. *Bootstrap Capital: Microenterprises and the American Poor.* Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute.

Sen, Amartya. 2000. *Development as Freedom.* New York: Anchor Books.

Sen, Gita and Caren Grown. 1987. *Development, Crises and Alternative Visions: Third World Women's Perspective.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Sen, Rinku. 2003. *Stir It Up: Lessons in Community Organizing and Advocacy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sisters in Action for Power. Undated organizational materials. Http://www.portlandonline.com/omf.

Skocpol, Theda. 1996. "Unsolved Mysteries: The Tocqueville Files: Unraveling from Above," The *American Prospect* 7 (25). Http://www.prospect.org.

Skocpol, Theda and Morris Fiorina eds. 1999. *Civic Engagement in American Democracy.* New York: Russell Sage.

Smock, Kristina. 2003. *Democracy in Action: Community Organizing and Urban Change.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Snyder, Margaret. 1995. *Transforming Development: Women, Poverty, Politics.* London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Six Questions You've Been Meaning to Ask About The Neighborhood Pride Team. Undated organizational description, Portland, OR.

Staudt, Kathleen, ed. 1997. *Women, International Development and Politics: The Bureaucratic Mire.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Stolle, Dietland and Thomas Rochon. 2001. "Are All Associations Alike? Member Diversity, Associational Types and the Creation of Social Capital." In *Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective,* eds. B. Edwards, M. Foley and M. Diani. Hanover New Hampshire: University of New England Press.

Stone, Wendy. 2001. "Measuring Social Capital: Towards a Theoretically Informed Measurement Framework for Researching Social Capital in Family and Community Life." The Australian Institute of Family Studies. Http://www.aifs.org.au.

Strategic Directions 1997-2000. Undated. Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency. Berkeley, California.

Sugrue, Thomas. 1998. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Post-war Detroit*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sullivan, Amy. 2005. "Faith Without Works," *Beliefnet and Washington Monthly.*

Http://www.beliefnet.com/story153/story_15325_/html.

Temkin, Kenneth and William M. Rhoe.1998. "Social Capital and Neighborhood Stability: An Empirical Investigation. *Housing and Policy Debate.* 9(1):61-88.

Tendler, Judith, 1996. *Good Government in the Tropics*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tinker, Irene ed. 1990. *Persistent Inequalities: Women and World Development.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Third Annual Mujer Obrera Award Program. 1996. La Mujer Obrera, El Paso, TX.

Trillium Artisans. Undated Organizational Materials. Http://www.trilliumartisans.org

Tripp, Ali Mari. 1998. "Expanding 'Civil Society in Africa': Women and Political Space in Contemporary Uganda." In *Civil Society and Democracy in Africa: Critical Perspectives*, ed. Nelson Kasfir. London: Frank Cass.

Twombly, Eric. 2001. *Welfare Reform's Impact on the Failure of Non-Profit Human Service Providers.* The Urban Institute. Http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID310104.

United We Stand, Bickerdike Redevelopment Corporation 1996 Annual Report. Chicago, IL.

Urban Institute. 2007. *Nonprofit Sector in Brief: Facts and Figures from the Non-profit Almanac*. Http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/311373_nonprofit_sector.pdf.

Vidal, Avis.1995. "Reintegrating Disadvantaged Communities into the Fabric of Urban Life: The Role of Community Development." *Housing Policy Debate* 6(1):169-230.

Watkins, Bonnie and Nina Rothchild.1996. *In The Company of Women.* St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press.

Williams, Lewis. 2002. "Gender Matters: Culture, Power and the Development of Communities." Http://www.devnet.org.nz/conf2002/papers/Williams_Lewis.pdf.

Young, Gay, Vidyamali Samarasinghe and Ken Kusterer. 1993. *Women at the Center*: *Development Practices for the 1990s.* West Hartford CT: Kumarian Press.

Young, Iris Marion. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zdenek, Robert. 1987. “Community Development Corporations.” In *Beyond the Market and the State: New Directions in Community Development*, ed. S. Bruyn and J. Meehan. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.