Gathering and dispersing
Union and independence
Stability—and movement
Motion—without instability

To accept and to emphasize opposing forces are central to solving problems in the late 20th century.

(Takamasa Yoshizaka, 1956)
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ABSTRACT

This thesis is about community development through partnerships in rural areas through a case study of North Sutherland in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. It examines whether participatory and collaborative approaches benefit rural communities and enhance their quality of life. Community development begins by seeking identities through looking at the environment in which people live and the relationship between people on which social activities depend. This approach has the effect of getting people to realize their roles within social networks. At the same time, a dynamic structural change in the approach to planning has been experienced in the Highlands and Islands. Working closely with the Scottish government, and the private and voluntary sectors, the mechanism of these initiatives has structured the framework of community governance in the area.

The key question is what kind of distributive patterns are associated with the outcomes being produced. To answer this, this thesis looks at how new forms of governance have emerged and what they intend to deliver. Moreover, it is important to clarify what the outcomes of community development are intended to be. This study is based on theory and practice. It defines the framework of ‘community development through partnership’, constructed through the application of an institutionalist approach to the analysis of planning practices. The main concerns of this institutional analysis are the process, mechanism and conditions of community development, and the links between different elements such as policies, the role of actors, and the funding of community development projects. These analytical ideas are supplemented by regulation theory, urban regime theory, and intersubjectivity.

The thesis outlines a wide array of policies and programmes from both European Union and the UK government / Scottish Parliament in order to understand the current picture of rural development and give a perspective on ‘spatial planning’ for rural areas. It examines the institutional capacities of four partnerships in the case study area. Some significant findings from the case study in North Sutherland are summarised in relation to three themes: changing governance; institutional capacity; and political coherence. These findings are discussed in depth through the notions of ‘heuristic processes’ and ‘potential space’.
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1 INTRODUCTION
1.1. Research background

This thesis is about community development through rural regeneration partnerships. It examines whether participatory and collaborative approaches benefit rural communities and enhance their quality of life. Before stating the aims and framework of the study, my personal views as a Japanese rural planning researcher should be stated. My first empirical study was of Kotakara-jima, one of the tiniest peripheral islands (just 1 square kilometre) 300 kilometres off the main island of Japan, with a population of only 48 in 1995. The study began with the assumption that the island was an autonomous living entity, on which residents live off the land and maintain their own cultural identities embedded in a rich natural environment. However, the reality was not like this. People were employed on public works projects or relied on pensions (one third of population were over 60 years old), which resulted in a lot of agricultural land being abandoned. All their food was delivered from the main island by a ship once every four days, as there was no shop on the island, and their life styles seemed eager to catch up the economic prosperity achieved in urban areas. It was a paradox, however, that the more materialistic prosperity and public services are improved, the more residents were likely to leave the island. Society in Kotakara-jima was maintained by subsidies from the central government. This situation appeared unsustainable.

These two years of fieldwork on Kotakara-jima, followed by an examination of state development policy in the remote islands of the Amami archipelago raised big questions about longstanding approaches to planning in Japan. Has excessive intervention through state subsidy in rural communities led to a dependency culture, which inevitably results in losing autonomy in local governance as well as cultural identities? On the other hand, however, there is no rationale for the Japanese Government to deny the demanded financial support for economic prosperity in disadvantaged rural areas. These contradictory notions have caused a structural problem: while the financial deficit of the state multiplies, public services, while giving employment opportunities and providing facilities such as hospitals, never satisfy the demands of local communities completely. To challenge this, rapid reorganisation of local councils is now promoted under the initiative of the central government. However, there are few suggestions as to the institutional structure of self-government which would form a suitable ‘autonomous
unit' for rural areas.

In the meantime, the last decade has seen an increasing number of community development workshops across the country, at various levels from neighbourhoods to local authority levels. Rural areas are no exception. Local community workshops have been carried out in a collaborative way in which local council officers, community representatives and planners work together. The purposes of the workshops have varied, ranging from encouragement of community involvement in the decision-making processes of city-master plans to drawing up a plan for a public park and toilet for the community. These ‘bottom-up’ approaches have become increasingly popular in both urban and rural planning fields in Japan, and viewed as an effective way in which socio-economic environments can be managed and enhanced by local communities rather than through state intervention. Planners, who often used to work with local authorities or the Government, have been impressed by the rapid progress in developing capacities, through which local communities come to communicate with each other, implement the projects, and expand their activities using knowledge acquired through the process. Gradually, they have become aware of the importance of the role of planners as catalysts that encourage interactions between participants in the workshops. On the other hand, some have also been made aware of the limits of bottom-up approaches, for community activities were likely to fade out due to lack of financial and human resources. This unexpected stagnancy in the process of community development projects seemed to be associated with the highly centralized planning system and the hierarchical institutional setting. In other words, these enthusiastic community activities could not be sustained under the complicated regulations and inflexible flows of subsidy.

To challenge this structural problem caused by the disintegration between state intervention and local initiatives, planners are required to broaden their theoretical background by looking at planning approaches and situations in other countries. In Scotland, devolution and decentralisation along with the reorganisation of local authorities has taken place and subsequently a fundamental shift in local governance has occurred. Since 1995, when the Rural White Paper, *Rural Scotland: People, Prosperity and Partnership* (The Scottish Office, 1995) was published as a comprehensive rural
development strategy, there have been an increasing number of community development programmes created by the Scottish Executive and EU initiatives. The Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE), a public agency, and its subordinate Local Enterprise Companies (LECs) are driving forces of the community-centred approaches in the northern part of Scotland, one of the less favoured areas in Europe. This region is far less populated and the socio-economic conditions seem worse than those of Japanese rural communities. In a sense, the region seemed to have no physical and financial resources other than human resources. However, when focusing on the intangible aspects of community development at a theoretical level, the communities in the region can be seen within a pattern of rich human networks. These networks have been built through community development programmes supported by the HIE and LECs. They play an intermediary role to bridge different stakeholders and their own financial and human resources, including public, private and community sectors at various levels from neighbourhood to the EU. This intermediary role seems to be a breakthrough in confronting the gap between top-down and bottom-up approaches.
1.2. Aims and objectives of the research

A dynamic structural change in the approach to planning has been experienced in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. Community development initiatives, such as Duthchas and Initiative at the Edge, are evidence that partnership is a prerequisite approach in planning. However, how far are these new initiatives and partnership structures able to achieve their claimed objectives? It is presumed that the process of structuring community governance is being accelerated by the activities of Highlands and Islands Enterprise including 10 Local Enterprise Companies, and other public agencies, in launching community development through partnerships. In addition, the day-to-day effort of Area Coordinators at the local level is undoubtedly effective in building community capacity.

These initiatives began by seeking identities through looking at the environment in which people lived and the interrelationship between people on which social activities depend. This approach had the effect of getting people to realize their roles within social networks. At the same time, working closely with both the Scottish government, and private and voluntary sectors, the mechanism of these initiatives structured the framework of the community governance in the area. When people began to create a new direction, the Enterprise network and Area Coordinators can function as a catalyst to speed up the process.

If this hypothesis that community development through partnership opens up scope for community governance is found to be valid, the key question is what kind of distributive patterns are associated with the outcomes being produced. To answer this, it is important to look at how new forms of governance have emerged and what they intend to deliver. Moreover, it is important to clarify what the outcomes of community development are intended to be. With the concept of institutional capacity, there are two main objectives to be analysed. As a main case study, community development programmes in the North Highland area will be the focus.

1) Review of community development
   ✓ The evolution of what community development means; and
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✓ The type of projects in the case study area

2) Description of the mechanism of community development through partnership

✓ How a partnership (an integrated interrelation) is shaped in implementing community development at national, regional and local levels;

✓ How community development is shaped into a suitable form for a local area through partnership (the process of building partnership); and

✓ Who animates community development in a partnership way and how.

The output of this case study will be evaluated to clarify opportunities and constraints of community development through partnership, and conclude with some recommendations for improving the ‘infrastructure’ as the institutional capacity in the area. Furthermore, it will be considered how and to what extent good practices from the case study can be applied to other rural areas as a basis for future rural planning.
1.3. Outline of the thesis

This study is based on theory and practice. Before commencing an empirical study, it is important to be clear what is meant by collaborative planning, community, community development, and governance in theory. Chapter 2 discusses significant themes to be dealt with in this research: collaborative planning; the notion of community; and new styles of governance. It also defines the framework of ‘community development through partnership’ employed in this thesis. In recent years, particularly in Britain, the discussion of institutional capacity has been actively made with the application of the institutionalist approach to the analysis of planning practices (Healey, 1998; Vigar and et al, 2000; Fernie and McCarthy, 2001; Magalhaes and et al, 2002). As a result, there is increasing recognition of the importance of institutional capacity in achieving such planning objectives as economic competitiveness, sustainable development and an improved quality of place (Healey, 1998). Institutional capacity is understood as a complex, fluid and evolving ‘infrastructure’, which enables the collective efforts of the communities to shape their futures.

Chapter 3 details the methodologies adopted to evaluate community development and the institutional capacities defined in Chapter 2. This thesis adopts the institutionalist approach as its main theory. The main concerns of institutional analysis are the process, mechanism and conditions of community development, and the links between the elements such as the policies, the role of actors, and the funding of community development projects. These analytical ideas will be supplemented by regulation theory, urban regime theory, and inter-subjectivity. The framework of data collection and evaluation of the institutional capacity of partnerships and partnership process will be laid out. The Scottish Highlands (and North Sutherland in particular) is chosen as the case study.

Chapter 4 outlines a wide array of policies and programmes from both European Union and the UK government/Scottish Parliament, which have been taken in the Scottish context, in order to understand a current picture of rural development and give a perspective of ‘spatial planning’ for rural areas. Increasingly over the last two decades, public-private partnerships have become a core element of area regeneration in general
(Geddes, 1997) and of rural regeneration and development in particular (Shucksmith, 2000a). Such partnerships are seen as having various potential capacities: to broaden support for area regeneration; to lever in a range of resources from the private and non-profit sectors; to coordinate disparate initiatives and agencies all working towards local regeneration; and to promote social inclusion (Osborne et al., 2002).

On the basis of the policy frameworks and relevant community development programmes drawn from Chapter 4, Chapter 5 concentrates on the activities carried out in the case study area, North Sutherland. The last decade saw an increasing number of programmes set up and implemented in order to enhance the quality of life for local communities. What is different from the conventional approach is the way in which these initiatives for communities are driven by a partnership; a consortium consisting of local authority, public agencies, private sector, voluntary sector and community representatives. This chapter describes the general picture of the community development landscape in North Sutherland, focusing on partnership structure and its process of establishment.

Chapter 6 examines the institutional capacities of four partnerships (both strategic and local community-led) identified through the review in the case study area. Strategic partnerships, in general, composed of local authorities and public agencies, set the framework of policy and funding. On the other hand, local partnerships are likely to involve a much wider range of community, private and voluntary groups, and individual development workers (called ‘community workers’ or ‘area-managers’) who conduct day-to-day activities with local communities. Focusing on the interrelationship between partnership networks (both horizontal and vertical) and the institutional capacity of the communities, this chapter evaluates whether the framework of programme delivery through a partnership enhances or diminishes the institutional capacity of the communities that community development projects aim to build.

Chapter 7 highlights some significant findings from the case study in North Sutherland, which are discussed in the relation to three themes: changing governance; institutional capacity; and political coherence. Through institutionalist analysis, this chapter answers why and how community development through partnerships has penetrated the planning
field in rural areas in the Scottish Highlands. It also seeks to identify institutional capacities which have become driving forces or obstacles to the construction of an intellectual and social base for open, communicative, and resilient approaches towards contingent future in the area. These findings about community development are discussed in depth through the notion of 'potential space'. Finally, policy and research implications are drawn for further study.
THE COLLABORATIVE PLANNING APPROACH
2.1. Introduction

"Planning is the guidance of future action" (Forester, 1989: 3). Planning is often understood either as a technical problem-solving endeavor or as a matter of politics. In practice, however, planners work on problems with people by: informing political communities about the range of stakeholders and about how they like to discuss issues; helping to shape arenas where stakeholders can meet; and helping those involved work out what it means to build new collective ways of thinking and acting, to re-frame and re-structure their ways of proceeding (Healey, 1997b). As Tewdwr-Jones points out, planning cannot ignore "a whole series of conflicting webs between different levels of government and different political actors that have to be reconciled" (2002: xi). Since it is the world of intensely conflicting interests and inequalities of status and resources, where planning ought to work in the face of power.

Taking account of these concerns, this chapter aims to describe 'collaborative planning' (Healey, 1997b) and its relevant components, in order to develop the theoretical base of this study. It starts with explanation of the background of collaborative planning as a planning theory. This will be followed by a focus on planning ethics. The activity of planning, based on the collaborative planning approach, should be aware of 'a constant ethical challenge' (Forester, 1989) as a daily necessity, which involves reconsideration of the notions of democracy and community. Theoretical aspects of collaborative planning should also be examined from practical perspectives: to what extent this planning approach impacts on political decision-making; and conversely to what extent the changes in policy-making process across various political and geographical settings differentiate a variety of perspectives in planning in practice. To analyse this, this chapter will need to explore the extensive process of change, both within planning and the political and governing processes within which collaborative planning originated and evolves. Combining these aspects together, the last two sections will try to define 'community development through partnership', as a planning approach, which provides an analytical perspective as well as a theoretical perspective for the subsequent case study.
2.2. Planning theory

"Planning theory is currently in a confused state as a consequence of a number of changes over the last ten years" (Allmendinger and Tewdwr-Jones, 2002: xi). In this section, first of all, a brief summary of various planning theories will be given, and the idea of collaborative planning, as both a theory and analytical perspective will be examined.

2.2.1. The trajectory of planning theory

For a long time, planners have been searching through their history the roots and meanings of their activity (Mazza, 1996). According to Friedmann’s description (1996), the intellectual influences that have shaped contemporary planning theory are placed within four major traditions; policy analysis, social learning, social reform and social mobilization. Healey (1991) classifies the characteristics of planners into five models; urban development manager, public bureaucrat, policy analyst, intermediator and social reformer.

The first three models of planners' roles (urban development manager, public bureaucrat, policy analyst) are classified as policy analysis, in terms of planning theory. Policy analysis was strongly influenced by Herbert Simon. His study of 1945, Administrative Behaviour, focused on the behaviour of large organisations and particularly on how they might improve their ability to make decisions (Friedmann, 1996). Friedmann points out that policy analysis has, strictly speaking, no distinctive philosophical position. This is derived from the primary task of planning in the 1950s, which is city building and re-building (Healey, 1991). The legitimacy of the planning experts was the taken-for-granted social goal of city building, which was confirmed by Parliament, rather than their own philosophical position.

The fourth role model, intermediator deploys interpersonal skills in negotiating and 'social learning' (Healey, 1991). This tradition focuses on overcoming the contradictions between theory and practice, or knowing and acting. Theorists in the social learning tradition have claimed that knowledge is derived from experience and
validated in practice, and is therefore integrally a part of action. Knowledge, in this view, emerges from an ongoing dialectical process in which the main emphasis is on practical undertaking: existing understanding (theory) is enriched with lessons drawn from experience, and this ‘new’ understanding is then applied in the continuing process of action and change (Friedmann, 1996). Social learning approaches could derive their legitimacy from assumptions about societal consensus (Healey, 1991), however, such assumptions are very difficult to sustain. Friedmann (1987) noted that the social learning tradition fails to acknowledge this lack of consensus and the existence of fundamental inequalities of opportunity in society.

While the former two planning approaches tend to focus on the technical skills or knowledge, rather than goals of planning, the social reform approach has clear motivations, i.e. improvement of the conditions of the disadvantaged (Gans, 1972). The vocabulary of social reform derives primarily from three sources: macro sociology, institutional economics, and political philosophy. Since the publication of Keynes’s *General Theory* in 1936, three areas of scientifically based and legitimate state intervention have been argued: the promotion of economic growth, the maintenance of full employment, and the redistribution of income (Friedmann, 1996). The social mobilisation approach, as Harris (2002) summarises, is characterised by three principle features: the assertion of the primary of direct collective action; the conception of planning as a form of politics; and the search for transformative processes.

However, these models are controversial, as Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982) argue, because such planning approaches expanded through the identification of ‘problems’ which reform and regulations are then deployed to solve. When these fail, or further problems result from the reforms, the solution is to provide new and more extensive forms of regulation. In addition, a problem identified by Friedmann is that if social mobilization needs planners who have ‘social change expertise’, their client is ‘the mobilized community or group’. Self-mobilization (of communities) should involve gaining an awareness of the promise of emancipation and confidence in the possibilities for change. This idea of self-mobilization needs to be differentiated from the idea of development intended for the constructive purpose of dealing with the surplus population of the progress of development – the development of capitalism (Cowen and
Shenton, 1996). Next, the counter arguments, which are often called 'another development', 'alternative development' or 'non-development', will be discussed.

2.2.2. The notion of development

The form of development discussed here is what Friedmann (1992) calls 'alternative development'. He summarises widespread beliefs about alternative development: the belief that the state is part of the problem, and that an alternative development must as much as possible, proceed outside and perhaps even against the state; the belief that 'the people' can do no wrong and that that communities are inherently gemeinschaftlich (Campero in Friedmann, ibid); and the belief that community action is sufficient for the practice of an alternative development, and that political action is to be avoided.

In its classical origin, as Cowen and Shenton describe, "development was understood as a natural process in which phase of renewal, expansion, contraction and decomposition followed each other sequentially according to a perpetually recurrent cycle" (1996: viii). We know that some developments start with decomposition: in real-estate development, for instance, the property developer causes the old to be destroyed in order to create the new. However, we do not see the destructive phase of a process of development, but just negative nuisance to be removed for the modern intension to develop. In this modern development doctrine, the intention is "to give order to a particular process of development, the development of capitalism, which embodies no developmental purpose and whose destructive dimension is poverty and the unemployment of the potential of productive power" (Cowen and Shenton, 1996: ix). Therefore, it is likely that the poor or the unemployed will be excluded from development process.

This exclusion happened at the international level throughout much of seventies and made an unequal power structure even worse. The rich countries pumped enormous amounts of money into the economies of the poor countries in the name of social and economic development, but debt and even the interest on the loan repayments has depressed the economies of the poor countries. The search for alternative development was inevitable. Friedmann claims, "if social and economic development means anything at all, it must mean a clear improvement in the conditions of life and livelihood of
ordinary people. People have an equal and fundamental right to better conditions of life and livelihood" (1992: 9). Strongly emphasising that such development must begin locally, Friedmann acknowledges the importance of the state intervention to some extent. It is argued, “without the state’s collaboration, the lot of the poor cannot be significantly improved. Local empowering action requires a strong state” (ibid: 7). This is because it is the state that underpins 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, organised in their own communities (Friedmann, 1992). At local level, these alternative development processes may also require the outside intervention of ‘organizers’ and others who can teach both a new awareness and the skills necessary for ‘self-reliant practice’.

2.2.3. The collaborative planning approach in contemporary planning

As Allmendinger and Tewdwr-Jones (2002) emphasise, the current landscape of planning theory seems heavily orientated towards ‘collaborative planning’. This planning approach is also called ‘argumentative planning’ (Forester, 1993), ‘communicative planning’ (Forester, 1989), or ‘planning through debate’ (Healey, 1992). According to Healey’s thesis “[Collaborative planning] is about why urban regions are important to social, economic and environmental policy and how political communities may organise to improve the quality of their places” (Healey, 1997b: xii). In this explanation, it is important to see collaborative planning theory as both a framework for understanding and as practical action.

Planning work is engaged in exchanging and discussing ideas and information with a range of other people, rather than in writing reports or in developing design frameworks. One reason for this shift is the greater institutional fragmentation of the public sector, and the various pressures fostering relations of ‘partnership’ between the public and private sectors. Inevitably this means that time needs to be spent in negotiating with various parties if any collective and co-ordinated actions are to proceed (Healey and Thomas, 1991). Moreover, planning concerns diverse issues from land use planning to community involvement. Conflict between environmental issues and economic development is likely to occur. When projects in different competent authorities
frequently overlap, the sectional implementation of projects is likely to be less financially effective. Moreover, it concerns the nature of expertise. Planning work involves drawing together this diversity to address the consequences of particular proposals. It also requires coordinating agencies with different capabilities and responsibilities to implement a project or develop agreement about a strategy. Friedmann’s argument is that the skills of the planner as policy analyst and as intermediator must be combined and harnessed to the task of social mobilization.

Collaborative planning theory, which had developed particularly around Habermas’s *Theory of Communicative Action* (1984; 1987), has been enriched by the theories of Michel Foucault and his followers. Their critiques of communicative planning theory address its failure in capturing the role of power in planning and therefore its weakness in serving as a basis for effective action and change (Flyvbjerg and Richardson, 2002). Foucauldian theory points out, firstly, the basis weakness of Habermas’s project as “its lack of agreement between ideal and reality, between intentions and their implementation, and is rooted in an insufficient conception of power” (Flyvbjerg and Richardson, ibid: 46), which is needed for political change. The second point of arguments is that while communicative rationality arouses in us a utopian idealistic goal, it does not show us how to get there. On the contrary, the alternative Foucauldian approach recognises power as unavoidable and pervasive in nature and emphasises its productive as well as destructive potential. However, this approach does not necessarily dissolve relations of power in a consensus-building process but, at least, has a powerful ‘sobering effect’ (Flyvbjerg, 1996) towards the dark side of planning theory, which has been explored by some planning theorists (Roweis, 1983; Yiftachel, 1995; Flyvbjerg, 1996).

In the light of these arguments, the collaborative planning approach can give a valuable way of understanding and creating arenas, where different stakeholders come together, either face-to-face, or articulate in some form of open discussion. They develop shared recognition, understanding and policy agendas in ‘different power’ situations (Healey, 2000a). As Healey and Thomas (1991) note, planning is multi-disciplinary, drawing on diverse fields of knowledge. Collaborative planning concerns a wide range of issues in the field and discipline of planning: notions of community; relations of power;
globalisation and its impact; environmentalism; cultures and systems of governance; institutional design; and spatial planning.
2.3. Planning Ethics

For community development, active participation is the starting point of the process as well as the most important means. If one can assume a goal, it is to create a form of planning which is closer to Habermas's ideal society – free from domination, more democratic and a strong civil society. The Collaborative Planning approach sees the regulation of actual relations of dominance as crucial. Foucault in particular seeks out a genealogical understanding of actual power relations in their specific context. For Foucault, freedom is a practice, and resistance and struggle are the basis for the practice of freedom (Flyvbjerg and Richardson, 2002). A moral philosopher, Alasdair MacIntyre (1985) describes the social setting, where the histories of individual agents are situated, as 'a practice', in which individuals recognize personal identity and acquire the virtues of how to live out their own lives. To find a rationale for participation as a practice in community development, the following sections will discuss democracy and moral philosophy in more depth.

2.3.1. Democracy

Smith and Blanc (1997) define democracy as a type of society characterised by particular kinds of social relations: it should be conceived of as a lived-in experience of its members, and that democratic practice is to be located in the social relations of the community. To understand contemporary democracy, which is associated with citizenship rights, it is necessary to clarify the concept of citizenship, especially in the UK context.

The concept of citizenship has been associated with democracy since the ancient Greeks. Arblaster describes the Athenian model of democracy: "[central] to the effective working of Athenian democracy was the idea of active citizenship... The state or polis was a whole of which individuals were parts dependent upon it and not self-sufficient. So the citizen could only flourish as a person by acting as part of member of the whole, the community" (1987: 21). Whilst the Athenian democracy was limited to males, except outsiders and slaves, it is worth pointing out that the original classical democracy was founded on the concept of "state and society as one, the citizen body governing
itself directly, through active participation in politics, a duty which fell upon every
citizen at one time or another” (Arblaster, ibid: 24).

The idea of participatory democracy can be deduced from the work of Rousseau. For
Rousseau, as Smith and Blanc (1997) argue, it was important to distinguish between
general will and particular will. The general will requires the recognition of a long-term
common good and is not simply the sum total of the interests of each individual,
because when individuals act solely in their own individual interests, it cannot be
assumed that they will act in support of the common good (Smith and Blanc, 1997).
However, Rousseau acknowledges that the method would be impracticable in a great
people (Cole, 1973). Whilst sustaining the idea of direct action by citizens, Rousseau
recognised that in more modern large-scale societies notions of delegation and
representation had a place. And then, Rousseau accepted the necessity of majority
voting in the pursuit of political rights, which refers to so-called representative
democracy. Nevertheless, Rousseau’s assumption that the representative method would
maintain the general will or long-term common good, has been criticised for
‘nostalgia’– harking back to small scaled ‘village’ society rather than the complexities
of industrial societies (Arblaster, 1987), and “his association of greater democracy of
greater equality” (Smith and Blanc, 1997: 283).

In many modern democratic societies, the representative model has been adopted as a
style of governance. Politicians are elected by citizens. They make policy on behalf of
citizens. Experts advise politicians and administrators carry out politicians’ wishes. This
representative conception of democracy can be legitimised by the idea that the ordinary
citizen has the right to silently judge his society’s government. For Schumpeter, “the
democracy method is that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in
which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for
the people’s vote” (1943: 269). However, as Smith and Blanc (1997) point out, this
position is firmly embedded in elite theory: leadership is a key aspect of political
decision-making, and the role of the ordinary people is to elect such leaders. In practice,
it seems that while the elected political leader mediates or arbitrates between various
short-term ‘legitimate’ interests in order to produce a general interest, the public
administration provides a democratic government consisting of amateurs with a
professional bureaucracy capable of putting their ideas into practice. In this case, there
are two concerns: firstly, pluralism does not seem to generate and maintain the long-
term common good, which Rousseau identifies as important as individual rights; and
secondly, bureaucracies with their own logic tend to treat the short-term interest of
political leaders lightly. This results in bureaucratism rather than democracy.

Confronted by this perversion, people become sceptical of bureaucratism and indifferent
to politics. Could models of participatory democracy restore the relationship between
the individual and the society? Models of participatory democracy seem more dynamic
processes of socialisation and integration of citizens in which the common good arises
out of the expression and consideration of specific individual and group interests.
However, there are still weaknesses. Firstly, the fact that contemporary capitalism
generates inequity in societal conditions, in general, may simply result in “the stronger
and better organised gaining the prize” (Smith and Blanc, 1997: 285). Secondly, there
remain doubts that participatory democracy can allow for the complexities of decision-
making in practice.

2.3.2. New models of democracy

There have been a number of attempts in recent years to rescue participatory democracy
whilst locating it in a real world of diversity. Smith and Blanc (1997) associate this
tendency with the radical-democracy movement, associationalism, and
communitarianism. The first strand, radical-democracy, is strongly influenced by the
work of Rousseau, which is the active citizen in a participatory democracy. Mouffe
(1992) claims that a radical, democratic citizen must be an active citizen, someone who
acts as a citizen, who conceives of herself as a participant in a collective undertaking. It
is formulated to take into account the existence of conflict, division and antagonisms
(Mouffe, 1992). Mouffe links democracy with identity in that identity implies difference,
often constructed on the basis of hierarchies. The second strand, associationalism is
defined by Hirst (1993) as a normative theory of society, the central claim of which is
that human welfare and liberty are both best served when as many of the affairs of
society as possible are managed by voluntary and democratically self-governing
associations. It is argued, by Smith and Blanc (1997), that associational participation is
not seen as an alternative to representative democracy, but a way in which one can supplement and extend it. However, if the overarching state intervenes to help the form of associations, their independence and legitimacy might be threatened. The third strand, communitarianism wants to modify representative democracy by a bottom-up community-bases participation which rejects special-interest groups but conceives rather of a series of overlapping communities each based around a moral consensus (Smith and Blanc, 1997).

Whilst these participatory theories of democracy vary in their starting points, it could be said that a desire to recognise the idea of the active citizen striving for the common good which is not, in itself, coercive of minority interests, but rather recognises the existence of a pluralism of values within certain limits (Smith and Blanc, 1997). Etzioni (1995) also claims that agreement on a common core of values will be achieved by ‘moral suasion’, which is very different from coercion. Thus, it is worth clarifying the moral issues by which a participatory theory of democracy is legitimated.

2.3.3. Moral philosophy

The current attempts to deploy the participatory democracy in many political arenas call attention to ‘cardinal principles and core virtues of the good society’ (Etzioni, 1996). Thus, it is important to understand what kind of philosophy underlies these participatory theories of democracy. There are three issues to be raised here: what ‘virtues’ really mean; what ‘the good society’ means; and how ‘the good society’ can be achieved in seeking ‘virtues’. The last question will produce implications for the legitimacy of participation in planning, particularly in community development contexts.

The first issue concerns virtue, which is synonymous with moral justice. When it comes to the definition of virtue or justice, one can easily find that there is no single core conception. It is argued, by MacIntyre (1985), that the concepts (of justice) have in at least some cases changed their character in the past three hundred years; the evaluative expressions have changed their meanings. Hence, MacIntyre assumes that every moral philosophy offers explicitly or implicitly at least a partial conceptual analysis of the relationship of an agent to his or her reasons, motives, intentions and actions, and in so
doing generally presupposes some claim that these concepts are embodied or at least can be in the real social world. This implies a fundamental point that virtue is a concept embodied in the relationship between the agent and the society to which he or she belongs. There are roughly two different scopes of conception of the 'individual' and of 'her society or community'. One is a concept which liberal individualism tends to deploy, and the other is a concept in favour with those who criticise excess individualism; 'communitarians' for instance.

For the former, an individual is someone who is freed, as it were, from the dictates of nature and the sanction of the social roles (Avineri, 1992), and a community is simply an arena in which individuals each pursue their own self-chosen conception of the good life, and political institutions exist to provide that degree of order which makes such self-determined activity possible (MacIntyre, 1985). On the other hand, for the latter, individuals are intimately related to one another not only in one communal life but also in the totality of existence (Suzuki, 1953), and a community is a unity in which the individuals are members. It is thought, therefore, that personal autonomy is better achieved within the community than outside communal life, or that the community gives our lives their moral meaning (Avineri, 1992), and that a community is a body with some common values, norms, and goals, in which each member regards the common goals as her own, is a good in itself.

In the liberal concept of the individual, the capacity to be a moral agent is located in the self rather than in any of the social role or practices that it adopts. Therefore the resources for the possession and exercise of moral judgement are to be found in that unencumbered self alone (Mulhall, 1996). On the other hand, in the communitarian concept of the individual, the reintroduction of rationality to morality by means of the concept of a human virtue can be brought about only by rejecting the abstract, ghostly emotivist-self and regarding the person as necessarily implicated in and defined by her social, cultural and historical circumstances (MacIntyre, 1985). Moreover, Etzioni (1999) claims that society should be the agent responsible for promoting moral behaviour, though he rejects state regulation of moral behaviour. Whilst the conception of the individual differs in liberal thought and communitarian thought, it can be said that the meaning of virtue is to act as a guide towards a desired goal, and to enable
individuals to understand how they should live their lives.

In liberal thought, in which the individual is to be a moral agent in nature, the good life can be determined and pursued by the individual-self. It is this capacity that the rights which are prioritized in the first principle are there to protect (Mulhall, 1996). Therefore, the good society should be a society that makes each individual desire maximally possible. This strongly influences the modern political theory of liberty that the individual right is prior to social goods or justice. However, this does not mean that social goods are not necessary, but that people need an authority which forms the social order and provides the justice by which the right to pursue different individual desires is secured. It is a paradox that people need a ‘strong national government’ that will be a ‘shaper’ of citizens, and help them cope with the weaker facets of their nature (Etzioni, 1999). Without it, danger is that they will abuse their liberties, becoming profligate and indolent as a result. Against the excessive individualism in contemporary societies, the communitarians place the community as the agent responsible for promoting moral behaviour. Liberals might respond that each person should formulate his or her own virtue, and that public policies and mores should reflect only agreements that individuals voluntarily form (Locke, 1956). However, Etzioni (1996) notes a fear that collective formulations of morality will lead to judging as morally inferior, those who are less able to live up to them.

In the communitarian account, as individuals do not exist outside particular social contexts, the individuals can only acquire virtues within the framework of the community or society of which they are members. MacIntyre (1985) argues that human behaviour cannot be characterized independently of intentions, and intentions cannot be characterized independently of the settings that make those intentions intelligible both to agents themselves and to others. Thus, the good life for any individual is inseparable from social good. It is important to note that there is no premise that the social good is more fundamental than individual autonomy. MacIntyre claims that the social setting has a history, within which the histories of individual agents are not only, but also have to be, situated, because without the setting and its changes through time the history of the individual agent and his changes through time will be unintelligible. Whilst communal standards and authorities in societies vary, all societies must maintain some
modicum of social order or they risk extinction. Indeed, integral to the social order of all societies are at least some processes that mobilise some of their members’ time, assets, energies, and loyalties to the service of one or more common purposes (Etzioni, 1996). This social setting is what MacIntyre (1985) calls ‘a practice’, which involves standards of excellence and obedience to rules as well as the achievement of goods. In the communitarian account, a good society is a society with a particular social setting in which individuals recognise personal identity and acquire the virtues that provide the reasons to live out their own lives.

It is argued that the distinction between communitarianism and liberalism is perhaps not so obvious, because one can still argue that the common good of Western liberal societies is neutrality and basic liberties (Avineri, 1992). However, in a political arena, a fundamental distinction can be found in the degree of the value of participation. Avineri points out that for communitarians’ active participation is another good which devalued by individualists, who at best regard it as an instrumental good. Because of the importance of the mediating structures which enable people get involved, communitarians are less fearful of the emergence of an oppressive government as a result of the politics of the common good (Avineri, ibid), whereas many individualists argue that the politics of common good are likely to result in intolerance and semi- or fully totalitarian regimes (Arendt, 1958). To this fear of totalitarianism, communitarians would argue that the roots of totalitarianism do not lie in their own premises, but in limiting the political sphere, in alienating people from public debate and public activity (Avineri, ibid). This evokes the political rights, which are identified one of elements of citizenship by Marshall (1950), to participate in the exercise or political power, as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such a body. These political rights have become limited over the twentieth century to particular persons or places where individuals can enjoy them, partly because the number participating is too large and remote to command the right and to make of it a continual driving force (Marshall, 1950).

The problem for contemporary planning and environmental systems is, argued by Healey (1997b), that the state can neither know enough, nor stand above its own concerns sufficiently, to act as protagonist for the ‘public interest’ unaided. The question
of the movement towards participation should be recognised not only as a force of reaction against the excessive individualism, but as fundamental human rights with which individuals can seek their own good lives. MacIntyre (1985) argues that the good life for man is the life spent in seeking for the good life for man, and the virtues necessary for the seeking are those which will enable us to understand what more and what else the good life for man is. If this is true, it is worth exploring a new paradigm of planning theory based on communitarian philosophy.

2.3.4. Social capital

In relation to community development, seeking the capacity for ‘the good life for man’ can be translated into seeking ‘community capacity’. Community capacity is what a community is capable of doing in a process of community development, involving values, motivations, effort and energy as well as knowledge and skills (Dundee City Council, unknown). The idea of community capacity is often considered interchangeable with the term social capital. For example, the creator and main exponent of social capital theory, Robert Putnam, defines the concept of social capital as features of social organisations, such as trust, norms, and networks, that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions and that enables participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives (Putnam, 1993; 1995). Coleman (1990) argues that social capital refers to the organizations, structures and social relations which people build-up themselves, independently of the state or large corporations. It contributes to stronger community fabric, and, often as a by-product of other activities, builds bonds of information, trust, and inter-personal solidarity. Newton (1999) argues that outcomes may be the capacity to co-operate effectively and efficiently, and take the form of tangible and physical products.

In theory, social capital can be described as a mixture or blend of subjective social norms (trust), objective features of society (social networks), and outcomes (effectiveness, efficiency) (Newton, 1999). In fact, different analysts emphasise different points: for Putnam, the starting point is social trust; for Coleman, the starting point is organisations or structures as object and outcomes are trust; and for Newton, outcomes include tangible products. It is also argued by Newton (1999) that without the
individual and subjective attitudes and expectations of trust and reciprocity which make cooperation possible, and without the social networks and organisations which result from these attitudes, there would be no social capital in the third sense of collective facilities and services. This suggests that there seems to exist a kind of process in which various features of social capital are acquired.

This process would start from the interpersonal relationship. At a personal-level, the psychologist, Jacob Moreno (1934) argued that the concrete patterns of interpersonal choice, attraction, reputation, friendship, and other relations in which people are involved, result in social configurations, as a pattern of networks. In this line of social configuration, Warner (1941) argued that a modern community consists of various types of sub-group, not only the family, the church, classes and associations, but also informal associations of people. An important point is that, at a community-level, these sub-groups have a degree of group feeling and intimacy and certain group norms of behaviour have been established. Norms, however, can be difficult to identify. It is helpful to rephrase vague norms into formal roles for action within the policy field. Indeed, 'role' is an important term through which the social networks can be understood. For example, Nadel (1957) claims that social structures are structures of roles, which are defined through networks of interdependent activities. Actors play their own roles, which are seen as relations of power, obligations and understandings that structure how actors think and act. In collaborative planning theory, it is taken for granted that the social worlds of people in formal agencies of government are intertwined with wider social forces, embedding governance processes in the wider relations of economic activity and civil society (Vigar et al., 2000; Berger and Luckmann, 1966).
2.4. Communities as a principle

In the previous sections, it is argued that a new planning approach as a policy driven system is required to develop an account of the process by which existing democratic practices might be transformed in the direction indicated by the theoretical models (Smith and Blanc, 1997). Also it is clear that new these directions in governance modes are more sensitive to the ‘consumers’ of public policy rather than the government ‘products’ of policy (Healey, 1997b). The ‘consumers’ undoubtedly refer to ‘communities’ of which individuals are members. In theory, this type of governance can be understood and created though ‘collaborative planning’, which involves the articulation of rules of behaviour with respect to the collective affairs of a political community and of principles for allocating resources among community members. Moreover, particularly in the community development approach, a sense of community is essential not only as ‘the mobilised community’ in Friedmann’s term, but also as the self-mobilising agents. When it comes to community development in rural areas, practical ways deployed in implementing objectives would vary, depending on the notion of community. In the case of community being regarded as merely a body to which Government distributes social benefits, community development does not refer to community involvement, which is a principle of collaborative governance. On the contrary, what underpins genuine community development is community as the agent that attains its own objectives through partnership in which it builds a new style of governance.

2.4.1. The notion of community

It is argued, by Liepins (2000), that ‘community’ has more often provided a shorthand term for the significance of a social space or arena, and a set of cultural meanings and practices which continue to have great significance to rural people. Pointing out that recent analyses of rurality, rural change, and rural problems have included passing references to ‘community’, Liepins claims that a debate is needed between the conservative image of ‘community’ in rural settings, which has so often been associated with dominant power relations and hegemonic discourses about rurality and acceptability, and a more challenging image of ‘community’ as a social and cultural
space which might nurture alternative political possibilities.

Considering community as a social construct, moral issues associated with ‘common goods’ or ‘rights and responsibilities’ are increasingly popular subjects for social science. Corbridge (1993) argues for an interrogation of the boundaries between moral and political philosophy and development studies. Smith (1999) identifies two moral dimensions of community in recent discussions: that community is good in itself; and that it speaks with moral autonomy. These assumptions are embedded in communitarian account: communities are social webs of people who know one another as persons and have a moral voice (Etzioni, 1995) and personal autonomy is better achieved within the community than outside communal life (Avineri, 1992). The communitarian account legitimates community involvement in planning as a policy driven system, which directly or indirectly influences their socio-economic life. Moreover, these daily activities, which occur in a particular space and structure, retain or modify their own cultural and historical identities. The maintenance of these identities requires the overcoming of adverse economic and social conditions, which in turn provide an essential rationale for community development (Murray and Dunn, 1996).

In this model of ‘community’, the social construct involves four elements: people; meanings; practices; and space/structures. The conceptualisations and readings of ‘community’ can be shaped by interactions between these four elements. This seems to happen through the following process. Firstly, people share sets of meanings about beliefs, experiences and interests which shape their cultural identity. Secondly, people participate in practice and activities by which people conduct their economic, social and political life. These cultural and economic dimensions of life occur in spaces and through structures (Liepins, 2000). This is a scenario, on the basis of which substantial community development programmes are implemented. However, the notion of community as a social construct still lacks consideration of the interrelation between community and ‘place’. As explained in previous sections, the collaborative planning perspective concerns ‘the quality of place’ (Healey, 1997b), and therefore, it is necessary to consider the notion of community in a ‘place-related’ context.
2.4.2. Integrated place-based community in planning

With respect to the interrelation between community and place, some argue the need to recognise place-based community. However, the emphasis of those arguments varies. Wilkinson (1991) claims that community requires three things: a locality where people achieve their daily needs together; a more or less complete local society; and the opportunity for local residents to express mutual locality-oriented interests in collective actions. Others emphasize the dynamics of the terrain of discursive and power relations (Liepins, 2000). Etzioni argues that non-geographic communities often provide at least some elements of the communitarian nexus; hence they tend to have the moral infrastructure, which are considered essential for a civil and humane society (Etzioni 1995). Healey (1997b) argues that communities in urban and rural areas are offered the opportunities to get involved with 'community development' activities of various kinds, in which the word 'community' is used merely as a synonym for 'the people who live in an area'. Pointing out that the metaphor carries more meaning than this, she envisions an integrated place-based social world (Healey, 1997b). Integrated place-based communities were identified in mining villages, and other 'company towns', where people shared a common work relation and built up a culture of accommodation and resistance to it (Frankenberg, 1996). The latter reminds us that a community only exists in relation to the culture and society to which it belongs.

Since face-to-face contact still remains important to humans, the place-based community plays an important role in implementing community development. However, the expanded notion of community, including businesses, voluntary organisations and governmental bodies who are concerned with the place, is applicable to planning practices in contemporary societies, not only in urban but also rural areas. With respect to this, the notion of community should include a wide range of actors (from an individual to governmental bodies), who interact at various levels (from the neighbourhood to the supra-national). In this case, it should be carefully considered that the stimuli of community development exist not only within a community as an actor, but also in-between different actors. And importantly, the transformative influence (Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger, 2002) upon existing structures (in the institutional sense) should be considered too. The collaborative planning approach, particularly in
the UK context, has evolved around concerns of formal institutional arenas for mediation typical of the UK system which have often constrained the development of participatory processes (Healey, 1998a, 1998b; 1999).
2.5. Stimuli to a new style of governance

It has been seen that re-conceptualization of community, the articulation of which can challenge the 'moral anarchy' and fill the 'moral vacuum' of contemporary societies (Smith, 1999), is a stimulus to advocating a collaborative approach in contemporary democratic societies. However, this moral debate is not the only rationale for community development. While social/community capacity can evolve as a consequence of internal evolution, some external forces also affect its development. Therefore, a considerable part of what community development can achieve depends on the extent to which the some driving forces of some community development projects have evolved in a local governance culture. In the UK context, there is no doubt that some changes in social and political settings have pervaded the idea of community development. In particular, decentralization and modernization of local governments, which have been strongly encouraged by central Government in recent years, are external forces leading to a new style of governance at local level. Three issues are raised here concerning community development in the UK: the role of the state in contemporary democratic societies; the new welfare state regime; and sustainable development.

2.5.1. The shift in the role of the state

It is argued that in modern societies, governance has traditionally been equated with what governments do with the machinery of the 'state' (Healey, 1997b). Ham and Hill (1993) describe the state as institutions composed of legislative bodies, subordinate law-making bodies and judicial bodies. Moreover, the state is a political structure in which a number of state institutions are located at various levels - national, regional and local. The initial function of the state is the maintenance of law, order and peace. As the distinction of the modern state, Ham and Hill (1993) highlight the character and scope of its intervention, and point out that the growth of state intervention has tended to increase the powers of central institutions. In contemporary terms, three important areas of state intervention are identified; the range of public services often referred to as 'the welfare state'; regulation of the economy; and a range of regulatory activities to limit the collective impact of individual behaviour in the complexity of societal life. These
points suggest that whilst politics is seen as a matter for a particular group of people, our daily life is deeply bound up with the political activities of the state. This is why some academics in the social and political sciences in recent years have debated the difference between government and governance, by using analytical perspectives based on Foucault's 'governmentality' (Foucault, 1991). Studies on 'governmentality' show how we think about governing others and ourselves in a wide variety of contexts (Dean, 1999). In a more analytical sense, it concerns any relatively systematic way of thinking about government, which is called a 'rationality of government' or 'mentality of government'. This includes: the form of representation of the field to be governed; the agencies to be considered and enrolled in governing; the techniques to be employed such as theoretical knowledge, particular programmes, and forms of practical know-how and strategies; and the ends to be achieved (Dean, ibid).

In addition, the notion of 'governmentality' has a second meaning, which marks the emergence of a distinctly new form of thinking about and exercising of power in western societies (Foucault, 1991). Dean (1991) argues that the emergence of governmentality in Western European societies in the early modern period is linked with the emergence of active state through 'governmentalisation of the state' (Foucault, 1991: 103). This form of power is bound up with the discovery of a new reality, the economy, and concerned with a new object, the population (Dean, ibid). For example, following Ham and Hill (1993), in the UK in the nineteenth century the Factory Acts, which regulated working conditions, were a response to perceived deficiencies in the way in which factory owners organised production processes. In the twentieth century, the apparent failure of private enterprise and market mechanisms to maintain high levels of employment has resulted in state intervention in the economy. The ways in which the state is concerned with economic activities can be categorised into two types of state intervention. One is as a stimulus for economic development, including public works programmes and state ownership of industry in an attempt to create jobs, and the other is a protective force for employees and consumers. It is plausible to say that state institutions ought to be autonomous from the market economy. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the state activities are influenced by economic factors to a great degree.

In western industrialised societies, the autonomy of the state is acknowledged by the
political system, representative democracy. However, Beer (1965) distinguishes the collectivist theory of representation in the British context, which legitimises a much greater role for groups, from the earlier conception of representative government, which emphasises the importance of widespread political participation. Richardson and Jordan (1979; 1987) describe the British style of governance as a 'post-parliamentary democracy' in which policies are developed in negotiation between government agencies and pressure groups, organised into policy communities. The strong interrelationship between state institutions and business institutions has been reinforced over last three decades, e.g. the development of policies on prices and incomes and the attempt during the 1970s to develop planning agreements with industry (Winkler, 1976).

Ham and Hill (1993) clarify the current political attention towards the relationship with private sectors as 'corporatism'. They argue, quoting Winkler's (1976) description of economic factors in prompting corporatism (industrial concentration, international competition and declining profitability), that policies in economic development are worked out by the state in collaboration with business and trade union elites, who have played important roles as pressure groups. Middlemas (1986) points out that the effect of incorporation, by which major interest groups are involved into the governing process, is to maintain harmony and avoid conflict by allowing these groups to share power. Hence, corporatism can be seen as a political structure within advanced capitalism which integrates organised socio-economic producer groups through a system of representation and cooperative mutual interaction at the leadership level and mobilisation and social control at the mass level (Panitch, 1980). As far as economic policy is concerned, the relation of the state to corporations tends to be characterised by collaboration with producer groups, and have developed into a more centralised form because of the concentration of economic and productive policy-making activities at national and central levels (Ham and Hill, 1993).

From a Marxist viewpoint, Miliband (1977) acknowledges that, whilst the state is not a neutral agent, but rather an instrument for class domination by which the bourgeoisie such as business elites can benefit, it has some autonomy from the bourgeoisie. This autonomy helps explain why, for instance, the state may carry out reforms in the interests of the proletariat (Ham and Hill, 1993). This is the other aspect of state
intervention as a force protective of employees and consumers, e.g. compensation schemes and job training programmes for the unemployed. Ham and Hill (1993) claim that while the corporatist policies have developed at central level, competitive or pluralist politics have developed at local level because local agencies are concerned with consumption. This leads to the question: does the state only carry out the policies of capitalist interests and elite groups? Is the state an agent of the citizens or controlled by them? This democratic, moral debate involves the notion of radical participation of people and requires that policy-making processes should be decentralized and localized. It is also argued by Healey (1997b), that neo-liberal political philosophers aim to ‘roll-back’ the state, and reduce the role of formal government, because the distribution of responsibilities within the state institutions is a matter of specific geography and history. Reflecting this shift, the language of privatisation and deregulation is accompanied by the promotion of ‘partnership’ and ‘empowerment’ between the public and private sectors, not only at the national level but also at the local level. Moreover, partnership at the local level particularly has meant exhorting private companies to perform social roles, for example, in promoting art in the community, or providing environmental benefits (Bailey, 1995).

Given current political tendencies, such as decentralisation, deregulation and localization, collaborative planning with consumer-oriented pluralist politics seems to highlight planning practices at the local level. To move in this direction, the role of the state needs to change. Responding to this, Healey (2000a) suggests some possible ideas for new ‘governance’ models: moving away from the ‘command and control’ model to the ‘partnership’ model; moving away from the ‘provider state’ model to the ‘enabler’ model. It is important to point out that, at an early stage in the collaborative processes of governance, the state still needs to play an important role as an advocate.

2.5.2. The new welfare state

Partnership may be a distinctive feature that represents a new style of governance. The current trend towards state collaboration with the private sector in promoting economic development is now being endorsed in promoting social welfare. This is seen as the consequence of the decline and fragmentation of established bureaucracies in the face of
reform which has sought to involve private and voluntary agencies in key aspects of
service delivery since the 1980s (MacKinnon, 2001). In this context, community
services are increasingly delivered through ‘partnerships’ consisting of public, private,
voluntary sectors and communities. This has been strongly promoted by the UK
government (DETR, 1997; 1998a; 1998b). Partnership approaches are not the only
tactics for the effective provision of public services, but also a way in which
institutional capacity is built up. In recent years, the emphasis in attempts to change
urban governance capacity, particularly in the UK, has been on encouraging catalytic
projects and partnerships (Healey, 1998a). The current community development projects
under the EU, and Scottish Executive initiatives also seek to develop partnerships,
which consist of mainly public bodies in these areas, in order to support community
activities.

It is important to note that in British context current welfare policies have evolved over
time. The current debate on the British welfare state is the ‘New Welfare Deal’ which
the Labour government under Tony Blair leadership sees as a necessary corrective to
two decades of inappropriate politics characterized by undesirable outcomes (Heron and
Dwyer, 1999). It is necessary to look at the origins of the welfare state in the British
context, its evolution, and the distinguishing feature of the New Deal.

It is said that there is no agreement in social science over when the first welfare state
was established or what the term actually means. Some historians have identified its
establishment in nineteenth-century Europe, others exclusively in the period after the
Second World War (Lowe, 1999). Regarding its meaning, Lowe (1999) argues that
many social scientists (and politicians) have used the term as a mere synonym for a
discrete range of social services, and others have used it broadly to describe the full
range of powers exercised by government or indeed a whole society. It could be said
that foundations of social welfare systems in contemporary industrialised countries were
established during post-war period. However, definitions of ‘welfare state’ or ‘welfare
system’ are diverse. It is argued, by Lowe (1999), that in each country, post-war reforms
had to be welded onto existing services which had acquired over many years distinctive
national peculiarities and had to be introduced in a variety of economic and political
circumstances. Acknowledging that the ultimate objectives of welfare states vary,
Esping-Andersen (1990) categorises styles of welfare state into three models: the social democratic model, the corporatist model, and the liberal world model. Firstly, in the social democratic model (e.g. Scandinavia), the state relieves its citizens of traditional market and family pressures by providing high earnings-related benefits, which guarantee accustomed living standards during absence from work, and extensive state services for the old and young. Secondly, in the corporatist model (e.g. Germany, France), high benefits are administered by a variety of occupationally based funds which maintain the difference in status between their members. However, government actively seeks to ensure the right to employment and security by brokering deals with both sides of industry which ensure that such rights are matched by responsibilities. Finally, in the last ‘liberal’ world model (e.g. Britain, USA), there is no such brokerage and the state provides only a minimum of services. Individuals seeking to maintain accustomed living standards or to free themselves from family responsibilities have to resort to the market, although they are frequently subsidised to do so. In Addition to these, Sainsbury (1994) regards the fourth model as the ‘wage earners welfare state’, in which government obviates the need for extensive services by ensuring, through arbitration awards, that workers have wages sufficient to meet their welfare needs. All of these welfare models represent very different concepts of the proper relationship between government and the individual.

In the British context, Lowe (1999) describes the welfare state as an organ of the community whose role was to serve the welfare of its citizen and respect international law, compared with the tyrannical ‘welfare’ state which imposed its will on both its citizens and its international neighbours. Most importantly, Lowe claims that it was the 1942 Beveridge Report which considerably increased the international reputation of the British welfare state. It is argued, by Hill (1993), that when Labour came to power in 1945 the main battle over the development of the welfare state was more or less over. Hill shows that many key interventions had occurred in the period between 1906 and 1936, and identifies the Beveridge Report as the main direction for social security. These accounts imply that the British welfare system originated in the post-war period and was influenced by the Beveridge Report, in which social security that became popular during the war, meant the freedom of all citizens from the fear of poverty (Lowe, 1999).
It is important to acknowledge that all democratic capitalist states develop some form of welfare institutions, because democratic politics can involve an auction in which party competition to win elections drives up social expenditure, particularly when the costs can be hidden, delayed or spread (Tullock, 1976; Brittan, 1977). This draws attention to the implications of political ideologies of parties and welfare policies. As far as social policy ideologies in the UK context are concerned, Hill (1993) suggests that there is likely to be divergence between the two main parties in their stance on the issue of ‘universalism’ between the ‘socialism’ of the Labour and the ‘selectivism’ of the Conservative. Democratic socialism was developed by the reformist wing of the Labour Party which reached its intellectual peak in the 1950s and early 1960s (Lowe, 1999). It took as its goal the achievement of services open to all citizens on the basis of need, paid for out of taxation and not rationed by charges (Hill, 1993).

Moreover, the purpose of welfare was not only the relief of a hard core of deprivation, but also the provision of social justice, by providing compensation for the increasing social costs of economic damage (such as illness arising from environmental pollution or unemployment arising from technological redundancy) (Lowe, 1999). For the democratic socialists, state intervention is not merely the means of remedy for market failings, but vital in generating a more equal and fair society. In contrast, selectivism is seen as the policy of the moderate wing of the Conservative Party which, following the modernisation of Conservative policy by R. A. Butler in the 1940s, dominated the party until Margaret Thatcher’s election as leader in 1975 (Lowe, 1999). The reluctant collectivists, according to Lowe’s account, were essentially liberals, personally committed to the free market because they believed that the minimisation of state intervention would maximise the freedom of the individual and hence political freedom, economic efficiency and social variety. However, politically they had realised state intervention was essential, influenced by the Keynesian view that the market is no longer self-regulating and thus state intervention is required to ensure that there is neither deficient nor excess demand in the economy (Lowe, 1999). Income deficiencies are to be overcome by means of simple means tests for instance; individuals can afford to buy services – health care, social care, education, and housing – on the open market. Therefore, it should not be necessary to provide free services to make up for income deficiencies (Hill, 1993).
Whilst these dominant ideologies can be distinguished within party politics, there has been a rather complex pattern of decision-making of welfare policies within government as a whole. It should be considered that sometimes the democratic socialist tendency in Labour’s approach has pulled a pragmatic Conservative party along with it, whilst those who could afford it and facilitating public expenditure economies, enabled the Conservatives to pull a reluctant Labour party in their direction (Hill, 1993). This implies that the British welfare system constructed a longstanding consensus about the basic institutional framework, in which the state powerfully intervened in social welfare not only as a guarantor for social equity but also as a single producer of social services. Examining the performance of the British welfare state, Ashford (1986) points out that the state intervention was the product of an elite, dominant in Parliament and the civil service. It had a specific set of beliefs about both the scope for and the limits to collective action, as well as about the appropriate forms intervention should take (for example, a strong commitment to centralism). However, the 1980s saw the institutional changes in the British welfare state, particularly under the Thatcherite Conservatives.

It began with the arrival of Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister in 1979, which made enormous difference to the politics of welfare. Lowe (1999) identifies the failure of Keynesian demand management by 1975, not only to sustain economic growth but also to resolve the combination of high inflation and mass unemployment, as a trigger that obliged both the Labour and Conservative Parties to reconsider their economic policies. In contrast, the Conservative under Thatcher’s leadership adopted ‘New Right’ policies, which sought to reinforce faith in the market. The New Right asserted that the market maximised efficiency in both the use of resources and the satisfaction of individual need (Lowe, 1999). Mrs. Thatcher regarded the civil service, dominated by the paternalistic elite culture, as a potential source of obstruction (Young, 1989). Additionally, Thatcher’s considerable hostility to Labour-dominated urban local governments inspired the institutional reform in local authorities. The new approach of privatisation, ranging from the sale of council houses at large discounts, to the provision of social services by private contractors, was a drastic tactic, by which the role of the state shifted from ‘provider’ into ‘enabling authority’ (Hill, 1999). Nevertheless, for local governments, its consequence revealed that what they were able to do was quite tightly constrained by both their limited financial resources and statutory controls and grants from central
government. It is also said that the institutional reform in local authorities has been done with the intention that the central government of one party could work well with local governments of the other, and ‘deviant’ local councils were disowned by their own national party (Thrasher, 1981). Another important feature of the Thatcher governments’ institutional reforms was commitment to cutting public expenditure overall to prevent tax rising. Therefore, it was inevitable that the share of social service provided by the state was reduced, and a more entrepreneurial culture was fostered through both privatisation and partnership between public and private sectors.

Lowe (1993) points out that since 1979 the welfare state certainly has continued to fulfil many of its original objectives and ensured a minimum standard of living for all. Hills’ analysis (1993) of the performance of the welfare policies leads to the conclusion that the value of benefits and services going to those with lower incomes was greater than the taxes which they paid to finance them (under any plausible allocation of financing costs). On the other hand, for the better-off, welfare policy acted as a savings bank which redistributed income over their life cycle. Conversely, Lowe (1993) argues that the welfare policy of the Thatcher government as a whole failed because: the major shift from direct to indirect taxation created a degree of inequality; real expenditure on the major social services (including housing) increased, as did social expenditure as a percentage of GDP; and that the temporary abandonment of ‘full’ employment also reduced the active role which government played in the promotion of individual welfare. To conclude, it can be said that ‘New Right’ welfare policies both increased costs and increased inequality and poverty at the same time (Heron and Dwyer, 1999).

Following its landslide election victory in 1997, as Lowe (1999) describes, the Labour Party inherited a radically restructured range of services and the popular support they still continued to command. Lowe recognises its commitment to maintaining a ‘high and stable’ level of employment as a signal for returning to the positive vision of Beveridge. The Labour government under Blair’s leadership deployed the ‘New Welfare Deal’ to reform the British welfare system. Heron and Dwyer (1999) assume, quoting Blair’s hostility account of the Right’s ‘market dogma’ and crude individualism of the 1980s (Blair, 1995), that Labour is shifting its emphasis towards the acceptance of a more pragmatic role for the market and a more sophisticated interpretation of
individualism. Examining the rhetoric behind the Labour government's welfare reforms, Heron and Dwyer (1999) explore concepts of communitarianism and stakeholding. Welfare based on these concepts seems to endorse a specific moral agenda: individual recipients of social welfare 'do the right thing' by conforming to a particular welfare system which emphasizes the values of both individual and moral responsibility. The Labour Government's message is clear in *A New Contract For Welfare* (DSS, 1998):

"The welfare system is a proud creation. But reform is essential if we are to realize our vision of a modern nation and decent and fair society. Through our proposals we aim to break the cycle of dependency and insecurity and empower all citizens to lead a dignified and fulfilling life. We need a new 'contract' between citizens and state, with rights matched by responsibilities. *We will rebuild the welfare state around the work ethic: work for those who can; security for those who cannot*" (DSS, 1998: I, original emphasis)

Heron and Dwyer (1999) emphasise community involvement as an alternative means of social welfare provision: the moral expectancy placed on individuals could bring themselves to take a more active role in providing for their own welfare needs. In future, the state will provide only a basic minimum. Obviously, social welfare would be no longer what the state provides for individuals, but collaboration between the state and recipients in which individual recipients actively are involved as providers of social welfare. Whilst individuals have rights to receive social benefits, they also have some duties or responsibilities to the service provision of welfare, which benefits both oneself and others. This is associated with the communitarian account of 'shared' values (Etzioni, 1996). The mutuality of rights and obligations is embedded in Frank Field's essay, *Making Welfare Work* (1995), and also in Hutton's work, *The State We're In* (1996). Welfare based on this notion of mutuality is termed 'stakeholder welfare'. The fundamental idea of stakeholding is social and economic inclusion, rather than equality. Inclusion implies membership, and thus you cannot be included if you are not a member. But membership entails obligations as well as rights. Field's notion of stakeholder welfare is that public welfare provisions encourage individuals to take control of their own welfare and ultimately to be responsible for meeting their own needs whenever possible (Heron and Dwyer, 1999). With a different emphasis, Hutton's active welfare
state is defined as a revised welfare state, in which the role of governments will primarily concentrate on creating opportunities for the unemployed to re-enter the labour market. The relief of poverty via benefits assumes secondary importance.

New Labour's 'New Welfare Deal', underpinned by a new moral order, is to be an inclusive politics. It aims to eliminate social exclusion and deprivation. However, what is distinctive from conventional welfare provision is the extent to which individuals are required to undertake self-help and self-improvement. Heron and Dwyer (1999) point out that Labour aims to forge a new deal between the state and the individual. Practically, the reciprocal relationship is necessarily to be placed at local level, where individuals are likely to consider individual rights and communal responsibilities, and take actions. To create the place where individuals come together and share common concerns, a communicative or collaborative planning approach would seem to be appropriate.

2.5.3. Sustainable development

The most well-known definition of 'sustainable development' has caused much confusion as to its meaning. That is the account in the Brundtland Report: "humanity has the ability to make development sustainable - to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (WCED, 1987: 8). The term 'sustainability' or 'sustainable development', which has been translated into wide rage of meanings, could be summed up as follows (Bridger and Luloff, 1999; Batie, 1989):

1) a perception that the biosphere imposes limits on economic growth;
2) an expresses lack of faith in science or technology as the primary means by which human betterment can be achieved;
3) extreme aversion to environment risks;
4) support for redistributive justice and egalitarian ethics and policies;
5) concern over population growth and faith in the wisdom of human capital development; and
6) survival of species, and protection of the environment and minority cultures are goals that are at least as important as economic growth.
These implications inductively embrace the conclusion that sustainable development and community participation must go hand in hand (Porritt, 1998). Particularly since the UN conference on Environment and Development in Rio in 1992, when world leaders signed up to Agenda 21 as the agenda for the twenty-first century, it was confirmed that sustainable development requires community participation in practice as well as in principle. Warburton (1998) argues that the concept of sustainable development presents a fundamentally challenging shift in global politics creating, for the first time, an ethic which encompasses a challenge to the inevitability of poverty and inequality. Elimination of deprivation caused by inequality is not only necessary for economic development to meet human needs but also imperative to halt environmental destruction. Therefore, sustainable development involves maximum community participation, empowerment and local activism.

In so much as the sustainable development aims to meet both biospheric and human needs, it refers to achievement of both environmental protection/conservation and economic development. These activities are not new, but have been developed and implemented independently. Indeed, the British environmental movement has a long history, as Britain was the first nation to industrialise and urbanise. This movement is said to have originated in the nineteenth century. Carter and Lowe (1998) argue that rural areas or countryside were viewed by the Victorian middle classes, who formed the first amenity and conservation groups, as places of retreat from the grimy, polluted, insanitary and unruly industrial towns. At the same time, in urbanised towns in Britain, various professional and regulatory fields of environment issues were established, such as public health, pollution control, sanitary engineering and town planning. As a consequence, the physical environment had been under pressure from not only increasing demand for a good quality of living environment, but also increasing economic development until the post-war period. Since then, however, environmental issues seem to have changed direction. Environmental issues began to involve the recovery of the degraded physical environment, as well as protection from the further demands of development. Britain is not the only case, however, and this tendency has emerged in both developed and developing countries. Environmental problems are no longer issues that can be solved within one nation. Carter and Lowe (1998) point out, in
the British context, that the drastic industrial restructuring of the 1980s diminished some environmental pressures: large-scale closure of plants, especially in traditional heavy and extractive industries, eliminated long-standing sources of air and water pollution but left behind extensive areas of dereliction.

On the other hand, it was in the late 1960s and early 1970s, as Warburton (1998) argues, that community development and community work were being developed in Britain. Initially, community development consisted of two objectives: to tackle poverty and deprivation; and to increase the political participation of excluded groups (particularly the poor and the disadvantaged). The assumption underpinning this approach is that the poor need communities in which they can look after each other, and it was initially developed as a method of development in developing countries. In the British context, when top-down approaches to development were seen to have failed to solve the problems of poverty, environmental degradation and urban decline (Hastings et al, 1996; Oakley, 1991; Rahman, 1995), community development began to be highlighted as an alternative approach. Distinct from the means employed in developing countries, these developments are based on both an increasingly sophisticated critique of traditional voluntary service, and a political belief in the potential for community development at neighbourhood level to create social change and tackle poverty and inequality (Warburton, 1998). This suggests that, in highly developed countries, community development has been promoted by those who are enthusiastic to take actions voluntarily in local communities. In fact, such community development activities have been acknowledged in Britain since the establishment of the Community Development Projects in 1969 (Cullingworth, 1997), and implemented by non-governmental bodies, such as Rural Community Councils and Councils for Voluntary Service throughout England, and Community Councils in Scotland (Warburton, 1998).

The environmental movements of the 1960s and 1970s were focused on global issues rather than neighbourhood. However, Bridger and Luloff (1999) claim that global environmental issues, which are not directly relevant in daily life, are meaningless to many people. By contrast, local issues are most keenly felt the consequences of environmental degradation, towards which people are likely to take actions. Therefore, what Bridger and Luloff (1999) call ‘sustainable community development’, may
ultimately be the most effective means of demonstrating the possibility that sustainability can be achieved on a broader scale. Warburton (1998) discovered that there began to be greater links between environmentalists and those involved in community action in the 1980s. In urban areas, where some of community development projects have been effective in tackling poverty, concerns about environment issues, such as urban wildlife or the importance of commonplace, get local communities involved in the planning process in various ways. On the other hand, in rural areas, where countryside conservation and socio-economic development have been dependent upon state intervention, environmental and local economic sustainability cautions a commitment that local communities should take an active role to improve their local environment. To conclude, regardless of the distinction between urban and rural areas, sustainable development presumes community involvement as a principle. Moreover, community development, which values the skills and abilities of local residents and makes efforts to engage them in new and more participatory programmes (Warburton, 1998), is required to achieve the goal of sustainability in planning practice.
2.6. Community development through Partnership

Based upon moral issues, for example the question “should I pursue my greed even though it does harm to others or the environment?”*, the notion of sustainability applies to social, economic and environmental issues. Tracing the trajectory of planning in the UK context reveals that lots of different techniques and approaches in implementing environmental protection, economic development, or provision of social services have been introduced separately. However, confronted with the necessary achievement of the principle of sustainability, an integrated and holistic approach is required. One of the innovations is partnership. The partnership approach, which was initially deployed as an efficient method in economic development and social service provision, is now stimulating a new style of governance. In parallel, community development has evolved around the notion of social inclusion and restoration of democratic societies. Originally, community development was employed to challenge deprivation. Warburton (1998) points out that community development was taken as a method of development initially for disadvantaged people in developing countries. The assumption is that “the poor need communities in which they can look after each other; the rich do not need community because they can buy what they need” (Warburton, 1998: 20). Such community development presupposes that those who are poor and vulnerable need somebody’s support and those who are better off do not. Binding these phenomena, it is now necessary to draw a perspective of community development in rural areas, which reflects transformation from the traditional style of governance into a new style of ‘community governance’ (Stewart, 2000).

2.6.1. The community development spectrum

The method of community development, which was initially deployed in developing countries, has since been adopted in some developed countries. In the UK, Cullingworth (1997) describes that in the 1970s there were community development projects which were originally aimed at overcoming the sense of disintegration and depersonalisation felt by residents of deprived areas, particularly in urban areas. Cullingworth points out that this type of urban programme continued with an increasing emphasis on economic development. Community development projects became evident in emerging
approaches to local economic development, particularly in the types of strategy which metropolitan local authorities began to develop from the mid-1970s to tackle the rapidly growing problems associated with local deindustrialisation (Haughton, 1999). These approaches sought to 'defend jobs' by working with unions and communities to fight closures, to meet local needs by promoting co-operatives and community businesses, and to create high quality local jobs through supporting co-operatives and selective investment in firms.

The content of many local economic development strategies was very traditional with the emphasis upon public sector schemes and initiatives. It aimed to first encourage the private sector (particularly indigenous small firms) to engage in direct job creation and investment, and secondly, to provide training as a means of improving people's ability to gain access and progress through the labour market (Hart and MacFarlane, 1999). In this model of economic development, the priorities became the creation of a more business-like approach to working with the private sector, and meeting funding programme requirements to set and achieve output targets (Haughton, 1999). This sometimes caused a tension of incompatibility with local welfare strategies.

On the other hand, in rural areas, community development has been associated with social development aimed at overcoming rural deprivation, which results from lack of affordable housing and access to employment, less accessibility to public transport and the closure of schools and shops. There was increasing concern about community involvement by those who needed social welfare. In fact, in the context of UK planning, community involvement has been perceived as a set of legal or procedural requirements involving due notice, ensuring that meetings are open to the public, or providing forums for public comment (Blanco, 1995). As an expansion of the legitimacy of community involvement, it is possible to highlight the increasing number of community initiatives that have been involved in economic and social development, which has reinforced the need for integrated and cross-sectoral planning approaches.

A number of community groups, who actively took responsibilities in place of social services, emerged as so-called community business. They are generally registered as companies limited by guarantee without share capital, and in reality, may have a similar
profile of community involvement. There has been a growing expectation that some community businesses will move towards viability, while others may continue to receive grant funding (Hart and MacFarlane, 1999). Pearce (1993) argues that community business has four principles: the openness of the group (any individual, resident); a democratic principle of ownership and control (one member one vote); the focus on the economic welfare or development of a specific community; and profits for the benefit of the community and not individual members. These include co-operative banks, producer co-operatives, consumer co-operatives, artisan co-operatives, agricultural co-operatives, community co-operatives, social housing projects, social pharmacies, social tourism, mutual insurances, credit unions, non-profit-distributing community companies, and some community service providers.

These community businesses were seen as having the potential to create new employment opportunities targeted at those least likely to be employed by private entrepreneurs in privately owned businesses. Importantly, the surpluses that community businesses generate can be used to provide an investment in the social capital of these disadvantaged communities. In short, community businesses maintain a pool of capital invested within the community and its shared economy (Hart and MacFarlane, 1999).

Since the early 1980s, there has been a shift towards local economic development strategies as the most appropriate means to revitalise the economic fortunes of disadvantaged areas and groups (Hart and MacFarlane, 1999). In pursuing efficiency in delivering social services or providing resources for economic growth, a community development approach was likely to be a ‘top-down’, rather than a ‘bottom-up’ such as community empowerment. It was evident that there was a tendency in the Government advice on community involvement, that efforts to involve the public should be reduced in the interests of efficiency and economy (Scottish Development Department 1984). Ironically, this traditional model of community development approach, largely emphasising economic growth and efficiency in public service delivery, was facing a concealed paradox.

Two controversies could be raised. First, it is argued that those who are the subject of community development are likely to remain excluded in political and social terms. In
so far as there is social exclusion, the poor are unlikely to direct their needs to the community development process. However, as Warburton (1998) points out, it should be recognised that poverty is not just a problem for poor people, and there is no reason why poor people have to be separated out from the rest of the population in tackling poverty and its many implications. Secondly, there is a certain hierarchy in community development, in which a powerful provider (perhaps the state or local authorities) allots a financial budget to a number of vulnerable recipients. This results in generating a 'dependency culture' in which the vulnerable do not make any effort to improve their circumstances but become reliant upon the state. Meekosha (1993) points out that the recipient groups become trapped by the need to continue to demonstrate oppression, disadvantage or victim status for funding purposes, rather than continue the project of social change. In short, targeted community empowerment may contribute to the disempowerment of targeted communities (Warburton, 1998).

In addition, some areas, where innovative approaches could meet genuine community involvement and develop decentralised mechanisms in the delivery of social services at local levels started to see a new dilemma emerging. Clark and Stewart (1994) point out that the innovations manifesting themselves in structures such as partnerships, local agencies for economic development, ad hoc initiatives in economic and community development in inner city and rural areas, add to complexity within the community, whatever other benefit they may bring. These dilemmas have two principle causes. Firstly, the traditional model of community development is out of date in the current 'democratizing of democracy' mode involving constitutional reform, the stripping away of archaic symbols and privileges, and measures to introduce greater transparency and accountability (Giddens, 2000). Secondly, since the innovative models of community development have become various and fragmented, these approaches cannot work efficiently within the archaic system of governance. These assumptions imply that community development should not be sought without a change to the system of governance as a whole.

2.6.2. A modernised community development through partnership

The twin themes of 'globalisation' and 'localisation' have been prominent features in
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the debate on economics and politics since mid-1980s. It is argued, by Morgan et al. (1999), that, as the economy becomes more and more globalised, the local dimension of economic development has attracted more and more interest from both scholars and policy-makers. In Britain, the 1980s saw a dramatic change in the role of the state, under the Conservative Thatcher government, which was committed to rolling back the state and emphasising individual choice (Stewart, 2000). The ideology of the Conservative government was faith in the market, rather than in state control, yet the role of the state has remained. At the local level, local authorities have been required to change their role mainly to that of service provider.

However, Stewart (2000) argues that the role of the local authority is seen not only as a provider of services, but also as a political institution constituted through representative democracy. Here there is a new emphasis on the public as customer and on the public as citizen. This movement was endorsed by the Citizen’s Charter introduced by John Major in 1991 (HMSO, 1991). One of significant features of this Charter was that the central government sought a way in which local authorities could deliver social services cost-effectively, by contracting them out of the private sector. This was more than the adoption of contracting culture. Morgan et al. (1999) argue that this process of negotiation takes many forms, but increasingly assumes the form of private and public actors orchestrating their activities through networks with a view to sharing information, pooling resources and designing joint solutions to common problems. Moreover, there is increasing emphasise on partnership in which a wide array of services are now performed by a complex set of public and private organisations (Rhodes, 1991; 1996), particularly in the government’s publications such as “Local Democracy Community Leadership” (DETR, 1998a), “Modern Local Government: In Touch with the People” (DETR, 1998b).

As far as economic development is concerned, the localisation of training and business support services, delivered through Training and Enterprise Councils (TECs), Business Links and Trade Associations, has forced public and private organisations to collaborate much more than hitherto in the design and delivery of these services (Cabinet Office, 1996). It is increasingly acknowledged that to access the EU’s Structure Funds, eligible areas must satisfy the Commission that they have created genuine ‘regional
partnerships' between their public, private and voluntary sectors (Wulf-Mathies, 1995), and likewise that to access UK government funds, such as the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) in England, area-based partnerships are required (Garmise et al, 1996).

Partnerships, which have been developed mainly in economic development and are seen as a new impetus in effective business services (Morgan, 1996), have potentialities for inspiring a new governance system. In terms of the relationship between the function of local government and the locality consisting of its social, economic and physical conditions, Stewart (2000) argues that this bond is built up through a multiplicity of relationships between the authority and the public and other organisations. This process would constitute what Stewart describes as 'community governance'. Partnerships would lead to a new governance style, in which the state (central and local government) sees itself as an 'enabler' which appreciates the locality and brings out the community's abilities to improve well-being. There is no doubt that this shift in the role of state is one of the reasons that community development through partnership has permeated the planning arena.

In the United States, Murray and Dunn (1996) examined the interplay between federal, state and local participants. Their core argument was that the future well-being of rural America depends increasingly on acceptance of a paradigm based on collaboration between and within these levels. In the UK, the key principles of Government's policy are mainly classified into three categories: maintaining a competitive and sustainable economic base; sustaining communities; and a sustainable environment (The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, 1999). In addition, in the current process of devolution, such as the establishment of the Scottish Parliament and Welsh Assembly, and Regional Development Agencies, 'partnership' at every level is required to achieve the principles, mentioned above, in a democratic way (DETR, 1997). Within these bodies, a collaborative or partnership approach is increasingly being found in community development. However, community development is sometimes associated with social development, in which local communities in deprived areas are required to participate in the process. Is community development only applied to such areas and people? Is there any possibility that community development is a means to achieve other principles, such as economic development and environmental conservation? Since
the traditional model of community development betrayed its inactivity, a new model has been developed through partnership which has been embedded in the current dynamic change in political settings, namely ‘entrepreneurial spirit’ (Newton, 1999), decentralisation, and endogenous development.

Firstly, it is said that the move towards a more competitive, market economy in many western states in 1980s and 1990s has introduced more competition and encouraged an ‘entrepreneurial spirit’ in delivering public services and changed the role of government at both national and local levels. At the local authority level, there are an increasing number of public services, which used to be delivered mainly by the public sector, now being delivered through partnerships between public and private sector bodies. This partnership provision of public services is deemed to be a more cost-effective operation, and also improves the quality of the services being delivered. The second fact is that the Regional Development Agencies in England (established in April, 1999) and the devolved authorities in Scotland and Wales (established in May, 1999) aim to deploy an inclusive approach in which decisions must be taken in the regions and action must be tailored to local circumstances, and take account of local needs (DETR, 1997).

The emergence of the decentralised and participative approach was also encouraged by supra-national policies, such as the EU Structural Policy. In 1988, the debate over the most appropriate style of Structure Policy intervention for the EU resulted in the adoption of a territorial, endogenous model for rural development (Ray, 2000). Taking account of the fact that many peripheral rural areas in the UK are aided by the EU, the UK’s rural development policy in general is to follow the EU policy that emphasizes participation and a ‘bottom-up’ approach which harnesses the creativity and solidarity of rural communities (Commission, 1996). During the early 1990s, after a decade of private-sector-led initiatives, the UK central government sought to engage community groups more centrally in its area regeneration programmes. Since the Rural White Papers (for England in 1995; for Scotland in 1995; for Wales in 1996) were published, notions of communities and partnership have become crucial issues in the UK. A modernised community development approach, described by the Community Development Foundation (http://www.cdf.org.uk), better resourced through regeneration programmes and local government reform, links empowerment with
building civil society and social capital, and complements, through people’s autonomous activities, a range of public service and development initiatives.

2.6.3. Current issues in community development

Table 2.1 shows how over the decades the objectives of community development have changed their features and modified disputed approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Policy objectives</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70s</td>
<td>Overcome deprivation</td>
<td>(In developing countries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80s</td>
<td>Local economic development</td>
<td>(In deprived urban areas in the UK)</td>
<td>A tension between efficiency and welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Public sector initiatives</td>
<td>Social exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ To encourage the private sector to create jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ To provide training for people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ To deliver public services in efficient way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90s</td>
<td>Local social economy Decentralisation</td>
<td>(In rural areas in the UK)</td>
<td>Powerful provider vs. vulnerable recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endogenous development</td>
<td>➢ Community involvement</td>
<td>Dependency culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Integrated/cross-sectoral approaches</td>
<td>Complex and fragmented mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Community business</td>
<td>Inefficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ To create jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ To invest in social capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership provision of public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost effective operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity and solitariness of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People’s autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here two crucial issues concerning current community development are summarised. Firstly, through community development that provides a platform where community businesses grow, it is assumed that a more localised economy could be developed. This
hypothesis is that so-called 'local social economy' has a potential to create employment opportunities locally; to reduce their costs of living by improving energy efficiency in housing; to reduce food bills by providing local shops or local growing schemes; and to help individuals to access the welfare systems to ensure that they receive their full entitlements (Haughton, 1999). Braudel (1980) examines the plurality of forms of economic activity and attempts to establish an architecture of society which sees the economy as consisting of at least three layers: subsistence, the local market economy, and a world economy. Rather than constructing policy around a single, flat economy, focused on building competitive advantage in world markets, it is important to construct policy around all three layers, including policies for the everyday survival of the individual.

The second concern is about social capital. The concept of social capital is vague and intangible, for instance, social capital refers to: features of social organization, such as trust, norms, and networks (Putnam, 1993); the organisations, structures and social relations (Coleman, 1990); the building of networks, reciprocal relations, trust, norms, shared values, responsibilities and knowledge (Roseland, 1998); and the value of social networks, bonding similar people and bridging between diverse people, with norms of reciprocity (Dekker and Uslaner, 2001). The current approach of community development, to some extent, aims to develop and reinforce 'social capital' on which sustainable social, economic and environmental development could only be achieved. Sustainable development closely involves communities with all stages of the process, at which communities make the most of social capital and strengthen them.

There are several considerable questions. Does social capital really affect the local social economy? What kind of activities and interactions reinforce social relations, when does it happen, and who interacts? It is argued that the exact functioning of social capital depends heavily on culture- and group-specific arrangements and, in particular, in political settings. Certainly, not all the solutions to economic and social exclusion can be found at the local level, and there is thus a clear responsibility upon government, at whatever scale, to create the conditions within which local communities can seek to ameliorate their specific problems (Hart and MacFarlane, 1999). It is argued, by Lowe et al (1995), that an approach to rural development should be sought by focusing on the
dynamic interactions between local areas and their wider political and other institutional, trading and natural environments.

In so far as current community development is driven mainly by public sector initiatives, it is important to understand how the power relations between providers and recipients forge or diminish the social capital of local communities which the current community development aims to build. As Ray (2001) claims that “the local level does and must interact with the ‘extra local’ level; at the very least, at the intangible level of the dynamic flow of ideas”, it is important to examine what extent to which regional, national and supranational policies, funding and tax regimes, and institutional systems act to support local communities, can generate genuine bottom-up development. To answer these questions, the empirical analyses that focus primarily on a specific group of partnerships in specific settings are required. Thus, the following section will take up the current attempt in Scotland, some areas of which have been labelled as a ‘less favoured area’ and therefore it has devoted to innovation of an appropriate approach to overcome social and economic disadvantage.
2.7. The definition and aims of community development

An overview of the evolution of planning theories and political settings over the years shows the fact that the ‘community development through partnership’ approach is increasingly popular in many rural areas of the UK. Examination of current policies for rural areas in the UK, especially in Scotland, displays a clearer idea about the definition of community development, and what it aims to achieve. It is necessary to clarify the definition of community development, on which the following analysis is based.

According to a Highlands and Islands Enterprise’s consultation paper (HIE, 1991), community development is the process;

- which harnesses the collective energy of communities to improve quality of life through the provision of facilities, services and networks;
- which involves people working and interacting together, providing mutual support, using recreation and leisure time constructively, identifying with local culture and expressing themselves artistically; and
- which encourages individuals to participate and become involved in community affairs, so that communities become active, diversified and resilient to forces which cause social disintegration and demoralisation-factors inimical to enterprise.

Community development aims to develop community capacity at the local level to identify needs and problems, find solutions, and maintain their environment through participatory activities. In practice, there is a formalisation of community institutions such as community co-operatives or community trusts, which allow participants to work together towards their objectives. These collective activities will produce community facilities, certain services, information such as news letters, and so on. While it produces these relatively tangible outputs, there might be less tangible community capacity building emerging within these communities. Thus, there is also a need to focus attention on the notion of community capacity. What is meant by community capacity? What elements affect tangible outputs and increase community capacity itself? To answer these questions, it is necessary to conceptualise the term of community capacity.
2.7.1. The conceptualisation of community capacity

As discussed in section 2.3.4, in recent years, particularly in Britain, the discussion of social capital or community capital has been actively made with the application of the institutionalist approach to the analysis of planning practices (Healey, 1998a; Raco, 1998: 1999a: 1999b; Wood et al., 1999; Amdam, 2000; Phelps and Tewdwr-Jones, 2000; Fernie and McCarthy, 2001; Cars et al., 2002). As a result, there is increasing recognition of the importance of institutional capacity in respect of achieving such planning objectives as economic competitiveness, sustainable development and an improved quality of place (Healey, 1998a).

Especially in the planning field, there has been increasing development of institutional capacity, to examine how disparate actors in dispersed governance contexts come together to build consensus around difficult local environmental and development issues (Innes, 1992; Innes et al., 1994). In these studies, attention has been paid to ‘communicative planning processes’ (Healey, 1997b). This planning theory emphasises how people learn through practicing (Schon, 1983) and how, for planners, their activity is inherently a communicative one, through which participants in the policy development processes learn about each other and about the problems they face, and develop shared meanings and understandings through which policy co-ordination could take place (Bryson and Crosby, 1992; Innes, 1992).

These ideas feed into work on conflict mediation and consensus building. This directs attention not merely to what institutional capacities there may be in a locality, but to the processes through which this capacity gets built and transformed (Vigar et al., 2000). As consensus building is an important process of community development, the term institutional capacity can refer to community capacity as used in this study. The concept of institutional capacity, as Healey (1997b) points out, refers to the overall quality of the collection of relational networks in a place.

Healey’s (1998a) conceptualisation of institutional capacity and its emphasis is one of the by-products of theorisation about the relationship between context and practice, based on the governance change in contemporary Europe. The institutional approach
developed by Healey (1997b; 1998a) focuses attention on the quality of the relational webs in an urban region. This institutional capacity can also be seen as a transformative force, through which stakeholders collaborate, co-ordinate, and build institutional coherence. Community development as process, therefore, can be evaluated by means of institutional capacity in this study. Healey’s conception of institutional capacity (IC), which encompasses Innes’s notion (Innes, 1992; 1996; Innes et al., 1994), has three dimensions: knowledge resources (K), relational resources (R), and capacity for mobilisation (M). She also explains the development process of the institutional capacity (see Figure 2.1).

This model shows that institutional capacity at one point in time is transformed into future capacity through the interaction of knowledge resources (K, intellectual capital), relational resources (R, social capital) and their translation into mobilisation capacity (M, political capital). This KRM model of institutional capacity will be articulated later. (see chapter 3)

Healey acknowledges that this collective term, encompassing intellectual capital (knowledge resources), social capital (relational resources), and political capital (mobilisation potential) is preferred to the increasingly used term 'social capital', which emphasises only the elements of building relations of trust (Healey, 1998a). Nevertheless, she argues that the assets of networks of a place are more than the social
capital of knowing who to contact and the general 'trustworthiness' of relationships. Where such networks exist, knowledge can flow, increasing the 'intellectual capital' available, while the knowledge and networks can be mobilised to develop and deliver policy objectives which are of concern to all stakeholders.

In this context, institutional capacity can be built up by substantial projects, where there is an effective political regime with a new style of governance. Using the development model, Healey (2001a) conducted research into the governance processes of a city centre regeneration partnership in Newcastle upon Tyne. She claims that "the initiative was innovating in governance practices, but that this innovation was limited by the governance history in the city and by the degree of transformation going on in other governance arenas in the city and the region, which distracted attention from the city centre partnership" (Healey, 2001b: 19). This implies that the attention also should focus on a new governance culture and its history, which may well influence community development projects.

2.7.2. A conceptual structure of community development

As a result of the definition of community development and its relevant factors, it can be summarised that community development generates tangible outputs, which mirror both internal community capacity and the external political regime (see Figure 2.2).

In this conceptual structure, community development consists of both tangible and intangible elements. Tangible elements can be evaluated by quantitative measures such as the number of people involved in a community co-operative, the number of meetings held in the past twelve months, and the number of people using adult learning programmes provided by community organisations. These tangible elements have value for the community, because these substantially benefit the members of community. Moreover, the specific results of a project also relates to the intangible consequences of a project. For instance, the skills and higher morale which participants acquire through the process of a project can be a transformative force for getting involved in a new project. These intangible elements also have value for the community, because they create stability. That is community capacity, on which community activities are based.
In the conceptual structure, it is assumed that community development projects can be embedded in a new style of governance, in which different stakeholders, with specific remits, exist, negotiate, conflict, and generate a particular political regime. In so far as these stakeholders play important roles in the implementation of the project, the degree of policy coherence, the performance of partnership and the existence of a catalyst can be seen as external effects on the performance of the project.
2.8. Conclusion

The meaning of community involvement should be given something more than lip service by policy makers who pretend to behave in a decent democratic manner. The perspective of community development is more than a method of overcoming social poverty and deprivation. The system of state governance in which politicians as representatives of the public and bureaucrats as specialists in delivering of state policy work together systematically within government was an innovation in the Twentieth Century. It provided an efficient remedy for recovery from the Second World War in terms of social welfare as well as the economy. State intervention in social welfare and economic development reinforced affluence to the extent that productive activities caused environmental degradation and catastrophe that sometimes causes harm to human health. Thus sustainable development is the priority. Regarding social equality, the 1990s saw the collapse of communist societies in the former Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe, and in capitalist societies there are problems remaining either of increasing inequality and/or the increasing social welfare budget.

Sustainability, including environmental reinforcement and protection, steady economic growth and the social welfare reform, is the issue for the twenty-first century. To achieve this priority, seeking new techniques within the existing policy driven system is not enough. It is necessary to challenge the system of governance by the 'democratizing of democracy', and develop an efficient approach based upon the notion of community, in which individuals identify themselves and seek their well-being. 'Community development through partnership' can be an appropriate approach within the new style of community governance, seeking ways to achieve sustainability.
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3.1. Introduction

According to Yin (1994), design of research strategies should be considered carefully, since there are several ways of doing social science research, each of which has particular advantages and disadvantages. The characteristics of each piece of research depend upon three conditions: 1) the type of research question posed; 2) the extent of control an investigator has over actual behavioural events; and 3) the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events.

The key aim of the research is, as set out in Chapter 1, to evaluate the institutional capacity of the partnerships that operate in the Highlands and Islands area. In so doing, an evaluative framework will be laid out in this chapter. The method used here is the case study approach in which interviews, questionnaire surveys, documents and archival records are used as methods of data collection. First of all, a case study area will be considered. Then, the institutionalist perspective, as a main theory employed in the research, will be discussed. The main concerns of institutional analysis are the process, mechanism and conditions of community development, and the links between the elements such as policies, role of players, and funding of community development projects. These analytical ideas will be supplemented by regulation theory, urban regime theory, and intersubjectivity. Lastly, the framework of data collection and evaluation of the institutional capacity of partnerships and its process will be summarised.
3.2. Selection of the case study area

For an evaluation of community development, the selection of the subject of the case study depends on the nature of the primary research question, which is concerned with good practice in community development. This thesis takes the Highlands Council area as its case study. The Highlands has the largest administrative area in the UK (25,000 km²) and most of the area is categorized as rural. Only 4% of the population of Scotland live within the Highlands (208,000) and the overall density is the lowest of any region in the European Community (www.highland.gov.uk/maps/keyfacts.htm). Today the overall population is growing steadily by 4% per annum, but population change at local area level shows considerable differences of growth and decline (Highland Council, 2000). Some areas are still experiencing depopulation, an ageing society, and low level of social services and incomes. The reasons for choosing the Highlands Council area as a case study are summarised as follows:

- Due to the problems in the area, the Highlands has been given Objective 1 status during the 2000-2006 period. The area has also been one of the LEADER initiative areas since 1991. LEADER (Liaisons Entre Actions de Development de L’Economie Rurale) is an EU community development programme for rural areas. It was introduced in 1991 for a three-year period, followed in 1995 by an expanded, five-year version, LEADER II. Taking over the remit of developing and testing new approaches to rural development measures, LEADER + is to be implemented for a seven-year period 2000-2006 (The Committee of the Regions, 2000).
- There are a number of community development projects at the local level, where certain new mechanisms have been established. These projects are supported by the EU, the Scottish Government, the Highland Council, public agencies, and voluntary sectors.
- There is a formal partnership strategy, the ‘Community Plan’, underpinning community development through partnership, which is agreed among partner agencies (Wellbing Alliance, 2000b). ‘Community Planning’ in Scotland refers to a process in which a shared vision for the area is drawn through a partnership that mainly consists of key public agencies. As one of the pathfinders, the Highland Council was asked to produce a ‘Community Plan’ by December 1998. The
Wellbeing Alliance, originally created in 1996 as a series of informal meetings between the chief executive of five key public service agencies, (Highlands Council, Highlands and Islands Enterprise, Communities Scotland, Highland Health Board and the Northern Constabulary), was given responsibility for producing the ‘Community Plan’.

✔ There are so-called intermediary organisations who take an important role in stimulating community development through partnership, such as Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE) and Local Enterprise Companies (LECs). Originally the Highlands and Islands Development Board (HIDB) was established in 1965, as a Non-Departmental Public Body, the aim of which was to overcome economic and social deprivation in the area. In the 1980s, fundamental changes in the political and ideological context resulted in a significant change in the way in which HIDB operated. Its operations were placed on a more commercial basis which stressed the encouragement of entrepreneurship and the fostering of increased private sector involvement in the development field (Fairley and Lloyd, 1995). In 1991, the new sub-regional development mechanism was restructured into the HIE Network under which ten geographically based LECs operated. HIE has a long tradition of working in a partnership with public bodies and local communities. In the Highlands area, the six LECs still play an important role in community initiatives, providing professional advice and assistance across the complete spectrum of their economic and social remit. Thus HIE Network and LECs may play a catalytic role.

Taking account of these conditions above, there is enough reason to take the Highlands area as an appropriate case study. Through evaluation of community development in the Highlands area, it is expected that lessons could also apply to other rural areas as an appropriate planning approach.
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3.3. Analytical ideas for evaluating community development

This thesis is concerned with the identification of factors which encourage good practice in community development. The opportunities for community development through partnership will be evaluated on the basis of a description of its mechanism. To analyse the mechanism, an approach known as 'institutional analysis' is employed. The basis of institutional analysis sometimes can be found in other approaches, for example, social constructionism (Burr, 1995), and social network analysis (Wesserman and Faust, 1994; Scott, 2000). These accounts have a similar idea regarding the nature of the world: that human beings together create and then sustain all social phenomena through social practices (Berger and Luckmann, 1966); that individuals' behaviours are embedded in the institutional settings or the environment in which they live. Therefore, the 'institutionalists' are concerned with political, economic and social life, which are embedded in social relations and heavily dependent upon a mix of cognitive, cultural, social and political institutions (Suh, 1998). Moreover, they seek to show why social relations matter to economic and political activity.

The following sections will discuss the institutionalist perspective and relevant theories, in order to develop a framework of analysis for this study. Firstly, a brief introduction to institutional analysis will lead to four analytical themes: processes; people: policy discourses; and power relations. Within this framework, two important sets of theories will allow deeper understandings of the community development arena as social lifeworld and how to analyse it: 'urban regime theory' and 'regulation theory'; and 'intersubjectivity' and 'Actor-Network theory'. Finally, to formalise an analytical framework, three dimensions of institutional capacity will be discussed.

3.3.1. Institutional analysis

Institutional analysis understands social phenomena as patterns of recurrent acts through institutions or social networks, where people behave and interact with each other in social and natural circumstances. In this thesis, community development is understood as an approach in which a variety of actors interact with each other through their own particular roles. These interactions create a network or an institution, in which actions
take place. The most comprehensive discussion of the institutional setting (structure) and individuals (agency) is probably in Giddens.

Structure, as recursively organized sets of rules and resources, is out of time and space, save in its instantiations and co-ordination as memory traces, and is marked by an 'absence of the subject'. The social systems in which structure is recursively implicated, on the contrary, comprise the situated activities of human agents, reproduced across time and space. Analysing the structuration of social systems means studying the modes in which such systems, grounded in the knowledgeable activities of situated actors who draw upon rules and resources in the diversity of action contexts, are produced and reproduced in interaction. (Giddens, 1984: 25)

From an institutionalist perspective, four analytical themes should be considered. Firstly, the processes through which certain patterns are established, maintained and changed. These patterns are shaped by both the particularities of local circumstances and broader external forces. The institutionalist approach takes for granted that the social worlds of people in the formal agencies of government are intertwined with wider social forces, embedding governance processes in the wider relations of economic activity and civil society. To understand the mode of local governance and the effects of external forces, 'urban regime theory' and 'regulation theory' are employed. The second focus is on the people, who play key roles of shaping in the processes of change. The importance of the interlinked networks is also identified using the idea of 'intersubjectivity', which is what Crossley calls 'the fabric of our social becoming' (1996); the temporal structure which is composed of multiple networks and always in a process of becoming something and is never static. In addition, 'Actor-Network Theory' provides a more semiotic approach, which tells "entities take their form and acquire their attributes as a result of their relations with other entities" (Law, 1999: 4). The third focus is on policy discourses, which are structured and institutionalised (Hajer, 1995), involving the formal design of regulatory legislation, the implementation of substantial programmes, and resource allocation systems. Finally, attention is given to how the power of external forces is made manifest in specific instances, and the extent to which these influences are accepted, reinterpreted and struggled over (Vigar et al., 2000).
In Scotland, there are several major programmes in which the community development approach is employed, for example: the HIE community development projects on the initiative of the HIE network and the LECs; the Rural Partnership, launched at the local authority level; the EU LEADER programmes, and so on (see in Chapter 4). As these programmes have been implemented through partnerships that were constituted separately, this thesis will firstly focus on each programme, in terms of the relevant policy background. The rationale for this will be discussed in the next section in more detail. However, the thesis does not aim to evaluate the extent to which each programme achieved its objectives. Rather, it aims to examine reciprocal relations between different programmes, because the achievement of each programme depends upon the circumstances in which it is embedded. In theory, as Barnes (1954) describes, the whole of social life could be seen as a set of points, some of which are joined by lines to form a total network of relations. In this notion, each programme and its relevant partnership refer to a 'partial network' of a total structure of community development. This implies that it is necessary to analyse the interactive effects on the performance of each partnership's activities.

3.3.2. Regulation theory and urban regime theory

Whilst institutional capacity can develop as a consequence of internal evolution, some external forces also affect its development. Therefore, a considerable part of what community development can achieve depends on the extent to which partnership, a driving force of community development projects, has evolved in a local governance culture. In the UK context, there is no doubt that some changes in social and political settings have altered the idea of community development. Particularly, decentralisation and modernisation of local governments, which have been strongly encouraged by central Government in recent years, become external forces leading to a new style of governance at the local level.

In regional economic literature, the notion of institutional capacity has been developed to refer to the social qualities of a place, which seem to make a difference to economic competitiveness, and community development (Taylor, 1995; Wilson, 1997). Using 'regulation theory' (Aglietta, 1979) as a framework, these works have directed attention
towards the crucial role of extra-economic mechanisms called 'modes of regulation' - such as state policies, cultural norms, social relations - in sustaining capitalist forms of development (Goodwin et al., 1995). Researching rural development, Philips (1998) has argued that, regulation theory has been used to understand the interrelationship between rural change and the concurrent cultural representations, political strategies and social conflict. More recently, regulation theory has been recast as a methodological framework for analysing institutional relationships across a range of spatial scales (MacKinnon, 2001). Especially in the UK, with respect to decentralisation and the shift from local government to local governance, the regulationist approach focuses on the on-going transformation of subnational or regional governance (Jessop, 1997; Jones, 1998; MacLeod and Jones, 1999).

Community development can be conceptualised as a multi-dimensional approach. However, in terms of planning practice, community development is seen as a product embedded in a political regime; in other words, governance relations with actor groups. This account is known as 'urban regime theory' (Stoker, 1995; Lauria, 1997). Using the term 'urban regime', Fainstein and Fainstein (1986) argue that who the participants in a regime are and how it operates varied from city to city, depending on local geography and history. They also emphasise that identifiable regimes can arise and endure to create governance coherence. In this context, the 'urban regime' highlights the competence to act, not just to maintain the power of governing coalitions, but to mobilise local resources and develop the qualities of localities (Vigar et al., 2000). There is an assumption that the content and outcomes of urban public policies are the product of the 'composition of the governing coalition', the 'nature of the relationships among members of that coalition', the 'resources the members bring to the coalition', and the 'power of dependencies' (Stone, 1989; Stoker, 1995; Rhodes, 1986). This approach, therefore, focuses analytical attention on key actors and their networks, and on their mobilisation capacity (Vigar et al., 2000).

3.3.3. Intersubjectivity

'Intersubjectivity' is a complex and multilayered concept and thus there are many different understandings and theories of it. However, many theorists identify a system of
interlocking perspective (Crossley, 1996) as a common ground. Crossley argues that, through the trace of works of Merleau-Ponty, Wittgenstein, Mead, Schutz, Habermas and Foucault, our actions and thoughts aren’t reducible to us alone. We are always involved in networks of interdependency emotionally, practically, and financially, and thus these networks provide some of the leverage required for power relations. It is because we depend upon others for being what we are and achieving what we want that we are open to their influence. As such, the intersubjective perspective does not treat ‘subject’ as separate from other ‘subjects’ or ‘objects’.

For community development, intersubjectivity matters. For instance, at the community level, community development is based on the notion that it harnesses ‘the collective energy of communities’ (see Section 2.7). This implies that a single agent does not have power, rather that the energy upon which any agent may draw in any concrete struggle always has a value relative to a particular social arena and to certain functions in that arena. In other words, the collective energy and resources, which community development aims to harness and create, may be regarded as properties of the field and the location occupied by the agent in it, rather than of the agent itself. This proposition is found in Actor-Network Theory (ANT). The semiotic approach of ANT tells us that “entities achieve their form as a consequence of the relations in which they are located” and that “they are performed in, by, and through those relations” (Law, 1999; 4).

Meanwhile the emergence of partnerships at the strategic level, which mainly consist of local authorities and public agencies, encourages community groups to achieve community involvement through the mechanisms of the community development programmes. In this case, it is important to consider two issues: how power relations are constituted within a newly established strategic partnership; and how power at the strategic level affects the actual actions of local community groups. Latour points out that “many of elements necessary to make sense of the situation are already in place or are coming from far away” and therefore we need “to look for something else, some other level, and to concentrate on what is not directly visible in the situation but has made the situation what it is” (1999: 16-17).

Regarding the notion of power, Habermas (1987) argues that our society is undergoing a
process of colonisation, whereby once consensually governed areas of life are increasingly governed by strategic (rather than communicative) actions. If this is true, there seems no chance at all for community groups to be empowered in the framework of community development programmes, because they are always controlled under strategic partnerships. However, the evidence shows that a new mode of governance is emerging, which has transformed the role of the nation state partly due to the emergence of supra-national and regional political and economic agencies, which are able to act within and between national boundaries. What Habermas’s view appears to entail is that a given agency is said to have power to the extent that it has the capacity, presumably a relatively fixed capacity, to secure certain definite outcomes (Crossley, 1996). Therefore, it fails to understand that something is emerging beyond the existing power.

On the contrary, Crossley criticises Habermas’s account of power, noting Foucault’s view of power, which “can be shown to be precisely the effect of a particular configuration of intersubjective relations and practices” (1996: 127). He understands power as ‘parasitic upon intersubjectivity’, rather than as something an agency possesses naturally. From the viewpoint of intersubjectivity, Crossley argues, “concrete social/political outcomes (of the sort associated with ‘power’) are never the result of the capacities or actions of a single agent but rather of a struggle between agents, a dialogical engagement in conditions which present definite obstacles (including the action of third agents) to those agents and which must be negotiated” (ibid: 128-129).

Outcomes of community development, in this sense, appear contingent and cannot be predicted upon the basis of identifiable capacities of local community groups or strategic partnerships alone. Neither the institutional capacity of local communities nor of strategic partnerships is reducible to them alone. As mentioned above, their institutional capacities, which any partnerships acquire through any concrete implementation, seem to reflect the position occupied by them and certain functions in the whole structure of community development programmes and partnerships. When it comes to examination of the institutional capacity of each partnership, whether local or strategic, the notion of intersubjectivity suggests the importance of analysing power exercised in-between different partnerships, and knowledge resources shared and access channels constituted amongst them.
3.3.4. Three dimensions of institutional capacity

On the basis of the theoretical background outlined above, this section aims to develop a framework of analysis for this thesis. Drawing on the study of institutional capacity in Newcastle’s Granger Town Partnership by Magalhaes et al. (2002), a systematic analytical framework can be produced. Before doing so, it is necessary to explain three dimensions of the KRM model, mentioned briefly in Chapter 2, which consists of: Knowledge resources; Relational resources; and Mobilisation capacity.

Firstly, Knowledge Resources mean various kinds of knowledge on what to do, why and how. These are ideas about community development, which stakeholders in a locality can access and use. Magalhaes et al. (2002) identify the importance of “the conscious reflection on, and development of, frames of reference” (55), which shapes the meanings and interpretations given to the flow of knowledge. This is understood by the intersubjective notion, in particular from Actor-Network Theory, that knowledge performs their meanings as a consequence of the relations in the contexts in which they are interpreted. They also concern the learning process that takes place as knowledge is exchanged between stakeholders. This process is relevant to “the openness and learning capacity of stakeholders to absorb new ideas, to search for new ways of understanding and acting, and to access new sources of information and inspiration” (ibid.: 56). In this process, interactions between members of a partnership matter. The degree of integration of knowledge and frames of reference used by the members can be understood as the entire knowledge resources of the partnership, which will distinguish itself from other partnerships and therefore generate its own identity.

The second dimension, Relational Resources, refers to the nature, reach and quality of the relational networks brought into the governance process by the stakeholders. As argued in Section 2.3.4, the concrete patterns of interpersonal relations in which people are involved result in a pattern of networks. They are built up on the basis of “the nature of the bonding values holding these networks together” (ibid: 56) and the bonding values are defined through networks of interdependent activities. Relational Resources also can be understood as “the nature of power relations” (ibid: 56), by which actors think and act within the networks. The morphology of the networks can be pictured by:
the density of interconnections; spatial and temporal reaches; nodal points; and key 'switching points' where transfers and connections between networks are possible. In addition, power relations matter not only within, but also beyond a partnership, as they shape the links with national and international centres of economic, legal and ideological power.

The third dimension, Mobilisation Capacity, refers to the ability of actors and their networks to draw resources, rules and ideas into the effort of collective action. In this sense, Mobilisation Capacity partially overlaps with Knowledge Resources and Relational Resources. What is distinguishable is that Mobilisation Capacity can be identified both within and beyond a partnership. Within a partnership network, the ability to identify the arenas, where key resources and regulatory power lie as well as the most effective access routes to them, can be reducible to individuals. This is also the case with networks beyond a partnership, as many actors in the partnership are presumably relevant to the networks of different partnerships which launch different programmes in the same geographical area. In this case, the Knowledge and Relational Resources of each partnership are parasitic upon on those of other partnerships through the skilled change agents who “operate at critical 'nodal points' on the routes to resources and regulatory power” (ibid.: 57). Therefore, Mobilisation Capacity relies on change agents. If a partnership has such agents who have the ability to identify key resources and regulatory power that belong to other partnerships, and the most effective access routes, its Knowledge and Relational Resources will fully get performed (and perform themselves) in reciprocal relations with the others.
3.4. Data collection methodology and the process of analysis

Based on Healey’s ‘Institutional Capacity model’, which consists of Knowledge Resources, Relational Resources and Mobilisation Capacity, a framework of the evaluation of community development was adapted to this case study (see Table 3.1). Using this framework, the extent to which community development programmes enhance the institutional capacity of the communities through partnerships is examined. For this purpose, there are many considerations to be taken: an overview of the case study; fieldwork procedures; case study questions; and guidance for the case study report (Yin, 1998). The overview covers the background information, the main issues examined, and a review of the literature relating to the issues. Fieldwork has many important challenges, including: gaining access to interviewees; making a concrete schedule of the data collection; preparation for unexpected events like a change in the availability of interviewees or their time; and, most importantly, deciding what questions to ask. In the following sections, data collection methodology will be discussed, followed by the process of analysis.

### Table 3.1: Framework of evaluation of community development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative dimensions</th>
<th>“Translation” for evaluation of community development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Formal Partnership Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key players; Organisations involved; and Their roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology and</td>
<td>Personal networking mapping:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network integration</td>
<td>‘Horizontal network’ within a partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The density of interconnection, patterns, nodal points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power relations</td>
<td>Where the power lay in the partnerships – identifying key players, in terms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making process; resource allocation; and disseminating info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range and frames</td>
<td>The range of issues related to partnerships and community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horizontal issues; Vertical Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>The integration of issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who shares it; and How far shared horizontally and vertically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness and learning</td>
<td>The extent to which members of each partnership evaluate their performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning process, Issues, Skills acquired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The stage where they are now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared knowledge</td>
<td>The interrelation between the extent to which they shared issues and the extent to which they evaluate the overall performance of the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arenas</td>
<td>The interrelation between the extent of vertical networking (to other partnership members) and the extent to which they evaluate the overall performance of the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repertoires and Change</td>
<td>Identifying key players’ roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>Through key players, how members define their paths to action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How far the key agents affect upon the performance of partnerships, horizontally and vertically</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adopted from Healey et al, 2001a
3.4.1. Data collection

In this study, the main data collection methods are threefold: documentary research; interviews; and questionnaire surveys. These were combined according to the objectives at each stage of the process of analysis. Before starting the main fieldwork, a pilot study was conducted. Through this process, a general picture of partnerships and policies was gradually drawn and a case study area was finally defined. The first analytical concern, the policy framework, required gathering relevant documentary information and archival records. Secondly, a series of open-ended interviews was conducted during the same period, to find out which partnerships and community development projects were operating in the area. Thirdly, a questionnaire survey was conducted amongst the members of four partnerships who were identified through the earlier documentary research and interviews: the Wellbeing Alliance; the Initiative at the Edge National Steering Group; the Sutherland Partnership; and the North Sutherland Community Development Forum.

Pilot Study

A pilot case study is helpful to refine data collection plans with respect to both the content of the data and the procedures to be followed (Yin, 1998). Simultaneously, the pilot study tests the approach and opens up the research issues. The pilot study can be much broader and less focused than the final data collection plan. The pilot study for this research was conducted between 9th and 22nd of April 2001 in Inverness, North Sutherland, Skye & Lochalsh, and Isle of Harris. It aimed to discover the relevant policies and programmes that employed community development approaches, and to identify the key actors, agendas and arenas.

Firstly, two main bodies, the Highland Council (HC) and Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE), were asked to identify where current community development programmes have been launched. Two senior planning officers in HC and a community development officer in HIE were interviewed separately. The results of the enquiries identified important issues in terms of policy on community development, partnership,
and implementation.

✓ Policy: It was discovered that there were an increasing number of new programmes in both EU and Scottish policies and that almost all divisions in both the HC and HIE were concerned with community involvement and partnership working. However, those who were interviewed had no idea exactly how many programmes and partnerships the organisation was involved in. Therefore, the data about programmes and partnerships had to be gathered from broader sources than had been expected.

✓ Partnership: It seemed to be at a transitional stage. It appeared that there was an increasing dominant mode of partnership with other public agencies in the HC and HIE, and they tried to find out who were the key officers in other organisations to contact. Meanwhile, both HC and HIE also felt it necessary to rationalise the number of similar programmes and partnerships within their own organisations, but at that point in time nothing had been done.

✓ Implementation: It was identified that some designated areas of community development programmes were regarded as ‘successful’, but not many. In fact both HC and HIE had a hierarchical structure for implementation, whilst the headquarters dealt with strategic issues, substantial activities were implemented through local branches of the Council or the Local Enterprise Companies of the HIE network. This indicated the necessity of analysing not only horizontal partnerships, but also vertical connections between strategic and local levels.

Secondly, semi-structured and open-ended interviews were conducted with two groups of people:

1) community development officers in four LECs
   - Caithness and Sutherland Enterprise
   - Lochaber Enterprise
   - Skye & Lochalsh Enterprise
   - Western Isles Enterprise, and

2) the programme manager or community workers appointed by two different programmes
   - the Initiative at the Edge
   - the Duthchas
The interviewees were selected according to the recommendations that were given through the first interviews with the HC and HIE officers. Four main sets of data were requested concerning: the programmes; the role of the organisations or of the individuals; socio-economic and demographic information of the operating areas; and the attitudes towards the partnership, the headquarters, other partnerships and organisations, and other areas. The main findings from the series of interviews and their implications were twofold.

- The LECs were lead agencies at local level and had broader networks in the areas in which they were operating, including public agencies, voluntary groups, and active individuals. This indicated a great advantage in accessing the LECs, in order to identify key individual persons who were not formally appointed but were practically influential in the activities that had taken place at grass-roots level.

- The administrative structures of community development programmes and the degree of achievement varied. Considering this, the case study area, North Sutherland, was finally defined, according to the possibilities of access to the geographical sites, to the informants, to the relevant archival records.

**Documentary research**

Documentary research as a method reflects a very broad spectrum of perspectives and research sources (Yin, 1998). Documentary information can take many forms. These include official documents deriving from the state, public sectors or private sources, such as proposals, progress reports, and other internal documents. Letters, memoranda, agendas, announcements and minutes of meetings, and other written reports of events are also included. Besides, mass media outputs, virtual outputs such as Internet resources, and formal studies or evaluations of the same site under study should be considered. In addition to these, archival records, such as organisational records (charts and budgets over a period of time), maps and charts of the geographic characteristics of a place, and survey data (census records) may also be used in conjunction with other sources as both quantitative and qualitative information. These documents play an explicit role in any data collection and are helpful in terms of: verification of the correct spellings and titles or names of organisations that might have been mentioned in an interview; provision of other specific details to corroborate information from other
sources; and inferences that allows the researcher to find new questions worthy investigating (Yin, ibid).

In order to answer the research questions, the study used several kinds of documentary evidence. To understand the framework of policies relevant to community development and its coherence, in particular, official documents from EU, the state, local authorities, and public agencies were collected and analysed, some of which were easily found through their own official Internet sites. However, as these official documents are usually the final versions of policies or programmes, the process of transformation through which initial ideas were adapted is often unpublicised. Besides, outputs from on-going projects are unlikely to be published until these projects are completed. To find this missing information before and after the official documents were published, quasi-official documents, such as internal reports and minutes of meetings, were provided after the interviews where the interviewees thought they would be important and helpful. Although it could be considered that these non-official documents were biased, many inferences were drawn from these records. In addition to the main documentary research which was conducted mainly during 2000-2001, some changes were also mentioned new situations after that period.

Interviews

The interview is one of the most important sources of case study information. The interview not only depends on the quality of the questions asked, but also on the awareness of the interactions of those who are involved. The personal contact and the continually new insights into the subjects’ living world make interviewing an exciting and enriching experience (Kvale, 1996). Initially, two important factors should be considered: who is being interviewed; and, which type of interview is used? In this thesis, the type of interview employed was an open-ended one in which the researcher asked the interviewees for the facts of a matter as well as for their own opinions about events (Yin, 1998). The interviewees were also asked to propose their own insights into current approaches of community development and partnership. They not only provided the researcher with insights but also suggested sources of corroboratory evidence or initiated access to other sources.
The interviews were conducted in two rounds. The main interviews were carried out between 29th of August and 14th of September 2001 to obtain information that corroborates other sources. Follow-up interviews were conducted between 22nd and 29th of July 2002 to obtain information to confirm the results of the questionnaire survey. The interviews were conducted at various locations that were selected by the interviewees: in their place of work, at their own houses, and sometimes on the sites of the projects with which they were dealing. All interviews were recorded on tape with the permission of the interviewees and transcribed into written texts. Some parts of the transcripts that contained little relevant information were condensed and summarised, as the initial purpose of the interview was to corroborate other information sources. However, due to the lack of valid responses to the questionnaire survey from the 11 village representatives (see below), information drawn from the interviews inevitably became more important. Therefore, words and phrases that had relevance to the issues of community development projects and partnerships had to be carefully collected.

For the first phase of interviews, three groups were identified to be interviewed through the pilot study. This was on the basis of a 'snowballing' technique in which a few appropriate individuals are located and then asked for the names and addresses of other who might also fit the sampling requirements (Oppenheim, 1992). These groups were: the key actors in the partnerships (such as programme manager, advisor); the LEC community development officers; and the key individuals from 11 villages in North Sutherland (representatives of their community groups set up under the current community development initiatives). The name and career summaries of interviewees are attached in Appendix 1. The initial purposes of the series of interviews were threefold. Firstly, the interviews sought to identify current issues and problems of community development projects. Secondly, they attempted to find out the quality of institutional capacities in relation to partnerships. Thirdly, the interviews attempted to identify how these capacities influence the process of community development programmes and the outcomes of each project. This was based on the premise that the quality of community development programmes may depend largely on the quality of relationships amongst actors in partnership networks (both horizontal and vertical) and their capacities.
The interviews began with a brief explanation of the purpose of the research by the interviewer, followed by a discussion of experiences of community development programmes and achievements or difficulties that they had experienced during the period. In addition to the projects, the representatives from 11 villages provided knowledge of village life in more detail and reasons why they had chosen specific projects. An important finding from these interviews was that village representatives hardly understood other partnerships and programmes that had taken place outside villages.

After the analysis of questionnaire survey, the follow-up interviews aimed to confirm whether or not the result of questionnaire survey was acceptable and to obtain further information that should be up-dated. The interviewee was selected from the result of network analysis (see Section 3.4.2). A total of 11 individuals were interviewed as the most significant key actors in four different partnerships, which included not only officers from the Local Authority and public agencies, but also representatives from the voluntary sector and community groups (see Appendix 1). As some of them were being interviewed for the second time, they were able to give further information of how the projects had progressed since the last interview was held a year before. These comments showed that while the framework of community development programmes could change quickly, the situation on the ground moved only slowly.

**Questionnaire survey**

The function of a questionnaire is measurement (Oppenheim, 1992). The detailed specification of measurement aims must be precisely and logically related to the aims of the overall research plan and objectives. The purpose of the questionnaire survey in this study was to measure the three dimensions of the institutional capacity of partnerships (see Section, 3.3.4 and 3.5.3). For this purpose, designing the questionnaire proceeded after the work on the policy framework and the first interviews, by which the variables that need to be measured and the types of instruments that will have to be built were specified.

The questionnaires were sent to all members of the four partnerships who were
identified through the review of policy and partnership frameworks (see Section 3.4.1). Because the total number was more than 100, the postal method was employed, although there are disadvantages, such as low response rates and no opportunity to correct misunderstandings or no check on incomplete responses. The members of these four partnership groups are shown in Appendix 2. They were surveyed between November 2001 and January, 2002 and 38 responses were received from a total of 109 questionnaires. All data collected were analysed using SPSS (Statistical Packages for Social Science).

In order to measure the institutional capacity of partnerships, respondents were asked to evaluate 'partnership performance' and 'networking'. The first set of questions was about their views on the level of 'partnership performance', which aimed to understand the roles and functions that each partnership has and measure the degree of satisfaction with the partnership approach. A wide range of features of partnerships was adapted from the criteria found in "Evaluation of the local rural partnership scheme" (Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, 2000), "What is community development?" (Beard, 2000), and the order in which these features were emphasised was on the basis of 'group development' (Tuckman, 1965)\(^1\). 10 features related to planning and 5 features related to partnership were carefully ordered in terms of the assumed process of community development, and the respondents were asked to give a rating from 1-5 (5 = very well) on the performance of each function.

The second set of questions aimed to understand personal networks within an organisation, within a partnership, with other partnerships, and at local community level. The respondents were asked to indicate the names and organisations of people with whom they had most contact, how often they had contact, and what kinds of issues were discussed. The first two responses were provided for the basis for an analysis of Relational Resources, and the third for Knowledge Resources. For the analysis of Mobilisation Capacity, all responses relevant to the network with other partnerships were used as sources. In addition to the main questions, respondents were asked to give their opinions of partnerships.

\(^1\) see Section 3.4.2.3
3 Methodology for Analysing Community Development

3.4.1. Analytical methodology

The following sections will explain the process of analysis, which requires a stage-by-stage approach. Three analytical tools are employed: 'group dynamics'; 'social network analysis'; and 'discourse analysis'. These ideas and techniques are combined in use at each stage, details of which will be explained in subsequent sections. In the first stage, it was important to choose appropriate partnerships to analyse. The process of choosing partnerships was carried out through a review of community development programmes in the Highlands and Islands. The details of the policy review will be discussed in Chapter 5. In addition, the pilot study indicated that the institutional capacity of partnership depends largely upon individuals and arenas in which actions are embedded. Taking account of the interrelationship between individuals (key actors) and partnerships (structures), four stages for analysis and relevant analysis methodology will be discussed.

Understanding the partnership networks in the area

From the policy review of the whole structure of the partnership network, six important community development projects and relevant partnerships within the North Sutherland area were identified in the case study area: LEADER; Duthchas; the Initiative at the Edge; the Scottish Rural Partnership; Community Planning; and the Social Inclusion Partnership. However, due to the transitional phase and completion of projects, some partnerships no longer exist. Therefore, in this case study, four different partnerships were selected for analysis. These are: the Initiative at the Edge's National Steering Group (IatE, NSG); the Wellbeing Alliance (WBA); the Sutherland Partnership (SP); and the North Sutherland Community Development Forum (NSCDF, successor to the Pilot Area Advisory Group in Duthchas North Sutherland).

---

2 The Highlands and Islands Social Inclusion Partnership was involved in the WBA.
3 The NSCDF includes 11 village-based community groups.
### Table 3.2: Partnerships in the thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Development Programme</th>
<th>Relevant partnerships</th>
<th>*Case study in this thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEADER</td>
<td>North Highlands Youth Partnership</td>
<td>Transitional phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North and West Highlands Heritage Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duthchas</td>
<td>Duthchas Partnership</td>
<td>Completion of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative at the Edge (IatE)</td>
<td>Pilot Area Advisory Group in North Sutherland</td>
<td>*North Sutherland Community Development Forum *National Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Rural Partnership</td>
<td>Sutherland Partnership</td>
<td>*Sutherland Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Wellbing Alliance</td>
<td>*Wellbing Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion</td>
<td>Highlands &amp; Islands Social Inclusion Partnership</td>
<td>Part of WBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partnerships operate at different levels and cover different overlapping areas, and interact with each other both vertically and horizontally. Figure 3.1 is a 3-Dimensional model of different partnerships located at different levels, and functioning under different programmes. In this model, each programme creates certain community projects on the ground. In so far as different programmes target the same area, the question is, therefore, whether overlapping or competition occurs between programmes and partnerships. Moreover, some organisations sponsor more than one partnership in different programmes. For instance, the Highlands Council is involved in all four partnerships. In this case, with respect to resource allocation, it is important to understand how those agencies involved in different partnerships determine their resource allocation in a meaningful way.
In practice, it is assumed that the decisions will be taken both within and beyond a partnership because of personal interactions. It could be argued that people are likely to be supportive if they know each other well. As intersubjective views on human behaviour show, "people cannot be understood when cut apart from their groups (including their families, friendship cliques, work groups)" (Forsyth, 1999: xi). For instance, when two colleagues in an organisation are involved in different partnerships, they presumably exchange information of their own partnerships with each other frequently in the office. It is likely to happen because members in an organisation, who are working as professionals, must coordinate their various skills, resources, and motivations so that the organisation can make decisions, generate a product, or achieve its remit. Much of these interactions held within an organisation revolve around the tasks the organisation must accomplish (Forsyth, ibid.). However, as Bales (1950) points out, other interactions also spring from the interpersonal or socio-emotional side of life. Such actions do not directly affect the organisation is accomplishing its
designated task, but they do sustain the emotional bonds linking the members to one another and to the organisation. While these bonding values are essential for institutional cohesion, a negative implication should be considered; that people within an organisation are not necessarily supportive, because if the emotional bonds are not well-developed, personal knowledge might often generate antagonism and thus fail to achieve the organisation’s task.

Likewise, when two individuals from different partnerships know each other well because they are neighbours, do two different programmes support joined-projects more often? To answer this, social psychologists claim ‘the impact of propinquity’ (Forsyth, 1995). They argue that close proximity removes some of the obstacles that can block the development of interpersonal attraction. It is the case that many members of partnerships get involved in neighbourhood activities, such as Hall Committee and various kinds of voluntary groups in the villages where they live. The more frequently they are exposed to social activities, the more they tend to like others. McCarthy (1991) suggests that although there is a difference between behaviour in organisations and that outside of them, organisations must involve an overlap of social and system integration. This means that for the members in an organisation or partnership, social activities cannot be neatly divided between those involving systematic instrumental action in partnerships, or organisations that aim to achieve certain programmes and those involving mutual communicative action in daily life in the neighbourhood.

In either case, personal networks both within an organisation and in the neighbourhood might cause effective/ineffective approaches between strategic- and local-level partnerships. Consequently, the integration of personal networks built into partnerships could directly affect the performance of the partnership, causing synergy and avoiding duplication on the ground where there are several similar programmes. In order to depict how different partnerships operate in the area, it is important to reveal personal networks, which are developed in partnerships and get the substantial activities done.

**Mapping the individuals and their personal networks**

The evaluation of institutional capacity started with the ‘mapping’ of the actors
involved in the partnerships. This task included two objectives: identifying key actors; and evaluating Relational Resources, one of the institutional capacities.

To understand the substantive features of personal networks within a partnership, 'Social Network Analysis' (SNA) is employed. This is the idea that 'social configurations' are the result of the concrete patterns of interpersonal choice, attraction, reputation, friendship, and other relations in which people are involved, and they are the basis upon which large-scale 'social aggregates', such as the economy and the state, are sustained and reproduced over time. Wasserman and Faust (1994: 4) summarise four important assumptions on which SNA is based. Firstly, SNA views actors and their actions as interdependent rather than autonomous units. Secondly, it views relational ties between actors as channels through which resources (material and/or nonmaterial) flow. Thirdly, network models focusing on individuals view the network structural environment as providing opportunities for, or constraints on, individual action. Finally, network models conceptualise structure (social, economic, political and so forth) as lasting patterns of relations among actors. In addition, SNA can be used to study the process of change within a group over time.

In order to evaluate the Relational Resources of the partnerships, the first task was to identify those who were involved in any relevant way in the community development projects and their purposes and relative position of their involvement. The data from the questionnaire survey was used for modelling partnership networks. The questionnaire contained questions about the respondent's ties to the other actors.

The network model is known as a 'sociogram' (network diagram), which was devised by Moreno (1934) and is one of the earliest of techniques for formalising social network analysis (Scott, 2000). Visual displays using sociograms (two or sometimes three-dimensional spatial representations) have proved useful for presenting structures of interaction patterns in groups (Wasserman and Faust, 1994). In addition to the theoretical development of SNA, the mathematical models, invented by Harary and Norman (1953), were a crucial breakthrough in SNA. One of major mathematical foundations of network methods is graph theory, which provides both an appropriate representation of a social network and a set of concepts that can be used to study formal
properties of social networks.

In the graph theory, the ‘sociogram’ represents the formal properties of social configurations as a diagram analogous to those of spatial geometry, with individuals represented by ‘points’ and their social relationships to one another by ‘lines’. The sociogram is known as ‘webs’ of connection, the ‘social fabric’ and, on occasions, of ‘networks’ of relations (Scott, 2000). Using this method, the personal network is drawn in a directed and valued graph (see Figure 3.2). Each member ('point') is connected by a directed ‘line’ and the order in which the points are arranged to locate is determined only by the attempt to ensure a minimum of overlap among the lines that connected them. The point with the highest centrality is positioned at the centre of the spatial framework, in which a central point is the ‘hub’ of a series of radiating ‘spokes’ which connected it to the more peripheral points. There are a number of forms of network diagram, some of which are shown in Figure 3.2.

---

The sociograms provide “explicit formal statements and measures of social structural

---

4 This is done in a trial-and-error process of drafting and re-drafting until an aesthetically satisfactory solution is achieved. It is acknowledged, by McGrath et al. (1997), that the order in which the points are arranged arbitrarily by the researcher. Thus great care must be taken in choosing the spatial framework and the criteria by which points are located within it.

5 The ‘centrality’ can be calculated simply in terms of the number of points to which a particular point is adjacent to and its frequency.
properties that might otherwise be defined only in metaphorical terms” (Wasserman and Faust, 1994: 17). Through the use of the sociograms, the second objective was to examine the Relational Resources. The map of personal networks will identify the key players in a partnership and show the extent to which the partnership is integrated in terms of decision-making, resource allocation and sharing identities. The key concepts in the evaluation of these networks are: actor; cohesive sub-group; and network roles and positions.

In SNA, the ‘actor’ as social entity is an individual, a corporate, or a collective social unit. Examples of actors are: people in a group, departments within a corporation, public agencies in a city, or nation-states in the world system. In this study, actors refer to individuals who are involved in a partnership, rather than institutions to which these individuals belong (such as, Local Council and public agencies). This is because it is assumed that personal networks in a partnership are knitted together beyond the organisational boundaries to which they belong. This point will be discussed more in Section 6.2.2. Actors are linked to one another by social ‘ties’. The ties are linkages between a pair of actors and provide a viewpoint from which the others can be viewed (Crossley, 1996), for instance, expressed friendship, or respect. The ties also refer to transfers of material resources, including business transactions, lending or borrowing things. The tie is “inherently a property of the pair and therefore is not thought of as pertaining simply to an individual actor” (Wasserman and Faust, 1994: 18). It is important to identify the meanings of the ties between actors. This task required examining the Knowledge Resources that were transferred through the ties between actors.

Because SNA is concerned with a linkage that establishes a ‘tie’ between ‘actors’, the analytical focus is on a ‘sub-group’ of actors. Studying sub-groups using specific criteria has been an important concern in SNA. It is necessary to define “a finite set of individuals on which network measurements are made” (Wasserman and Faust, 1994: 19). There are many possible criteria for the definitions of sub-groups. In SNA, the term ‘cohesive sub-groups’ refers to subsets of actors amongst whom there are relatively strong, direct, intense, and frequent ties. In this study, two variables were used to define sub-groups: the frequency of interactions between actors; and reachability - that all sub-
group members were mutually reachable through relatively short paths of communication, but not necessarily adjacent. It is assumed that "the more tightly that individuals are tied into a network, the more they are affected by group standards" (Collins, 1988: 416). Consequently, to define sub-groups is to evaluate their coherence; in other words, to identify roles that all the members of sub-groups share. In addition, it is important to explore links between the roles of sub-groups in the partnership. This will lead to an examination of the structure and coherency of the partnership itself.

In the description of the properties of network structures, SNA is concerned with the dual notions of 'social position' and 'social role'. In SNA, "position refers to a collection of individuals who are similarly embedded in networks of relations, while role refers to the patterns of relations which obtain between actors or between positions" (Wasserman and Faust, 1994: 348). Thus, the notion of social role is conceptually dependent on the notion of social position. In this study, roles in a partnership were modelled at three different levels: actors; sub-groups; and the partnership as a whole. As Forsyth (1995: 358) says, roles are "sets of behaviours characteristic of people in a context". Every individual (actor) takes on roles—such as leader, follower, or critic—in groups. These also reflect the group's structure—the underlying pattern of relationships among actors (Cartwright and Zander, 1968). In the case of a partnership, the roles are attributed both to individual actors and sub-groups (sets of actors who have similar characteristics). In other words, actors can retain multiple roles, which are usually based on multiple relations and the combinations of these relationships (Wasserman and Faust, 1994). This point is important in order to examine vertical relationships between different partnerships and will be discussed in detail in section 3.4.2.4, concerning Mobilisation Capacity.

**Assessing Knowledge Resources**

This task of assessing Knowledge Resources consists of two components: the range of the knowledge resources; and the process of acquiring these resources. As analytical approaches, 'discourse analysis' and 'group development' give the researcher the perspectives through which the quality of the Knowledge Resources of partnerships is assessed.
The first analysis aimed to examine the Knowledge Resources of partnerships, using discourse analysis. A variety of disciplines are coming to appreciate the importance of using language analysis as a method for studying social change. The term discourse is, however, a difficult concept, as Fairclough (1992) points out, largely because there are so many conflicting and overlapping definitions formulated from various theoretical standpoints (e.g.: linguistics which focuses on the specific study of language and language use; psychology, on beliefs and how they are communicated; and the social sciences, on the analysis of interactions in social situations). Fundamentally, discourse can be seen as ‘a form of language use’ and is more adequately understood in terms of three main dimensions: language use; the communication of beliefs (cognition); and interaction in social situations (van Dijk, 1997). The basis on which the cross-disciplinarity of discourse analysis has developed is that discourses do not only represent social entities (people using language) and relations between people, but also they construct key social entities. Thus, in this study, discourses are defined in terms of “the social actions accomplished by language users when they communicate with each other in social situations and within society and culture at large” (van Dijk, 1997: 14).

In addition, Foucault’s (1972: 1979: 1981) discussions of the ‘discursive formation’ of objects, subjects and concepts, provide deeper theoretical insights. From the Foucauldian perspective, discourse is also seen as “actively constituting or constructing society on various dimensions: discourse constitutes the objects of knowledge, social subjects and forms of ‘self’, social relationships, and conceptual framework” (Fairclough, 1992: 39). This notion leads to those who use language being seen as ‘social effects of discourses’ (Fairclough, 1992), which is emphasised in Actor-Network Theory.

On the basis of these theoretical perspectives, the procedures for doing discourse analysis can be set out. The evaluation of Knowledge Resources was broken down into two stages: identifying the range of issues related to partnerships; and assessing how far these issues were shared within and beyond a partnership. Discourse samples were collected from the questionnaire survey asking ‘What kind of words do you exchange within the partnership and with other partnerships?’. In addition, the samples were supplemented by the interviews with 11 village representatives (see Section 3.4.1.3). In
this study, the first analytical emphasis was on linguistic contents (words) as objects of knowledge, and on social subjects (who used the words). This will determine the quality of integration of the partnership, in terms of shared Knowledge Resources. Secondly, there was a focus on social relationships (those with whom they shared the words), because those words were not simply posted from one actor to another but somehow shared (Condor and Antaki, 1997). This might be associated with the personal networks as Relational Resources. If those who use these words are regarded as 'social effects of discursive practices', 'words' can be seen as 'ties' in the terminology of SNA (see Section 3.4.2.2). Shared knowledge beyond the partnerships will be dealt with in the next section.

The second stage focused on the self-evaluation of partnership performance. This aimed not only to examine issues and skills identified through partnership activities, but also to describe the process of acquiring the Knowledge Resources. 'Group dynamics', named by Kurt Lewin (1951), focuses on the processes through which groups and individuals react to change. In group dynamics, groups are seen as beings that change over time as all living things do. A group may begin as an assortment of unrelated individuals, but in time, roles develop and friendships form. Whilst new members join the group, old members might leave. Then, the group may become more cohesive or begin to lose its unity. In most groups, these changes take place as a predictable pattern (Wesserman and Faust, 1994). Tuckman's (1965) model of 'group development' consists of five phases: orientation (forming); conflict (storming); organisation (norming); performance (performance); and dissolution (adjourning). In short, groups repeatedly cycle through phases during their lifetimes, oscillating back and forth, and therefore can be seen as being both positive and negative. In each phase, there are major processes, which are summarised in Table 3.3.

In this study, the data was collected from the questionnaire survey, which consisted of questions about partnership functions (see Section 3.4.1.4). It is important to identify the phases in which a partnership was located, because the fact that the partnership faced conflicts between actors, or that increasing independence amongst actors resulted in less integration, should not automatically be considered as negative aspects, but as part of the process of partnership development.
### Table 3.3: Process of group development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Major processes</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Criteria employed in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Exchange of interactions</td>
<td>Tentative interactions</td>
<td>Identifying characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forming</td>
<td>Increased dependence</td>
<td>Polite conversation</td>
<td>Sharing ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task exploration</td>
<td>Concern over ambiguity</td>
<td>Drawing strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of commonalities</td>
<td>Self-disclosure</td>
<td>Setting up an action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Disagreement over procedures</td>
<td>Criticism of ideas</td>
<td>Strategic phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storming</td>
<td>Expression of dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Poor attendance</td>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional responding</td>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>Fractionation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Growth of cohesiveness and unity</td>
<td>Agreement on procedures</td>
<td>Recruiting community worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>norming</td>
<td>Establishment of roles, standards and relationships</td>
<td>Reduction in role ambiguity</td>
<td>Mobilizing resources and getting the work done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased cohesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Goal achievement</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Implementation phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performing</td>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on performance and production</td>
<td>Mutual cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolution</td>
<td>Termination roles</td>
<td>Disintegration and withdrawal</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; reviewing phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjourning</td>
<td>Completion of tasks</td>
<td>Increased independence</td>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: From Tuckman, 1965; Tuchman & Jensen, 1977, in (Wesserman and Faust, 1994: p361)

**Assessing Mobilisation Capacity**

The third analysis aimed to examine Mobilisation Capacity. This was concerned with the arenas where key resources and regulatory power lie. It is assumed that the ability to access the arenas is associated with the position of members and their attitudes towards the partnership. The attitudes towards the partnership to which people belong are understood as ‘group commitment’. When a particular group membership is salient, people are inclined to construct norms with respect to attitudes, feelings and behaviours (Terry & Hogg, 1996). In this study, the question was relationship between the extent to which they shared issues and the extent to which they evaluated their partnership performance. It is assumed that the morphology of the partnership (i.e. a component of sub-groups) and the vertical network (to other partnership members) influence the partnership performance. Thus, the analysis took account of the ‘Relational Resources’ and ‘Knowledge Resources’ that each partnership retained. In addition, the roles of key
actors, who were identified through analysing ‘Relational Capacity’, were considered by exploring the paths through which other members took particular actions.

‘Intergroup behaviour’ (Tajfel, 1981) or ‘intergroup relations’ (Forsyth, 1999) in social psychology, deals with conflict and cooperation between groups and their effects on group identities. According to Sherif’s definition of intergroup behaviour, “Whenever individuals belonging to one group interact, collectively or individually, with another group or its members in terms of their group identification, we have an instance of intergroup behaviour” (1966, 12). From the social psychological perspective, there is a dialectical relationship between social settings and the reflection in them of subjective group memberships. For example, Doosje et al. argue “the extent to which group members tend to act in terms of the group norms may depend on the context (and structural salience of group membership), as well as on differences in importance attached to a group membership” (1999: 87). Tajfel states the general principles of this relationship between the social settings and group identities.

The social settings “which an individual will perceive as being relevant in some ways to his group membership will increase as a function of:

1) the clarity of his awareness that he is a member of a certain group;
2) the extent of the positive or negative evaluations associated with this membership;
and
3) the extent of the emotional investment in the awareness and the evaluations” (1981: 239).

This leads to the assumption that interactions between different partnerships can benefit in terms of ‘collective self-esteem’ (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) assumes that as people tend to derive their self-image from group memberships, they will therefore try to compare a group to which they belong (an ‘ingroup’) favourably with other relevant groups to which they do not (‘outgroups’). This comparison contributes to a positive social identity, but sometimes it can escalate into ‘intergroup conflict’ (Forsyth, 1999). One of effects of this kind of interaction is, as Coser (1956) argues, that conflict serves to establish and maintain identity and boundary lines of groups. This implies that the interrelations between
different partnerships as Mobilisation Capacity influences the quality of Knowledge and Relational Resources, and *vice versa*. In this sense, the analysis focused on the quality of vertical networks; the extent to which each partnership had contact with other partnerships by exchanging their own Knowledge Resources.

Mobilisation Capacity is associated with key actors’ roles, which transferred the institutional capacity of each partnership. As noted above, the vertical networks between different partnerships depends on the extent to which actors are aware that they are members of a partnership, and are able to evaluate that membership. In this sense, attitudes towards the partnership to which key actors belong will presumably reflect the Relational Resources of the partnership, in terms of the position in which they are located. Regarding interactions between different partnerships, it is assumed that conflicts caused by ingroup/outgroup biases will fade if actors interact with members of the other partnerships regularly (Forsyth, 1999).

Wright et al. (1997) have tested the extended contact hypothesis; when group members learned that one or more members of their group had a friend in the other groups, they expressed more positive intergroup attitudes. Even though the other group members had not themselves developed friendships with members of the other groups, the knowledge that someone in their group considered another group member to be likable moderated the ingroup/outgroup bias (Wright, Aron McLaughlin-Volpe, and Ropp, 1997). This result indicates the importance of key actors who create the vertical networks and promote cooperation between different partnerships. In addition, it is important to consider that experiences taken through the vertical networks that lead to successes are more effective than experiences that lead to negative outcomes. This is because, as Worchel (1986) points out, if the cooperative encounter ends in failure, each partnership may blame the other for the misfortune, and the vertical networks may be further eroded. Consequently, Mobilisation Capacity will not be enhanced.
3.5. Conclusion

An important aspect of the organisation of research is the coherent integration of method, theory, and philosophy. As described in Chapter 2, this thesis views the phenomenon of community development as an entity that consists of three units: community development programmes as tangible outputs; the institutional capacity as internal forces; and the political settings as external forces (see Figure 3.3). It is important to note that evaluation of the institutional capacity of partnerships is difficult because its result can be different according to the definition of elements of institutional capacities, and because of a particular researcher's perspective. Throughout the analyses of the three units, the perspective of institutionalism is employed.

The institutionalist perspective gives more attention to the art of crafting institutions at both the micro- and the macro-levels. Partnerships as institutions embody the rules that govern public and private actions. They affect distribution of various resources, efficiency of resource allocation of public money, and the development of human resources. These capacities, which enable self-governing impulses to be enacted and find support in the society, constitute a vital public resource. They take place within complex processes of social reproduction. To investigate these processes, the notion of reciprocity might be useful. Oakerson (1993) argues that reciprocity is a mutually productive transfer; a continuing relationship between or among persons based on mutual expectations of behaviour. This is also similar to what Latour calls 'a circulating entity', which has "the bizarre property of not being made of agency and structure" (1999: 17). He regards the social as a certain type of circulation without encountering either the micro- or the macro-levels and claims "there are only local summing up which produces either local totalities or total localities" (ibid.: 19). This study views the current community development phenomena as a circulating entity. In other words, the process of community development can be understood as the continual embodiment of activities taken by various actors through which both horizontal and vertical interrelationships are constituted.

This chapter developed the evaluative framework that consists of the three units of analysis, relevant analytical perspectives, and methods of analysis and data collection.
(summarised in Figure 3.3). The next chapters deal with the political settings in the Scottish context (Chapter 4), the framework of community development programmes in the Highlands and Islands (Chapter 5), and the evaluation of the institutional capacity of partnerships (Chapter 6). This analysis not only contributes to a deeper understanding of the evolution of a new style of governance in the case study area, but also provides useful suggestions for community development through partnerships.

![Figure 3.3: Unit of analysis and perspectives](image-url)
Planning Policy for Rural Areas in Scotland
4.1. Introduction

The late 1990s saw significant changes in the design and implementation of rural development programmes in the UK, in particular in more peripheral rural regions (Ward and McNicholas, 1997). This chapter starts with changes in wider rural development policies in the post-war period in the UK. It reveals a shift of political emphasis in rural development, from traditional agricultural policy in the immediate post-war period to new concerns about protecting the rural environment from the excesses of intensive agricultural activities in the 1980s. In the 1990s, a new concept of ‘governance’ emerged and had large impact on wider stakeholders who were concerned with rural areas. Goodwin and Painter (1996) point out that it involves not just the formal agencies of elected local political institutions, but also central government, a range of non-elected organisations of the state as well as institutional and individual actors from outside the formal political arena, such as voluntary organisations, private businesses and corporations, the mass media and, increasingly, supra-national institutions, such as European Union. This new mode of local ‘governance’ is being established in the context in which community development through partnership is moulded in many rural areas, particularly in the Highlands and Islands area in the north part of Scotland. This chapter examines a wide array of policies and programmes that have been taken in the Scottish context, in order to understand a current picture of rural development and give a perspective on ‘spatial’ planning for rural areas.
4.2. The evolution of policies for rural planning

Post-war rural planning in the UK has been divided into a ‘twin-pillars’ planning system (Murdoch, 1997): Town and Country Planning (under the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act), which effectively ‘nationalised’ development rights throughout the entire country (Reade, 1987) in order to protect agricultural land from urban encroachment (Hall et al, 1973); and resource planning (under the 1947 Agriculture Act), which effectively made agriculture a ‘ward of the state’ (Self and Strong, 1962). The former concerns the control of development and the maintenance and enhancement of the environment through mechanisms of statutory development plans and development control. The latter concerns primarily economic development in the agricultural sector, since farming and related activities provide the dominant economic base and source of employment in rural areas (Morris and Bailey, 2001).

In 1942, the Committee on Land Utilisation in Rural Areas (Ministry of Works and Planning, 1942) under the chairmanship of Lord Justice Scott reported on rural policy, in which support for the maintenance of agriculture would have the effect of reviving country life and bringing about an improvement in the physical and social standards of country areas (Hodge, 1996). In the Scott Report, a prosperous agricultural sector was seen as the only way of preserving the traditional appearance of the countryside. Curry and Owen (1996) point out that the Town and Country Planning system has evolved with a narrowly-focused role on the countryside with a ‘no development’ ethic and it has remained largely unchallenged ever since. Despite conservation ethics, an environmental approach in rural areas has not been fully embraced. This is partly because of the exemption of agrarian land use, in which agriculture and forestry operations have been outside development control. As far as the resource planning sector is concerned, there was little consideration for the environment in post-war reconstruction, instead food supply to the nation was the main focus. Where agriculture and forestry interests interfered with ‘planning’ conservation designations, the Town and Country Planning system could not refuse development. Therefore in so far as planning affected farm and forestry operations, it was largely in terms of resource planning.
Rural planning in general during the last 50 years can be summarised in the following way: the Town and Country Planning system with responsibility for the environment having a largely ineffectual role in rural areas other than resisting development; and the dominant resource planning system in rural areas having no existing environmental objectives (Curry and Owen, 1996). The consequence of these contradictory approaches caused a crisis both in environmental and socio-economic terms. Environmental damage in the countryside was largely caused by agriculture and forestry operations, rather than development *per se*. Ironically, concentrated activities on agrarian land, which aimed to promote economic prosperity, provided an unstable narrow economic base in rural areas. Once agriculture and forestry sectors declined due to overproduction, then “the whole of the rural economy suffers, with concomitant impacts on the infrastructure of those areas from housing to transport, from services to a sense of community” (Curry and Owen, 1996: 3), since the ‘no development’ ethic obstructed building of such infrastructures.

In order to tackle the interlocked socio-economic problems which hit many rural communities by the early 1960s, an integrated rural development approach was tested. This was undertaken by the newly established development agencies, such as the Highlands & Islands Development Board (HIDB) in Scotland (set up in 1965) and the North Pennine Rural Development Board (set up in 1969 under the Agricultural Act in 1967 and dissolved in 1971 following the announcement by the Conservative government), whose remit was to promote economic development in an integrated way in designated areas. In crude terms, whilst conventional regional policy assistance represented a ‘top-down’ provision of assistance which did not discriminate in its effects on the designated geographical areas, the individual development agencies represented a ‘bottom-up’ perspective on the specific circumstances of the areas in question and provided a means of establishing an infrastructure for indigenous economic activity as well as inward investment (Fairley and Lloyd, 1995). However, except for the HIDB in northern Scotland, those development agencies set up during the 1960s and 1970s did not last long. This was because the whole concept of a rural development board, and particularly its power over land transfer, was alien to the philosophy of the Conservative Government.

In the 1970s, due to the economic recession in the UK, development policies under the
Town and Country Planning Act were devoted to tackling urban deprivation and many regeneration projects were provided. Nevertheless, since deprivation was concentrated in the inner cities, the Labour Government (1974-1979) weighted resource allocation in that direction (Wright, 1992). Thus, as far as rural planning was concerned, there was little interest in a comprehensive development approach for rural communities. There were two White Papers in the 1970s: Food From Our Own Resources (MAFF, 1975) and Farming and the Nation (MAFF, 1979). Both papers concentrated primarily on agriculture and continued to advocate 'productivism'.

In the 1980s, on the other hand, rather than empowering the Town and Country Planning system with environmental controls over agriculture and forestry, both European and domestic agricultural policies have adopted their own environmental objectives for rural areas (Curry and Owen, 1996). This was largely because of the failure of the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). The costs of administering the CAP in the face of surplus production became a major political issue and measures such as Milk Quotas (in 1984) and Voluntary Set-Aside (in 1988) were put into operation. Environmental concerns were adopted and a new scheme, Environmentally Sensitive Areas, was introduced in 1987, followed by the Agri-Environment package in the 1992 CAP reform.

Since affiliation to the European Community in 1973, domestic development policies, particularly in rural development, were influenced by EU policy. Hence, the principle impetus for the adoption of environmental concerns in agriculture and forestry planning came with the Agriculture Act 1986, which either introduced, or laid the foundation for, a number of 'agri-environment' measures. Some measures were set alongside a number of the more long-standing conservation measures and designations that had been traditionally within the remit of the Town and Country Planning system (Curry and Owen, 1996).

The 1980s saw an attempt at planning deregulation as a result of the Conservative Party's 'neo-liberal' and 'market-based' reforms under the Thatcher administration. The 1989 White Paper The Future of Development Plans (DoE, 1989) is evidence that the whole planning system tended to move away from plan-led decision-making to one of
negotiation between planner and developer. However, the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act reasserted plan-led development policies as the principle plank of strategic planning (Curry and Owen, 1996). This strategic perspective was introduced for the first time for much of rural areas at the local plan level. Nevertheless, at this stage, rural development policies were mainly driven by central government through Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs). Originally introduced in 1988 as Rural Enterprise and Development, PPG7: The Countryside and the Rural Economy (DoE, 1992) seeks a balance between conservation and development, rather than no development at all in the countryside, by allowing a greater degree of flexibility to be exercised within settlements in undesignated areas.

The 1990s was an era of growth in informal planning. This seems to have been an attempt at merging the two separate planning systems in rural areas and consequently diverse and independent informal plans and strategies were spawned. For instance, the Countryside Policy Review Panel recommended, “each county council should prepare a rural/countryside strategy for it’s area embracing economic and social development objectives, environmental and recreational objectives and policies for the use of rural land” (1987: 42). The Local Government and Housing Act 1989 also provides a general power for all local authorities to promote the economic development of their areas. Tourism Development Action Programmes and Rural Development Programmes were initiated as a requirement for grant bids, especially for Rural Development Areas since 1984. English Nature (1991) saw the environmental White Paper This Common Inheritance (DoE, 1990) and its call for the implementation of the principles and practices of sustainable development, as a principle spur to their growth. These are all non-statutory documents but “working very much at the interface between planning and agriculture, where the two planning systems are at their weakest” (Curry and Owen, 1996: 15).

What is necessary for integrated rural planning is to combine incentives and controls in order to unite the two planning systems which influence rural communities. Curry and Owen examine the strengths and weakness of two planning systems. Whilst Town and Country Planning has mandatory regulatory powers and can deal with local distinctiveness, since its operation occurs at county, district and even parish level, where
local variations are capable of being taken into account, its powers seem to be negative to the extent to which development control cannot ensure that the right development takes place in the right place at the right time. On the other hand, resource planning is dominated by national and European imperatives that take regional variation into account only by virtue of the predominance of different farming systems in different types of rural areas. Yet it has the direct power to influence change and thereby positive action can be taken. This power would seem to be desirable in any deliberate process of intervention to steer change.

In the late 1990s, there were an increasing number of approaches which focused on environmental concerns in the agricultural sector, socio-economic regeneration by non-sectoral means, and local decision-making through community involvement. The vision of these approaches was underpinned by the principles of sustainable development, strong communities, inclusive society and stakeholder partnership. As Morris and Mailey argue, "sustainable development must be adequately defined if it is to be useful, with social, economic and environmental indicators which reflect quality of life in rural communities, methods for screening the suitability of development options, and mechanisms for engaging rural populations in the development process" and "a key element of the rural features debate is the maintenance of strong communities, through ensuring access to services and supporting community involvement" (2001). Strengthening the capacity of institutions in rural communities is central to this process (Barker and Selman, 1990; Clark et al., 1997). The detail of these issues will be dealt in the following sections.
4.3. Community development through partnership in the Scottish context

Scotland seems to be a prominent area in giving an insight of the value of community development through the partnership approach. As described above, the original model of community development is derived from measures against the economic and social deprivation, particularly the north of Scotland, as the Highlands and Islands is the area where since 1965 several pilot programmes were promoted by the government agency, the Highlands and Islands Development Board (the predecessor of Highlands and Islands Enterprise). Due to the lagging condition not only in economy but also in social terms, they have experienced what did work and what did not in their approaches, and thereby show the evolution of community development itself.

The current issues relevant to community development are not only an innovation of narrowly defined planning techniques, but also, more importantly, a fundamental challenge towards a wider change of planning context, including its definition and purpose, procedural system and the power relations between stakeholders. The latter issue is evidence that some non-statutory plans were proposed by the Scottish government and become powerful driving forces to encourage all relevant stakeholders' businesses to adapt to a more integrated and modernised direction. This attempt seems to have resulted from devolution in 1999. However, it is assumed that beforehand there was a gradually emergent commitment toward the shift to a new style of governance in the area.

The following part will describe the rich experience in Scotland, mainly focusing upon the three components of current Scottish government’s policy; community involvement, partnership and sustainability. Firstly, the 1995 Rural White Paper is examined as a watershed, which opens up significant themes in rural areas. Secondly, following these broader concerns regarding to rural areas, two practical planning schemes introduced by the Scottish government are scrutinised: the ‘Scottish Rural Partnership’; and ‘Community Planning’. These two schemes are important in terms of developing a new style of governance and partnership ways. The third scheme is ‘Local Agenda 21’ that was introduced for the achievement of sustainability. The significance of this scheme is that alongside identifying the meaning of sustainability and substantial actions, a
process-focused and partnership mode between local authority and communities was developed. The last scheme examined in this section is called ‘Social Justice’. This programme reflects New Labour’s manifesto of social inclusion. Thus some social- and community-related strategies are influenced by this government’s policy. These current schemes are interdependent and thereby generate a more solid foundation on which community development through partnerships can flourish.

4.3.1. The 1995 Scottish Rural White Paper as a watershed in rural planning

The White Paper on rural policy in Scotland, Rural Scotland: People, prosperity and partnership (Scottish Office, 1995, Cm 3014) was published in December 1995. For the first time, according the foreword, government policies for rural communities and the way in which they are put into practice in the working landscapes of Scotland were set out in one document. In short, there were two key features: a statement of the overall aims of rural policy in Scotland; and the setting up of new machinery to encourage a more widely-based partnership approach to the tackling of problems throughout rural Scotland. The significant point was that the conventional sectoral approach was replaced by a ‘coherent’ approach through ‘partnership’.

A coherent approach

Before articulating its purposes and objectives, there is an interesting story behind the issue of the White Paper. The approach taken in the Scottish Rural White Paper reflected differences in the machinery of government in Scotland compared with other parts of Great Britain. In terms of government administration, Randall (1997) pointed out that responsibility for most functions affecting rural Scotland was the responsibility of a single government department, the Scottish Office, responsible to one Minister, the Secretary of State for Scotland. These functions included agriculture, fisheries, the environment, tourism, health, home affairs, industrial development and local government in Scotland.

This could have benefited the production of a coherent rural policy, since a wide range of responsibilities within the portfolio of one Cabinet Minister enabled and encouraged
an integrated view of rural development issues. Randall explains that the Scottish Office had considerable experience of developing and implementing policies which recognise the complex interrelationship between various sectoral policies and the overall impact of policy on particular geographical areas. It could be said that the integrated nature of the Scottish Office was an important factor in the approach taken in the Scottish Rural White Paper.

Regarding the contents of the 1995 White Paper, it reflected the political climate of its era, focusing more on socio-economic issues than land and environment issues (Bryden and Mather, 1996). The White Paper began with a relatively healthy economic picture of rural Scotland, indicators of which showed recent population and economic trends in rural Scotland: rural districts saw population growth in the 1980s compared with depopulation by 1.4% for the whole of Scotland; employment increased by 6.5% in rural Scotland compared with 0.7% for Scotland as a whole; unemployment rates in rural areas are below the national average (Scottish Office, 1995).

However, it also acknowledged that there was considerable variation between rural districts in terms of population and employment change, and also in levels of unemployment. Moreover, as Bryden and Mather (1996) pointed out, there is no doubt the analysis at district level also masks changes within districts, since casual observation suggests that in many cases middle-sized rural towns and surrounding commuting settlements in such districts have been growing at the expense of more outlying areas and smaller villages.

The Government’s overall aims for rural Scotland were four-fold.

Rural Scotland should be:

- economically prosperous, with a range of job opportunities which will enable those who live in rural communities, native or new-comer, to enjoy worthwhile ways of life;
- vigorous in its community life, supported by good local infrastructure and quality services;
- culturally competent, cherishing local traditions and distinctive ways of life, and able to adapt to and benefit from changing circumstances; and
able to protect, conserve and enhance its outstanding natural environment.

The narrative of the 1995 Rural White Paper was in a sense blurred. However, compared with what was used in the past rural policies, such as 'agricultural issues' and 'social deprivation', the perspectives on rural areas described above seem to be constructive. In considering the concept of rural planning, the White Paper adapted a multidimensional perspective that takes into account the role of communities and their cultural values in establishing priorities (McDonagh, 2001).

A new machinery: a partnership approach

As seen above, the overall aims of the White Paper formed the basis of the notion of sustainable development, linking economic prosperity, social stability and environmental quality. Nonetheless, it remains a huge difficulty to reconcile when irreconcilable conflicts reveal contests over its interpretation in practice. In response to this, an innovation was required. That was the second notable point in the 1995 White Paper; the notion of voluntarism and partnership pervading the document. The Scottish Rural White Paper emphasised the importance of addressing rural issues through voluntary arrangements, a bottom-up approach involving the local community, and an integrated and non-sectoral approach (Watt, 1999a; 1999b). A major concern about coherent rural policies is a mechanism in implementing objectives, including appropriate regulatory and financial support.

The key mechanisms were identified at the time for delivering this 'new' partnership approach; that was the creation of Local Rural Partnerships. This partnership approach to public policy development lies at the heart of the current Government's efforts to assist the delivery of sustainable rural development (Watt, 1999). The partnership approach is not a new idea in Scotland. At Scottish national level, there was the Rural Focus Group, established in 1992, consisting of representatives of the main government departments, agencies, local government, and the private and voluntary sectors to coordinate rural policy and other initiatives in rural Scotland. Basically, the National Rural Partnership builds on this Group, extending membership and expanding specific functions.
At the local level, the idea of Local Rural Partnership emerged from the consultation on the Rural White Paper. During the consultation process, the need for improved co-ordinating mechanisms in rural areas below the Scottish level was identified. Indeed, some local rural partnerships already existed in parts of rural Scotland. The new idea of Local Rural Partnership was to formalise a mechanism that brought together round a single table representatives of the key government departments and agencies, along with the local communities, to discuss priorities and devise a strategy for future development in each local area (Randall, 1997).

The three main mechanisms to utilise the notion of partnership are articulated the following section.

4.3.2. Scottish Rural Partnership

The Scottish Rural Partnership was established in 1996 following the Scottish White Paper, as part of a range of innovative measures to promote rural development. The key components of Local Rural Partnerships (LRPs) in the 1995 White Paper were: that the needs and priorities of rural communities would be put first; and that Government agencies, local authorities, the voluntary and private sectors, and other representatives of the community and community groups, would work together in an integrated way.

Basic structure of Scottish Rural Partnership and its evolution

At the national level, the Scottish National Rural Partnership (SNRP) was proposed as an advisory body to the rural policy of the Scottish Government (see Table 4.1). On the other hand, the Local Rural Partnerships (LRPs) were proposed at the local level. With backup of the SNRP, the main roles of the LRPs were:

(1) drawing up a strategy for the area covered;
(2) considering how services in the area could be provided more effectively, and in particular, the potential for joint delivery of services;
(3) seeking ways to involve local communities in decision-making and planning of services;
(4) looking at the provision and training of community development agents in the
area and deciding if this type of service should be expanded; and (5) encouraging local communities to develop their own projects and advising them on funding options.

In addition to those wide ranges of roles, in the Guidance Note of 1996, three types of LRP were proposed:

- **Strategic partnerships**: which can cover quite a substantial geographical area, which enables them to take an overview of a wide range of issues and activities.
- **Area based partnerships**: which have the advantage of being pitched at a level that is a little closer to local communities and may be able to consider in a more detailed way, the issues facing a smaller geographical area.
- **Topic based partnerships**: which can concentrate on a specific set of issues which are felt to be of special priority and can be either strategic in nature, or based at a more local level, depending on the area they cover.

Due to the wider and time-consuming tasks given to the LRPs, it was unlikely for a lower-tier partnership to achieve all its objectives. Therefore, it was inevitable that the two-tier structure itself would come under scrutiny. Over the consultation process, a consultation document, *Toward a Development Strategy for Rural Scotland* (The Scottish Office, 1997), followed by a further document, *Toward a Development Strategy for Rural Scotland: The Framework* (The Scottish Office, 1998a) were published. In the 1998 Framework, two amended types of partnerships were proposed: **Strategic Rural Partnerships** and **Local Rural Partnerships**. The functions of the two partnerships are identified in Table 4.1. In this modified mechanism, the lower-tier was split up into two-tier partnerships, and thereby while the Strategic Partnership takes responsibility in strategic planning, the Local Partnership focuses on operational functions. This more feasible picture seemed to be produced in parallel with an emerging idea of the 'Community Plan'. The Community Planning Working Group, a joint working group on 'Community Planning' including the Secretary of State and Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA), was established in July 1997 and issued a consultation report (The Scottish Office, 1998b). Therefore, it can be seen that Scottish Rural Partnership generated the idea of 'Community Planning' in Scotland. Table 4.1 shows the partnership structure as a whole. It is worth noticing that producing the 'Community
Plan’ was supposed to be done at the Strategic Partnership level and that both Strategic and Local Partnerships were supposed to perform different functions.

### Table 4.1: Functions of Scottish National Rural Partnership and Local Rural Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scottish National Rural Partnership</th>
<th>Local Rural Partnership (1998 Framework)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➤ Advice Government on policies of importance to rural Scotland</td>
<td>➤ The articulation of a vision for the local community which reflects local needs and concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Generate innovative ideas on ways of achieving sustainable rural development, including through the commissioning of research</td>
<td>➤ The employment of development officers (animators) to aid project planning and partnership development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Liaise with other national partnerships on the delivery of their policy objectives in rural areas</td>
<td>➤ To provide an interface between local communities and strategic partnerships and feed back to rural development strategies and Community Plan developed at the strategic level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Provide feedback from other rural partnerships to Government on the success of policy delivery in rural areas</td>
<td>➤ Contribute to the planning process for EC-funded programmes in rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Help support the development of quality rural strategies</td>
<td>➤ Work with local communities, develop plans for community involvement in rural development strategies and support local partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Contribute to the planning process for EC-funded programmes in rural areas</td>
<td>➤ Feed views to and receive feedback from the SNRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Advice Government on the allocation of Government funding to rural development objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the proposed institutional structure of the programme, a set of financial schemes was also proposed: the Scottish Rural Partnership Fund (SRPF). Basically, the SRPF aims to assist the formation of LRPs and to encourage local community involvement (The Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, 2000) and consists of three funds:

1. **the Local Capital Grants Scheme for Community Facilities**, which assists local voluntary, youth and community organisations in providing new, or upgrading existing premises for educational, social and recreational activities;
2. **the Rural Challenge Fund (RCF)**, which encourages rural projects that propose innovative ways of tackling particular rural problems or create a wider range of

**Funding for pump-priming purposes**
opportunities in rural areas and that would promote social inclusion; and

(3) the Rural Strategic Support Fund (RSSF), which offers revenue grants to LRPs (and organisations which wish to provide a service to them), rural and semi-rural Councils of Voluntary Service, and environmental organisations operating on a national basis throughout Scotland.

It was anticipated that the RSSF would offer a pump-priming grant for LRPs for the first three years partly to cover the employment and training of community development agents and, occasionally, administration costs. The RSSF is also available to bodies working at a national level to provide support to LRPs or rural communities on a national basis (such as information, advice and training). It is important to note that these partnerships themselves do not produce any goods or deliver any services. Nevertheless, there was a commitment for spending public money for establishing and supporting these partnerships in Scotland. This suggests that the notion of social capital has penetrated and been regarded as something worth investing in.

4.3.3. Community Planning

Although ‘Community Planning’ in Scotland was originally introduced as being non-statutory, it has been a key vehicle for promoting the partnership approach in many public services. The origin of the idea of Community Planning is derived from various strands. In the following section, attention is given to three important strands, which became the principles of ‘Community Planning’ in the Scottish context. Firstly, it was subject to the modernisation of public service delivery. Secondly, it emerged through the reform of local authority. The third strand was the modernisation of statutory plans. These were interlocking strands inspired the concept of ‘Community Planning’ in the late 1990s.

---

1 Community Planning became a statutory plan after the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003 came into force on the 1st of April 2003. See also Chapter 7.
Background of the idea of Community Planning

The first strand is that of Community Planning as a concept originating in a consultative draft of the Labour Party's policy statement for local government (Labour Party, 1995). Community Planning was primarily concerned with developing new approaches to consulting communities about the local authorities own strategies and service planning and delivery (COSLA, 2000a). While Community Planning was developing within the context of the clarification of the Best Value regime, the increasing focus on partnership was seen as a key mechanism for delivering public policy objectives.

Significantly, in the Scottish context, "the notion of community planning arose out of a concern about the uncertainties attendant upon the likely future relationship and balance of power between the unitary councils in Scotland and the forthcoming Parliament" (Alexander, 1997). In this context, the second strand was Community Planning as essentially the re-assertion of the role of local authorities at a time when new relationships, policy agendas and national priorities were being developed in Scotland to accommodate the Parliament (Sinclair, 1997). Indeed, the report of Community Planning Working Group placed a greater emphasis on Partnership and on the role of Community Planning as the vehicle through which local authorities could make a reality of their role as community leaders (The Scottish Office, 1998b).

The third strand has developed through empirical studies. It is claimed in the evaluation report (COSLA, 2000a), that Community Planning was increasingly seen as the key vehicle for developing a vision for the area – a vision that was both partnership-based and community-based. It is understood that Community Planning contains the seeds of a much more fundamental change in the ways of working and the culture of local authorities and their partner organisations – a change that will impact on the role of elected and appointed representatives as well as on managerial and operational staff (COSLA, 2000a) and a potential means of defining practical agendas for positive policy action between the numerous and diverse agencies engaged in local governance, economic regeneration, social inclusion and environmental sustainability (Lloyd and Illsley, 1999).
The third concept seems to be fundamental to Community Planning and the future vision. The following part provides some empirical studies at the Scottish national level through the experiences of pathfinder authorities, from which the current concept was extracted.

**Evolving Community Planning**

In 1998, Community Planning was launched in five pilot authorities in Scotland; Edinburgh, Highland, Perth and Kinross, South Lanarkshire, and Stirling. They were asked to produce a Community Plan by December 1998. An evaluation study of these pilot areas was conducted by Birmingham University between July and August 1999 (COSLA, 2000a). They point out that “the pathfinder projects have generally been pragmatic in so far as they were based on existing initiatives”. It is important to build on what is already in place. Community Planning should not be regarded as a blank sheet.

Thereafter, the rest of local authorities in Scotland were asked to lead Community Planning processes and produce Community Plans. Strictly speaking, at that time, Community Planning was non-statutory, but operated in a statutory context. This was because of an agenda of making sure that local authorities carried out the process, and for local authorities, taking back leadership was an important objective. Community Planning became regarded as a means that provided a non-statutory framework.

However, a contemporary problem is that the Community Planning processes in the 32 unitary authorities can vary in institutional terms. This is because the ways in which Community Planning is put into practice vary according to geographical space and scale, culture, coincidence and the existing communities of local authorities. The evaluation report shows that the Community Planning processes in the five pathfinder schemes vary, and local authorities tend to respond to their on-going programmes and policy initiatives. Consequently, some local authorities have taken it forward, but others have not produced anything yet, even though they recognise its importance.

It is important to note that there was a debate as to whether or not Community Planning should be statutory. In June 2000, it was announced, by Wendy Alexander, Minister for
Communities in the Scottish Parliament, that the Scottish Executive intended to introduce a statutory power of community initiative and of community planning in the Local Government Bill (Alexander, 2000). The Scottish Executive circulated a consultation paper, A Power of Community Initiative: Community Planning: Political Restrictions on council employees, in November 2000. It says, “if guidance were to be deemed beneficial it should in the first instance be non-statutory in nature. Only if the non-statutory route were not found to be effective should the statutory option be considered”

4.3.4. Local Agenda 21

The third strand of community development in Scotland is ‘Local Agenda 21’ (LA21). LA21 is Britain’s interpretation of Agenda 21, which was signed at the Rio Earth Summit. The Agenda outlined the rationale for action on issues of environment and development in Chapter 28 as follows:

Because so many of the problems and solutions being addressed by Agenda 21 have their roots in local activities, the participation and co-operation of local authorities will be a determining factor in fulfilling its objectives. Local authorities construct, operate and maintain economic, social and environmental infrastructure, oversee planning processes, establish local environmental policies and regulations, and assist in implementing national and sub-national environmental policies. As the level of governance closest to the people, they play a vital role in educating, mobilising and responding to the public promote sustainable development.

(United Nations, 1993: Agenda 21, Section 28.1)

Local Agenda 21 proposed in Scotland

This strand was not originally derived from within the UK, but from outside of the state. Therefore, the initiative of promoting LA21 was taken by the UK government, through the DETR. In Scotland, as a part of the UK, councils were asked how their LA21

---

2 See note 1, p110.
process addresses the long-term well-being of other areas and communities and the wider world, by December 2000. The DETR gave the description of features of LA21 in a document, *Sustainable Local Communities for the 21st Century* (1998c), which is summarised in Appendix 3.

Nevertheless, according to a survey conducted by COSLA Sustainability Group in 1999 (COSLA, 2000b), almost half of the Councils cannot yet show how their LA21 will promote sustainability outside their local area. This is largely because there are similar type of agenda of which local authorities should take account at the same time, such as Sustainability, Social Inclusion Strategies, Rural Development Strategies, and Community Planning (COSLA, 1999). At that time, all these initiatives were still underdeveloped in both strategic and practical terms, which caused huge confusion among local authorities. This confusion has arisen not because of any conflict, but because these major strategies are so similar.

**A hybridised Local Agenda 21 in Scotland**

Because of this chaotic situation, COSLA issued several guidelines to how to cope with these similar initiatives and adapt them into their existing strategy and plans (COSLA, 1999; 2000c). COSLA describes, in *News Line* (summer, 1999), similarities between Community Planning, LA21 and Rural Development Strategies, as shown in Table 4.2. Although it was acknowledged that local authorities were asked to prepare the draft Community Plan in 1999, and LA21 by 31st of December 2000, COSLA recommended that Community Planning, LA21 and Rural Development Strategies should be integrated where possible. Consequently, 16 local authorities adopted LA21 as a strategy by December 2000, 7 local authorities have adopted the LA21 criteria as their Community Plan, and 2 local authorities combined the Community Plan and LA21 as a strategy (COSLA, 2000b).

In general, despite a clear commitment that local authorities should contribute the achievement of sustainability, it can be concluded that the products of LA21 itself were poorer than expected. However, the core concept of LA21 was not extinguished. Rather, in identifying the meaning of sustainability and substantial actions, a process-focused
and partnership mode between local authority and communities was confirmed along with other similar schemes which emerged in the same period. As Young (1998) explained, it is the participatory aspect of the UK approach to LA21 which has received most international attention. In particular, in the Scottish context, community involvement and partnership aspects were emphasised.

Table 4.2: Features of Community Planning, LA21 and Rural Development Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Planning</th>
<th>LA21</th>
<th>Rural Development Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A process through which a council comes together with other organisations to plan, provide for or promote the wellbeing of the communities they serve</td>
<td>A long term vision for the sustainable development of their area, and wellbeing in national and global terms</td>
<td>Reflecting of the three components of sustainable development – the economic, social and environmental – and encompassing of the areas of responsibility of the agencies involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A belief that councils, as democratically elected bodies, have a community leadership role and responsibility for the wellbeing and sustainable development of its area</td>
<td>A prioritised action plan for the delivery of the vision</td>
<td>Establishing of a vision for the sustainable development of the area and the respective and complementary contributions each partner will make towards attaining that vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways must be found to enable communities themselves to participate effectively in the process</td>
<td>The involvement of the key local partners in framing and delivering the vision and action plan</td>
<td>Being integrated with the overall Community Planning and set out the means for delivering the relevant elements of the vision agreed in the Community Planning through action by the partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A duty to promote the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of their areas and to strengthen council’s powers to enter into partnerships</td>
<td>The involvement of the interested sectors of the community in the process</td>
<td>Developing of plans for community involvement by working with local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will put sustainable development at the heart of council decision making and will provide an overall framework within which councils must perform all their existing functions</td>
<td>Arrangements for the active involvement of all the other partners and sectors after 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.5. The Social Justice Programme

The last scheme examined in this section is the so-called ‘Social Justice’ programme (Scottish Executive, 1999b). This programme reflects New Labour’s manifesto commitment to social inclusion. Thus some social- and community-related strategies are strongly influenced by this government’s policy.
Empowering Communities

In recent years, policy debates about inequality have tended to focus on social exclusion rather than on poverty (Shucksmith, 2000a). In Scotland, the Social Justice Agenda was one of policy priorities of the Scottish Executive. In March 1999, the late Donald Dewar, the first Minister of Scotland, launched the Social Inclusion Strategy. Following the election of the Scottish Parliament, a Ministerial Taskforce on Poverty and Inclusion was set up to lead the social justice agenda. What was really new about this policy tackling poverty, was that “the strategy emphasises both people and places in the fight against poverty and the targets are focused on people and changing their lives” (Scottish Executive, 1999b). The following Action Note issued in June 2000 emphasised “empowering communities – so that people have the means to influence, to manage and to deliver success.” (Scottish Executive, 2000b) Although, the initial focus of social justice was to tackle poor health, housing and education, and a lack of jobs and income, the notion of community empowerment can be used in other areas. Apparently, the Scottish Social Justice strategy regards empowering communities as not only the avoidance of deprivation but also as progress with a constructive vision of future. In this sense, Social Justice was likely to be echoed in other community development programmes.

The Social Inclusion Partnership programme

The Scottish Executive has established priorities including supporting the Social Inclusion Partnerships (SIPs) in the regeneration of Scotland’s most deprived neighbourhoods: tackling the subject of child poverty in partnership with the UK government; working to regenerate the most disadvantaged communities to ensure that decent affordable housing is available to everyone; and, promoting quality of opportunity and community development (Scottish Executive, 2000c).

There is currently a network of 48 SIPs (April 2001) in place across Scotland. Of these, 34 are comprehensive area-based initiatives and 14 are thematic-based initiatives, tackling disadvantage in particularly vulnerable groups that include excluded young people, children in care, young people leaving care, and young carers. Equal
opportunities, particularly the promotion of opportunities for those from ethnic minorities, are addressed by a number of thematic SIP programmes. SIPS are broadly based partnerships, comprising the local authority and other public agencies such as Scottish Homes and the LECs, the voluntary and private sectors, and will have the local community at their heart (www.scotland.gov.uk/socialjustice/sips.index.htm). The Scottish Executive is providing worth of £169 million of in funding over three years from February 2000 to March 2003, in supporting their delivery.
4.4. EU policies

The area-based approach can be also seen in recent EU rural policy. The following section will review the current landscape which has been evolving for over the last decade. For many local and regional planning authorities, the EU is seen in the first place as a source of funding (Williams, 1996). To articulate the details in the evolution of EU regional policy is the subject of another thesis, however it is reasonable to summarise the current policies which are particularly relevant to community development issues.

The most important and influential manifestation of the EU policy in rural areas is seen in the 1998 Structural Policy reform. Ray points out that “responding to budgetary pressures, environmental and equity arguments to reform the Common Agricultural Policy, and the apparent failure of Structural Policy to bring about economic convergence between the regions of Europe, the EU announced a shift in the use of the Structural Funds away from the sectoral approach and towards interventions that targeted territories of particular socio-economic disadvantage” (2001: 10). This policy shift reflected the Cork Declaration: a living countryside (Commission, 1996). It emphasised participation and a ‘bottom-up’ approach which harnesses the creativity and solidarity of rural communities. Rural development must be local and community-driven within a coherent European framework. LEADER programme, an innovative approach to rural development on local, endogenous, and partnership basis (see below), is evidence of this territorial manifestation.

What Ray calls ‘neo-endogenous development‘ such as LEADER programme is “the result of various combinations of the from above and intermediate level sources interacting with the local level”. He argues that ‘neo-endogenous development’ can be animated, firstly, “by actors within the local area”, and secondly “from above, as national governments and/or the EU respond to the logic of contemporary political-administrative ideology”, and thirdly “from the intermediate level, particularly by non-governmental organisations which see in endogenous development the means by which to pursue their particular agendas” (Ray, 2001: 9, original emphasis).
EU policy on rural development seems to have the same political discourse as that of the UK and Scottish Governments, such as 'genuine community involvement' and 'partnership between public, private, and voluntary sectors'. Furthermore, taking account of the fact that the EU LEADER initiatives were introduced in 1991 and are still in operation, Ray's thesis suggests that EU policy has been influential in promoting the current community development movement in Scotland.

This part focuses on 'neo-endogenous' development policies which have emerged in EU policy. The first programme is Structural Policy, the overall budget of which is approximately one third of the European Community budget and therefore Structural Policy can be seen as a mainstream policy of the EU. The Scottish Highlands and Islands area has been the subject of Objective 1 status under Structural Policy, and thereby the area has received a considerable amount of money from the EU. Therefore, it is crucial to understand how far the EU policy influences the current political regime at Scottish national and Highlands and Islands regional level. Moreover, due to EU enlargement, the Structural Policy has been reformed time after time. Secondly, one of the Community Initiatives programmes under the EU, LEADER, will be articulated. As mentioned above, the importance of LEADER is not only as a new approach to rural development, but also as "an incipient radical new social movement" (Ray, 2001). The third programme called 'LIFE' derives from the EU environment policy. Firstly adopted in 1992, LIFE programmes are still active and offer integrated financial support for those who are responsible for the environment at the local level.

4.4.1. EU Structural Policy

Firstly, the European Community Structural Policy is briefly summarised. Then, the current Structural Policy reform will be described.

Background

The overall objective of the EU Structural Policy is to reduce development gaps and promote economic and social cohesion within the Union. The 1997 budget of the European Community was a total of ECU 87,000 million, 36.6% (ECU 31,830 million)
of which was allocated to the Structural operations. The Structural operations contain Structural Funds and Cohesion Funds. In terms of budget allocation, the Structural Policy is a significant impact on the regions which receive funds.

Firstly devised in the 1970s, the Structural Funds were significantly reformed and expanded in 1988 and became tailored to meet specific, and spatially targeted, development objectives (Ward and Woodward, 1998). The Structural Funds, mainly composed of Community Support Frameworks and Community Initiatives, is the term used to refer to the four funds whose operations are now co-ordinated, ERDF, ESF, EAGGF and FIFG (see Table 4.3 and Appendix 4). Programming and planning expenditure of the Structural Funds are delivered according to three forms of operations: Community Support Frameworks (CSFs), Single Programming Documents (SPDs), and Community Initiatives (CIs).

The Cohesion Funds were adopted in May 1994 to enable all member state to join the
final phase of economic and monetary union as quickly as possible by helping those with the greatest number of handicaps to overcome them (Williams, 1996). This is available for environment and transport infrastructure projects in Greece, Ireland, Portugal and Spain.

The current EU Policy reform: Agenda 2000

In order to facilitate EU enlargement, when Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia prepared to join in 2002, the next period of European Regional policy was approved as Agenda 2000 (The EC, 1997). Agenda 2000 includes: EU policies and policy instruments; Structural Funds reform; and, Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) reform (Colwell and Mclaren, 1999). In the following section, the current topics of Structural Funds reform and CAP reform are summarised in turn.

The current Structural Funds reform reflects the 1997 Amsterdam Treaty, which included a new Employment Chapter, and strengthened articles on Equal opportunities and Sustainable Development. In order to use the money from the Structural Funds as efficiently as possible, it was decided to concentrate their use by reducing the number of priority objectives from 7 to 3, and nearly 70% of total spending will be targeted on regions whose development is lagging behind (Objective 1). Accordingly, for the 2000-2006 period, the final picture of eligible areas in Scotland was approved (shown in Table 4.4). It is acknowledged that, since the economic indicators that identify eligible areas of the EU funds tend to prioritise the new EU member states, for Scotland the strategies prepared for the 2000-2006 period were to be regarded as 'existing strategies', which should plan to fully exploit and maximise their potential to bring about economic recovery (Colwell and Mclaren, 1999).

As a result of the Structural Fund reform, in Scotland, there was one eligible area of Objective 1 status and four areas of Objective 2 status (shown in Table 4.4). Scottish Enterprise, HIE, COSLA and the Eastern Scotland European Partnership formed a steering group for the preparation of new programmes (2000-2006) across Scotland. Throughout the consultation period, four themes were discussed as the global/EU/national trends: (1) enterprise, (2) leaning, (3) infrastructure and (4) inclusion.
In addition to these themes, the priority of sustainable development emerged as a horizontal theme. Key issues in the four themes are summarised in Appendix 5. The Single Programming Document (SPD) is and remains an economic development programme, focusing on the delivery of jobs, training and economic prosperity. However, it is claimed by Colwell and McLaren (1999), that regional economic development must take into account the need to manage the environment wisely and ensure that local communities and individuals are not excluded or disadvantaged by economic development activities.

Table 4.4: EU Structural Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>EU funds available 2000-2006 (ECU billion)</th>
<th>% of Structural Fund budget</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Eligible area in Scotland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1</td>
<td>Less developed regions (below 75% GDP of EU average)</td>
<td>135.9</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIFG</td>
<td>The Highlands and Islands (special transitional programme)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Objective 2  | Regions with major economic and social restructuring needs  
   > Industrial decline  
   > Fishery sector decline  
   > Rural areas in decline  
   > Urban areas in difficulty | 22.50                                    | 11.5%                        | ERDF, ESF                      | Dumfries and Galloway (100% coverage)  
   Scottish Borders (85% coverage)  
   Rural Stirling (transitional 5b areas)  
   Upland Tayside (transitional 5b areas)  
   North and West Grampian (transitional 5b areas) |
| Objective 3  | Regions needing support for education, training and jobs (all regions except Objective 1) | 24.05                                    | 12.3%                        | ESF                            |                                               |

Source: The EC, 1997

To assist in the effective use of resources in the new SPDs, there was a consensus that closes integration was needed between the goals of regional and national socio-economic strategies, and those which are intended to guide the EU's Structural Funds. The European Commission also required a formal assent to be given to the SPD by all the regional partners. This encouraged regional partners to work together, co-ordinated by the Programme Executives on behalf of the Scottish Executive, to agree on proposals for the contents of programmes, which inevitably will represent compromises between the various organisations (Colwell and McLaren, 1999).

The other significance aspect of EU policy reform concerns CAP reform. It is pointed
out, by Baldock et al., that "the mid-1990s saw increasing interest in combining the agricultural structures measures of the CAP with the partnership approaches to rural development employed in the Structural Funds" (2001: 16). In 1996, at the conference on rural development at Cork in Ireland, an 'integrated rural policy' was adopted. "Central to the Cork agenda was the notion that some element of the resources saved from future reductions in agricultural commodity support should be recycled within rural areas through agriculture-environment, agricultural structures and rural development spending. The 'Cork Declaration' pointed towards an expanded rural development programme with an emphasis on including the whole, farmed countryside" (ibid: 16). The new rural development policy Rural Development Regulation (RDR), which is the most radical feature of the European Commission's Agenda 2000 proposals for the reform of the CAP (Lowe and Ward, 1998), is regarded as the 'second pillar' of the CAP. The Regulation aims to put in place a consistent and lasting framework for guaranteeing the future of rural areas and promoting the maintenance and creation of employment (EU Rural Development website).

Each Member State was required to draw up seven year rural development plans for the period 2000-2006, in which all kinds of rural development, such as forestry and agri-environment measures, were to be integrated within a single plan. In effect, it is said that "a fragmented set of EU farm structures, forestry and regional adjustment policies has been welded together, broadened in scope and elevated to a new strategic status" (Baldock et al., 2001: 17). The Rural Development Programme for Scotland was approved in December 2000 and it "aims to promote the sustainable economic, environmental and social development of rural areas through extensive land management and enhancing biodiversity, encouraging diversification into forestry and supporting farming incomes in the Less Favoured Areas" (European Commission, 2000e).

4.4.2. Community Initiatives

The Community Initiatives, which were launched for the first time in 1989, are special instruments of the European Community's structural policies, complementing the Community Support Frameworks (CSFs) and Single Programming Documents (SPDs),
which are proposed by the Member States and negotiated with the Commission (EC, 1998). Originally, there were 13 Initiatives, some of which were entirely new (Employment-Youthstart, Adapt, Textiles and clothing in Portugal, Urban and Pesca) while the other extended, expanded or embraced measures which had already begun (see Appendix 6). The Community Initiatives have mainly three features:

- Support for the development of trans-national, cross-border and inter-regional cooperation;
- A ‘bottom-up’ method of implementation; and
- A high profile on the ground through expanded partnership

**LEADER programme**

LEADER, the rural development version of Community Initiatives, was introduced in 1991 for a three-year period and was extended in 1995 by an expanded, five-year version: LEADER 2. LEADER is a single intervention interpreted in manifold national, regional and local situations throughout the EU (Ray, 2000) and conducted directly by the Commission not through their respective governments. It is said, by Black and Conway (1996), that the aim of this direct route to Brussels for applications is to ensure that the funds are allocated to projects, which the Commission has approved and not diverted to projects favoured by member states. A key concept of LEADER was the dissemination of best practice around Europe through a rural development network of Local Actions Groups (LAGs) in each country. Adopting a ‘bottom-up’ approach, it aimed to foster innovative approaches and local partnerships for rural development. At operational level, the local partnership was required to include representatives of local authorities, development agencies, voluntary organisations and community groups (Black and Conway, 1996).

The LEADER initiative was intended to encourage the involvement of local inhabitants, associations and collective bodies which, together, will define and implement coherent development strategies to meet the specific needs of the rural areas where they operate. LAGs, which consist with the public and private partners, drew up joint development strategies and received financial assistance under LEADER.
Other collective bodies (cooperatives, chambers of agriculture, collective bodies) could also submit eligible projects. Most of programmes relate to the three main measures set out in the Commission’s guidelines; (1) rural innovation, (2) skill acquisition, and (3) trans-national cooperation (see Table 4.5). In October 1997, there were 775 LAGs and 46 other types of collective actors across the Member States (EC, 1998). In the UK, 5 regions were identified as eligible areas, and in the Highlands and Islands, Scotland, 9 LEADER areas were approved (see Table 4.5). Many of LAGs were composed of representatives drawn from Local Enterprise Companies, Local Councils, key public agencies and private and voluntary sectors.

Table 4.5: LEADER programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Aims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural innovation</td>
<td>To provide finance for innovative development strategies drawn up by local people for their areas Innovation appears in the proposed programmes in various guises The nature of the projects proposed (new services, exploitation of the cultural identity of the areas, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill acquisition</td>
<td>To provide finance for measures to inform and motivate local people, for territorial analyses to identify the strengths and weaknesses of an area and for the presentation of an appropriate development strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans-national cooperation</td>
<td>For LAGs or others from more than one Member State to carry out joint projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UK LEADER2 approved since 1994 (source EC 1998) (http://www.rural-europe.aeidl.be)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Total amount (ECU million)</th>
<th>Contribution of the Structural Fund</th>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Total budget (ECU 1000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highlands &amp; Islands</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>Argyll &amp; the Islands</td>
<td>7737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>31.47</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>Caithness &amp;Sutherland</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>57.78</td>
<td>25.85</td>
<td>Lochaber</td>
<td>5111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish 5b areas</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>Moray Badenoch &amp; Strathpey</td>
<td>1766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>Ross &amp; Cromarty</td>
<td>3147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Inverness &amp; Nairn</td>
<td>1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Isles, Skye &amp;Lochalsh</td>
<td>9585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Community Initiatives from 2000

Following the EU Structural policy reform and the end of second period of Community Initiatives, Agenda 2000 reduced the number of Community Initiatives from 13 to 4 measures, covering the themes shown in Table 4.6. The key principles of the new Community Initiatives are summarised as threefold; (1) a bottom-up approach, (2) combined with the regional and local responsibility and (3) involvement (the
As a principle in reforming the Initiative measures, simplification was a key theme. Firstly, 13 measures were reduced to 4 measures. The second simplification is that each Community Initiative was to be financed by only one of the Structural Funds. INTERREG and URBAN area financed under the ERDF, LEADER+ under the EAGGF and EQUAL under the ESF. Hence the scope of each Community Initiative would also include measures covered by the other Funds. For instance, INTERREG, under the ERDF, should also be able to support activities that normally belonged under the ESF or EAGGF. In this way, it is deemed that action under each Community Initiative would be more closely tailored to the problems to be tackled and to the needs of the authorities deploying the resources. Thirdly, it was pointed out that administrative and assessment arrangements should be as simple and informal as possible and approval procedures should be speeded up, and accordingly, the administrative machinery should be streamlined (EC, 2000a).

It was also mentioned as a principle of the new Community Initiatives that as the Community Initiatives supplement the other Structural Fund initiatives under the programme for the new Objectives 1, 2 and 3 regions, the Community Initiatives should be coordinated with the Member States' programming documents and the operational programmes. Therefore, the vital role played by regional and local authorities in connection with the framing, implementation and assessment of programmes was stressed.

As far as LEADER is concerned, there are many evaluations of the previous LEADER
projects on which the new rural development measure, LEADER+ follows (Ray, 1996, 1998, 2000; Black and Conway, 1996; Shucksmith, 2000b; Barke and Newton, 1997; EC, 2000b). Firstly, LEADER1 marked the start of a new approach to rural development policy which is territorially based, integrated and participative. Secondly, LEADER 2 saw the LEADER 1 approach put to more widespread use, with emphasis on the innovative aspect of projects. The strengths and weaknesses of the LEADER approach are summarised as following four points shown in Table 4.7. Additionally, the lessons learned from LEADER areas can be applied to all rural areas in the fifteen EU member states.

**Table 4.7: The strengths and weaknesses of LEADER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mobilising of local actors to reflect on and take control of the future of their area</td>
<td>Delays in the selection of beneficiaries and consequently in the launching of programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its decentralised, integrated and bottom-up approach to territorial development</td>
<td>The creation of fragile partnerships when roles are poorly defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opening-up of rural areas to other territories by the exchange and transfer of experience and through the creation of networks</td>
<td>The accumulation of disparate procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its ability to take into consideration small-scale actions when administrative, technical and financial intermediaries are present who can support promoters of small projects</td>
<td>The dispersal of financial resources access a very large number of LAGs, resulting in interventions of low effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

source: EC, 2000b

The new initiative LEADER+ aimed to encourage and help rural actors to think about the longer-term potential of their area. It seeks to encourage the implementation of integrated, high-quality, original strategies for sustainable development designated to encourage experimenting with new ways of:

1. enhancing the natural and cultural heritage;
2. reinforcing the economic environment, in order to contribute to job creation; and
3. improving the organisational abilities of their community.

Moreover, 'cooperation' was a fundamental component of LEADER+, which must be created within rural areas, between such areas in the same Member State, between rural areas in several Member States and even beyond if necessary (EC, 2000b). To concentrate Community resources on the most promising proposals and to give them maximum leverage, LEADER+ is structured around three actions (see Table 4.8).
Table 4.8: Action criteria of LEADER+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1      | Support for integrated territorial rural development strategies of a pilot nature based on the bottom-up approach and horizontal partnerships  
- The presentation of a development plan  
- Based on a representative partnership  
- Structured around a strong theme typical of the identity of the territory concerned |
| 2      | Support for interterritorial and transnational cooperation  
- Achieving the critical mass necessary for a joint project to be viable  
- Encouraging complementary actions |
| 3      | The networking of all rural areas in the Community, whether or not beneficiaries under LEADER+, and all rural development actors  
- Stimulating and achieving cooperation between territories  
- Providing information and drawing lessons concerning territorial rural development |

Undertaken by Scottish Executive, Team Community Initiatives, *The Single Programming Document (SPD) for the Scottish Leader + Programme 2000-2006* set out proposals for the involvement of local communities in rural areas developing and testing pilot strategies and innovative approaches to strategic, integrated and sustainable development of these areas (Scottish Executive, 2001). The SPD set out the overarching Programme for the Leader + Community Initiative in Scotland. The Scottish Leader + Programme makes over £17 million of European funding available over six years. With the addition of co-financing the overall value of the Programme is over £34 million.

Like the former LEADER1 and 2 programmes, Local Action Groups (LAGs) are in charge of its implementation at operational level. After the consultation period, 13 LAGs were finally approved in Scotland (see Table 4.9). As seen in Table 4.9, the former 9 LAGs under LEADER 2 in the Highlands & Islands area were re-organised into 5 new LAGs. These approved LAGs were required to submit more detailed Business Plans setting out how they envisage implementing the Initiative over the following six years. The Scottish Executive monitors progress set against this Business Plan and was responsible for a review after three years. The first Business Plan covered the period 2001-2003, and further Business Plans are required during the lifetime of the programme. The major change is an administrative shift from Highlands & Islands Enterprise and the Local Enterprise Companies Network to the Scottish Executive and Local Authorities (although some LAGs continue to operate under LECs, for instance,
Northern Isles under Shetland Enterprise).

Table 4.9: LEADER 2 and LEADER + in Scotland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argyll &amp; the Islands</td>
<td>Argyllie, the Isles &amp; Lochaber LEADER +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochaber</td>
<td>Western Isles, Skye and Lochalsh LEADER +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Isles, Skye &amp; Lochalsh</td>
<td>Northern Isles LEADER +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caithness &amp; Sutherland</td>
<td>North Highland Youth Partnership and North &amp; West highlands Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross &amp; Cromarty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Inverness &amp; Nairn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray Badenoch &amp; Strathpey</td>
<td>Moray Community Action LEADER +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cairngorms Partnership LEADER +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dumfries &amp; Galloway LEADER +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Fife LEADER +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lomond &amp; Rural Stirling LEADER +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upland Tayside LEADER +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Borders LEADER +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tyne/Esk LEADER +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3. The LIFE Programme

LIFE is a financial instrument supporting European Community environmental policy. The general objective of LIFE is to contribute to the implementation, updating and development of Community environment policy and of environmental legislation, in particular regarding the integration of the environment into other policies, and to sustainable development in the European Community.

Background

Adopted in 1992, the first phase was completed in 1992-1995. A revised regulation was adopted in 1996 for a second phase covering the period 1996-1999. Before LIFE, a number of financial instruments provided support to actions in the environmental field (http://europa.eu.int/comm-life/whatis.htm). Most of the financial instruments of the European Union have an element directly or indirectly concerning the environment, but LIFE is the only instrument which specially supported the development and implementation of Community environment policy (EC, 2000c). Basically, the LIFE
programme consisted of three major areas of action: Environment, Nature and Third Countries. While all three areas aim to improve the environment, each had its specific priorities. Actions of each area to which LIFE funding is available are summarised in Table 4.10. The LIFE 3 regulation was adopted by the Council in June 2000 and by the European Parliament in July 2000. A financial framework of ECU 640 million was provided for LIFE 3 (2000-2004), of which 47% was earmarked for LIFE-Environment, 47% for LIFE-Nature and 6% LIFE-Third Countries (EC, 2000c)

### Table 4.10: Actions eligible for LIFE funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Total budget (2000-2004) ECU 640 M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>➢ Innovative and demonstration actions for industry</td>
<td>ECU 300.8 M (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Demonstration, promotion and technical assistance actions for local authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Preparatory actions to support community legislation and policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>➢ The conservation actions of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora of EU interest</td>
<td>ECU 300.8 M (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Countries</td>
<td>➢ Technical assistance in the establishment of environment administrative structures, nature conservation actions and demonstration actions to promote sustainable development</td>
<td>ECU 38.4 M (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEFE-Environment programme**

To achieve the objective of LIFE-Environment, which is to contribute to the development of innovative and integrated techniques and methods and to the further development of Community environment policy, this focuses on two different types of projects; demonstration projects and preparatory projects. LIFE-Environment demonstration projects are categorised into 5 themes; (1) Land use development and planning, (2) Water management, (3) Impacts of economic activities, (4) Waste management, and (5) Integrated production policy (see Appendix 7). The preparatory projects are called for separately by the Commission on an ad-hoc basis.
4.5. Conclusion

As described above, there are three key themes in rural development policies: sustainable development, partnership and community involvement. These key words repeatedly appear in many documents that both supra-national and national governments published in the 1990s. This attempt can be seen as the results of changes in the political climate such as Scottish devolution, re-organisation of local authorities and EU enlargement. In addition to this, it is influenced by globalisation and economic integration, together with wider substantive policy problems ranging from transport and energy to pollution control, sustainability, and agriculture (Tewdwr-Jones and Williams, 2001).

As far as rural development is concerned, the most notable event in the 1990s in Scotland was clearly the publication of the Rural White Paper in 1995. Since then, it has been increasingly recognised and accepted that development in rural areas is neither just a sectoral problem nor simply a question of economies. A consensus has emerged that it is constructive to view rural development as a broad notion, encompassing all important issues pertinent to the individual and collective vitality of rural people and places (Harkonen and Kahila, 1999).

After the Scottish Rural White Paper was issued, people-centred and partnership approaches have become taken for granted. This was also the result of pressure on public funding, which forced public subsidies available for rural development to be targeted efficiently so as to maximise the economic, social, cultural and environmental benefits. In order to achieve this objective, endogenous approaches were employed in community development programmes in Scotland, which gave preference to making the most of local resources, including human capital, and encouraged local people as agents in the development process. In effect, participation becomes both a means and an end of rural development (Lowe et al., 1998) and builds the basis of a spatial or territorial as opposed to a sectoral approach to rural development (Huillet et al., 1990).

This territorially-focused development also derives from certain pilot programmes such as the EU LEADER initiative. Particularly in the economically disadvantaged parts of
the UK, such as the Highlands and Islands in Scotland, the real significance of the EU lies in its potential for maximising the benefits that can be obtained from funding programmes (Roberts, 1997). Tewdwr-Jones and Williams (2001) point out that, through EU intervention in rural development in the UK, there is an attempt to enhance the European dimension of planning and to adopt a Continental concept of ‘spatial planning’ as a means of developing a more complete policy framework. They describe ‘spatial planning’ as concerns of “the location of both physical structures and activities within the territory of the jurisdiction to which it is applied”, which aims “to provide coherence and coordination of policy making for the variety of authorities and agencies that may need to take spatial decisions, and provide guidance and greater certainty for private sector developers” (ibid: 7). With the influence of the EU’s spatial policy, the term ‘spatial planning’ has come into widespread use in the latter 1990s in the UK (see Healey et al. 1997; Vigar et al. 2000; Harris. 2002).

Seeking effective means of spatial planning, community involvement can be achieved only through an appropriate partnership approach. Despite all policy documents related to community development including ‘partnership’ as a means of implementation, this appears to be limited to the formal government sector. Community Planning in Scotland, in particular, tends to focus on the effective delivery of public services, and therefore the coordination of cooperative actions amongst public agencies is highly prioritised. In this case, there is a rhetoric of community leadership from the local authorities, however, it is uncertain whether this kind of leadership is either desired by, or appropriate to, local communities.

It might be too early to judge the extent to which Community Planning would create a new form of governance, breaking through the narrowly defined planning system which describes in essence the statutory planning process of development control and development plan preparation. However, whilst the frequent appearance of key words such as ‘sustainable development’, ‘partnership’, and ‘community involvement’ that every policy related to rural development uses, there is little concern about the policy integration between those initiatives described in previous sections.

In the Scottish context, there is a clear agenda for rural development at national and
local authority levels, but it has not yet penetrated down to the community level. On the other hand, there are relatively long histories and rich experiences of community-led projects, which have been driven by LEADER since 1991. What is now required is to inlay these fragmented individual projects into a strategic framework. This should include programmes and strategic policies both in the Scottish and EU contexts. What Agenda 2000 in EU policy generates is a commitment that the various farm, rural development and agri-environmental measures should be brought together within one Regulation (Lowe and Ward, 1998). They are also to be subject to new decision-making and resource-allocation procedures (programming, subsidiarity, co-financing and flexibility across measures) intended to provide “Member States with an opportunity of defining their priorities themselves and making their own choices among the schemes contained in the Regulation” (CEC, 1998). This external pressure would encourage local authorities and public agencies to consider how a ‘strategic framework’ embraces local knowledge acquired in the last decade and create a clear picture of ‘spatial planning’ in the area.
The Policy Framework for Community Development in the Highlands and Islands
5.1. Introduction

As described in Chapter 4, community development has been diffused as a planning approach in the last decade in the UK. Particularly the 1995 Rural White Papers (in England, Scotland and Walls) are seen as a watershed, and the idea of local-based initiatives has been broadly recognised and often employed by public agencies. Local authorities and governmental bodies were required to adapt their working strategies due to the government initiative, 'Modernising Government' (DETR, 1998). For many public agencies, pressures from above, such as effective public service provision, and from below, such as local community involvement, should be met alongside the top priority of the national strategy, 'sustainable development' (HM Government, 1990; 1994; 1999; Scottish Office, 1999).

In the Highlands and Islands, in the northern part of Scotland, the last decade saw an increasing number of programmes set up and implemented in order to enhance the quality of life for local communities. What is different from the conventional approach is the way in which these initiatives for communities are driven by a partnership; a consortium consisting of local authority, public agencies, private sector, voluntary sector and community representatives. This chapter aims to describe the general picture of the community development landscape in the Highlands and Islands, focusing on the partnership structure and its establishment. To achieve this task, firstly, a wide array of programmes relevant to community development is described from the viewpoint of their mechanisms, including when they were launched, for what purposes and what type of partnership was set up (Section 5.3). Following this general picture, the chapter focuses on the case study area of North Sutherland and describes the process of how certain programmes designated for the area were moulded by the local situation (Section 5.4).

To understand the general picture of the community development landscape in the Highlands and Islands, data was gathered from official archives, held by relevant organisations, and through face-to-face interviews with officers involved in the partnerships. Together with this information, the partnership structure as a whole in the area is summarised in order to provide a basis for the analysis of community
development through partnership, which will be discussed in the following chapter.

5.2. General information about the area

5.2.1. Area and population

The area of the Highlands and Islands stretches for over 640 kilometres from the Shetland Isles in the north, to Campbeltown at the southern tip of Argyll. The Highlands and Islands has a total land area of 39,919 square kilometres (about 51% of the land mass of Scotland) and a coastline of over 9,000 kilometres. Land in the east of the Highlands and on several Islands such as Orkney, Jura and Bute is agriculturally productive. In the centre of the Highlands and in many locations on the west, the land rises to mountains over 1,000 metres and is characterised by broken rocky, heather moors. On the west coast, many sea lochs provide locations for the area’s growing fish farming industry, inshore fishing and areas for yachts to explore.
The Highlands and Islands is one of the most sparsely populated regions of the European Union. The population in 2000 was 430,241 (about 8.4% of the Scottish population) (HIE, 2001) and a population density of only 10.8 persons per square kilometre (EU average of 116 square kilometre), which is one of the lowest of any NUTS 2 area in Europe. In addition to a very low population density, 30% of the population of the Highlands and Islands live on more than ninety inhabited islands. Inverness is the largest settlement with more than 40,000 people and Fort William, situated at the foot of Ben Nevis, is the second largest settlement. The inner Moray Firth (Nairn, Inverness, Dingwall, Alness and Invergordon) contains approximately 70,000 people, or nearly 20% of the Highlands and Islands population. With such a dispersed population, 61% of Highlands and Islands residents live in rural areas or settlements of fewer than 5,000 people.

As the above figure shows, by 1961 the population had fallen by some 30% to 302,000, from a peak in 1851. Between 1921 and 1961 alone the Highlands and Islands lost almost a quarter of its population. The concomitant of heavy out migration was

---

1 NUTS units is a system of territorial definition that can work throughout the EU, in order to define the areas of benefit of the Structural Funds. The whole of the EU is classified into three NUTS levels. Each member-state is divided into a whole number of level-1 units, each of which in turn is divided into a whole number of level-2 units, themselves divided into a whole number of level-3 units (Williams, 1996).
increasing age structure imbalance. It was during the 1970s, however, that there was a
dramatic turnaround in population trends in the Highlands and Islands. These were the
areas to benefit directly and indirectly from oil-related development. Population growth
during the 1980s had clearly moderated, yet was still in evidence, in contrast to the
overall position of decline in Scotland. Compared with the previous decade, therefore,
the 1980s are seen to be characterized by a narrowing of the range of a real variation in
population change within the Highlands and Islands (McCleery, 1991). Since the early
1990s there has been a different pattern of growth and decline by sub-area. Based on an
analysis of the 10 Local Enterprise Company areas (HIPP, 1999), three areas (the
Western Isles, Argyll and the islands, and Caithness and Sutherland) in the Highlands
and Islands have tended to see falls in their populations, while seven areas have gained.
The population loss in three areas was associated with the closure of a military base or a
reflection of structural economic problems. In contrast, the fastest growing part of the
Highlands and Islands has been the Inverness and Nairn area, followed by Ross and
Cromarty. Parts of the west coast have also been growing, notably Skye and Lochalsh,
although at a slower pace than in the 1980s when the population of this area increased
by almost 15%. The population structure of the area as a whole is slightly biased toward
the older age groups. Focusing on the age groups above 65 years of age, they comprise
16% of the Highlands and Islands population, compared to 15.3% for Scotland (HIPP,
1999). In the 20-44 age group the Highlands and Islands has 33.6% of its population
(36.8% for Scotland), and young people of school age (5-19 years) comprise 19.5% of
its population (18.9% for Scotland).

5.2.2. The economy

Compared to Scotland as a whole, the economic base of the Highlands and Islands is
caracterised by the continuing importance of primary industries (agriculture, forestry
and fishing) and tourism activities. However, the mountainous terrain of the region and
the short growing season still impose difficulties for agriculture and economic activity.
With the exception of agriculturally productive land in the east and on some islands,
almost all of the area is classed by the European Union as a Less-Favoured Area for
agriculture. Remote rural areas and islands in particular are highly dependent on
agriculture and fisheries. The manufacturing sector is diverse and is typified by SMEs
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and micro-enterprises. New activities in key technology industries such as medical products and pharmaceuticals, contrast with traditional sectors such as oil-related engineering and textiles. The service sector accounts for over two thirds of employment and is characterised by the importance of tourism and public administration (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.1: Employment by Industry, Highlands and Islands 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sectors</th>
<th>Highlands and Islands (% of total)</th>
<th>Scotland (% of total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, fishing and forestry</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and water</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution, hotels and restaurant</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and communications</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking, financing and insurance, etc.</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration, education and health</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1996 Annual Employment Survey (NOMIS)

Unemployment in the Highlands and Islands has declined considerably during the late 1990s, partly because of improvements in the British economy as a whole. Unemployment in the area is much more seasonal than is the case for Scotland and the UK as a whole. This reflects the importance of primary industries, tourism, and construction in the economy. Unemployment, however, varies substantially around the Highlands and Islands. High unemployment tends to be associated with the islands, notably: the Uists and Barra; Lewis and Harris in the Western Isles; Islay and Mull in Argyll; and Skye and Lochalsh. There are also high levels of unemployment found in more urban locations such as the small towns of Wick (Caithness), Campbeltown (Kintyre), and Dunoon and Rothesay (Argyll and the Islands).

Over the recent past, the Highlands and Islands has been transformed into an area characterized as suffering from the ‘Highland problem’ or a ‘downward spiral of deprivation’ (McCleery, 1991), including long-term population loss, low incomes, limited employment opportunities, dependency on a narrow and often seasonal range of economic activities, poor infrastructure, inadequate housing, poor transport, access and adverse geography. In the light of these structural problems, community-based development has been started in the area. Community-based development stresses not
just general job creation and economic growth but the preservation of community identity and the responsible use of resources (HIPP, 1999). Economic development in the area has been underpinned by what Ray called the ‘culture economy’, which attempts to “localize economic control – revalorise place through its cultural identity” (2001: 16). In the Highlands and Islands area, therefore, the focus is on offering opportunities for employment and confidence raising across a range of diverse sectors which include Gaelic, arts, culture and heritage, in particular.

These sectors have been supported under the current EU and Scottish government’s policies, such as LEADER, the Duthchas project, Scottish Social Inclusion Partnerships, and the Initiative at the Edge programme (HIPP, 1999). New and innovative opportunities exist to increase the role of communities in the stewardship and management of land and land assets, and the sustainable management of these assets for the benefit of the community. In the Highlands and Islands, the voluntary sector has played a primary role in socio-economic development. Local traditions of mutual aid, self-help organisations and other community resources are important cornerstones of the social economy, and the communities in the area have been regarded as strong in these areas. At the Highlands and Islands level, an assessment of the social economy (HIPP, 1999) showed its economic contribution to be substantial: there are 2,700 voluntary groups which employ 8,829 people and the total income of this sector amounts to £200 million, which is about 6% of GDP in the Highlands and Islands area (source: Highlands and Islands Enterprise; 1997 Assessment of Social and Community Development).

According to McCleery (1991), experience suggests, that the development of local resource-based industries would seem to offer the best prospects for future employment opportunities. A bottom-up approach to the development of remote rural regions has been advocated in the area, which involves the indigenous population in the identification of needs and resources and in the formulation and implementation of development strategies. In the following sections, the current community development programmes in the area will be described in order.
5.3. Community development programmes

This section deals with a wide range of programmes relevant to community development in the Highlands and Islands. Firstly, the European Union’s initiatives are scrutinised, which includes: Structural Policy (Objective 1); an EU Environment Programme, ‘Duthchas’; one of the Community Initiatives, ‘LEADER’; and a new programme, ‘Community Economic Development’. The emergence of the decentralised and participative approach was encouraged by supra-national policies, such as EU Structural Policy. In 1988, the debate over the most appropriate style of Structural Policy intervention for the EU resulted in the adoption of a territorial, endogenous model for rural development (Ray, 2000). Taking account of the fact that many peripheral rural areas in the UK are aided by the EU, the UK’s rural development policy in general is to follow the EU policy that emphasises participation and a ‘bottom-up’ approach which harnesses the creativity and solidarity of rural communities (European Commission, 1996).

The second part focuses the Scottish national programmes, which have been launched since the publication of the 1995 Scottish Rural White Paper. As argued in Chapter 4, current Scottish programmes have different strands. The first strand is a new driving force of community development through partnerships, so called ‘Community Planning’. The purpose of this new policy is to enhance community capacity through both community involvement and a partnership approach. The second strand is the conventional planning tool, the Structure Plan. The Highland Council is responsible for this statutory development plan to deliver public services to the local communities. The Structure Plan has covered a range of issues relevant to community life, but the current review is influenced by other non-statutory planning issues such as ‘Community Planning’. Hence, a review of the current Structure Plan is necessary. The third strand originates from the worldwide commitment to sustainable development. Every local authority is expected to contribute to sustainable development so have to set up ‘Local Agenda 21’ in some form. In addition to these strands, the New Labour administration since 1997 is strongly committed to the idea that ‘community must be central’. This policy is reflected especially in social and education policies. In Scotland, the ‘Lifelong Learning Strategy’ and the ‘Social Inclusion Partnership’ were launched in 1998 and
1999 respectively. The last strand is an area-based project, ‘Initiative at the Edge’, which is designated for the most vulnerable communities in Scotland. This is not a mainstream approach, but seemed to be an experimental pilot scheme.

The following sections describe these community development programmes including their backgrounds, launch dates, types of partnership set up, and mechanisms employed.

5.3.1. EU programmes

*Highlands and Islands Special Transitional Programme and the Highlands and Islands Plan Team*

Acknowledging that the area’s particular and unique structure problems of low population density combined with low GDP, the Special Programme for the Highlands and Islands of Scotland was approved by the European Council of Ministers in March 1999 (see also Section 4.5.1). In response, the Highlands and Islands Plan Team (HIPT) prepared the Single Programming Document (SPD) for the Highlands and Islands, which set out proposals for an integrated series of actions across the Structural Funds and Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance. The HIPT, convened in January 1999, is a partnership composed of representatives from public sector and voluntary organisations that are responsible for the area (see Table 5.2). Additionally, the SPD is recognised as the vision shared by the partnership for the region, which looks to the long term future of the Highlands and Islands; twenty or more years ahead. In the document, it is highlighted that “partnership is the key to the vision and the key to developing this Plan” (HIPP, 1999: 1).

To assist the effectiveness of the resource management, the SPD required a formal assent by all key partner organisations in the area. The Scottish experience of administering Structural Fund programmes involved the use of a well-developed partnership model. The model has ensured that partnership working was broadly based and has fully reflected the interests and concerns of the Scottish sectors. The European Commission acknowledged the Scottish model to be an effective and efficient approach to programme management and implementation (Colwell and McLaren, 1999).
5 The Policy Framework for Community Development in the Highlands and Islands

In the Highlands and Islands context, there is a Programme Executive, located in Highlands and Islands Enterprise, a socio-economic development agency, which performs the administration within the area, based on some of the functions previously performed by the Scottish Executive. The Programme Executive involves a four-tier structure: Programme Monitoring Committee; Programme Management Committee; Advisory Groups; and Programme Management Executive (see Table 5.2).

Table 5.2: The Highlands and Islands Plan Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Structure of HIPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National government</td>
<td>Programme Monitoring Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Department (convenor)</td>
<td>- To oversee the strategic implementation of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Affairs Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands &amp; Islands Partnership Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>Programme Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll and Bute Council</td>
<td>- To consider the recommendations from the Advisory Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Isles Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney Islands Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland Islands Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Aryshire Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public agencies</td>
<td>Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
<td>- To appraise projects on a priority basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands and Islands Enterprise</td>
<td>- To judge about whether projects should be approved or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish National Heritage</td>
<td>- To appraise and score project applications against the criteria set out in the SPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurso College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands of Scotland Tourist Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Highlands &amp; Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary sector &amp; Community group</td>
<td>Programme Management Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Union of Farmers Scotland</td>
<td>- To provide management and administrative support to the Committee and Advisory Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Council for Voluntary organisations</td>
<td>- To undertake a wide range of support functions to the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Council of National Training Organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colwell and McLaren, 1999

The SPD contains economic, social and environmental analyses of the area and details the strategic framework and priorities considered most appropriate in addressing the region’s development needs. The plan reflects the policies of the EU, both the UK government and Scottish parliament, and the local authorities.
The guidance for the programmes in the period 2000-2006 produced by the European Commission set three priorities for action:

1. the competitiveness of regional economies;
2. increasing employment and social cohesion; and
3. urban and rural development in the context of a balanced European territory.

As the UK government’s priorities, social inclusion and learning opportunities were particularly emphasised. The Scottish Government also had the same priorities, which were laid out in the document, *A Programme for Government, Making it Work Together* (Scottish Executive, 1999a).

At local level, Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE) launched the strategy for Enterprise Development in February 1999, which aimed to enable the people of the Highlands and Islands to realise their full potential through the three strategic objectives of:

1. strengthening communities;
2. developing skills; and
3. growing business.

As the lead agency of the Team, HIE seems to have substantially influenced the SPD. The SPD also complements the plans of local authorities of the area. The Highland Community Plan deployed a partnership method in which sustainable communities are to be developed through investing in skill-based economic activities, improving infrastructure and environment, increasing research activities, and giving local communities control over the use and management of natural assets. Similar concerns were evident in the Orkney Islands Council Strategic Plan and the Structure Plan of Moray Council, where the aim is to ensure that development is sustainable in economic, social and environmental terms.

Closely linked to these strategies, the shared vision of the Plan Team states that “our vision for the Highlands and Islands is of prosperous, inclusive and self-sustaining communities, where the unique cultures, traditions and environments are enhanced and the region makes a distinctive contribution to Scotland, the UK and the European Union” (HIPP, 1999). Emphasising the people and communities, four key issues to achieve the vision are summarised in Table 5.3.
Table 5.3: Shared Vision of the Highlands and Islands Plan

| The people of the Highlands and Islands will have access to employment and a full range of learning opportunities and social provisions thereby enabling them all to achieve their personal potential and to fully contribute to the economic and social well-being of the area |
| The people of the Highlands and Islands will generate sustainable economic prosperity and employment opportunities through innovative and outward looking action |
| The people and communities of the Highlands and Islands will have a strong and confident sense of identity, purpose and empowerment |
| The people and communities of the Highlands and Islands will sustain the environmental and cultural assets of the region in the long term |

source: HIPP, 1999

One of the significant effects of the EU Structural Funds is that local, regional and national actors built a new way to plan for and administer rural development programmes. The SPD was devised for the area with details worked out through negotiation between the European Commission, the national government and local bodies working in partnership, and actors and organisations from the target local area were given the opportunity to make an input into policy design under a new model termed 'local rural development' (Ray, 1996). This new form of decision-making and wider networks have emerged principally as part of the shift from 'local government' to 'local governance' more generally within the UK and the process has been compounded by the importance of EU Structural Fund monies in rural localities. (Jessop, 1995; Goodwin and Painter, 1996; Ward and McNicholas, 1997).

'Duthchas' Project and Partnership Group

The Duthchas Project was 50% co-funded by the EC LIFE Environment Programme for the period January 1998 – December 2000 (see Section 4.5.3). The LIFE Environment programme supported demonstration and pilot projects, which aimed to promote sustainable development and the integration of environmental considerations into land use development and planning. In order to qualify for funding, appropriate initiatives should have been at once innovative and exemplary within a European context (Duthchas leaflet).

It was steered by a partnership of nineteen public bodies and two NGO networks, shown
in Table 5.4, and worked in three pilot areas in the Highlands and Western Isles of Scotland:

- North Sutherland
- North Trotternish, in Isle of Skye
- North Uist and Berneray

These pilot areas were identified according to criteria of economic fragility and high environmental quality. Duthchas had the management structure, shown in Table 5.4, to deliver the project at national and local levels.

Table 5.4: Duthchas areas and partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Structure of Duthchas programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Executive Rural Affairs Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Council * #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Isles Council §</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands and Islands Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Scotland Water Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands and Islands Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofters Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Tourist Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Environment Protection Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Scotland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Arts Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Museums Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Highlands and Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary sector &amp; Community group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Council Development and Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Environment LINK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Central Staff** - Management, coordination and support to the areas - Working at HIE office

**Management Group** - A subset of 4 organisations from the partnership group, who play a more regular management role

**N. Sutherland** - Coordination of the work at a local level

**Pilot Area Coordinators**

**Pilot Area Advisory Groups (PAAG)** - A group set up in each pilot area to support and advice the Project locally. - Made up 50% Partner agency representatives and 50% community representatives.

Note: * only for North Sutherland, # for North Trotternish, § for North Uist and Berneray

Source: www.duthchas.org.uk

The principle aim of Duthchas was to develop mechanisms for achieving sustainable development within remote rural areas which have both high environmental quality and
fragile economies (Duthchas, 1999). The project was based on the premise that the full participation of local people with public authorities would enable the development and implementation of integrated local strategies for sustainable development and achieve measurable social, economic and environmental benefits (Duthchas Partnership Group, 1997). This concept was inspired by the critical relationship between the welfare of local communities and the condition of the natural environment that underpins them, and by the potential of a rich environmental and cultural heritage to create new opportunities for economic development and overcome the relative disadvantage of remoteness and sparse population (www.duthchas.org.uk). Duthchas, therefore, emphasised:

1. focusing on local people and communities;
2. strengthening of the local economy;
3. recognising of cultural diversity and identity;
4. enhancing of natural environment; and
5. working in a partnership way.

To achieve these aims, seven actions were planned: building a picture; sharing our ideas; focusing on the issues; planning for the future; getting to work; rewarding achievements; and monitoring progress (shown in Table 5.5). Within the three-year project period, four phases were pre-designed to finish by the end of the project, December 2000 (it eventually ended in March 2001).

Building a partnership for the implementation of Duthchas projects was not such a difficult task for those institutions involved, since at least they had experience through the EU Structural Fund partnerships (see previous section 5.3.1.1). It was, however, a challenge for some Non-Governmental Organizations and networks, who were invited to be partners, to find their roles for the projects, because they did not contribute financially as other local authorities and public bodies did. It was also a challenge for the designated local areas to train newly appointed Area Coordinators and organise Pilot Area Advisory Groups (PAAGs), which were required to involve public agencies and local community representatives equally. Unlike the establishment of National Steering Group, members of each PAAG had never experienced such consultation processes and therefore they had to start with organising the meetings. Despite the fact that developing shared identities and objectives normally takes time, the project timing was fixed in
advance and consequently there was some discord amongst participants. In some cases, they had to issue plans that were even unfinished and unsatisfactory. As each designated area has a different story, the details of the process of the programme will be discussed in the following section through the case of North Sutherland.

Table 5.5: Plans of action under the Duthchas

Introduction of project to pilot area communities  
Establishing Pilot Area Advisory Groups  
Planning of initial research and project  
Recruitment of staff  
Establishing offices  
Developing administrative and financial systems |
|---|---|
- To gain an understanding of where we are now, by highlighting all aspects of our lives including the land use, the local economy, the lifestyle, and things that are worth holding onto.  
- To draw up the “Initial Review”.  
Sharing our ideas  
- To publish a profile of our findings, stating SWOT, and  
- To hold local exhibitions, and what work needs to be done, who will assume the various responsibilities. |
- To explore the issues most important to the future of the area (setting up 5 strategy groups).  
Planning for the future  
- To draw up a formal action plan and calendar – for the management of our areas in a more sustainable way – to help us in getting the work done on time. |
- To start work on a range of projects which will demonstrate new ways for the future.  
# Duthchas does not fund projects directly but will work with our communities and public bodies to help ideas get off the ground.  
Rewarding achievements  
- To develop an award for communities, which recognises their efforts, achievements and progress that has been made.  
Monitoring progress  
- To decide what is important for the future of the area, and  
- To develop ways of measuring this, so those communities can gauge their success. |

Source: Duthchas leaflet
LEADER+ and Local Action Group

As mentioned in Section 4.5.2, the Highlands and Islands area has implemented LEADER programmes, the rural development version of Community Initiatives, since 1991. The distinctive features of the Community Initiative are: “support for the development of trans-national, cross-border and inter-regional cooperation; a bottom-up method of implementation; and the high profile on the spot which they give to Community measures” (European Commission, 1994). This early experience has given the area a chance to widen partnership-working methods. Under the LEADER programme, there were 9 Local Action Groups (LAGs) operating in the Highlands and Islands area. At the end of the LEADER 2 programme (1995-1999), a reformed version LEADER+ was introduced in 2000, which focused on ‘endogenous development’ but expands the designated areas across the whole of Scotland. Consequently, the number of LAGs in the Highlands and Islands alone was reduced from 9 to 5 (see Table 5.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAG</td>
<td>Leading Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll &amp; the Islands</td>
<td>LEADER +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochaber</td>
<td>Argylle, the Isles &amp; Lochaber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Isles, Skye &amp; Lochalsh</td>
<td>Western Isles, Skye and Lochalsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td>Northern Isles LEADER +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>Moray Community Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caithness &amp; Sutherland</td>
<td>North Highland Youth Partnership and North &amp; West Highlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross &amp; Cromarty</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Inverness &amp; Nairn</td>
<td>Moray Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were some changes in the institutional arrangement under LEADER+ from the previous programmes. Firstly, the leading bodies shifted from Local Enterprise Companies (LECs) to local authorities, except in some islands’ cases. This is linked with the shift of administration of the programme at Scottish national level, from Highlands and Islands Enterprise to Scottish Executive. Secondly, the amalgamation of some of former LAGs means that some local areas lost their autonomous institutions.
This happened in the North and West Highlands areas, where three independent LAGs (Caithness & Sutherland, Ross & Cromarty, and Rural Inverness & Nairn) under their respective LECs were replaced by two umbrella groups: North Highland Youth Partnership and North & West Highlands Heritage grouping, which are mainly led by the Highland Council. The third change is the linkage to other EU Structural Funds programmes. In the areas where the former LAGs of LEADER 2 disappeared, there are newly formed partnerships under the Community Economic Development (CED), Sub-Priority 4 (b) of the Highlands and Islands Special Transitional Programme (2000-2006), which aims to “facilitate ‘bottom-up’ community development through investment in an integrated package of actions at the local level” (Scottish Executive, 2000e). These partnerships or forums of the CED programme are seen as successors to the former LAGs. For instance, in the Caithness & Sutherland area, the Caithness and Sutherland Community Economic Development Forum, led by Caithness & Sutherland Enterprise Company’s administration, replaces the former LAG, and the new Forum membership is almost the same as that of the LAG (see Table 5.7).

Table 5.7: Membership of Community Economic Development Forum in Caithness & Sutherland area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CED Forum (2000 onwards)</th>
<th>[Prioritised themes]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Groups Caithness</td>
<td>Access to opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Groups East Sutherland</td>
<td>Green and cultural tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Sutherland Council for Voluntary Action*</td>
<td>Local produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of Caithness Community Councils*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Crofting Federation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Farmers Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands of Scotland Tourist Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caithness and Sutherland Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Highland College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSPB*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: *agencies who were not members of LEADER LAG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Eligible projects]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local services, business and infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural/cultural resource based activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fisheries industry support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caithness & Sutherland Community Economic Development leaflet

“Planning for CED began as far back as early 1999, when representatives of the LEADER 2 Local Action Group in Caithness & Sutherland began the process of developing a rural development plan for the areas” (Caithness & Sutherland Local Development Group, 2001), and its Local Development Plan aims to enhance the ability
of local communities to develop and implement their own priorities. The priorities of the plan and eligible projects through the CED measures are summarised in Table 5.7. In the light of this arrangement, it is assumed that the area would carry on their preferred development activities under CED a mainstream funding rather than LEADER+, but in similar ways to that which they have experienced through the LEADER programmes.

LEADER+ was targeted only at those areas covered by the selected LAGs. However, it has been confirmed that “the LEADER+ network can extend further and lessons learned can be tried in other contexts such as through the CED priority of the Highlands & Islands Special Transitional Programme or within the Objective 2 Programmes in Scotland” and “The Scottish LEADER+ Programme will require to co-ordinate with other mainstream Structural Funds programmes across Scotland in order to ensure that there is no duplication of effort and the most efficient use of resources” [sic](Section 1.9, Scottish Executive, 2000d). It can be concluded that LEADER-type programmes that are as decentralised as possible and based on partnership and co-operation between all levels concerned (local, regional, national and European) will be the mainstream of the future rural development.

5.3.2. Scottish programmes

The White Paper on rural areas from the Scottish Office in 1995 marked an important milestone for rural planning in Scotland. The White Paper particularly emphasised the importance of addressing issues through voluntary arrangements, a bottom-up approach involving the local community, and in an integrated and non-sectoral way. Since then, a series of important events happened in Scottish politics. In 1996, with the reorganisation of local authorities, 32 unitary authorities were created. In May 1999, following the New Labour Government’s manifesto, the Scottish Parliament came into being. These political changes have provoked a wide range of new initiatives in rural planning policy and relevant programmes in Scotland. In this part, seven initiatives / policies, which focus on the issues of community, partnership, and sustainability, will be summarised.
Community Planning and Wellbeing Alliance

Following the publication of the Scottish Office / COSLA Community Planning Working Group’s report in June 1998 (The Scottish Office, 1998), the Highland Council was appointed as one of five pathfinder authorities which were asked to produce Community Plans by December 1998. In the Highlands, it was decided that the approach to Community Planning should be built on the existence of a number of partnership arrangements. In particular, the Wellbeing Alliance (WBA) was created in 1996 as a series of informal meetings between the chief executives of five key public service agencies. (see Table 5.8) It was asked to be in charge of drawing up a Community Plan.

The origin of the establishment of the Wellbeing Alliance (WBA) was to identify a common interest in promoting the well-being of the people of Highland, to share ideas of key public agencies and to develop their joint activities (the WBA, 2000). However, it is said that at the early stage, while there were data and information to share between partner agencies, “the WBA did not have particular things to do” (comment from Policy Officer of the Highland Council). It was, therefore, reasonable for the WBA to take responsibility for leading the Community Planning process and this led to the formalisation of the status of the WBA itself. The WBA started with the formation of the working groups, led by the Council’s Head of Policy, including representation from Scottish Natural Heritage, in order to take forward Community Planning and to produce a draft Plan. In addition to the Community Planning group within the WBA, there were two sub-groups set up at the beginning of process: Community Safety; and Young People (see also Table 5.8 that shows the current structure of the WBA). As a lead partnership in the Community Planning process, the WBA has been criticised for not extending the formal Partnership to include a number of other organisations. The WBA’s response to this was that “reluctantly we have decided against this as the numbers involved in Partnership meetings would make the process unmanageable” (the WBA, 2000). However, as Table 5.8 shows, the Alliance tries to involve more people and partners through the sub groups and projects that consist of representation from other organisations.
The specific activities agreed by the six partners for the Pathfinder project were:

1. agreeing partnership arrangements for Community Planning;
2. agreeing shared objectives and resourcing priorities;
3. agreeing the issues in *Looking Ahead for the Highlands* (an earlier strategic vision document);
4. reviewing and simplifying partnership and planning arrangements; and
5. agreeing local community priorities and how they would be addressed

(COSLA, 2000a)

In the Highlands case, the draft Community Plan was published in April 1999, and after the consultation period, the final Community Plan was published in January 2000.

Table 5.8: Wellbeing Alliance: key partner agencies and institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Structure of WBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National government</td>
<td>WBA Partners &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>sub-group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(includes SIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaelic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data and Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LA21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public agencies</td>
<td>Local Rural Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>such as PRIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sutherland Partnership...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary sector &amp;</td>
<td>Initiative at the Edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Wellbeing Alliance, 2000b; interview to Planning Officer of the Highland Council

The Highland Community Plan gives common ground on which actions will be taken toward achieving their goals. The overall purpose of the Plan is “to map out a course between what our community is today and what those who live here would like it to be in five, ten, even twenty years from now – and then to launch the actions which will start us in the right direction” (WBA, 2000b). To achieve this, three main commitments have been agreed:
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- a commitment to working in a partnership way;
- a commitment that the Community Plan will influence and reflect a wide range of other plans and strategies; and
- a commitment to a continuing process.

The Action Programme set out in Section 3 (p14-29) of the Community Plan is structured around five perspectives on community life in the Highlands: (1) Prosperous Communities; (2) Learning Communities; (3) Capable, Confident Communities; (4) Healthy, Safe Communities; and (5) Communities Rich in Their Heritage.

Local Rural Partnership

The Local Rural Partnership (LRP) is the key mechanism for delivering the new partnership approach. To date (July 2002), a total of 12 Local Rural Partnerships have been registered in the Highland Council area. This seems to be a small percentage of the total number of rural partnerships in the area, most of which are not registered. For instance, it is said that in the Highland area alone, there are in excess of 150 partnerships (Halhead, 2001). The Wellbeing Alliance can be seen as one of the LRPs. However, due to its large area coverage, a two-tier structure is employed in the Highland: the WBA is a strategic partnership covering the whole Highland area, and 12 LRPs operating in each area. Here, LRPs refer to partnerships that operate at local level (sub-Highland regional level). Because of the fact that the LRPs vary in its institutional structure, the size and area coverage, and the number of partners, it is difficult to articulate every LRP's circumstance. Nevertheless it is worth describing an example of a LRP, which shows general picture of what LRP aims to do and how it works in a particular local context.

As one of the first Local Rural Partnerships to gain registration status with the Scottish Executive, the Sutherland Partnership, an alliance between key public, private, community and voluntary sector bodies, was set up in 1996 as a Company Limited by Guarantee (Sutherland Partnership, 2000). The Partnership covers the whole Sutherland area, the northern part of Highlands. The overall aim of the Partnership is to "bring about sustainable economic, social and environmental change which will improve the
quality of life for people in communities throughout Sutherland by tackling the problem of rural disadvantage and maximising the potential of its environmental assets" (Sutherland Partnership, 2000). In practice, it was expected that “the Partnership will have a pivotal role in generating applications for the Rural Challenge Fund, advising the Scottish Office on the priority ranking that should be given to applications within the area and monitoring progress of these projects that are funded” (Sutherland Partnership, 1997). The partners of the partnership are shown in Table 5.9.

In terms of organisation structure, it is a two-tier structure comprising a Board of Management, with representatives drawn from all constituent partners, and three issue-based Development Forums with representatives drawn from a wide variety of public, private, voluntary and community sector organisations. Table 5.9 shows organisational structure of the Partnership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National government</th>
<th>National government</th>
<th>National government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authorities</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Highland Council</td>
<td>The Highland Council</td>
<td>The Highland Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public agencies</th>
<th>Public agencies</th>
<th>Public agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caithness &amp; Sutherland Enterprise</td>
<td>Caithness &amp; Sutherland Enterprise</td>
<td>Caithness &amp; Sutherland Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands of Scotland Tourist board</td>
<td>Highlands of Scotland Tourist board</td>
<td>Highlands of Scotland Tourist board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Highland College</td>
<td>North Highland College</td>
<td>North Highland College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Crofters Union</td>
<td>Scottish Crofters Union</td>
<td>Scottish Crofters Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Authority</td>
<td>Forestry Authority</td>
<td>Forestry Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Care NHS Trust</td>
<td>Primary Care NHS Trust</td>
<td>Primary Care NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voluntary sector &amp; Community group</th>
<th>Voluntary sector &amp; Community group</th>
<th>Voluntary sector &amp; Community group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West Sutherland Council for Community Action</td>
<td>North West Sutherland Council for Community Action</td>
<td>North West Sutherland Council for Community Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Groups – East Sutherland</td>
<td>Voluntary Groups – East Sutherland</td>
<td>Voluntary Groups – East Sutherland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North &amp; West Federation of Community Councils</td>
<td>North &amp; West Federation of Community Councils</td>
<td>North &amp; West Federation of Community Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of South East Sutherland Community Councils</td>
<td>Association of South East Sutherland Community Councils</td>
<td>Association of South East Sutherland Community Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Parbh</td>
<td>Am Parbh</td>
<td>Am Parbh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private sector</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of Sutherland Partnership</th>
<th>Structure of Sutherland Partnership</th>
<th>Structure of Sutherland Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Management Directors Advisors</td>
<td>Board of Management Directors Advisors</td>
<td>Board of Management Directors Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Advisory Groups</td>
<td>Project Advisory Groups</td>
<td>Project Advisory Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership &amp; Funding Manager</td>
<td>Partnership &amp; Funding Manager</td>
<td>Partnership &amp; Funding Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Initiative</td>
<td>Community Transport Initiative</td>
<td>Community Transport Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Officer</td>
<td>Community Transport Officer</td>
<td>Community Transport Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Futures Sutherland Project Leader</td>
<td>New Futures Sutherland Project Leader</td>
<td>New Futures Sutherland Project Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion Partnership Project Worker</td>
<td>Social Inclusion Partnership Project Worker</td>
<td>Social Inclusion Partnership Project Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum</td>
<td>Forum</td>
<td>Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Tourism Business Support Biodiversity</td>
<td>Community Development Tourism Business Support Biodiversity</td>
<td>Community Development Tourism Business Support Biodiversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9: Sutherland Partnership: partner agencies and institution

In 1997, the Partnership drew up the first strategic framework document, *A Platform For Growth* (1997), which provided a firm foundation for the Partnership’s members to work together for the economic, social and environmental well being of Sutherland. In
December 1999, it was agreed that the Partnership should review and update its first strategic document in order to ensure that its strategies consisted of and reflected the current political, social and economic climate (Sutherland Partnership, 2000). A reviewed Strategy was issued in 2000, which is used to inform the public of the policies of the Partnership and forms the basis of the Sutherland Partnership’s Action Plan in order to facilitate a move towards more sustainable communities in Sutherland. Table 5.10 shows a new set of principles that were originally identified in the 1997 Strategy and objectives that provide a framework for partnership action at a Sutherland wide level. It is also clearly stated that “the role of the Sutherland Partnership is to complement and add value to the existing policy framework of its constituent members”, therefore, “its objectives and subsequent actions are compatible with statutory documents such as the Council’s Structure/Local Plans and other key reports” (Sutherland Partnership, 2000).

Table 5.10: Principles and Objectives of Sutherland Partnership (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Strategic objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To enhance income and employment levels</td>
<td>Objective 1: To facilitate a climate for increasing employment through the expansion of existing local business and community initiatives, and to attract complementary inward investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To strengthen local communities and their capacity to develop their own solutions to local issues</td>
<td>Objective 2: To empower communities and individuals to initiate, develop and manage locally relevant initiatives as part of an integrated approach to community planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To improve the quality of service delivery and provision of facilities</td>
<td>Objective 3: To promote economic and social development measures which assist in maintaining and improving rural services and providing access to them for the local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To ensure that all development and economic activity is environmentally sustainable in accordance with Local Agenda 21</td>
<td>Objective 4: To realise the area’s potential for tourism through effective partnership working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reduce the marginalisation of the disadvantaged</td>
<td>Objective 5: To support a programme of positive area promotion and image building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To improve the quality of life by ensuring a sound infrastructure including social welfare, housing, health provision, education, recreation, sports, arts, culture and heritage</td>
<td>Objective 6: To bring about improvements in the quality and management of the built and natural environment in a sustainable manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To strengthen and diversify the local economy</td>
<td>Objective 7: To co-ordinate and improve the quality of training and other labour market initiatives as a means of promoting employment and life long learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To maximise the opportunities for locally-added value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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According to an evaluation report on Local Rural Partnerships by the Scottish Executive (The Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, 2000), there can be seen some benefits including improvement of communication between agencies and local organisations, and efficient resource distribution by joint working. It is also pointed out, by Halhead (2001), that this has resulted in better links with communities, strong capacity to take up Government and other initiatives and funding opportunities, increased support for local project development and assistance for the growth of new local organisations.

**Local Agenda 21 Highland**

The Highland Council adopted Local Agenda 21 (LA21) following the Scottish Executive initiative. Unlike Community Planning, this task required only the efforts of local authority, and therefore the process of adopting LA21 was undertaken within the Highland Council. However, as the following process shows, LA21 is necessarily involved in the Community Planning process and some other community development programmes.

The Highland Council issued a statement in a form of leaflet containing principles of sustainable development and an Action Plan with 21 steps (see Table5.11). In the leaflet, it is stated LA21 challenges us to test our policy and practice against what is sustainable. The LA21 Highland aims:

1. to look for local solutions;
2. to build on where we are now;
3. to encourage all the public agencies to become involved;
4. to bring in business, voluntary and community organisations; and
5. to publish progress

It argues that it is up to “you and me to do our bit” (The Highland Council, Sustainable Highland, Local Agenda 21 Highland leaflets).
### Table 5.11: Principles and Action Plan of LA21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questioning what we do and why?</td>
<td>building in sustainable principles into the new Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting needs</td>
<td>every Council Service to develop understanding of key sustainability issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating policies</td>
<td>develop policy on integrating sustainable thinking into Council papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone counts</td>
<td>keep members and the public informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise use of resources</td>
<td>council teams to look at what sustainability means and identify 4 additional things that they are going to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>an action plan on enhanced energy and resource savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community action</td>
<td>Green Commuter Plans: encouraging other travel to work options than by car. Lends credibility to wider concerns about rural fuel prices and also a sustainability issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for the future</td>
<td>“Buy Sustainable” action, purchasing more environmentally-friendly and more local goods and services where possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable accounting</td>
<td>LA21 “Blue Peter Badge” scheme for employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World responsibilities</td>
<td>Draw the links with other Well-being initiatives such as Community Planning, Social Inclusion Partnership and Community Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary principle</td>
<td>A Sustainable Communities Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining environmental quality</td>
<td>Safer Route to School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making it happen</td>
<td>Working with our Partners in the public and voluntary Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring progress</td>
<td>WHAM: Support of the local WHAM group through landfill tax contributions is a cost-effective way of Highland promoting waste minimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A belief that things change</td>
<td>Local Biodiversity Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making quick wins to make everyone more aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LA21 wall planner to every house, display materials and leaflets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hold local workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LA21 electronic newsletter and web site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate message of sustainability in core training programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jimmy Cricket; nominated individuals charged to promote LA21 within their team and work place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the meantime, as a new pilot scheme to deliver sustainable development at the community level, ‘Network 21’ was launched in November 2000. The concept of Network 21 was developed by the Duthchas LIFE Project and Local Agenda 21 Highland, and involved considerable community and partnership consultation (The Highland Council, 2001b). The scheme is operated as a joint WBA initiative managed by the Highland Council. The overall purpose is to provide a practical way of promoting sustainable development throughout the Highland area. To achieve this, the scheme aims to help community groups carry out practical projects, through a grant element (up to £2,000) and by offering advice, to help groups get the best out of their projects. All applicants are asked to think about how sustainable their projects are and whether they
can be improved. In practice, local groups are required to fill out the NETWORK 21 Sustainability Checklist, on which applicants draw the positive and negative aspects of their proposed projects in terms of benefits to Business, Community, Environment and the Future. Additionally, they are asked to give ideas about how they are minimising the potential negative impacts. A package of £30,000 partnership funding (year 2001/2002) was secured from the Highland Council and Scottish Natural Heritage to support a pilot scheme together with some offers in kind, or indications of funding for future trenches from others in the WBA (The Highland Council, 2001b).

The deadline of applications for the grant was set for the 31st of January 2001. The result was that 60 applications were received – from a wide range of community groups and with a bias towards the economically fragile areas of the north and west. Project proposals were varied and included traditional music, waste management, visitor interpretation and the environment (The Highland Council, 2001b). Meanwhile, an evaluation framework has been prepared and agreed. The first year awards for community projects were approved around the end of February 2001. 27 community groups won grants ranging from £200 to £1,800, and in total £23,820. The grants were paid during March 2001.

Since no budget allocation for Network 21 in the Highland Council 2000/2002 budget was prepared, there was no commitment from the WBA as a whole to further funding (The Highland Council, 2001b) and thus the future perspective of the scheme itself was not clear.

Structure Plan

The former Highland Structure Plan was approved in November 1990, which was based on information and views obtained in the late 1980s and sought to look only some 10 years ahead. In December 1999, presenting a revision of the strategies and policies, a new Structure Plan, The Highland Structure Plan was issued, and finally approved by Scottish Executive in March 2001. Due to the administrative boundary change in 1996, this Structure Plan is recognised as the successor to the Highland Region Structure Plan. The Highland Structure Plan incorporates the overall Strategic Goals and Values
adopted by The Council in 1996 and is consistent with the wider corporate vision presented in the discussion paper *Looking Ahead* (Highland Council, 1998), which aimed “to put more flesh on the vision contained there and to develop further the concept of long term joint strategic thinking, planning and operations across the Highlands” (ibid).

The challenge for the new Structure Plan was that the development concepts and the vision for the future of the Highlands had to be incorporated into the new Council-led Community Planning process (the Highland Council, 1999a). The Structure Plan was drawn up in tandem with the Community Plan that was to be finalised in early 2000. As a result, by addressing land use and other related planning issues raised in the Community Plan, the new Structure Plan became an important mechanism for its delivery (the Highland Council, 1999a).

In the introduction, the Structure Plan is characterised by four main features as: (1) a land use planning document; (2) a corporate plan; (3) a partnership statement; and (4) a lobbying document (shown in Table 5.12). It is apparent that the new Structure Plan is not only about land use planning but is a more integrated corporate document for the Highlands as a whole. In the Highland context, this fruitful outcome is not just the fact that the Council was appointed as a pathfinder of Community Planning. Significantly, this coincides with the fact that there was a strong movement for adapting the Structure Plan into a comprehensive plan. According to an officer of Planning and Development Department in the Council, it is evidence that “before Community Planning came along, we tried to make the Structure Plan a co-operate and partnership document, as more than just a land use plan document”. Even though the Structure Plan is a statutory document that regulates policies and public services within the local authority, the new Structure Plan in Highland is the one which integrates all sectoral issues within the Council and even influence the policies and plans issued by other public agencies in the area.
Table 5.12: Four main features of the Structure Plan

(1) a land use planning document
- To set out the broad principles on which individual planning decisions are made
- To give a framework for the development of Local Plans
- To guide developers on where new homes and other buildings, businesses and other projects can be best sited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council and partnership plans</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Council service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highland Community Plan</td>
<td>1999-2008</td>
<td>Chief Exe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Strategy</td>
<td>2000-</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agenda 21</td>
<td>2000-</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plans</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Transport Plan</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transport Strategies</td>
<td>1999-2004</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Strategies</td>
<td>1998-2003</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Energy Conservation Strategy</td>
<td>1998-2008</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety Plan</td>
<td>1999-</td>
<td>Chief Exe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Care Plan</td>
<td>1997-2000</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for Children and young People</td>
<td>1998-2001</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Strategy</td>
<td>1996-2025</td>
<td>Protective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaelic Development Strategy</td>
<td>1998-2002</td>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Strategy</td>
<td>1996-2005</td>
<td>Protective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Development Strategy</td>
<td>1999-</td>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Strategy</td>
<td>2000-</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Sports Strategy</td>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) a corporate plan
- To set out the strategic goals of the Council and aim to guide policy development in all spheres, not simply that of land use planning
- To ensure that the Council makes wise use of its resources and makes an active contribution to achieving the aim of sustainable development

(3) a partnership statement
- To help bringing together and galvanising the actions of others in Highland to achieve common goals
- To take account of the aims and objectives set out in the plans of our key partners and write in the light of extensive formal and informal consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key partners plans</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Constabulary</td>
<td>Health improvement</td>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWA</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>Policing with Purpose</td>
<td>1996/97-99/00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Homes</td>
<td>The Way Forward</td>
<td>1998-2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNH</td>
<td>Corporate Plan</td>
<td>1998-2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Plan</td>
<td>1998-2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans in Progress</td>
<td>1998-2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) a lobbying document
- To play an important role as a lobbying document for the wider recognition and financial support of the needs of the Highland area by Government and the European Union

Source: Highland Council (1999a)

Lifelong Learning Strategy

Following the publication of the Government report *Communities: Change through Learning* (The Scottish Office, 1998c), each local authority was asked to produce Community Learning Plans to address the needs of individuals and communities
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through two main elements: a Community Learning Strategy, for the development of community learning throughout the Highland area; and Community Learning Plans, the specific ways in which the strategy will be delivered and implemented at local level (The Highland Council, 1999b). The idea of community learning is sometimes vague; some call it adult learning, and others lifelong learning. The key features of community learning are identified in the Plan, shown in Table 5.13.

**Table 5.13: What is Community Learning?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community learning</td>
<td>learning which takes place locally in your community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners become actively involved in decision what they want to learn</td>
<td>and shaping the content, design and evaluation of the learning programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday issues facing adults, i.e. childcare, education, poverty,</td>
<td>health, finance, or local community concerns may provide the starting point for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning can be both formal and informal – from and SQA module to the</td>
<td>formation of an active tenants' group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning is concerned with personal development and community</td>
<td>development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: the Highland Council, 1999b

The Community Learning Strategy is regarded as an integral part of Education Service goals, thus the consultation process was led by the Education Department in the Highland Council. The Strategy is to be delivered in an integrated way with the collaboration of relevant public and voluntary agencies. In working towards the Strategy, 40 organisations from across the Highland participated actively in the consultation process. Those leading the consultation process in each area, usually the Community Education Service, sought to be sensitive to local circumstances, drawing in learning partnerships and organisations active in their community, including Area Committee members and staff, schools and community organisations, while also creating opportunities for broad public consultation.

Taking account of the crucial relationship between learning opportunities and empowering people, the Highland Community Learning Strategy is closely linked with other policies at national and Highland level. The features of these policies that underpin the Community Learning Strategy are shown in Table 5.14. As far as Community Planning is concerned, it is thought that “the Community Learning Strategy is one of the first strategies to be developed since the Community Planning process was introduced and it is essential that the linkage between these two initiatives is clearly
expressed. As a consequence, with strong link to the Community Plan, the Community Learning Strategy is to be implemented in other partnership initiatives, such as the Wellbeing Alliance, Social Inclusion Partnership, and Highlands and Islands Partnership (The Highland Council, 1999b: 8).

Table 5.14: Relevant policies at National and Highland level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Social Inclusion</th>
<th>Active Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifelong Learning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Informal learning can open doors to a better life for people who find themselves excluded from opportunities that many of us take for granted: jobs, good quality housing, a safe environment, good health and leisure opportunities.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Active citizens are essential in building strong, healthy communities by taking part in the democratic process, making their voice heard on issues of concern, volunteering to help deliver services and care for their neighbours, joining with others to find a ‘self help’ solution and strengthening social networks through arts, cultural, heritage, social, sports activities and community action.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Commitment to a lifelong learning process of acquiring new skills and updating skills to secure people’s employability in a rapidly changing economy&quot; (Opportunity for Scotland, September 1998, the SO)</td>
<td><strong>Promoting opportunities to participate in society through work, learning and active citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Raise awareness of lifelong learning</td>
<td>● Tackling barriers to inclusion expected by people in poverty, people with disabilities, people who are homeless, offenders, ethnic minorities and others disadvantaged by their circumstances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Improve access to learning opportunities</td>
<td>● Promoting inclusion particularly amongst children and young people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Extend participation by excluded groups</td>
<td>● Building strong communities through anti poverty action, consultation and participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Encourage progression appropriate to ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Ensure the quality of learning opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highland Level (Community Plan for Highland)</th>
<th>Safe, Healthy Communities</th>
<th>Capable, Confident Communities</th>
<th>Sustainable Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➤ Enabling lifelong learning for all</td>
<td>➤ Promoting safer communities</td>
<td>➤ Building community capacity</td>
<td>➤ Enabling community ownership and management of community assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Creating a ‘Highland Grid for Learning’ and accessible ICT networks</td>
<td>➤ Tackling inequalities in health</td>
<td>➤ Supporting and enabling community participation</td>
<td>➤ Promoting and investing in the cultural and natural heritage of the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Building schools, libraries and other community facilities for the 21st Century</td>
<td>➤ Creating healthy places that support healthy choices</td>
<td>➤ Supporting volunteering and community action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As far as its implementation is concerned, Local Learning Partnerships (LLP) have been
developed throughout the Highlands. Skye & Lochalsh Local Learning Partnership
(LLP) was the first partnership to be established in the Highlands and Islands as a
company limited by guarantee with charitable status. Membership of the Partnership
consists of a broad cross-section of organisations involved in education, training,
development and business, who are working in the area. Skye & Lochalsh LLP’s aims
are:

1) to develop a commitment to lifelong learning for individuals and businesses;
2) to develop local strategies to promoting the provision and awareness of lifelong at
local level;
3) to work with partnerships and providers to overcome problems such as rural
remoteness and gaps in provision;
4) to assist implementation of existing and emerging government initiatives, within a
local context; and
5) to work with small and medium enterprises to develop coherent training provision
based on the needs of the area (SALE, date unknown).

Having its own strategies and projects, each LLP has been established with other
partnerships, such as the Scottish University for Industry Liaison, the Scottish LLP,
Highlands & Islands LLP Network members, and the SALE Individual Learning
Account Liaison. Following a re-structuring period during the year 2001-2002, the LLP
became part of a new organisation called Careers Scotland from 1st April 2002, which
combines the Education Business Partnerships, Careers Service Companies, and
Guidance Networks (www.careers-scotland.org.uk).

Social Inclusion Partnership

While the previous sections concern policy framework, the following two programmes
are substantial mechanisms which operate within these policy frameworks and
partnership arrangements. The Social Inclusion Strategy is one of a series of
Government initiatives that are part of Social Justice – a Scotland where everyone
matters (Scottish Executive, 1999b). The Highlands & Islands Social Inclusion
Partnership is one of 47 new Social Inclusion Partnerships (SIP) across Scotland,
funded through the Government’s Social Inclusion Strategy, of which the Wellbeing Alliance (WBA) is now in charge. The initial award to the partnership is for five years from April 1999.

The Strategy is based on encouraging agencies to work together to assist people facing a combination of disadvantages such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime, bad health and family breakdown. The principle aim is to use the extra expenditure to encourage agencies to assist people facing exclusion by ‘bending’ the provision of mainstream services to prioritise these groups. This initiative focuses on young people aged 14 to 25 who are the most vulnerable to social exclusion and aims to work with young people, families and communities to make difference through:

- Improved co-ordination and integration between public & voluntary services, changing ways of doing things,
- Empowerment of disadvantaged individuals, communities and community groups through devolving decision-making, and
- Innovation, trying approaches to the development of services to identify “what works” and building them into mainstream service provision.

Seven Highland Council areas, Ormlie, North West Sutherland, Westford & Milnafua, Merkinch, Upper Fort William, Kinlochieven, West Ardnamurchan, (Westray in Orkney Islands, and Uig, The Bay of Harris, Berneray, Lochboisdale, and Eriskay in Western Islands), have been chosen as pilot areas, where local Partnerships have been established to work with young people in these local communities. Previous approaches to tackling social and economic disadvantage have largely focused on large urban areas through the Urban Programme. The Highlands & Islands SIP provides a unique opportunity to demonstrate need and approaches that work in less urban and rural communities (Highland Council, 2001a).

The first year of operation (1999/2000) concentrated on developing the area-based aspects of the Programme, establishing staffing (most staff appointments were made by February 2000), management, induction and financial arrangements. The local Partnership Steering Groups were also set up to maintain communication and involvement between partners, young people and community interests (20 to 30
organisations). The second year of the programme (2000/01) reported that "a feature of the work this year has been trying to ensure that the programme is integrated with other service provision and policy initiatives aimed at young people, while maintaining momentum and progress" (Highland Council, 2001a).

Essentially, there are two groups in charge of the Programme. One is the WBA Youth Strategy Group (Officers) and the other the WBA Social Inclusion Partnership Steering Group (including WBA Partners, Council Services and representatives of area SIP Partner organisations). As a management function, there is a Programme Manager, who works in the Highland Council, consulting with Youth Voice, local Steering Groups and WBA Partners. Local Community Workers are appointed to deal with day-to-day matters and projects at a local level. The structure is shown in Table 5.15. Because the Programme started with the Youth Issue Group, one of three issue-based groups set up in the WBA, it still takes responsibility for the Programme, while projects are delivered by the SIP Steering Group. The SIP Steering Group has developed the implementation Plan on which the allocation of resources is based. Now that the Programme is co-ordinated through the WBA-SIP Steering Group, a rationalisation of the management mechanism is necessary. Indeed, in order to run the Programme effectively, it is proposed that the SIP Programme should be run more within the Youth Strategy, with the "Steering" Group taking on more of an information and exchange function, while the WBA Youth Strategy Group should monitor and advise on the development of the SIP Programme for the Alliance (Highland Council, 2000).

Approval was given for expenditure of £603,375 in 1999/00, and £770,000 in 2000/01. In addition, the Partnership has been successful in applying for a carry forward of £116,000 from 1999/00, a total of £886,000 in 2000/01 (Highland Council, 2000). Government support is set at 75% of approved expenditure in the first year and 100% for the next two years. In terms of funding allocation at local level, it was recommended in the report (Highland Council, 2000) that as "Local Partnerships are still firming up expenditure plans with Partners and local Steering Groups", the Area funding levels should remain indicative at this time, with approval given to continuation of existing expenditure and projects. Also it is mentioned that the WBA SIP Steering Group would review expenditure plans for the 2001/02 financial year in May 2001 to ensure that
proposed new developments could be met within the Grant allocation for the year.

Table 5.15: Structure of the Highlands & Islands Social Inclusion Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Structure of Sutherland Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National government</td>
<td>WBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>WBA SIP Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public agencies</td>
<td>Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary sector &amp; Community group</td>
<td>Highland Voluntary Sector Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Highland Council, 2001a

‘Initiative at the Edge’ Programme

In 1997, the ‘Initiative at the Edge’ (IatE) Programme was introduced to encourage greater inter agency co-operation in project development in Scotland’s fragile rural areas. It was then launched in March 1998, to concentrate attention and effort on tackling the problems faced by the most fragile rural areas of northern Scotland. A total of 46 fragile communities have been identified by Highlands and Islands Enterprise, taking account of demographic and economic conditions such as declining population, ageing communities, and the lack of employment opportunities, eight of which were selected as pilot areas. Four of these pilot areas are in the Western Isles, namely Uig and Bernera, the Bays area of Harris, Eriskay and Lochboisdale. The other four areas are Westray and Papa Westray, North Sutherland, Ardnamurchan and Colonsay.

The programme is directed by the Scottish Executive and the partner agencies are Argyll and Bute Council, the Crofters Commission, Highlands and Islands Enterprise
network, the Highland Council, the Orkney Islands Council, Scottish Homes, Scottish Natural Heritage and Western Isles Council. IatE has the management structure, shown in Table 5.16, to deliver the project at national and local level. The National Steering Group consists of representatives from partner agencies. The National co-ordinator, Meg Rodger, whose post is funded by the Western Isles Council, Western Isles Enterprise, the Western Isles Skye and Lochalsh LEADER Programme, and the Scottish Executive Enterprise and Tourism Division, was appointed to deal with strategic issues of the agencies at national level. It is a symbolic challenge that the national administration office was placed in Bays of Harris, one of pilot areas. At local level, there is a basic structure, including a Local Development Officer (LDO) and Local Steering Committee/Group. The majority of the LDOs are from local areas, and employed by the local development organisation or Local Steering Committee (LSC).

IatE is based on three operating principles:

- Community led - communities identify their needs and required action, and develop projects accordingly;
- Partnership approach - projects are supported by the initiative partner agencies with particular emphasis given to finding solutions to these projects in a collective manner; and
- Sustainable actions - all actions must be sustainable, meeting the needs of the present without comprising the ability of future generation to meet their own needs.

The overall aim of IatE is to engender a more sustainable future for the most economically and socially fragile areas in the Highlands and Islands through a community led, multi-agency initiative. To achieve this, 5 objectives have been identified: 1) to reduce geographic and social isolation; 2) to restore a more stable demographic structure; 3) to increase and diversify local economic activity; 4) to improve community confidence; and 5) to integrate the action of agencies in the pursuit of objectives.
### Table 5.16: Structure of the Initiative at the Edge programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>National government</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
<th>Public agencies</th>
<th>Voluntary sector &amp; Community group</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Executive</td>
<td>The Highland Council Western Isles Council Orkney Island Council Argyll &amp; Bute Council</td>
<td>Highlands &amp; Islands Enterprise Scottish Homes Scottish Natural Heritage Crofter Commission</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IatE National Steering Group, internal document

A special budget called ‘Seedcorn Fund’ has also been set up to assist small projects within the boundaries of the IatE areas. The purpose of the fund is to disperse low level grants to provide rapid and practical assistance at local community level. It is claimed that such actions would be the first or critical step toward achieving a social or economic ambition, which aims to be of ultimate benefit to the wider community. Applications to the Seedcorn Fund are to be locally constituted groups or the promoters of groups or, if appropriate, individuals who are acting for the ultimate benefit of the community at large. The average grant allocation is set up between £500 and £1,000, and the maximum grant being £2,000. The Seedcorn Fund can be used for financial assistance under the following general headings: initial overheads i.e. telephone, fax, hiring a hall, photocopying, posters etc.; actions which increase the capacity of recipients to pursue other funding, establishing constitutions for community group; networking and awareness raising; confidence building measures; equipment purchase (if integral to project); travel grants i.e. to attend conferences, seminars, project visits.
5.3.3. The policy framework for community development in the Highlands and Islands

Community development projects have been taken as a means for delivering a wide range of policy areas, including rural deprivation, social inclusion, local economic development, life-long learning, and the natural environment. From the UK government’s viewpoint, partnership is an efficient mechanism in three ways: firstly, it alters the fragmented public sector due to re-organisation of local authorities and proliferation of quasi-state agencies during the 1980s and 1990s; secondly, it reduces the role of government in the implementation of economic and social development by joined-up working with private and voluntary sectors in order to encourage a more ‘business-like’ state and supplement scarce public expenditure; and thirdly, it decentralises decision-making processes in social, economic and environmental development, in which “strong central direction of policy by government has been combined with policy delivery through partnership mechanisms at the local level” (Geddes, 1997: 8).

As described in previous sections, a number of community development programmes through partnership have launched in the Highlands and Islands. Figure 5.3 shows the general picture of relevant policies and programmes, which covers several policy areas ranging from rural poverty (Duthchas, Initiative at the Edge), social inclusion (SIP), education (Community Learning), local economic development and community issues (LEADER, Community Economic Development), and environment (LA21). Even though the policy backgrounds vary, all these programmes aim to enhance the quality of life and the ability of the local communities to help themselves. Keeping the policy framework as a whole in mind, the following section will concentrate on the case study
area of North Sutherland, where several community development programmes have directly influenced the communities in many ways.
Figure 5.3: the whole structure of community development in the Highlands and Islands
5.4. Case studies of community development projects in North Sutherland

This section focuses on a remote rural area, where eleven villages are scattered along the north coast of Highlands. North Sutherland is described as one of the most vulnerable communities in Scotland, and therefore subject to the current community development initiatives launched by the EU and the Scottish Executive. As a consequence, rather dynamic change in terms of community involvement in planning decision-making and implementation has been seen since 1998.

As far as community development is concerned, process is significant, in which certain projects are originally started at the 'extra-local' level and gradually adapted into a 'local' situation. Therefore this section aims to describe the process of community development in North Sutherland area from the local viewpoint. Firstly, general environmental, demographic and cultural information for the area are briefly shown below. The second part shows the process through which certain actions are accomplished and how patterns or continuities are established, maintained and changed in the area, as a consequence of the community development programmes, which were described in the former section.
5 The Policy Framework for Community Development in the Highlands and Islands

5.5. Case study area

Sutherland, the northern part of the Highlands, occupies about one eighth of the landmass of Scotland. North Sutherland, stretching along the alternately sandy and rocky coast from Durness in the west to Melvich in the east and southwards down the fertile straths of Halladale and Strathnaver to Kinbrace and Altnaharra, covers an area of 1,971 km². Much of the land is covered in blanket peat bog - the largest area of this habitat in the world – and abounds in rare species: primula scotica, sea eagles, golden eagles, and orchids. The area, therefore, has designated status, both National and International, to protect its extraordinary rich wildlife, natural beauty and way of life. 47% of the land area is designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, 28 areas of which are candidates for Special Areas for Conservation or Special Protection Area. In addition, 241 km² are designated as a National Scenic Area (Duthchas Project, 2001). The coast consists of white sand, clear turquoise water and rocky headlands with sea arches and caves. The inland view is dominated by spectacular mountains. The fertile straths still have pasture and relics of ancient birch woods often with oak, ash and hazel. Some of these old woods are part of a Native Woodland regeneration scheme and here too are opportunities for diversification, providing wood for furniture (e.g. Sutherland Chairs), producing charcoal, and growing Shitake mushrooms.

With a population of just under 2,000, North Sutherland has a population density of less than 1 person per square kilometre. Archaeological remains give evidence of over 6,000 years of occupation. Humans first settled along the straths which offered shelter and fertile land as well as fish from the rivers. Nevertheless, the Sutherland Clearances imposed a completely new lifestyle on the people who were evicted to make room for sheep, and by 1819 with a few exceptions the entire population was concentrated along the coastal strip, and forced to make a living out of fishing and crofting.

Between 1988 and 1998, Sutherland’s total population remained static, but based on current trends a decrease of 7.7% is forecast between 1998 and 2013 (GRO(S) estimates 1998. Highland Trends 1999). In North Sutherland, the population at the 1981 census was 2054, and at the 1991 census 1950, which represents a decline in a 10 year period of 5% (Duthchas Project, 2001). With its long history of net youth out-migration, the
The age structure of Sutherland is slightly older, on average, than that of the Highlands as a whole. This is reflected in a 33.7% decline of the population in the 16-29 age group, 1988-1998, and causes an imbalance in the age structure of the communities; with 5% more than the Highland average in the 65 over age group (Duthchas Project, 2001). Unemployment levels remain unacceptably high within Sutherland with a persistently high unemployment rate of 7.2% (June 2000). Sutherland has the highest levels of part-time employment in the Highlands which is a reflection of the seasonal tourism opportunities and a proportionately high number of female employees (Sutherland Partnership, 2000). Jobs are not numerous - Dounreay, the Call Centre in Thurso, and the Highland Council create a few. Further west fish farming - salmon, oysters, mussels is developing. Crofters are looking at different ways of using some of their land, e.g. creating facilities for tourists - walks, heritage trails; looking at a new range of crops (e.g. blueberries); introducing native breeds; and developing marine resources.

Many people still run crofts but are finding that their income from this needs to be supplemented by a job or by diversifying on the croft. However, it is important to notice that crofting is itself largely dependent on the direct subsidies through the Common Agricultural Policy (Sutherland Partnership, 2000). There are some crofts producing crops and keeping livestock cattle but the reality of making a living from the land is becoming less attractive to the crofting families. Crofters today do not solely rely on earning a living from their land and some are diversifying and seeking new ways of making the land productive and incentives are available for various schemes (Durness, 1998). There are not many Gaelic speakers left in the area but the language and culture is undergoing a revival with the very successful Gaelic Medium Unit at Tongue Primary School and Gaelic Centre at Melness. There is a tradition of poetry, piping, singing and story telling and these can still be appreciated at Ceilidhs throughout the area.
5.6. The process of community development projects

There are several community development programmes that have taken place in North Sutherland area. In particular: the ‘Duthchas’ project under the EC LIFE programme; the ‘Initiative at the Edge’ project; North Sutherland ‘Social Inclusion Partnership’; and the ‘Sutherland Partnership’ are the main driving forces, and were launched during the last couple of years from different policy backgrounds. However, this situation seems to cause, to some extent, confusion and duplication of services to the communities. For the communities who had never been consulted and involved in decision-making processes, it was welcome but took some time to understand the ideas of the programmes and to utilise the opportunities. For the providers of these programmes, on the other hand, it was a dilemma, in that while the programmes ought to be promoted according to predetermined schedules, community involvement and their commitment to the programmes were not fully understood. There remains suspicion whether the outcomes of short period of community involvement fully reflect the communities’ preferences. In the following section, focus will be on the process through which local communities and public agencies start understanding each other and gradually mould a pre-fixed model into their particular circumstances. The process here is divided into three parts: the first period of establishment of a new community group under the ‘Duthchas’ programme; the adaptation and enhancement period of community groups’ activities; and the ending of the programme and emergence of its successor.

5.6.1. The very first step: the start of the ‘Duthchas’ project

Duthchas, a co-funded project of the EC LIFE programme, chose North Sutherland as one of three pilot areas in January 1998. In operation, Duthchas had four phases over a three year project life (see Section 5.3.1.2, Table 5.5). During Phase 1 (Jan. 1998 – Oct. 1998), one of activities of the programme was to recruit staff who would take significant roles at local level. In North Sutherland, two individuals were appointed as Area Co-ordinators (ACs) in October 1998: Anne MacConnell and Meg Telfer. These appointments were made later than had been anticipated. This was probably caused by various bureaucratic loose ends not being tied before the project started. The post of ACs was funded by the European LIFE programme, the Highland Council, Caithness
and Sutherland Enterprise, and Scottish Natural Heritage. Both ACs are from the area and have experienced community issues before the Duthchas project started. Since then, the two ACs worked at the Naver Teleservice Centre, in Bettyhill. The Pilot Area Advisory Group (PAAG) for North Sutherland was also set up to support and advise the project locally. North Sutherland PAAG, chaired by Jim Johnston (Head teacher of Farr High School in Bettyhill), consisted of partner agency representatives (18 members from 12 public agencies) and 22 members from community representatives, shown in Table 5.17.

Table 5.17: Members of North Sutherland Pilot Area Advisory Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Agencies</th>
<th>Community representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOAEFD</td>
<td>Bill Cattanach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Council</td>
<td>Margaret Fyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eirene Jardine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alison McGee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graeme McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Polson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Keith (Councillor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Enterprise</td>
<td>Neil Money (CASE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Homes</td>
<td>Fiona Munro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angus Mackay (Skerry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWA</td>
<td>David Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
<td>Willie Beattie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Tourist</td>
<td>Sandra Peterkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Murray (Strathdiradale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural</td>
<td>Jackie Fairweather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Scotland</td>
<td>Noel Fojut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Arts</td>
<td>Jim Tough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Turnbull (Sutherland Partnership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHI</td>
<td>Jasmine Grant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At an early stage, two ACs were asked to take a training programme which enables ACs to acquire the skills and tools required for carrying out the Initial Review, which includes gathering evidence, producing a sustainability profile, and establishing visions and ideas for the future. It was recognised that the successful facilitation of the Initial Review process was heavily dependent upon the ACs who ought to have series of abilities and attitudes listed in Table 5.18.
In Phase 2 (Oct. 1998 – Apr. 1999), substantial work for those who were involved in the project began. In order to draw up the Initial Review, participatory methodology was employed. Initially, two separate but mirroring processes were run – a ‘Community Process’ aimed at identifying community views and an ‘Agency Process’ aimed at identifying agency views – then these were brought together in a common forum (Duthchas, 1999). The community strand of the work was carried out at a sub-area level, as the pilot area was too large to get meaningful participation. The ACs decided to divide the whole North Sutherland area into 11 sub-areas (see Table 5.19).

Table 5.18: Abilities required to Area Co-ordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abilities required to Area Co-ordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Respect for all local perceptions and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ A belief in the capacity of all people to identify, analyse and record information about their locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ An open mind and no pre-conceived solutions or theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Humbleness, confidence and a genuine interest in peoples’ rights to be heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The skills to prevent those who are used to dominating situations to have more than an equal say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ A strategy to monitor who is and who is not having an opportunity to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ An understanding of how to reduce some of the barriers to involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ An understanding of and commitment to keeping all aspects, as well as final reports, as visual and as much in the words and writing of the participants as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ An understanding and commitment to not use jargon and to use every day language (plain English)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: North Sutherland, 1999

Table 5.19: Community Participation in the Initial Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-area</th>
<th>Open Meetings (No. of attended)</th>
<th>Out &amp; About (No. of interviewed)</th>
<th>Interviews to School Children</th>
<th>Sub-total</th>
<th>Total voted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skerray</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathnaver</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altnaharra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettyhill</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armadale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvich/Portskerra</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halladale</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>147</strong></td>
<td><strong>314</strong></td>
<td><strong>365</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: North Sutherland, 1999

A community survey (part of the ‘Community Process’) was conducted by the two ACs. It was indeed the first time that local communities in North Sutherland had carried out such a survey, in which they were asked to give ideas about the future of the area in
which they live (NL, vol.1, Summer 1999). The methodology used in each sub-area was the same and consisted of open public meetings ‘out and about’ interviews, and a touring exhibition where people were asked to vote for their favourite ideas that had been gathered from the meetings and interviews. Table 5.19 shows the number of people who attended those open meetings as well as the interviewees, and the number of people voting.

Meanwhile, the ‘Agency Process’ was carried out at the pilot area level. The work consisted of a half-day facilitated workshop and a postal questionnaire. At the workshop, participants from partner agencies were asked to carry out a SWOT analysis of Area Sustainability and to establish partner visions and priority issues. The subsequent postal questionnaire required partner agencies to co-ordinate the information input from their own organisation – both centrally and locally. All the ideas and issues gathered from both the ‘Community Process’ and the ‘Agency Process’ were analysed and compared, and integrated into the Initial Review Report, issued around April 1999.

At that time, a transnational conference was held in Tongue and Strathy, between 14th and 17th April 1999. The conference, organised by the Duthchas Project, aimed to raise issues about the future for remote rural areas, and had workshops where critical subjects from local population to funding and information and skills were discussed (NL, Vol.1).

At the beginning of Phase 3 (Apr. 1999 – Dec. 2000), 11 Task Groups were set up in each sub-area to take forward each community’s favourite project. There were some existing organisations or committees in sub-areas which took responsibility for being the Task Group (e.g. Melvich). During the summer of 1999, each of the 11 communities were consulted by the ACs, and were asked to choose their own projects, many of which had emerged during the Initial Review survey. The Task Groups and projects in each sub-area are shown in Table 5.20. Some sub-areas decided to take forward a project that had already existed or been planned with additional support from Duthchas (e.g. Durness’s new Village Hall project). It is reported in the Strategy (The Duthchas Project, 2001) that local enthusiasm for the projects was evidence of the importance of consultation and involvement in decision-making.
Table 5.20: Task Groups and projects at sub-area level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-area</th>
<th>Task Group Project</th>
<th>Action Group status</th>
<th>Funding for setting up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altnaharra</td>
<td>Car park and information point</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>IatE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armadale</td>
<td>Energy efficient social housing</td>
<td>the Armadale Resettlement Project</td>
<td>IatE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettyhill</td>
<td>Tourist Information Centre, potential</td>
<td>A Charitable Company Limited by Guarantee</td>
<td>CASE 2000 IatE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>orientation and interpretive centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durness</td>
<td>Plans and funding for a new village hall</td>
<td>Village Hall Committee</td>
<td>Lottery SIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melness</td>
<td>Extending and upgrading community centre, pier &amp; youth</td>
<td>a Community Group was set up</td>
<td>1060 IatE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cafe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvich</td>
<td>Refurbishing the village hall</td>
<td>the Village Hall Committee</td>
<td>application to Lottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skerray</td>
<td>Local produce development, marketing</td>
<td>no extra funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathalladale</td>
<td>Village hall improvements</td>
<td>550 IatE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathnaver</td>
<td>Village hall renovations &amp; arts centre</td>
<td>IatE, SIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathy</td>
<td>Sustainable public toilet and information point</td>
<td>1000 IatE, Rural Challenge Fund CASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>Renovation of the football pitch</td>
<td>SIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: IatE - 'Initiative at the Edge' programme funding  
      CASE - funding from Caithness & Sutherland Enterprise  
      SIP - 'Social Inclusion Partnership' funding

The communities began to take ownership of these projects and try to access funding and support available through local initiatives – in particular Initiative at the Edge, a similar initiative launched in the area at the same time (discussed in more detail in the following section). Some groups also started applying for and gaining funding from other sources, for instance: the Social Inclusion Partnership; the Rural Challenge Fund; and the National Lottery Fund.

Meanwhile, the PAAG decided focus on two broader issues; (1) local produce and (2) interpretation of the cultural and natural heritage of the area. As one of the 'demonstration' projects, an art project, 'Feis ir an Oir', with funding of £5,000 from the Scottish Arts Council, a Duthchas Partner, opened up a space where people would make something happen. It aimed to provide an opportunity for all members of the community to learn and gain confidence from local tutors and artists, which in return gains income of young artists and musicians. The success of the initial local Feis has led to the initiation of a permanent Feis movement for the North Coast, to encourage the survival of the local culture by increasing local knowledge of the Gaelic language and
song, traditional music and dance. This project was also offered funding of £1,980 from Initiative at the Edge project.

Table 5.21: Five Strategy Groups of North Sutherland PAAG and their objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Project</th>
<th>Demonstration Action</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Land use &amp; Renewable Energy</td>
<td>To run a workshop for key players in the land use debate</td>
<td>Investing options for maximising local incomes from diversification of land use and links to local processing and marketing</td>
<td>Building links between land users and agencies for the greater good of the area as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable</td>
<td>Investing options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Produce</td>
<td>To organise a competition to design a logo for local produce</td>
<td>Creating potential economic gain from the market value of a clean environment</td>
<td>Creating local community confidence and pride in their area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture &amp; Natural Heritage</td>
<td>To create a Portal website for N. Sutherland</td>
<td>Selling the area to visitors utilising the market potential of its unique features / providing a market outlet for local business</td>
<td>Involving local people in selling the area and increasing confidence through doing so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Returners</td>
<td>To organise seminars for young people in N. Sutherland</td>
<td>Creating a more viable community for young people to stay in by improving facilities / cost savings in reduced car use</td>
<td>Enabling a more vibrant and active lifestyle for young people / improving social links across the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Services</td>
<td>To report on Domestic Sewage System Upgrades</td>
<td>Identifying affordable systems to enable crofters to meet SEPA regulations / minimising economic disadvantages to crofters</td>
<td>Reducing health risks by improving sewage disposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the autumn of 1999, the exercise of drawing up a strategy started. As with Phase 4 (Sep. 1999 – Dec. 2000), the PAAG chose five topics for immediate action, which were to be the five main strategies of North Sutherland, and established Strategy Groups.
These five strategies were created with the information gathered from the local community survey and the 22 partner agencies. The Strategy Groups were made up of some of members of the PAAG who wished to get involved in the group, and some local people who were not the PAAG members but wanted to get involved. The first meeting of the Strategy Groups were held on the 4th of December 1999, clarifying 'visions' for their topics, and developing objectives and actions required to achieve them (see Table 5.21). Each group chose a 'Demonstration Action' which was to be completed within the lifetime of the Duthchas Project (by March 2001). A small amount of seed corn funding of £1,000 was offered for each group to start the ball rolling (NL, Vol.3). At the end of the lifetime of the Duthchas project, North Sutherland produced the final area Strategy, North Sutherland Area Strategy 2001, in March 2001. As an achievement of the initial process of community development, the Strategy is comprehensively composed with a commitment of partner agencies and communities working together, the area strategy, and a vision of its implementation.

At the end of Duthchas project, a workshop was held at the 25th of September 2000. The workshop aimed to take initial soundings from community representatives on their view on how to take forward the work of Duthchas in their area beyond December 2000 (Small Town & Rural Development Group, 2000).

5.6.2. The enhancement of community groups' activities

There is no doubt that most of community development projects on the ground were initiated through the Duthchas project. However, some of other projects, which were launched in the area at same time, have supplemented on-going projects in terms of funding opportunities. The first supplementary programme was the 'Initiative at the Edge' (IatE) programme. North Sutherland was selected as one of eight pilot areas of IatE project, which had been nominated as the most fragile communities in Scotland. Despite the official launch in March 1998 in North Scotland, there was no action until the official initiative started in July 1999. Local Development Officer, Anna MacConnell, the former Area Coordinator of Duthchas project in North Sutherland, was finally appointed in January 2000 working for Caithness and Sutherland Enterprise, a Local Enterprise Company. In the meantime, Kerry Conlon replaced her as the new
Duthchas Area Co-ordinator. This appointment was partly because IaTE and Duthchas were running next to each other and it was not entirely easy to establish a Steering Group and Committee, which apparently seemed to be similar to those of Duthchas. This situation has caused problems with the launch of the project in the area, and the IaTE project took a backward step. It is assumed that at the early stage there was not enough discussion about the two similar projects overlapping.

After a period of consideration, it was decided that the best way for those involved was to have IaTE and Duthchas working in tandem. In terms of the mechanism, Duthchas built a strategy for sustainable development with a watertight community consultation process, and IaTE has emerged as a delivery mechanism for that plan and other locally driven projects. Consequently, there was no IaTE Steering Group set up at the beginning of IaTE project and the PAAG under Duthchas took responsibility for it. Since IaTE and Duthchas started to work in tandem, eleven sub-area Task Groups set up under the Duthchas project have benefited from IaTE Seedcorn Fund, in confirming their institutional structure and going forward with their own projects with feasibility studies or seeking extra funding resources (see the former section).

The second alternative programme was about social inclusion; particularly attention was given to the youth issue. North Sutherland is one of the pilot areas of the Highlands and Islands Social Inclusion Partnership (SIP). The North Sutherland SIP area includes the village of Durness, Bettyhill, Strathnaver, Melvich, Strathy, Armadale and Tongue, where there is high youth unemployment. Since her appointment in February 2000, a Community Worker, Yvonne MacKay, has been working at Durness. The Community Worker post is closely linked to the management structure of the Sutherland Partnership (see 5.3.2.2).

The North Sutherland SIP’s Youth Rooms programme, which aims to refurbish rooms in Village Halls to provide youth facilities, has finally seen some results with the successful and impressive refurbishment of unused rooms in Strathnaver Village Hall. Two rooms have been worked on, with one acting as a computing and study room and the other as a social area with comfortable seating, CD player and tea/coffee making facilities. Four similar development projects have being planned in Durness, Melvich,
Tongue and Bettyhill. The fact that these are what the Task Groups in sub-areas under Duthchas project decided as their own projects, shows how the SIP project is integrated with Duthchas and IaTE. "Young people are actively involved in developing ideas, looking at properties, drawings, estimates and business plans" (INclusive: SIP news letter).

The third opportunity was delivered by another partnership, the Sutherland Partnership, which covered the wider Sutherland area (see Section 5.3.2.4). Formally set up in 1996, the Sutherland Partnership has fostered nearly 50 projects through the forums and staff of the Partnership and with communities in Sutherland between 1996 and 2000. As far as North Sutherland area is concerned, it was taken substantial actions since 1998, some of which have been implemented jointly with the Duthchas or Initiative at the Edge projects (e.g.: Strathbay Environment Cabin; Melvich Youth Facility; Farr Edge Children’s Facility; Tongue Football Pitch; and, Durness Village Hall). During 2001, there was no Programme Manager for the Sutherland Partnership due to the end of financial support from Scottish Executive, which could support it only for the first three years. Consequently, it was unfortunate for the Sutherland Partnership that almost all forums set up eventually died out. After several months of inaction, a new Programme Manager, David Bryan was appointed in January 2002 and re-organising process of sub groups is taking place. The Partnership’s current themes reflect the formation of new sub groups: the Community Development Forum; Tourism Forum; Business Support; and a Biodiversity steering group (under consideration).

5.6.3. The end of PAAG and the establishment of the North Sutherland Community Development Forum

At the end of the three-year Duthchas project, people in the North Sutherland area were asking what should happen next. The process of the disbanding of the North Sutherland PAAG and some new arrangement started around January 2001, and in the meantime it was agreed to expand the life of the Duthchas project until the end of March 2001. The first thought amongst the communities was to carry on the community development projects stimulated by the Duthchas project and the ongoing Initiative at the Edge and other programmes (e.g. through SIP, Sutherland Partnership). Now that Duthchas was to
be finished and all minds were concentrating on project delivery, and it was proposed that a new group should be established.

In January 2001, a draft partnership agreement was prepared for the PAAG. In the document, establishment of a partnership was proposed to "act as a focus for joint activity by its members in implementing the sustainable community development strategy prepared by the Duthchas Project" (NSCDF, 2001). Like the Duthchas PAAG, the form of the partnership seemed to be a place where public agencies and local communities could work closely together. Six roles were proposed:

1) to implement a sustainable development strategy for the North Coast;
2) to manage and supervise project staff appointment to develop projects contained within the strategy;
3) to support and add value to the work of members and other organisations in taking forward projects contained within the strategy;
4) to assist in raising funds for strategy projects;
5) to support and encourage effective project management; and
6) to monitor progress in developing projects and evaluate the impact in terms of sustainable development (NSCDF, 2001).

One significant shift was the structure of the new partnership. Compared with the PAAG, the membership of the new partnership was proposed as one dominated by local community representatives: 3 officers from public agencies; 12 community representatives from villages; 2 councillors serving the area; and 4 representatives from voluntary sector organisations. The number of public agencies involved in the partnership was dramatically reduced - the former PAAG consisted of 18 individuals from 12 public agencies (see also Section 5.6.1) - only the Highland Council, Caithness and Sutherland Enterprise (CASE) and Scottish Natural Heritage remained. This can be seen a big shift from the public agency-dominated partnership to a genuine community-led partnership.

In February 2001, the final meeting of the Duthchas PAAG was held and various and significant points were raised from both partner agencies and community representatives. Firstly, it was confirmed that the Highland Council and CASE had
agreed to a two-year appointment of development workers - CASE was supposed to be
the employer- after the end of Duthchas. Secondly, there were some comments on the
draft of the new partnership agreement. One CASE officer gave his opinion that the
proposed draft partnership was too formal, and an informal arrangement, where
decisions would be made locally, was more appropriate. On the other hand, a National
Co-ordinator of Initiative at the Edge emphasised the relationship between the
partnership and IatE, and in this case a constituted group was needed to access funding
at some stages. She, however, added that there were a huge variety of possibilities.
Moreover, some emphasised that they had to take into consideration other things in
North Sutherland and in the Highland Council at this time, and the Scottish Executive’s
attempt to reduce the number of partnerships in existence. In the light of these external
situations, one raised the question of what the fundamental roles of the partnership
should be. Even though there was no further discussion within the meeting, participants
agreed that there was a room to reconsider the formation of the new partnership, and
that it should be different from the Duthchas PAAG.

After the completion of Duthchas project, a community meeting was held in April 2001,
at which 12 community representatives from 7 villages participated. This meeting was a
fresh start for the area with the idea that the initiative of the new partnership should be
taken by communities with some support from the lead agency, CASE. At this meeting,
it was clear that community development projects such as Initiative at the Edge would
play “a supportive role rather than a directive role in the development of this group”
(NSCDF, 2001 April). To make this situation happen, it was also emphasised that the
role of officers from public agencies and project workers should not be “leading the
community groups but doing what they want” (ibid). This means a significant change in
the delivery of certain projects, from the conventional way that professional agencies
provide the ideas or plans for community action, and lead the community as expected
outcomes are achieved, to the opposite way, that the community makes up its own mind
about what it wants to do first and then partner agencies assist if necessary.

Despite this shift on the partner agency’s side, the attitudes of communities still
remained uncertain, particularly as to how autonomous decision-making and
implementation powers could be attained and enhanced. However, some of community
representatives have already realised the importance of keeping ‘corridors of power’ (ibid) by utilising certain projects such as Initiative at the Edge, which allow local communities to have direct contact with Scottish Executive. At this meeting, participants began to think of a framework of the new partnership, including a steering group as the driving force for the institution and sub-groups concentrating on certain interests from the strategy. At last, James Mather, a young fisherman and local activist from Durness, was appointed as the new chairperson of the partnership. One important thing recognised in this meeting was that a good representation from the different communities gave fresh and encouraging feelings to participants, because ‘many people did not realise the amount of projects and development that are going on in the area’. This could be one of the rationales for the existence of the partnership or forum in an area where there are many community development projects going on but few exchanges of good practice and useful knowledge amongst different community groups.

Throughout the summer of 2001, the form of the partnership group was gradually developed. The partnership was finally named the North Sutherland Community Development Forum, and needed to become a legally constituted body. They started to consider the future direction for the Forum. In the meantime, two members of the Forum and two Project Workers attended a two-day Initiative at the Edge community seminar in Inverness on 18th and 19th June, where there were informative presentations on funding application processes, IT tools for information on various funding bodies and so on, and some workshops on project management. The members who attended the seminar gave positive feedback. This feedback could benefit the Forum itself because good examples in other areas could give opportunities to objectively examine what they have done and constructively modify their weak points.

The forum finally gained charitable status, as a Company Limited by Guarantee, in September 2001. There are still many concerns about future direction but, at least, what is shared amongst the members of the Forum is that “the Forum has an excellent opportunity, and with two paid staff to help progress projects the Forum already has a head start, so we must keep active and get some projects on the ground” (NSCDF, 2001 July).
5.7. Community development partnerships in North Sutherland

Now that the process of community development in North Sutherland has been described, it is clear that it is not necessarily appropriate and effective to lead the programmes, as was at the first thought. It is in the process of moulding the ‘extra-local’ resources of the programmes into suitable local conditions that the most appropriate way should be sought out. Therefore, when it comes to evaluate the extent to which community development programmes benefit the local communities, it is important to take into account of the whole range of programmes and relevant partnerships, and to give a great deal of attention to what is happening at the community level.

In the light of the particular situation in North Sutherland, where a number of such programmes happened at once, the worst case could be that of inefficient duplication, which also might cause tiredness amongst communities as a result of repeated requests to do similar things. This must be avoided not only because public spending is used in inefficient way but also because it spreads discouragement among the communities who must not recover quickly. On the other hand, the situation might turn into a good chance to make fragmented sectoral policies more integrated, and produce an efficient solution for different policy sectors and local communities, if they are interlocked at strategic and implementation levels.

Regarding the whole structure of partnership in the area, there are different partnerships set up and operating at different level. By September 2002, some programmes had ended and consequently the partnerships responsible to the programme delivery were either dissolved (Caithness & Sutherland LEADER LAG) or replaced by newly formed groups (e.g. Duthchas PAAG replaced by North Sutherland Community Development Forum). Reflecting a general philosophy of both partnership and localisation endorsed by the EU and UK Governments, these programmes have shaped local partnerships with balanced representation from public, private and voluntary sectors and located them as close to the communities they serve as they can. In many cases, there are two-tier structures of policy delivery; one is a strategic partnership at national or regional level, and the other, the local level. The role of the strategic partnership is that of setting the framework of policy and funding for local partnerships through successive programmes,
including resource allocation, provision of guidance and monitoring of progress. These
tasks are undertaken through certain mechanisms, such as line management between the
National Co-ordinator and Project Workers at local level. This direct linkage between
national strategic and local implementation partnerships perhaps foreshows a new
relationship between the state and local communities in the new form of governance. In
addition to this, it is also a challenge for different partnerships as to whether they can at
least avoid duplication, and maximise the limited financial and human resources to
achieve specific objectives by utilising other partnerships to complement their weaker
aspects. Indeed, in the North Sutherland area, the same partner agencies and individual
representatives are involved in many different partnerships. In this case, it is assumed
that if there are informal networks between individuals who are involved in different
partnerships, the formal settings of policy-making and delivery mechanisms can
synergistically become more integrated.

As far as the North Sutherland area is concerned, it was fortunate for the local
communities to have received so many chances to do something thanks to the social
policies of the EU and UK governments. After several years of experience, people in the
area are now seeking their autonomy and a more equal relationship with public agencies
and other strategic partnerships, using the North Sutherland Community Development
Forum (NSCDF), the local partnership which was one of outputs generated by the
Duthchas project in the area. The NSCDF, which consists of local representatives from
each village across the north coast, started to identify its role as enhancing the quality of
life in the area. The situation is still embryonic on the ground and thus it is too early
stage to examine how far the NSCDF can benefit the quality of life for the local
community, and also how far the current community development programmes will
influence the area. However, the establishment of the NSCDF and continuation of
community development activities can be seen as evidence that the local communities
have been empowered, acquiring institutional capacity which enables them to be
autonomous to some extent and to get things moving forward.
6 AN EVALUATION ON THE INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY OF PARTNERSHIPS
6.1. Introduction

As described in previous chapters, a wide range of policies and programmes aimed at enhancing the quality of life of local communities employ community development approaches. To deliver these policies and implement projects increasing numbers of partnerships are being set up, not only at a strategic level, but also the local community level. Strategic partnerships, in general, tend to consist of local authorities and public agencies which are responsible to the communities. On the other hand, local partnerships are likely to involve a much wider range of stakeholders; community, private and voluntary groups, as well as the public sector. Each partnership has its own role to play within a policy or programme: the strategic partnerships set the framework of policy and funding; the local partnerships conduct day-to-day activities with local communities by employing individual development workers (called ‘community workers’ or ‘area-managers’). In the light of the multiplying numbers of partnerships, it is necessary to evaluate how the partnership approach benefits community development projects; in other words, whether the framework of programme delivery through a partnership enhances, or diminishes, the institutional capacity of the communities that community development projects aim to build.

This chapter focuses on the relationship between partnership networks and the institutional capacity of the communities in the North Sutherland area. While the previous chapter focused on how these partnership networks were shaped in launching community development projects at national, regional and local levels and how these different partnership networks deliver community development projects on the ground, this chapter will concentrate on the individual members of the partnerships. Within the whole structure of partnerships in the area, this case study aims to explore the impact of individuals, particularly those who animate community projects. The process of implementation matters for community development. According to Ray, the process of delivering certain projects starts with “the clear and rationale identification of objectives, which are then translated into measures by experts in bureaucracies. These measures are implemented by agencies, leading to observable impacts on the ground” (1999: 1). In practice, however, he goes on, “this linearity can be interrupted by the various actors involved in the implementation and assessment of an intervention. This translation, or
even resistance, effect by such actors can be particularly marked once implementation reaches the local level” (ibid: 1). This emphasises the importance of analysing the individual actors and their attitudes to the partnerships to which they belong, in order to examine how the partnership approach improves the institutional capacity of communities. By using the institutionalist KRM model explained in Chapter 3, this chapter aims to evaluate the three elements of institutional capacity: Relational resources; Knowledge resources; and Mobilisation capacity.
6.2. Personal networks in Partnerships: Relational Resources

The evaluation of institutional capacity started with ‘Relational Resources’. As discussed in Section 3.3.4 and 3.4.2.2, the three dimensions of relational resources were identified as:

- The range of stakeholders involved in the partnerships, including organisations and key actors, and their roles in the partnerships
- The morphology as the institutional setting in which individual actors behaved, including the density of their network interconnections, the patterns (e.g. web, hierarchy, hub/spoke, corridor) and nodal points as ‘switching points’ where transfers and connections between networks were possible; the degree of network integration both within the partnership (horizontal), which was examined by identifying the density of shared nodes and ‘switching points’
- The power relations of the key actors and the partnerships, and how these interacted with wider authoritative, allocative and ideological structuring forces

Firstly, the range of stakeholders was identified through official statements and membership information listed in the previous chapter. While this partnership network showed a formal setting of community development programmes in Scotland, the second task was to draw a ‘map’ of individual actors involved in partnerships, using ‘sociogram’ techniques (see Section 3.4.2.2). It aimed to give an informal but substantial institutional setting on which actors in different partnerships handled the day-to-day activities. To examine the morphology as the institutional setting is important, because it would impact on individual actions by providing opportunities or constraints. Through this mapping activity, key actors, who played significant roles within a partnership (and features of ‘ties’ between actors), were identified. These results led to the evaluation of the quality of Relational Resources of each partnership. As noted in Section 3.4.2.2, interpersonal networks are presumed to spread beyond the boundary of the partnership to which actors belong. When it comes to analysing the network integration between different partnerships, a vertical perspective should be considered as well. This point is associated with power relations. This third dimension of Relational Resources will be discussed in section 6.4 along with the three important roles of key actors: Centripetal Forces; Diffusors; and Bridges.
6.2.1. The range of stakeholders

A general picture of the partnerships in the Highland area

Figure 6.1 shows partnerships set up in the case study area since 1996 under different community development initiatives at different levels. There were 18 public bodies including the Scottish Executive (Development Department and Rural Affair Department) and local authorities, 11 voluntary organisations and some private bodies which existed at the end of 2000. As Figure 6.1 shows, during 1998-2000, there were at least seven identifiable partnerships existing in the area in which a wide range of organisations had been involved. Unlike partnerships in many urban areas, which often involve many local private sectors, the partnerships in the Highland area were dominated by public agencies, which operate at a Scottish national level, over issues of health, safety, water, environment, housing, economy, culture, education, and community (see also Table 6.1).
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Figure 6.1: Partnership networks during 1998-2000

Note:
HIPT: Highlands & Islands Plan Team
iate: Initiative at the Edge
D-NSG: Duthchas National Steering Group
NS-PAG: North Sutherland Pilot Area Advisory Group
WBA: Wellbeing Alliance
SIP: Social Inclusion Partnership
SRP: Sutherland Rural Partnership

Levels of Policy Making:
- Scottish Executive
- Highlands & Islands
- Highlands
- North Sutherland

Partnerships - 2000

Community Groups:
- Durness
- Strathnaver
- Melness
- Tongue
- Altnaharra
- Halladale
- Skerray
- Bettyhill
- Amradale
- Strathy
- Meivoch
- Private
- Voluntary groups
- Public agency
Table 6.1: Partner organisations in different partnerships in the Highland area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Scottish Highlands &amp; Islands</th>
<th>Highlands</th>
<th>Sutherland</th>
<th>North Sutherland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Programme Objective</td>
<td>Initiative at the Edge</td>
<td>Duthchas</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership Group</td>
<td>Wellbeing Alliance</td>
<td>Wellbeing Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>HB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>NHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>NSWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>SNH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>FC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>FE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIE/CASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>STB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>CroFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>HS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>SMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>SELINK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>CrofU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>NUFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>UHI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCNTO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCVO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>VGES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>AmParbh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>NWFCCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASES SCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private body</td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE
- NHS: National Health Service
- CrofC: Crofter Commission
- CrofU: Crofters Union
- NDFS: National Union of Farmers Scotland
- FC: Forestry Commission
- FE: Forestry Enterprise
- FAC: Forestry Authority
- STB: Scottish Tourist Board
- SEPA: Scottish Environmental Protection Agency
- HS: Historic Scotland
- SAC: Scottish Arts Council
- SMC: Scottish Museums Council
- UHI: University of Highlands & Islands
- SCVO: Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations
- SCNT: Scottish Council of National Training Organisations
- SJJK: Scottish Environment LINK
- SCDI: Scottish Council Development & Industry
- VGES: Voluntary Groups East Sutherland
- NWFC: North West Federation of Community Council
- ASES SCC: Association of South East Sutherland Community Council
Roles of the partner organisations

For many public agencies, the purpose of participation is to make public service delivery work in an effective way through ‘joined-up’ projects. They saw themselves as service providers and project funders in the partnerships. On the other hand, for community groups and voluntary organizations, which had no particular statutory obligation and financial contribution in implementing community development programmes, it is assumed that there was little space to take significant roles in the partnerships, at least, at an early stage. Osborne et al. point out that “[a] prime example of this was its control of the community planning process in the region – and the extent to which local groups felt their own activities as subservient to this process” (2003: 9). This showed that although these projects aimed to enhance the ‘self-mobilisation of communities’, partnerships had excluded communities. There seemed to be fixed hierarchies in the institutional settings, which was seen as top-down in nature with the growth of the influence of the Scottish Parliament and Executive.

There were two types of partnerships identified in the area. One was a project-oriented partnership which was set up for the administration of funds for community initiative projects, such as the Highlands and Islands Plan Team for the Structural Funds, the Duthchas Partnership, and the National Steering Group for the Initiative at the Edge project. Therefore, stakeholders in these partnerships were likely to be dominated by public agencies as ‘sponsors’. The other type of partnership was an area-based one. Unlike the project-oriented partnerships, the area-based partnerships, such as the Wellbeing Alliance and the Sutherland Rural Partnership for Community Planning, had no specific funding for community projects. In this case, the partnerships were likely to encourage community involvement through voluntary organisations or the private sector as well as through public agencies. They had few financial resources but attempted to develop long-term strategies and access routes for funding. Therefore, it is assumed that in the area-based partnerships, all stakeholders could be both ‘donors’ and ‘receivers’.

Whilst the project-oriented partnerships with a fixed hierarchical structure based on the flow of money and therefore their approaches were likely to be a ‘top-down’, the area-based partnerships sought a different way to extend the range of stakeholders. For a partnership, broadening the range of stakeholders does not necessarily gain financial
resources directly, but does increase the range of access routes for funding. These different approaches lead to the further question of partner agencies’ attitudes toward the partnership in which they are involved.

Some organisations were involved in more than one partnership, and thus seemed to have an impact on several community development initiatives in the area. These organisations were mainly public agencies, operating at the Highlands regional level or Scottish national level. In particular, the Highland Council and two public agencies, Scottish Natural Heritage and Highlands and Islands Enterprise, which were involved in all seven partnerships, are prominent in the local community development landscape. When they wear the hat of a ‘project-oriented’ partnership, they become ‘sponsors’ or ‘donors’, providing their own financial supports and regulating the projects. In this case, their efforts would be directed at integrating their regular business with the partnership projects. On the other hand, they can also become ‘receivers’, when involved in the ‘area-based’ partnership. In this case, they might attempt to prioritise their own objectives within the partnership in which they are one of several stakeholders. According to social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978), people tend to draw their self-identities from the partnership to which they belong. In this sense, those agencies, who play roles of both ‘donors’ in the project-oriented partnership and ‘receivers’ in the area-based one, have to compromise their contradictory identities. They behave in a compromised manner. These attitudes can be regarded as ‘buffers’ which lessen the tension between needs and availability, and the gap between different remits or objectives.

**Shift to local-oriented picture from 2000 onwards**

After the three-year EU programme, ‘Duthchas’ ended in March 2001, some of the partners seem to have faded away from community development projects, because they were no longer partners of any partnerships (see Figure 6.2 of current partnership arena in the area from 2000 onwards).
Figure 6.2: Partnership networks since 2000 onwards

- HIPT: Highlands & Islands Plan Team
- ITe: Initiative at the Edge
- WBA: Wellbeing Alliance
- SIP: Social Inclusion Partnership
- SRP: Sutherland Rural Partnership
- C&S-CED: Caithness & Sutherland
- Community Economic Development
- NSCDF: North Sutherland Community Development Forum

Legend:
- public agency
- voluntary groups
- private
After the Duthchas project ended, there seems to have been a shift of stakeholders from national public agencies to local community bodies through the process of community development projects in the area. Due to the drawing back of some public agencies from the partnership arena, voluntary organisations and their umbrella bodies have become important stakeholders. These groups, including Voluntary Groups East Sutherland and Federations of Community Councils, used to be outside community development initiatives.

Now that a reduced number of public agencies are officially involved in the partnerships, a change in the power relationships between partners is inevitable. The question is whether key organisations such as the Highland Council and HIE (including Caithness and Sutherland Enterprise) can sustain a close relationship with those who no longer participate in the projects, in terms of financial and intellectual support. Is it the case that, when a partnership ends due to the programme ending, the partnership approach will also cease? Equally, once a partnership culture has been set up, are ex-partners likely to be supportive of other active partners? To answer this, it is necessary to examine the extent to which partnerships have shared understandings on which partner agencies interact, and how the norms are developed through the process of community development programmes.

6.2.2. Morphology and Network integration

Why do personal networks matter?

While the formal partnership networks set up in the area gave a general picture of partnership landscape together with some of the key organisations in community development initiatives, this part focuses on the substantial networks through which individuals communicate with each other and deal with day-to-day business relevant to community development projects. An officer mentioned that

'They know each other very well because the number of public agencies responsible to the area is relatively small compared with the urban areas' (Senior Policy & Projects Officer, HIE).

On the other hand, too many partnerships might be unnecessarily burdensome to those
who are involved in more than one partnership. Another officer commented:

'I said, "why not having the meetings at same time?" because members involved in the different partnerships are always the same!' (Policy officer, Highland Council)

These interviewees' comments hinted that the formal picture of partnerships may conceal the reality. The substantial interactions taking place between those individuals seem to be more informal so that it is important to consider how far these personal networks impact on the activities within and beyond the partnerships.

In order to describe the 'horizontal network' – a pattern of interpersonal relations within a partnership – data was collected from the questionnaire survey, which asked the members of four partnerships the following questions;

"With whom do you have most contact?"

"How often do you contact them?"

The horizontal network of each partnership was drawn by using the network diagram method (see Section 3.4.2.2). The initial sociograms consisting of individual names and organisations of all members are shown in Appendix 8 and 9. This section focuses on the Wellbeing Alliance (WBA) and Sutherland Partnership (SP). For convenience sake, the name of key individuals and groupings are referred to in the text as [A. Clark] or [G. Tood – A. Keating]. This is helpful because individuals can be identified as 'points' or 'cliques' (a set of points) in the sociogram that represents the properties of social configurations, and identifiable symbols can distinguish some of those who appear in different partnerships as key actors in both horizontal and vertical interrelations.

**The partnership network of the Wellbeing Alliance**

The sociogram of the partnership network of the Wellbeing Alliance (WBA) shows a relatively organised structure with a strong core group of senior officers of key public agencies (see Figure 6.3). It is important to notice that the graph does not show the

---

1 Responses from the Initiative at the Edge (2 responses) and the North Sutherland Community Development Forum (2 responses) were not enough to draw their personal networks that would show substantial interactions.

2 See Section 3.4.2.2
entire partnership network, but can be seen as a snapshot of a particular moment. It is almost impossible to capture all those who are concerned with the WBA, because some are appointed officially, others are just involved in the partnership activities in relation to their own organisations. This is frequently the case with the Highland Council officers.

Figure 6.3 shows that [A. Clark] plays a central role within the WBA. Ms Clark, Head of Policy of Chief Executive Office in Highland Council, is indeed playing a leading role as a co-ordinator of the WBA. With the centre of [A. Clark], the WBA’s network has a ‘hub/spokes’-like form, in which a number of different sub-forms are identified.

Three sub-sets of points (‘sub-groups’) connect directly to the central point [A. Clark]. The first sub-group (upper left) consists of four members and its centre is a Health Board officer as a ‘gateway’, who connects to [A. Clark]. This sub-group creates another ‘hub/spokes’-like form. The second (right) consists of six members, with three of them directly connected to [A. Clark]. In this sub-group, members are well connected...
to each other, and thus a 'web'-like network is formed without a particular central point. Importantly, those located in this sub-group are from the so-called 'Big Six' public agencies\(^3\). This implies that those members of similar status from public agencies are likely to develop a web-like network, rather than hierarchy- or corridor-type. The third sub-group (bottom) consists of nine members, and develops strong connections with each other in the way in which officers from Northern Constabulary, Highland Council, and Health Board are mixed to form a 'corridor' type of network.

In addition to these sub-groups, there is a small sub-network (top) which includes members of the Initiative at the Edge (IatE) National Steering Group (senior officers from Scottish Natural Heritage and Highlands & Islands Enterprise). This means that the WBA partnership has, to some extent, a close link to it. There are also two satellite sub-groups in which the Highland Council and Northern Constabulary officers are centrally positioned. These officers have close contacts with those who were not found in official documents that showed the membership of the partnership. Although, there was no proof that both officers had contact with other members of the partnership, it is assumed that they had close connections to [A.Clark] Highland Council and colleagues of Northern Constabulary, respectively. This implies that structures of partnerships multiply beyond their official boundaries. Both independent sub-groups are presumably working at the administrative level of the partnership through line management with the senior officers of the organisations like a satellite of the partnership.

All three sub-groups in the WBA seemed to have specific roles. For example, the first sub-group dealt with the youth and health programmes such as the Social Inclusion Partnership. The second sub-group dealt with partnership management as a core group and the third dealt with safety issues. It is the initial purpose of the partnership that under the banner of thematic programmes, different organisations work together in delivering their services. In this sense, the fact that there were some sub-groups with their own roles, leads to the conclusion that the WBA provided new arenas in which agencies would find working partners for achieving their remits.

\(^3\) The 'Big 6' includes Highland Council, HIE, Health Board, SNH and Scottish Homes (now Communities Scotland), and those are original core partners of the WBA since 1996.
**Partnership network of the Sutherland Partnership**

The partnership network of the Sutherland Partnership (SP) shows a complex picture with a large number of points (see Figure 6.4). This was not only because of the number of participants in the partnership, but also the variety of organizations to which the actors belonged. In fact, whilst the WBA consists of mainly public agencies, the membership of the SP is open to voluntary groups and community interest groups, as well as public agencies.

![Figure 6.4: Partnership network of Sutherland Partnership](image)

This shows that [G.Todd] is the centre of the partnership network. Mr. Todd, Area Development Manager of Highland Council, is indeed playing a leading role as an...
advisor of SP\(^4\). Unlike the WBA network, the SP forms a 'web'-like network around [G. Todd]. Several sub-groups can be identified. It is, however, difficult to find clear boundaries of sub-groups simply because some points are connected to other sub-groups by a 'spoke'. In order to describe the characteristics of the network, this part focuses upon three sub-groups.

The first sub-group is positioned at the upper left of the network. In this sub-group, [G. Todd] has a close relation to [A. Keatinge] Voluntary Groups of East Sutherland (VGES). Around the [G. Todd-A. Keatinge] axis, some 'web'-like networks appeared. They involve two community workers (CW) who are employed by the partnership and three representatives from community voluntary organisations. Taking account of the roles of VGES and CW, which is supposed to be in contact with local groups and individuals, the [G. Todd-A. Keatinge] axis can enhance community involvement, supporting the existing networks and establishing new networks. This can also have an influence upon the effective linkage towards ‘Community Planning’ throughout the Highlands area, enhancing community involvement. This has happened partly because three members in this sub-group are also members of the WBA, the strategic partnership launching ‘Community Planning’.

The second sub-group (upper right) includes five Caithness and Sutherland Enterprise (CASE) officers who have close contact with [G. Todd]. This expert sub-group can disseminate their knowledge whilst consulting over for what community groups require, financing or seeking matching funds for the projects. It connects to other sub-groups through two types of ‘gateways’. One is an ‘area-based-gateway’, including [A. MacConnell], [M. Telfer] and a community worker\(^5\), through whom village-based community groups can access to what is available in the SP, and, in turn, the SP can sense what community groups require and respond to them at the appropriate time. The other is a ‘project-oriented-gateway’, including officers from the Forestry Enterprise and Scottish Natural Heritage, through whom the third sub-group is connected to the

\(^1\) During the period of questionnaire survey, the post of SP project manager was absent, and thus Mr. Todd has been dealing with administrative jobs. Now the post is replaced by Mr. David Dryan, appointed as the manager post at 2001.

\(^5\) Ms MacConnell and Ms Telfer work at Bettyhill village and Ms MacKay on the Durness village basis.
centre of the partnership. Unlike the ‘area-based-gateway’, it is assumed that they can provide specific advice on the projects implemented with SP support.

In the third sub-group (bottom), there are ‘corridor’-type, ‘hub/spokes’- and ‘web’-like networks composed of those concerned with environmental and agricultural issues. While the third sub-group distances itself from the centre of the partnership, some individuals try to keep some ties to the centre, including two representatives from NorCelt (a community group) and North Highland Forestry Trust (NHFT), and a Forestry Commission officer. The representative of NHFT, in particular, seems to play an important role as a ‘hub’ to promote environmental projects, such as Boggie Forest, a community forest initiative.

The first and second sub-groups did not seem to be in favour of specific purposes such as delivering certain public services, but concerned a wide range of issues. This is because of the nature of these voluntary organizations and Local Enterprise Companies, which have a wide range of remits for community groups. If this means that these sub-groups had the capabilities to deal with a wide range of thematic issues, such a “jack-of-all-trades” type group can tackle specific localized problems and projects. On the other hand, the third group has a weaker connection to the centre of the SP, but they have an environmental and agricultural focus. This is because the third sub-group is a compound of kindred organizations with specific environmental concerns. These results raise a fundamental question concerning the establishment the partnership as to whether members of each sub-group benefit by joining the SP. For those who have already worked without joining the SP, partnership work would become extra tiring unless the SP created new opportunities to innovate more efficient means to achieve their objectives through joined-up projects.

The integration of the SP network was still poor. However, there were some nodes of intersection, which included both ‘area-based’ and ‘project-oriented’ gateways. These actors were mainly associated with the second sub-group and, more importantly, loosely linked with key actors who were located on the periphery of the SP but active in their sub-group. For the SP, it is necessary that ‘gateway’ actors create new arenas where different organizations with different remits find new partners for productive projects;
and that substantial money to implement the new projects is available.

6.2.3. Comment

In the case study area, there is a shift in the formation of partner agencies in the community development arena; from public agency dominant to local community-led. In this process, the number of partnerships in which public agencies got involved had to be rationalised. This was because those individuals of public bodies who attended the meetings and dealt with day-to-day administration were getting exhausted through being involved in several similar partnerships. This may cause not only duplication of similar programmes but also create burdens for the individual actors. Therefore, it would be inefficient to keep too many partnerships operating in the area.

While the number of partner agencies has been reduced, the Highland Council has come to play a considerable role within the whole partnership structure in the area. This tendency was found in both strategic and local partnerships. In the case of the Wellbeing Alliance, key nodal points were dominated by the Highland Council officers. The substantial driving force of the partnership consisted of the main public agencies, such as the Highlands and Islands Enterprise, Health Board, and Northern Constabulary. The strong networks between these public bodies have got the structure of the partnership well organised. In the mean time, this pattern seems to have developed thematic issues with which the members were likely to deal beyond the organisational boundaries.

Compared with the WBA, the Sutherland Partnership appeared less organized, which indicated difficulties with local community-led partnerships. It had a Highland Council area development manager at the centre of the partnership, but showed a more complex pattern. The thematic issues and objectives that the SP deals were consequently less specific, which seems to become an obstruction for some members in expressing their interests or making the best of their expertise within its institutional setting. However, due to a principle of open membership, it is impossible to develop the way in which each sub-group has specific thematic issues and roles within the partnership more simply. In addition, the main driving force was not only the Highland Council officer, but also the Caithness & Sutherland Enterprise officers and representatives from
voluntary organizations. These members deal with a wide range of issues relevant to community life, which differ from village to village. Therefore, it would be inefficient to build a rigid structure within the partnership to deal with such various and fluid issues. In the case of the community-led partnership, those individuals who play 'gateway' roles play a considerable role in clarifying an unclear institutional setting, by transferring meaningful information that emerges in sub-groups, and, moreover, in other partnerships such as the Wellbeing Alliance.
6 An Evaluation of the Institutional Capacity of Partnerships

6.3. Knowledge Resources of partnerships

The second evaluation of institutional capacity concerns 'Knowledge Resources'. As discussed in Section 3.3.4 and 3.4.2.3, the three components of Knowledge Resources were identified as:

- The range of Knowledge Resources and the frames of reference identified as relevant to community development projects
- The extent of integration of the range of knowledge and frames of reference among those involved in partnerships
- The process through which members of each partnership were open to new ideas and actions and found that they had learnt new knowledge and developed new skills

In order to identify the Knowledge Resources that members of the partnerships needed to implement community development projects, the questionnaire survey was used (see Section 3.4.1.4). The members were asked the question “What kinds of words do you exchange within the partnership?” In addition to the questionnaire survey, semi-structured, face-to-face interviews with 11 village representatives were carried out. The results of the questionnaire survey and the semi-structured interviews were scrutinised with regard to the first two components, range/frames and integration. To examine the third component, open/learning, the self-evaluation of the partnership performance was used.

6.3.1. Range of Knowledge Resources of partnerships and integration

Two elements of Knowledge Resources are emphasised:
- the objects of knowledge ('words'); and
- the social subjects (actors using 'words').

In addition, the relations between actors were analysed: i.e., who shared the words, and their integration.

There was a vast range of knowledge involved in the community development projects and deployed by different partnerships. Firstly, 'words' were divided into two categories; Planning and Thematic. Planning was subdivided into five categories:
the Strategy of the partnership in general;
Action, such as project management;
Partnership within members' own organisations and with other partnerships;
Funding allocation or opportunities; and
Community Planning.

There were eight thematic issues:
Community in general;
Youth;
Safety;
Health;
Transport;
Economy;
Agriculture; and
Environment.

Table 6.2 shows the range of issues and those who raised these issues within the partnership network. In Table 6.2, the three (or four) capital letters name to the names of the partnership and actors. For example, “W-AC” refers to “Wellbeing Alliance – A.Clark”.

Table 6.2: Range of issues that different partnerships raised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Various</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Community Planning</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W-CH</td>
<td>$ W-AC</td>
<td>$ W-M</td>
<td>$ W-MS</td>
<td>$ W-CW</td>
<td>$ W-SB</td>
<td>$ W-CH</td>
<td>$ W-MB</td>
<td>$ W-BR</td>
<td>$ W-PT</td>
<td>$ W-PP</td>
<td>$ W-M</td>
<td>$ W-AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-PS</td>
<td>$ W-AC</td>
<td>$ W-M</td>
<td>$ W-MS</td>
<td>$ W-CW</td>
<td>$ W-SB</td>
<td>$ W-CH</td>
<td>$ W-MB</td>
<td>$ W-BR</td>
<td>$ W-PT</td>
<td>$ W-PP</td>
<td>$ W-M</td>
<td>$ W-AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-NC</td>
<td>$ W-AC</td>
<td>$ W-M</td>
<td>$ W-MS</td>
<td>$ W-CW</td>
<td>$ W-SB</td>
<td>$ W-CH</td>
<td>$ W-MB</td>
<td>$ W-BR</td>
<td>$ W-PT</td>
<td>$ W-PP</td>
<td>$ W-M</td>
<td>$ W-AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-RM</td>
<td>$ W-AC</td>
<td>$ W-M</td>
<td>$ W-MS</td>
<td>$ W-CW</td>
<td>$ W-SB</td>
<td>$ W-CH</td>
<td>$ W-MB</td>
<td>$ W-BR</td>
<td>$ W-PT</td>
<td>$ W-PP</td>
<td>$ W-M</td>
<td>$ W-AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Initiative at the Edge National Steering Group (No of members who responded: 2)

Knowledge Resources and their integration of the Wellbeing Alliance

While the WBA covered a wide range of *planning* issues, it only covered the *thematic* issues relevant to ‘youth’, ‘safety’ and ‘health’. The former was due to the nature of the partnership, which was set up as a strategic one responsible for the whole Highlands area. ‘Strategy’ issues were discussed particularly well amongst members. The latter reflected the structure of the WBA, which is subdivided into three groups: Community
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Planning; Community Safety; and Youth Issues (WBA, 2000a). On the other hand, the members were less concerned about the thematic issues such as ‘community’ ‘economy’ and ‘environment’. The result clearly shows that the frames of reference used in the WBA are heavily dependent on the partnership structure. It is, however, a paradox that ‘community’ issues were hardly shared between members of the WBA, which is the lead Community Planning partnership (see Section 5.3.2). This was a negative aspect of the WBA partnership: that projects still tend to be delivered through a top-down approach, rather than bottom-up approach using local knowledge. During the follow-up interview, a member of the WBA acknowledged this point by stating:

“What we want to choose soft issues that are ones that have many dimensions. We can do things like ‘safety’, ‘health’ and ‘youth’ issues. They all have many dimensions that we can contribute.... The problems of other areas like ‘agriculture’ and ‘economy’ are that in each case there is an agency dedicated and set up by the government, specifically to do that. What you’ve got there is that agency will not give up their power to the partnership, and in some cases, the other agencies will not even want to ask for reasons of politeness. So they tend not to get into that. ....We have not done much in ‘community’, to be honest. ‘Environment’ is done by the Environment Agency and we do the ‘economy’.”
(Senior Policy & Project Officer, HIE)

This statement indicates a problem that the WBA should overcome; the way in which the strategic partnership innovates and delivers various programmes for community development was still dominated not only by a ‘top-down’ approach, but also by sectionalism.

With respect to the integration of Knowledge Resources, the emphasis was on actors who use ‘words’ and their positions in the partnership structure. For doing so, a distribution map of ‘words’, drawn up on the basis of the partnership network diagram (see Figure 6.3 in Section 6.2.2.2), shows which issues were shared in sub-groups within the partnership and how these words were transferred from one sub-group to another.
Figure 6.5 shows planning related Knowledge Resources distributed within the partnership. Those who were located in the centre of the WBA network were likely to share various issues. The second sub-group, consisting of officers from the ‘Big Six’ public agencies, in particular, shared almost all planning issues. In this sense, the second sub-group can be seen as a ‘centripetal’ force of the WBA. The main planning issues, ‘strategy’, ‘action plan’, and ‘Community Planning’ that were discussed in the second sub-group were also transferred to other sub-groups by [A.Clark] Co-ordinator of the WBA. However, unlike the second ‘centripetal’ sub-group, the other two sub-groups did not necessarily share all of the planning issues, rather they tended to emphasise more practical issues, such as ‘action’ and ‘funding’. Figure 6.6 shows thematic issues distributed within the partnership. It shows a simple pattern in which the thematic issues shared within the sub-groups matched the attributes of sub-groups. For instance, ‘health’ issues were distributed mainly in the first health project-oriented sub-group; ‘community’ issues in the second ‘centripetal’ sub-group; and ‘safety’ issues in the third safety sub-group.
Combining these patterns together, what Foucault called a ‘discursive formation’ was revealed. This ‘discursive formation’ is morphology of the networks of the WBA, through which these various issues as knowledge resources are pooled and transferred. Firstly, each thematic issue, which was decided within the second sub-group, was transmitted along with the strategy to two project-oriented sub-groups respectively, by the centre core of [A.Clark]. In this formation, all the three sub-groups dealt with their own thematic issues. For example, the first sub-group dealt with youth programmes such as the Social Inclusion Partnership, which aims to assist young people who are facing disadvantages such as unemployment, poor skills, and bad health. As the ‘centripetal’ force of the partnership, the second sub-group dealt with partnership management and ‘youth’ issues. The third sub-group, consisting of officers from the Northern Constabulary and the Health Board, dealt with joined-up programmes that focused on the ‘safety’ and ‘health’ issues. It was the initial purpose of the establishment of the partnership that, under the banner of thematic programmes, different organizations would work together in delivering their services. This leads to the conclusion that the WBA provided new arenas in which agencies found working
partners for achieving their remits.

In addition, an interaction with another partnership, namely the Initiative at the Edge (IatE) Partnership, was identified between [A.Clark] and senior officers from public agencies who were also involved in the IatE. The knowledge resources exchanged through this connection were much broader issues categorised as 'Community Planning', 'partnership', 'economy' and 'community'. These included 'the policy of Scottish Executive' and the 'economic health of the Highlands'. This means that the WBA contained an access route beyond the partnership boundary, through which they obtained extra knowledge resources. For the links to other partnerships seem to be important, this point will be discussed more in Section 6.4, Mobilisation Capacity.

Knowledge Resources and their integration into the Sutherland Partnership and North Sutherland Community Development Forum

There was a clear tendency that, while the strategic partnerships focussed upon strategic planning or management issues, the local partnerships were more concerned with local circumstances and problems. The Sutherland Partnership (SP) covered a wide range of planning issues, and 'action/management' and 'funding' issues were prominent. It also covered a wide range of thematic issues, except for 'safety' and 'health'.

At the local community level, the North Sutherland Community Development Forum (NSCDF) and the 11 village representatives identified 'funding' issues as one of the main concerns, but neither 'strategy' nor 'Community Planning' was regarded as of importance. On the other hand, they had a varied vocabulary of thematic issues, ranging from 'community' to 'environment'. As gathered from individual interviews about their own projects, there were a variety of specific words. Despite this, 'community' and 'community hall' were issues they had in common. This is partly because many of village projects started with a renovation of the Community Hall, and in many cases the Hall Committee in each village was in charge of the project.

In the light of the integration of Knowledge Resources at the local level, a distribution map of 'words' for the SP was drawn on the basis of the partnership network diagram.
(see Figure 6.4 in Section 6.2.2.3). Figure 6.7 shows planning related issues distributed in the SP; and Figure 6.8 shows thematic issues. There are four implications to draw from the maps.

Firstly, the [G.Todd-A.Keatinge] axis pooled a wide range of planning issues, and therefore it can be seen as the ‘centripetal force’ of the SP. However, it is important to note that ‘strategic’ knowledge was not automatically transferred to other sub-groups. Secondly, within the first sub-group, which was closely connected to the ‘centripetal force’, three community workers/area co-ordinators shared wider planning issues and particular thematic issues in which they specialised, namely ‘community’ and ‘transport’. In addition, the second expert sub-group retained various ‘funding’ related issues, and ‘community’ and ‘economy’ related knowledge resources. It is worth noting that although the second sub-group was positioned near the centre of the partnership,
there were no planning issues shared other than ‘funding’ in the sub-group. Thirdly, the third environmental & agricultural oriented sub-group did not pool knowledge resources, compared with the other sub-groups. It was evident that each issue was shared by only one or two members. In terms of knowledge resources, this lesser integration of the third sub-group reflects relatively less intense inter-personal connections as described in Section 6.2.2.3. Lastly, another type of knowledge transfer was identified. This was formed by both ‘area-based’ and ‘project-oriented’ gateways, which were connected to the second expert sub-group. They pooled ‘funding’ related issues and some thematic issues with which they each were concerned. Taking account of their functions as ‘gateways’, these knowledge resources were presumably transferred to members located in the third sub-group, as well as local communities who were not involved in the SP.

The Knowledge Resources of the SP were largely dependent on ‘funding’ and certain thematic issues were evenly dispersed. In the ‘discursive formation’ of the SP, the
[G. Tood-A. Keatinge] axis functions as a ‘centripetal’ force, from which two sub-groups are connected. As clearly addressed in its strategy document that “the Partnership [will] have a pivotal role in generating applications for the Rural Challenge Fund” (Sutherland Partnership, 1997: 3), it should contain functions to create a wider range of opportunities, tackling particular local problems. In practice, the two sub-groups near the centre seem to function as incubators, which continuously produce the main programmes of the SP one after another. The keys to create opportunities are to combine the members’ expertise with local based knowledge labelled as ‘community’ issues. For example, in the second sub-group, ‘economic’ information retained in the CASE, a Local Enterprise Company, can be combined with particular local problems, which appear in the personal networks of the SP. In collaboration with the ‘environmental’ expertise of Scottish Natural Heritage, projects assisting tourism can be developed.

In addition, the partnership is expected to implement these projects with local communities and to monitor them. It is a distinctive feature of the SP that two types of ‘gateways’ allow access routes though which community workers call on individuals and local community groups. An importance of these gateways is to transfer knowledge resources between the centre of the SP and other members of the partnership who are located at the periphery, namely the third sub-group. It also allows access routes to other partnerships, particularly to the NSCDF, through the ‘area-based’ gateways who were dealing with day-to-day activities within local communities.

The map of Knowledge Resources for the NSCDF was not constructed due to the lack of data. It is, however, worth noting the comments on ‘partnership’ issues by the 11 village representatives. They claimed a large concern for ‘partnership’ with public agencies and voluntary organisations, but few concerns about the exchange of information and ideas amongst different villages. The former seems to reflect local people’s concerns about ‘funding’ from public agencies. The latter implies that there was no place where different villages could exchange good practices. Rather, there was a sense of competitiveness between villages. Evidence was given by a community representative in Melness, that “Some villages are very good at accessing funding”. As Coser (1956) argues, competitive interactions between community groups have one useful side effect; they trigger a rapid rise in cohesion. Although this does not directly
lead to the acquisition of Knowledge Resources in each community group, it serves to establish and maintain the identity of groups. On the basis of this group identity, they are open and access to any kind of resources that could benefit for them. The NSCDF lacked an arena where community groups from different villages could interact and exchange their knowledge resources. However, a possible sign was given by a community representative in Tongue; "We intend to look at the Durness model that is quite successful (regarding a new project for a 'community golf course')". In fact, many community groups were at an early stage in their own projects. The links between the extent to which each partnership retains Knowledge Resources and the process of building networks within the partnership need to be examined in the next section.

6.3.2. Openness and learning process

As discussed in Section 3.4.2.3, there is a predictable pattern of processes through which actors in partnerships react to change: orientation; organisation; strategy development; implementation; and review. This part aimed to examine the extent to which members of each partnership were open to new ideas and actions, and had learned new knowledge and developed new skills through involvement in the partnership. For this purpose, the members of the four partnerships were asked to evaluate how well the various features of the partnership performed.

Each partnership had two features: planning process-related and partnership building. The first set of features of the partnership is regarded as a driving force throughout the process of community development: identifying ideas; setting strategies and action plans; implementing and monitoring the projects; and reviewing objectives. Secondly, the partnership creates an arena where each member can communicate with each other to obtain knowledge resources.

Figure 6.9 shows the extent to which each partnership evaluated its 'planning process-related' features, roughly divided into three phases; strategic-, implementation-, and monitoring/reviewing-phases. It shows that all partnerships identified their characteristics. However, as the process went on, the level of performance between four partnerships became variable. In the 'strategic-phase', while the WBA performed well
in setting strategic plans and drawing up action plans, the rest of three partnerships did not. Particularly, the members of the NSCDF was not totally convinced of their ability to set strategic plans.

However, when it came to the ‘implementation-phase’, the situation was turned around. The NSCDF, which were less strategic in the previous phase, performed better than other so-called ‘strategic’ partnerships. Here a clear boundary could be seen in roles that differentiate each partnership’s role. The WBA and SP worked well in the strategic phase and the NSCDF in the implementation phases. In other words, the WBA and SP were not good at handling substantial projects on the ground. This weak point resulted in lower scores in the ‘monitoring/reviewing phases’, compared with that of the
'strategic phase'. This is caused by the lack of communication with communities in the implementation processes. They have failed to listen to the communities who knew exactly the obstacles that they had to get rid of. As the results show, for the NSCDF, 'monitoring and reviewing' roles were performed poorly. This is partly because of the lack of a 'strategic viewpoint' that would have enabled them to confirm their direction. Since community development projects cannot be achieved in a short period, it is difficult to continuously motivate local communities to keep things going forward. Thus, to adapt the projects to fit the local circumstances, long-term and strategic perspectives are required.

There was a clear contrast in roles between the 'strategic' partnerships such as the WBA and SP and the 'implementation' partnerships such as the NSCDF. However, when these partnerships operate together on the ground with different perspectives, a functional gap between partnerships can cause the fragmentation of knowledge resources. Without the strategic partnerships' concern for what is happening on the ground, and local communities' ability to have a strategic viewpoint, there is a danger of leaving things unfinished or unachieved. Interactions both within and beyond a partnership will be examined when Mobilisation Capacity is discussed.

Figure 6.10 shows the extent to which each partnership evaluated its 'partnership building' arena. It was assumed that a partnership started to generate an arena by encouraging 'community participation', followed by improving the arena in which participants communicated with each other, and then by broadening it beyond the partnership to carry out the projects that would not have been achieved on their own.

'Community participation' was carried out well by the NSCDF, but not by the WBA and IatE partnerships. In the latter case, because their memberships were open to a limited number of organisations, which were dominated by public agencies, there was no room for local communities or other members to take part. However, while the WBA showed a relatively high level of achievement in 'networking to other partnerships' and 'taking account of the strategies of other partnerships', the NSCDF did not. This seemed be associated with partnership identity; the membership of the NSCDF was still unfixed and consequently the ability to expand networks remained weak. As stated before,
interactions with other partnerships would be effective in confirming their identity, but, in the case of the NSCDF, this would not readily happen unless participants were aware of being members of the Forum.

![Diagram of partnership building arena]

Figure 6.10: Self-evaluation of partnership building arena

6.3.3. Comment

There was a rich and multi-dimensional array of knowledge resources found in the case study area. Figure 6.11 shows the summary of Knowledge Resources of the partnerships.

With respect to planning issues, which are crucial for community development projects, relatively concrete strategies and understanding of their importance were shared at the strategic level. This was evident particularly in the WBA’s case, as the partnership was set up in order to draw up the Community Plan for the Highlands. Since it was formally created in 1996, the partnership had devoted time to intensive meetings and discussions among partnership members so they had had enough time to share their objectives and prepare to launch designated projects in the area for which they are responsible.
The SP was also set up at the same time in 1996, after the announcement of the Local Rural Partnership programme by the Scottish Executive. They had produced the first strategy in 1997, followed by the revised version in 2000, which was aimed at forming the basis of the SP’s action plan. The partnership structure, consisting of a planning management group and three thematic forums (economic, environment, and social development), was formalised around this time in order to facilitate the action plans. Thus, their planning-related knowledge and some thematic knowledge were also well developed.

Since the WBA and SP were set up and have evolved through ‘Community Planning’ in Scotland, both partnerships have achieved their objectives to some extent. These include a culture of partnership, thematic specialisation, and innovation in project management. However, it is acknowledged that what ‘Community Planning’ ultimately aims to achieve, community involvement, was poor at the strategic partnership level.

On the other hand, at the local level, the NSCDF and the 11 village representatives showed few concerns about planning knowledge within the partnership. Although they had experienced the drawing up of a strategy and action plan under the Duthchas initiatives during 1998-2001, this activity was not enough for the communities to share ideas and set-up strategies for the future. It is fair to mention that the NSCDF, which is regarded as a successor of Duthchas Pilot Area Advisory Group in North Sutherland,
has started with completely different objectives and membership. Indeed, the NSCDF was only formally constituted in early 2001 and it was too early to evaluate its achievement of strategic objectives. Despite a poor stock of planning-related knowledge resources amongst local communities, they had rich knowledge resources and means in community involvement and thematic issues accumulated through local experience, often lacked by strategic partnerships. This local knowledge was transferred by 'area-based' gateways. They transmitted various opportunities, such as new community programmes and funding opportunities, to local communities. In return, communities gave the NSCDF what they could afford and/or could not. To utilise and enhance these rich local knowledge resources, it is important to remember that the integration of shared knowledge not only within the partnership, but also beyond the partnership is crucial for all partnerships. This leads to the subject, the evaluation of Mobilisation Capacity, as vertical networks between the four partnerships.
6.4. Mobilisation Capacity in the partnerships

The third part of the evaluation of institutional capacity concerns Mobilisation Capacity. As discussed in Section 3.3.4 and 3.4.2.4, the three dimensions of Mobilisation Capacity were identified as:

- The arenas where mobilisation for action takes place, who has access to them, and how far the degree of access to the arenas affects on the performance of the partnership
- The shared knowledge for action perceived and available to various actors, the degree of shared understanding about this, and how far the shared understanding affects on the performance of the partnership
- The identity and significance of those recognised as change agents, and the repertoires that stakeholders and key agents use to mobilise and exercise influence

It was assumed that arenas in which implementation takes place existed not only within the partnership, but also in-between partnerships, as ‘vertical network’ arenas. The term ‘vertical partnership network’ refers to a pattern of interpersonal relations beyond the partnership to which actors belong. Since community development projects take place on the ground, all tiers of partnerships link to the community level. Firstly, the patterns of the ‘vertical partnership networks’ were drawn using ‘sociogram’ techniques. On the basis of these maps, analytical attention focused on the integration of shared knowledge between different partnerships. In addition, three important roles of agents who transfer these knowledge resources through the partnership networks were scrutinised: ‘centripetal forces’; ‘diffusors’; and ‘bridges’. Combining the vertical networks patterns with shared knowledge, the aim was to reveal the discursive formation of community development in the case study area.

6.4.1. Arenas

In this part, the arenas where those who have powers to get things moving forward with certain knowledge and network resources are explored. The evaluation of Relational and Knowledge Resources in the previous sections indicated that a programme manager or community worker of each partnership would be the first person whom other
partnership members would contact. In other words, the arenas could be found around those key actors, because they retained the Knowledge Resources of their own partnership and thus could mobilise them in creating arenas for action.

On the basis of this hypothesis, the data was collected from the questionnaire survey, which asked the members of four partnerships the question ‘How often do you make contact with programme managers or community workers of the other partnership?’ In this survey, nine names of those identified as programme managers / community workers were given in advance (see Table 6.3). Using the network diagram method, the first task was to scrutinise the vertical partnerships that each partnership built, followed by the vertical integration amongst partnerships. The initial sociograms consisting of individual names and organizations of all members are shown in Appendix 10, 11, 12 and 13. For convenience’s sake, the names of programme manager or community workers are referred to in the text as {A. Clark}, and other members as [S. Black]. Secondly, key players who influenced the performance of the partnership were identified.

Table 6.3: Names of programme managers and community workers of partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Partnership</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name (organisation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative at the Edge</td>
<td>National Co-ordinator</td>
<td>M. Roger (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSG</td>
<td>Co-ordinator</td>
<td>A. Clark (HC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion SIP</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>B. MacKinnon (HC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBA</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>G. Todd (HC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Officer</td>
<td>CW of SIP</td>
<td>Y. MacKay (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Rural Partnership</td>
<td>Community Initiative</td>
<td>J. Bond (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland Partnership</td>
<td>CSIC in N. Sutherland</td>
<td>V. O’Hara (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSCDF</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>A. MacConnel(CASE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area Co-ordinator</td>
<td>M. Telfer (CASE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: W: Community Worker
NSG: National Steering Group
CP: Community Planning
NSCDF: North Sutherland Community Development Forum
HC: Highland Council
CASE: Caithness and Sutherland Enterprise

The ‘inward-oriented’ network of the Wellbeing Alliance

Figure 6.12 shows the vertical network between the Wellbeing Alliance (WBA) members and other partnerships. Firstly, the WBA members had been building a strong
‘inward-oriented’ network around the WBA and the Social Inclusion Partnership (SIP) programme. The second ‘centripetal’ sub-group, consisting of the main public agencies, had interactions with the SIP through close contact with either {B. MacKinnon} Programme Manager of SIP, working on the Highland Council basis, or {Y. MacKay} a community worker in the SIP North Sutherland. Since {B. MacKinnon} and {Y. MacKay} were strongly connected each other as line management of the SIP, the vertical network between the WBA and the SIP programmes, including the local branch in North Sutherland was viewed as being integrated. Technically speaking, {Y. MacKay} was also located in the Sutherland Partnership (SP) and, in this sense, some WBA actors had interactions with the SP. Another frequent interactive path was found between the Highland Council (HC) officers and {G. Todd} advisor to the SP. This HC network, which stretched from {A. Clark} through the HC officers to {G. Todd}, was seen as an intermediary role between the WBA and the SP which were both set up under the Scottish Rural Partnership initiative (Scottish Office, 1995; 1997; 1998). This means that the integration of strategic-local partnerships was achieved to some extent.

On the other hand, there were less frequent contacts with the Initiative at the Edge (IaTE) and the North Sutherland Community Development Forum (NSCDF). A Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) officer was the only one who contacted the IaTE partnership, in which the SNH participates. Therefore, it can be concluded that the interactions with the IaTE and NSCDF, which were launched under a different initiative by the Scottish Executive (http://www.initiative-at-the-edge.org.uk), remained less interactive.
Figure 6.12: Vertical Networks of the Wellbeing Alliance
The ‘project-oriented’ network of the Initiative at the Edge National Steering Group

Figure 6.13 shows the vertical network between the Initiative at the Edge (latE) members and other partnerships. Overall, there were strong vertical connections to the NSCDF under the latE programme. [S. Black] Highlands & Islands Enterprise (HIE), [J. Watson] Scottish Natural Heritage and [J. Toal] Crofters Commission were connected to the NSCDF through close contact with {A. MacConnell} and {M. Telfer}, who were officially employed by the Caithness & Sutherland Enterprise, one of the Local Enterprise Companies of the HIE network. In the case of [S. Black] HIE, the institutional setting, namely the HIE-LECs line management, might enable him to get in touch with two area co-ordinators of the NSCDF easily. In the case of [J. Toal] Crofter Commission, it seems either that he was very active in networking to local groups or that projects relevant to crofting required him to bridge between latE and NSCDF.

In addition, latE members had been building a strong network at the strategic level. The members were relatively well connected to the WBA through close contact with {A. Clark}. This is partly because they were senior officers of the key public bodies involved in the WBA (e.g.: A. McCourt, Chief Executive of the Highland Council; J. Watson, Director of Strategy and Operations North of Scottish Natural Heritage; and S. Black, Director of strengthening communities of HIE). These networks at strategic level could affect the partnership performances as a result of the integration by exchange of information between different partnerships. They could avoid duplication of similar projects, and help to distribute funding and staff resources in an effective manner. In a case where several different partnerships exist at once, it is important for executive officers of key public bodies to participate in more than one partnership.
Figure 6.13: Vertical Networks of the Initiative at the Edge

Note

- Programme Manager (PM) or Community Worker (CW)
- IatE members
- HC: Highland Council
- SNH: Scottish Natural Heritage
- HIE: Highlands & Islands Enterprise
- CrofC: Crofter Commission
- CASE: Caithness & Sutherland Enterprise
- IatE: Initiative at the Edge
- SIP: Social Inclusion Partnership
Figure 6.14 shows the vertical network between the Sutherland Partnership (SP) members and other partnerships. Unlike both the WBA and IatE members, the vertical networks of the SP members were well established with both strategic and local partnerships. Those who had both upward- and downward-oriented networks were representatives from Caithness & Sutherland Enterprise, HOST (Tourist Board for Highlands and Islands) and voluntary organisations for the communities. These actors were categorised, in the analysis of Relational Resources of the SP, as the first sub-group (community & voluntary organisations) and the second sub-group (CASE experts) (see Section 6.2.2 and Figure 6.4). This was also the case for community workers working with the SP. They were well interconnected with each other and the programme managers/co-ordinators of different partnerships. Towards the upper level, they had connections through frequent contacts with B.MacKinnon and M.Rodger, followed by A.Clark. Vertical-downward networks were also well developed between the SP and NSCDF through their frequent networking with A.MacConnell and M.Telfer of the NSCDF.

In addition, those who were categorised as the third sub-group (environmental & agricultural oriented) kept close connections with the NSCDF, but weak connections with strategic partnerships. This seemed to be associated with the third sub-group’s position within the SP, where they kept a distance from the centre core of the SP and therefore hardly knew what the strategic partnerships were doing. Although those who transferred their own knowledge resources to the NSCDF were helpful, their roles could be enhanced in the way in which they exchange various resources within the SP and/or with the members of other partnerships more frequently than they did already.

Overall, the SP members, including the community workers, had been building various strong networks in vertical relationships. The result of the questionnaire survey implies that the SP members were concerned with more practical issues on the ground, rather than strategic and planning issues that the upper level partnerships tended to prioritise. As the nature of the middle position in the whole partnership structure, many SP members play a bridging role between strategic and local levels, which is known as the ‘bridging role’ of the Sutherland Partnership.
‘middle-in’ approach (Watt, 1999).

Figure 6.14: Vertical Networks of the Sutherland Partnership
The ‘individual reliance’ of the North Sutherland Community Development Forum

Figure 6.15 shows the vertical network between the North Sutherland Community Development Forum (NSCDF) members and other partnerships. All members had most contact with {M. Telfer}, the area co-ordinator of the IatE. Technically speaking, {M. Telfer} was not the co-ordinator of NSCDF but continues to provide advice and administrative work to them. The members also had a strong connection to {A. MacConnell}, who was independent from the NSCDF in technical terms. This is partly because {A. MacConnell} used to work as the first area co-ordinator when the Duthchas projects came to the area (Duthchas, 1999) and is still working at Bettyhill village. Her current position is Project Manager for community initiatives, which covers the Caithness and Sutherland area, but for many members of the NSCDF, she is more than a project manager or co-ordinator. {M. Telfer} is the same. Since the Duthchas projects came to the area in 1999, trust between {A. MacConnell}/{M. Telfer} and the local community seems to have grown stronger.

There were those who had contact with other partnerships directly, when they needed particular help for the projects that they conducted. This tendency was seen particularly in networking to {M. Rodger}, National-co-ordinator of the IatE. This is partly because the IatE programme has sponsored the current projects conducted by local communities since 1999.

Overall, there can be seen an ‘individual reliance’ of the members upon community workers, which might prevent the NSCDF forming a more sophisticated constitutional setting. While some members had direct but weak contact with other partnerships, these knowledge resources could not be retained within the NSCDF unless they fed back the information to other members and shared them.
Figure 6.15: Vertical Networks of the North Sutherland Community Development Forum

Note

- Programme Manager (PM) or Community Worker (CW)
- NSCDF members

HC: Highland Council
CASE: Caithness & Sutherland Enterprise
IatE: Initiative at the Edge
SIP: Social Inclusion Partnership
6.4.2. Shared knowledge in-between partnerships

In addition to the range of Knowledge Resources raised within each partnership (see Section 6.3), this part focuses on the issues that were shared between different partnerships. It was assumed that the more different partnerships exchanged words and shared ideas, the more each partnership was likely to take actions utilizing the vertically integrated Knowledge Resources that were stored in-between different partnerships. This is important in understanding vertical integration, because, in practice, development programmes/projects are implemented through line management between ‘strategic-’ and ‘local-’ partnerships.

Again, the data were gathered by the questionnaire survey asking “What kinds of words do you exchange with a project manager/community workers of other partnerships?” The same criteria for categorisation used in Section 6.3 was applied in order to evaluate the integration of Knowledge Resources between partnerships: planning issues, consisting of ‘strategy’ & ‘Community Planning’, ‘action’, ‘partnership’, and ‘funding’; and thematic issues, consisting of ‘community’, ‘youth’, ‘safety’, ‘health’, ‘transport’, ‘economy’, ‘agriculture’ and ‘environment’. Table 6.4 shows the range of issues and those who raised these issues between the four partnerships. In Table 6.4, the three (or four) capital letters refers to the names of the partnership and actors. For example, “W-AC” refers to “Wellbeing Alliance – A.Clark”.

Figure 6.16 (planning issues) and Figure 6.17 (thematic issues) show maps of the distribution of Knowledge Resources amongst four partnerships. The round or square figures refer to the Knowledge Resources of each of the partnership that were identified in Section 6.3, and valued ‘ties’ refer to shared knowledge between partnerships. These ‘ties’ are seen as the Mobilisation Capacity between partnerships.

In terms of planning issues (see Figure 6.16), ‘funding’ and ‘action’ were the issues that all different partnerships had in common. Regarding the arenas where different partnerships interact in order to enhance mobility to achieve their objectives, the results show – in terms of the number of issues exchanged - that the main arenas were in-between the WBA and the SP (under the ‘Community Planning’ programme), and the
Table 6.4: Range of Knowledge Resources shared in-between different partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal partnerships</th>
<th>Planning issues</th>
<th>Thematic issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-WAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-LAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-MAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-MMK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-MF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-ES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-PR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-JR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-PR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-PR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Initiative at the Edge National Steering Group (No of members who responded: 3) |
| WBA: Wellbeing Alliance(6) |
| SP: Sutherland Partnership (19) |
| NSCDF: North Sutherland Community Development Forum (5) |

Note

$ Programme manager / advisor
* Community Worker / Area Co-ordinator

SP and the NSCDF (a relationship at local level). This implies that actors do not necessarily have connections to all partnerships; rather they are more likely to have particular routes to immediate partnerships. Moreover, another minor arena can be found: a 'by-pass' route. It was evident that while the NSCDF had a strong connection with the SP, as an immediate upper level partnership, they had direct channels to the IaTE and the WBA through 'funding' issues as well. This indicates that, in terms of funding allocations, they learnt another way of by-passing the whole partnership structure. To take their actions forward, lower level partnerships were directly targeted at the point where funding decisions were made.
‘Strategy’ and ‘Community Planning’ issues were mainly shared between the WBA and the SP. However, few were shared beyond the programme boundary; (e.g. between ‘Community Planning’ and the ‘latE’ programme). This was also the case with ‘partnership’ issues. However, for the NSCDF in particular, what was meant by ‘partnership’ was to keep a pipeline for ‘funding’. In the light of the assumption that ‘partnership’ is regarded as part of a ‘strategy’ to stimulate community development, the discontinuity of the ‘strategy’ could affect the extent to which community-related projects are to be achieved. This also seems to have affected the identity building process within the NSCDF. As pointed out in the analysis of the Knowledge Resources of the NSCDF (see Section 6.3), the NSCDF had a tendency to be less concerned with ‘strategic’ or longer-term views for the partnership. Although it is one of the most important capacities for communities to access arenas where ‘funding’ opportunities lie, they can hardly achieve their goals without a ‘strategic’ perspective. Since ‘funding’ opportunities are not always guaranteed and change quickly, it is helpful for communities to know the circumstances beyond their partnership. For strategic partnerships, the continuity of the ‘strategy’ also matters, because none of the
programmes expects the activities taken by communities to fade away due to the lack of financial resources.

Compared with the integration of planning-related Knowledge Resources, Figure 6.17 (thematic issues) shows different patterns of distribution for thematic issues. Three types of arenas were identified: a programme-led arena; a local network arena; and the WBA dominant arena.

The first arena was associated with ‘youth’ related issues that appeared mainly between the WBA and the SP. This was because ‘youth’ issues were one of the WBA’s priorities, and the Social Inclusion Partnership (SIP) programme was assigned to the North Sutherland area with a community worker, Y. MacKay, who had been working with the SP. Some villages in the area took up ‘youth’ issues as their main projects and therefore they had obtained close connections with Ms MacKay. This case was a good example of the consolidation of the programme delivery with the strategy, which was organised at the strategic level. Although, knowledge resources relevant to ‘youth’ issues existed mainly between the WBA and the SP, this model seems to enhance the quality of knowledge resources in the way in which community workers like Ms MacKay stimulate more frequent interactions with local communities.

The second arena contained a wide range of issues: ‘community’, ‘transport’, ‘economy’, ‘agriculture’ and ‘environment’. Those who interacted in this arena were the SP and the NSCDF. Unlike the first arena, these emerged in the process of ‘bottom-up’ approaches in which projects were decided by local communities themselves. Since none of projects were under particular programmes, those who were involved in the projects had to seek the arenas where resources (human, knowledge, and financial) lie. As the result shows, many issues were shared only between the SP and the NSCDF and this leads to a concern that community groups would withdraw from the arena when they find no meaningful resources for their projects. This is of particular concern with the SP, which does not have specific funding resources, thus it might be difficult to retain Knowledge Resources in this arena. One possible solution is implied by the evidence seen in ‘transport’ and ‘agricultural’ issues, that some of members of both the SP and the NSCDF had begun to try to find another possibilities beyond this arena.
Figure 6.17: 'Thematic' issues as Knowledge Resources shared between partnerships
The last arena is that with which only the WBA was concerned. ‘Safety’ and ‘health’ issues were two of three main objectives of the WBA, but they did not have particular programme mechanisms as ‘youth’ issues did. Obviously, these knowledge resources were hardly shared with other partnerships, and consequently it seems to be difficult for their goals to be achieved. It is not necessarily a good idea to proliferate specific programmes like the SIP. However, all partnerships should consider expanding their repertoires to access other resources, in order to enrich their own Knowledge Resources.

6.4.3. Repertoires and change agents

When looking over all the partnerships in the area, each partnership plays a certain role and connects to others, thereby a number of community development projects at different levels have been implemented. In the case of joint working between different partnerships, there were arenas where members from different partnerships met. In these arenas, key actors channelled and negotiated their own perspectives with other partnerships, and, in return, brought back fresh ideas and disseminated them to the members of the partnership. In this part, the analytical focus is on the key actors, who play essential roles in the integration of horizontal and vertical networks.

Firstly, from a horizontal perspective, ‘centripetal’ and ‘diffusing’ roles are discussed. Within a partnership, both key actors tie the partnership members together by transferring information and encouraging new members to enter, thereby developing shared identities and setting up strategies/action plans of the partnership. While the ‘centripetal’ actors tend to locate themselves at the centre of partnerships, ‘diffusers’ locate themselves in-between sub-groups in the partnership, as ‘nodal points’. Secondly, from the vertical perspective, the ‘bridging’ role is discussed. This role exists when the arenas in-between different partnerships are created. These three roles are discussed in terms of the extent to which they affected the overall performance of the partnership. Finally, interlinks amongst them and their effects should also be considered, because these roles can be combined and performed by a key actor.
Centripetal forces

Firstly, the ‘centripetal forces’ play significant roles in establishing the foundation upon which members base the achievement of community development. The result drawn from the mapping of Relational Resources (see Figure 6.3, 6.4) implied that all programme managers of the partnerships take these roles. They were positioned at the centre of the network as the ‘hub’, from which a series of ‘spokes’ to the sub-groups radiated. Moreover, those actors covered a wider range of knowledge than other members of the partnerships, which is crucial for the future of the partnership (see Figure 6.5 and 6.6, in Knowledge Resources).

In the case of the WBA, the second sub-group can be regarded as a ‘centripetal force’ as well. The sub-group consisted of some senior members of public agencies, namely [C. Higgins] (Highlands & Islands Enterprise), [S. Bell] (Health Board) and [P. Sinclair] (Northern Constabulary), who surrounded the centre and shared a wide range of knowledge resources. Particularly, these players showed strong concerns about strategic and Community Planning issues and the means of delivering them. As far as the partnership approach is concerned, the WBA had an accumulation of centripetal forces and integration of the shared knowledge between them in this sub-group. It became a powerful driving force for the partnership “to bring together all the key public agencies, ..., to agree a vision of the future” (the WBA, 2000b).

In the SP’s case, the ‘centripetal forces’ consisted of [G. Todd], partnership advisor and [A. Keatinge] , VGES. Compared with the number of ‘centripetal forces’ of the WBA, there remained a risky situation in the [G. Todd-A. Keatinge] axis for the SP, because the range of its membership and thematic issues that they handled was much wider than those of the WBA. Evidence of this centripetal frailty can be found in the fact that members of the SP evaluated their performance as less successful throughout the process. In other words, their characteristics are still uncertain, because of a lack of shared understanding and vision amongst members. In the long term this situation should be overcome by the appointment of a programme manager. As the WBA’s case implies, the crystallisation by the ‘centripetal forces’ could ensure the penetration of the core values of the partnership to all members. To ensure partnership activities last, it is
essential to distribute the various kinds of information likely to be held by ‘centripetal forces’. Therefore, ‘centripetal forces’ should be considered with those who diffuse the strategic viewpoints of the partnership.

**Diffusors**

Secondly, it is important for the partnerships to have those who play a ‘diffusing’ role, who can form a bridge between sub-groups or the centre and the peripheral in the partnership. The ‘diffusors’ are crucial for the partnership, as it evolves, acquiring relational and knowledge resources.

In the WBA, the Highland Council officers were likely to take this role, namely [C.Way], [M.Smith] and [P.Chapman]. They were located in-between sub-groups, and therefore could disseminate and filter a variety of information, including funding and administration issues. Some officers from public agencies also became ‘diffusors’. They contributed to thematic issues in the arena where their expertise was required, for instance, [J.MacDonald] (Northern Constabulary) on safety issues and [M.Paton] (Health Board) on health issues. Overall, these roles were evenly scattered over the partnership network and thereby the partnership as a whole could be opened to new ideas and shared understandings between members.

In the case of the SP, the ‘diffusing’ role was taken by community workers, CASE officers and representatives of community voluntary organisations. Unlike the WBA, many ‘diffusors’ in the SP shared more ‘community’ and ‘action’ than ‘strategy’ issues. Two types of ‘diffusors’ could be seen. The first type were those who were positioned close to the centre of the partnership and co-ordinated the strategies and funding allocations. This group mainly consisted of public agencies’ officers as experts, namely [E.Sinclair] (CASE), [T.Keatinge] (SNH) and [C.Goskirk] (NWCCF). The group consisted of those who were positioned away from the centre of the partnership network but close to the communities, working at village level and conducting face-to-face arrangements for them. They who were identified as ‘area-based gateways’. [Y.Mackay] (SIP area co-ordinator) working at Durness and [A.MacConnell] (CASE) at Bettyhill, were good examples of this type.
While the first type of 'diffusors' had particular concerns in relation to their expertise, the second type, area-based 'diffusors' had a wide range of thematic issues. Both types of 'diffusors' did not necessarily work alone. Rather, in practice, there was a line-management mechanism, which created synergy by supplementing each type's weaker sides. This dual support mechanism seems not only efficient in providing various supports to the communities, but also preferable for the communities. There was a good example of the line-management model employed in the working of CASE, in which E.Sinclair (expertise diffusors) worked closely with [A.MacConnell] and [M.Telfer] (area-based diffusors) as their project manager.

Bridges

The third type of key role is particularly relevant to the vertical network. When different partnerships met each other, there appeared an arena of action where they could improve their own abilities to act. This is the arena where the Mobilisation Capacity of partnerships lies. The quality of the Mobilisation Capacity depends upon the attitude towards vertical network that each partnership has. Furthermore, the ability to mobilise partnership resources depends on those who contact other partnerships. 'Bridging' actors, who have the ability to communicate with members of other partnerships and feed back what they acquire from outside, appear in this arena.

In the case of the strategic partnerships, the WBA and IatE, the 'bridge' role was taken by both 'centripetal forces' and 'diffusors'. The most powerful 'bridge', in the WBA, was [A.Clark], Highland Council, followed by [C.Higgins] (HIE), [P.Chapman] (Highland Council), [J.MacDonald] (Northern Constabulary) and [M.Paton] (Health Board). In the IatE, [S.Black] (HIE), [J.Watson] (Scottish National Heritage) and [J.Toal](Crofters Union) played the 'bridge' role. There are two issues about the 'bridge' role to be considered. Firstly, the knowledge resources, as a means of communication with other partnerships employed by each 'bridge' player, varied. This is partly because these bridging actors are professionals from public agencies, which have their own remit. Secondly, vertical networks tend to happen under the same programmes – namely, the WBA and the SP networks under the Community Planning initiative, and the IatE and the NSCDF under the Initiative at the Edge programme. This
tendency was reinforced in the way in which 'centripetal forces' of each partnership plays 'bridging' roles as well. However, few contacts were seen in-between different partnerships beyond their own programmes so far.

These results lead to an implication that the 'bridge' roles do not necessarily reduce the potential for duplication amongst different partnerships. When each the 'bridge' actors perform wearing their public agency hats, rather than their partnership hats, different partnerships would cause duplication in the area and exhaust those members. With respect to this duplication, it is important for 'strategic' partnerships to integrate their own goals with the others. In the case study area, this inefficient situation seems to have been avoided to some extent, partly because of internal integration of the Highland Council. As the evidence of the personal network shows, [A. Clark] of the WBA and [A. McCourt] of the LatE, who are both senior executive officers of the Highland Council, had shared understandings of both different programmes and some power to diffuse them to each partnership.

In the local partnerships, the SP and NSCDF, many 'bridge' actors were identified. Particularly in the SP, most of them were also playing 'diffusors' roles in the partnership. Unlike the case of strategic partnerships, these individuals made the best of a wider range of knowledge resources as means of communication with local communities. This is understandable because different communities require different knowledge and financial supports at different times. As the results of the questionnaire survey show, there were many active individuals with a variety of knowledge resources in the SP. The positive aspect of this is that, through those active individuals, the SP positioned at the middle can contribute to the integration of all the partnerships in the area.

In addition to the existing 'bridges', there are some potential arenas for generating synergy between different partnerships. Firstly, those professionals who are located at the strategic level but have close personal connections with local communities. They can channel local views back up to the strategic level so policy making at the upper tier is conducted in the light of local requirements (Lowe et al., 2001). The second group consists of local individuals who have close contact with members of other partnerships through 'by-passes'. It is important for them to feed back the outside knowledge
resources to the partnership members, rather than to keep them as personal interests. In this sense, ‘bridging’ roles should be interlinked with ‘diffusors’ within the partnership to which the ‘bridges’ belong. Table 6.5 and 6.6 summarize the roles of key players in the partnerships.

Table 6.5: Key Players’ Roles of the Wellbeing Alliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Coasts/Planning</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>M. Roger</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Black (HIE)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. McCourt (HC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Watson (SNH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Toal (CU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Bell (HH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P. Sinclair (NC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centripetal force (Bridge)</td>
<td>A. Clark (HC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Bell (HH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Way (HC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Smith (HC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Russell (HH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. MacAsley (NC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. King (HC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V. McKay (HC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P. Chapman (HC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. MacDonald (NC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Paton (HH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. Wood (NC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note
- Issue discussed within WBA
- Issue discussed frequently within WBA
- Issue shared with WBA / latE
- Issue shared with SP / NSCDF
- Double-bridge (latE - WBA - SP / NSCDF)

CU: Crofters Union
HB: Highland Health Board
HC: Highland Council
HIE: Highlands and Islands Enterprise
NC: Northern Constabulary
SNH: Scottish Natural Heritage
Table 6.6: Key Players' Roles of the Sutherland Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name of member</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centripetal (Bridge)</td>
<td>B. G. Todd (HC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Kentinge (VGES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusors</td>
<td>*V. O'Hare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Goskirk (NWCCF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Shepherd (NWCCF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Sinclair (CASE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Boyd (FC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Rodlin (NorCell)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. Kentinge (SNH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Priddy (NSHT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Nixon (FE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*J. Bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Y. Mackay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Fife (HC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Smith (CASE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Allan (HC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Jack (CASE)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>A. Macleod (CU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Mackay (CASE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Peterkin (HOST)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSCDF</td>
<td>*A. MacConnell (CASE)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*M. Telfer (CASE)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- Community Worker / Area Co-ordinator
- Programme manager / Advisor
- Issue discussed within SP
- Issue discussed frequently within SP
- Issue shared with WBA / latE
- Issue shared with NSCDF
- Double-bridge (WBA/latE – SP – NSCDF)

CASE: Caithness and Sutherland Enterprise
CU: Crofters Union
FC: Forestry Commission
FE: Forestry Enterprise
HC: Highland Council
HOST: Highland of Scottish Tourist Board
NHFT: North Highland Forest Trust
NWCCF: North West Community Council F?
SNH: Scottish Natural Heritage
VGES: Voluntary Group of East Sutherland
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6.4.4. Comment

As discussed in previous sections, it was revealed that the Mobilisation Capacity of a partnership existed in-between different partnerships. Figure 6.18 shows a summary of the Mobilisation Capacity of the partnership structure in the area. It is drawn on the basis of Figure 6.11 (summary of Knowledge Capacity of each partnership) and the Mobilisation Capacities between partnerships are shown by black arrows (on planning issues) and circled in black lines (on thematic issues).

![Figure 6.18: Summary of Mobilisation Capacity of the partnerships](image)

The evaluation of Mobilisation Capacity led to an understanding of the whole partnership structure as a ‘discursive formation’, in which each partnership uses and obtains Relational and Knowledge Resources. As far as planning issues are concerned, there was little evidence that one partnership’s strategy and policy had a direct influence on the others. However, through substantial actions taken in-between different partnerships, the integration of community development programmes was maintained. Nevertheless, as these results show, all the issues relevant to community development do not necessarily involve all the different partnerships for implementation. This indicates that each partnership and each arena has particular subjects to deal with in the most effective way. Although there was no comprehensive strategy for the whole
partnership structure, sharing ideas through vertical networks beyond partnerships let the individual programmes of each partnership move forward and strengthened their institutional capacity.

It was also found that 'bridge' actors transferred substantial Knowledge Resources in order to get things moving forward. The partnership in the middle position is likely to take this 'bridge' role in the whole partnership structure. This is because the members of the intermediate partnership can easily connect both the upper-tier partnerships and lower-tier community groups. In North Sutherland, the SP played a ‘bridging’ role, whereby the strategic partnerships (the WBA and IatE) and the NSCDF local partnership could communicate with each other. One reason why this happened is that those ‘bridge’ actors of the SP were officers of public agencies who are responsible for the area, as well as residents in the area. However, this might lead to a fundamental question, that in so far as there are many individual actors playing the ‘bridge’ role in the area, the intermediate level partnership is not necessary.

In addition to the ‘bridge’ roles, it is necessary for ‘diffusors’ to feed back new resources to other members within a partnership. A good result was that there were many ‘diffusors’ actively operating in the SP, and in particular, some of the CASE officers and community workers were active in being ‘diffusors’ within the partnership as well as being ‘bridges’ in-between different partnerships. Those who transfer resources in all directions through the whole partnership structure could enable community development projects to achieve their objectives in more efficient ways.
6.5. Conclusion

Figure 6.19 shows a model of partnership networks in the area, especially focusing upon individual players. As the model shows, different programmes at the upper tier were linked by the Highland Council, which is doubly committed in the Initiative at the Edge National Steering Group and the Wellbeing Alliance. The integration between the WBA and the Sutherland Partnership was maintained mainly by three vertical personal networks. The first important network was maintained between programme managers, who were all Highland Council officers. The second network existed in the Highlands and Islands Enterprise and Local Enterprise Companies (in this case, with Caithness and Sutherland Enterprise) network. Although there was no concrete evidence in the case study, the HIE officials and CASE officers would have contacted each other as one of their operational strategies. The third network was developed through the voluntary organisations. As some representatives from the voluntary groups participated in both the WBA and the SP, they enabled both partnerships to understand their situations and avoid duplications which would have occurred.

![Figure 6.19: A model of partnership network in North Sutherland](image-url)
In addition to the network integration at the strategic level, more importantly, the networks between strategic and local partnerships should be considered. Close examination revealed a 'bridge' function linking the SP with the North Sutherland Community Development Forum. There were two patterns in the area: the case of area co-ordinators appointed by Caithness & Sutherland Enterprise; and the case of independent community workers on behalf of the SP. The roles of both players are particularly important where decisions from above are moulded to local demands. Their roles seem to resemble those who are active in different 'strategic' partnerships in their characters. However, these community workers are not necessarily members of a local community partnership. In fact, technically speaking, none of them are members of NSCDF, but they give administrative advice and help if necessary. It seems important that professionals employed by public agencies should be connected loosely with a local community partnership, leaving room for the local community to be autonomous rather than being controlled by intrusive bureaucracy.

The results of the above analysis suggest that when community development projects are released from the upper tier of the partnership structure, it is most important to distribute those playing the 'bridge' role throughout the partnership structure and give them a clear channel in the network. Crystallisation of the network structure is crucial because sometimes community workers and those who have the ability to play 'bridge' roles are likely to get exhausted seeking proper channels to the powerful cores, or just find themselves burdened with demands from above and below that are unfamiliar to them. Now that partnership approaches have become normalised in community development in the area, 'bridge' actors and a channel in the network should be encouraged so that participants of all partnerships can utilise and improve their knowledge resources through interaction within and beyond the partnership.

With respect to thematic issues, it was found that each partnership had certain thematic issues that it prioritised. In the Highlands case, the WBA was in charge of 'safety', 'health' and 'youth' issues. The SP and the NSCDF were responsible for any kind of thematic issues relevant to community life. In this context, again the SP played significant roles in dealing with demands from above and below. This was maintained through the SP members, who were mainly professionals from public agencies. While
they could drive the projects on the ground as an expert group in providing professional knowledge, they could pressurize the upper tiers as a spokesperson for local voices. Obviously, as a partnership cannot answer all demands, it is necessary for the partnership to be supplemented by other partnerships' specialists.

The Partnership structure as a whole, so far, is being built around the axis of Community Planning initiatives – the WBA and the SP. On the one hand, strategies and programmes proposed by these strategic partnerships seem to become concrete, but, on the other, the local community partnership NSCDF has been developed less concretely in terms of strategic perspectives and its members' roles. For strategic partnerships, their objectives can be achieved when the local communities are empowered and benefit from activities in which communities themselves are fully involved. Hence, from a strategic viewpoint, it would be ideal if the local community partnership had a well-organised structure in a same way as the strategic one, and thereby the interrelation between strategic and local partnerships would be more easily integrated. However, the case study shows that a well-organised and professionalised partnership structure does not necessarily benefit the local communities. To put a professional manager in the centre of the local partnership might be an easier way to create a core to which other partnerships could have access, but it could reduce autonomy and the potential for enhancement of the community's own institutional capacities.

In light of the NSCDF's current situation, there is a potential space emerging, where the local residents could share genuine ownership of the group without a particular centre and develop a non-hierarchical structure. Although a local fisherman has been appointed as the chairman of the group, it can hardly be expected for him to be the sole driving force of the group. It does not mean that he could not play a centripetal role, but rather it is desirable to create a space where things could happen continuously in the longer term regardless of the existence of a powerful leader. It is often the case that local community groups tend to be active temporarily and fade away when the leadership has gone. In the longer term, it seems less sustainable to create a manageable structure - from the strategic partnership's viewpoint - in which some particular members or managers control their activities implicitly or explicitly. What seems to be more sustainable is that there are as many accessible routes for local individuals as possible in order to utilise
other strategic partnerships, and that those who are professionally involved in the strategic partnerships and familiar with local communities give assistance to active members of the local partnership only when required or as they think necessary. There was evidence that the SP/NSCDF had various weak ties with the IaTE through particular projects. These accessible paths were cut through by community workers, and it would be better for local individuals to utilise these by-pass routes to the national strategic partnership. For the partnership in general, to have a variety of channels could allow the enrichment of institutional capacity, since they could acquire knowledge resources from outside expertise through the process.
CONCLUSION
7 Conclusion

7.1. Introduction

This study aimed at evaluating the institutional capacity created in the process of community development through partnerships, mainly using an institutionalist perspective which has been popular in the planning field since the 1990s. Taking an institutional approach to planning is both a complex and demanding enterprise (Salet, 2000). This is simply because social rules are not always explicit, their meanings shift in different situations, and they change as new practices are encountered (Bolan, 1996). Even when tangible norms already exist, their meanings are often interpreted in different ways. In short, an institutional approach is not a methodology containing a series of fixed steps, but is more of a way of thinking, and seeks to add a reflexive dimension to a predominantly pragmatic discipline.

Through institutionalist analysis, this work provides an explanation of why and how community development through partnerships has penetrated the planning field in the rural areas of the Highlands and Islands. It also sought to identify institutional capacities which have become driving forces or obstacles to the construction of an intellectual and social base for open, communicative, and resilient approaches towards an unpredictable future in the area. This evaluative work was carried out on the basis of a conceptual structure of community development as tangible outputs, which mirror both internal institutional capacity and external political settings. On this basis, the research clarified the interrelationship between community development and external and internal forces.

This chapter first summarises the findings from the case study in the Highlands. These are discussed in relation to three themes: changing governance; institutional capacity; and political coherence. Secondly, these findings are discussed in depth through the notion of community development as 'potential space'. In the final section, policy and research implications are considered.
7.2. The findings

7.2.1. Changing governance context through community development

Since the Rural White Papers for England and Scotland in 1995 and for Wales in 1996, partnership has been an important piece of policy development. This emphasis has been reinforced, "notably in consultation by the government on the new rural white paper (in 2000), in advice to Regional Development Agencies, policy briefings to the Scottish Parliament and the Welsh Assembly, and programming documents for the new round of European Structural Funds" (Edwards et al., 2001: 289). The process of building partnerships is synonymous with a transition in the institutional framework through which rural areas are governed, from the spatially contiguous, top-down, and hierarchical system of the local state to "an emphasis on promoting and/or steering the self-organisation of inter-organisational relations" (Jessop, 1995; 324).

As discussed in Chapter 2, this new emphasis on local governance was a stimulus to the establishment of several partnerships and the implementation of various community development projects in the case study area. The governance context of the late 1990s in Scotland showed that there were decentralising tendencies, which were accelerated by the delegation of powers to the Scottish Parliament since it took up its full legislative powers on the 1st of July 1999. However, this was not only a result of decentralisation, but also the diminishing scale of the traditional roles of local government. The recasting of local governance involved a redistribution of power within a new geography of local partnerships, which were constituted by elected local authorities and non-elected public agencies and the private and voluntary sectors. Furthermore, local partnerships (such as the Sutherland Partnership) were linked upwards to strategic partnerships at regional/national levels (the Wellbeing Alliance at the Highland regional level) or downwards to various community groups (the North Sutherland Community Development Forum). This is a feature of partnerships that "transgress the established scalar hierarchy of the state by formally linking institutions and organisations which operate at different scales" (Edwards et al., 2001: 292). The partnership culture affects the delivery of community development programmes as external forces. At the same time, it is being moulded into a new style of governance through the process of
substantial community development programmes.

It is important to note that, if several partnerships exist at different levels, what each partnership can achieve depends not only on the features of partnerships which have evolved in a local governance culture, but also on the features of networks between different partnerships. In this sense, the new style of governance could emerge as a result of policy coherency vertically (between different partnerships) as well as horizontally (between partners within a partnership). In terms of the creation of a new style of governance, community development has the potential as a planning approach to construct both vertical and horizontal policy coherence. Such programmes are mainly developed at the strategic level but they should be designed in a way in which local communities and other stakeholders are involved in the process of implementation. In the Highlands context, the features of partnerships at the beginning, particularly at the strategic level, could be seen as a means of increasing cooperation and collaboration between different governmental agencies for the more effective delivery of integrated policy goals. As time has gone by, several partnerships have emerged at different levels and started to differentiate themselves from other partnerships, in terms of their memberships and roles. ‘Differentiation’ of each partnership has appeared along with a clearer vertical policy ‘integration’ at the regional scale. How would these contradictory situations of ‘differentiation’ and ‘integration’ exist in the process of community development through partnerships? This point will be discussed in the next section in relation to the institutional capacities of partnerships.

7.2.2. The institutional capacities of partnerships

This study explored the nature of community institutional capacity as an internal means of achieving community development programmes through partnerships. Through the analysis of institutional capacities within each partnership in the case study area, it was found that the features of partnerships differ in three respects: the morphology of personal networks (Relational Resources); their interests and topics (Knowledge Resources); and the routes for accessing more resources belonging to others outside the partnerships (Mobilisation Capacity).
Regarding ‘horizontal’ integration within a partnership, strategic partnerships, such as the Wellbeing Alliance (WBA), tended to have an organised institutional structure, in which it was easy for members of the partnership to identify who took which roles. This well-organised structure meant that the partnerships targeted specific thematic issues, such as ‘youth’, ‘safety’ and ‘health’. The partnership itself achieved the development of ‘joined-up’ programmes between different public bodies involved in the partnership beyond the organisational boundaries. For instance, the representatives from the Highland Council, the Northern Constabulary and the Health Board dealt with both ‘safety’ and ‘health’ issues together. It can be concluded that the strategic partnerships are more likely – and successfully - to build integration within partnerships. However, this well-organised institutional setting can sometimes prevent them from expanding their own capacities (both in terms of Relational and Knowledge Resources) without networking with other partnerships. Figure 6.17 (Thematic issues as Knowledge Resources shared between partnerships: p231) provides evidence that, regarding ‘safety’ and ‘health’ issues, none of the other partnerships had common interests or discussion with the WBA at all (except some of the Sutherland Partnership about ‘health’). This is one of the dilemmas for strategic partnerships, in particular, that the more organised they are in accumulating professional Knowledge Resources and building infrastructures for delivery of targeted projects within the partnership, the less they build networks to community groups whom they are designated to serve. This might result in inconsistency in building ‘vertical’ coherence.

On the other hand, local partnerships such as the Sutherland Partnership (SP), showed a more complex partnership infrastructure (see Figure 6.4: Partnership network of the SP, p204). This complexity was a result of a number of representatives from a wide variety of organisations - from public agencies to local community groups. Moreover, the fact that none of the project managers sat at the centre of the partnership, during the period of this study, seemed to result in a multi-centred network. It was an interesting result that no hegemony appeared within the partnership, particularly by the Highland Council, who seemed keen on dominating the WBA as the lead agency in Community Planning. Although an Area Development Manager of the Highland Council was playing a significant role, arranging meetings and administration loads for the partnership – therefore described as one end of the key ‘axis’ – he emphasised his current position
was a temporary substitute and should be replaced by a proper manager for the SP. This complexity and fluctuation of institutional settings, however, might have more potential for creating new arenas, where thematic issues, treated separately, could make contact and be dealt with as joined-up programmes.

Concerning Knowledge Resources, Figure 6.8 (Thematic Knowledge Resources of the SP: p.209) shows various points of contact for different thematic issues. These points can be seen as potentialities for 'joined-up programmes' composed of: 'community', 'transport', 'health', 'youth' and 'economy' issues in the first sub-group; 'community', 'economy', 'environment', 'agriculture', and 'youth' issues in the second sub-group. This is very important for community-led partnerships at the local level in moving community projects forward, since problems tackled on the ground can hardly be divided into simple thematic issues.

It is essential for partnerships to acquire and build institutional capacities to run their activities; drawing up the strategic plans or implementing projects for instance. Nevertheless, it is wrong to impose one model of partnership infrastructure on others operating at different levels. The strategic partnerships need mechanisms for disseminating their programmes to local partnerships and in particular reflect back local conditions into the programmes. The local partnerships need catalysts which bind the separate issues together and provide innovative outcome. The case study showed some key roles were important to answer these needs.

Three key players' roles enabled partnerships to build and enhance their own institutional capacities. These were: centripetal forces; diffusors; and bridges. Each role had its own advocates and it is not the intention here to assert the significance of one role above the others. What is important is that each partnership has a range of these roles and makes the best of their abilities to enhance their institutional capacities. The 'centripetal force' plays a core role in the partnership, generating significant themes to which members of the partnership adhere. 'Diffusors' promote and support individual members' ambitions, disseminating a variety of information. 'Bridges' are particularly important in representing their partnerships' viewpoints at other levels of partnership. This then is a key driving force linking together the different levels of partnership and
ensuring both upwards and downwards accountability.

7.2.3. Political coherence

The policy context of community development programmes which has taken place in the Highlands is notoriously complex. The map of community development programmes during the period of 1991-2000 in the Highland region (see Figure 5.3: p169) showed "a complicated [set] of programmes, targeted at a tangled mosaic of partially overlapping areas, spearheaded by different departments" (Bennett in Osborne et al, 2003). This is a common view at the launch of regeneration programmes in the recent UK context. Some other key initiatives have multiplied the complexity over the same period, including Local Agenda 21 initiatives; Community Planning initiatives and the development of the local strategic partnership approach; and the social exclusion/inclusion policy initiatives of the current Labour Government. Osborne et al., examining the impact of regeneration programmes upon the governance of public policy initiatives at the local and community level across England, Scotland and Northern Ireland, found that "it is a patchwork of varying EU and national policy initiatives and funding regimes, which invariably require applicants to put together a number of partners for any one bid and to include a number of different funding sources" (2003: 2-3).

Through the process of constructing policy coherence, the structures and memberships of partnerships change. It seems as if partnerships themselves rationalise the appropriate scale for the operation of any particular programme. This is closely linked to the process of 'territorialisation' (Edwards et al., 2001), by which partnerships identify the territory of the economic, social, political and cultural nature of that space. As described in Chapter 6, the evaluation of the partnership structure as a whole concluded that, while strategies and programmes proposed by the strategic partnerships have become concrete, the local community partnerships have developed less clear strategic perspectives. In short, political coherence throughout the partnership structure as a whole was inconsistent. At the strategic level, partnerships such as the Wellbeing Alliance, which consisted of the Highlands Council and the five main public bodies in the area, seem to have changed least since its initial establishment. However, at the local level, the
community-led partnerships, namely the Sutherland Partnership and the North Sutherland Community Development Forum, have changed dramatically in terms of the membership of partner organisations and their institutional infrastructures. This is because, in practice, the ‘discursive formation of partnerships’ is framed not only by official policy documentation, but also by the actual operation of establishing more partnerships (see Section 6.4). The members of the partnerships jointly internalise ideas and objectives in a self-organising, distributed way in order to achieve things they want collectively and individually. This is ‘network power’ (Innes and Booher, 2000), which grows neither from hierarchy, nor from the ability of one player to compel the actions of another, but flows through a networked system of agents.

For all partnerships that make up the partnership structure as a whole, the creation of a strategic perspective is an essential driving force for sustainable development. The final report on the Duthchas project claimed that

“[people] were able to build on their many ideas and shape these through a simple framework into major new platforms for development. … The communities were also able to gain the respect and support of the government bodies for their comprehensive approach”, but concluded that “[a] strategic approach proved to be challenging to facilitate at community level.” (Duthchas Project, 2001; 3)

It is indeed difficult to find a comprehensive strategy. The report pointed out uncertainty as to the ability of the Partners to continue to support a local strategic approach, pointing out that the current operating framework is not sympathetic to this approach.

To summarise, the current Scottish political context proves both how far changing governance influences the way in which the community development approach has increasingly been employed in rural planning, and, contrarily, how far the implementation of community development programmes has provoked a swift shift to a new style of governance in the case study area. Within this context, the horizontal policy coherence amongst the public and private sector and communities at each level was achieved adequately, which gave each partnership its own characteristics. It is, however, acknowledged that vertical policy coherence, which derives from the EU, Scottish
government, local government and community levels, had not yet been fully achieved. The gap between the strategic and local community levels in terms of a comprehensive strategic perspective still remained.
7.3. Discussion

These findings show the influence of the governance context on the delivery of community development programmes. This section aims to provide a deeper understanding of how the new style of governance emerges in parallel with the particularities of partnerships, and how this consistency (or inconsistency) affects community development programmes in a local situation. One question is, how does the new style of governance through partnerships relate to community development? The conclusion that they are inextricably linked follows from a reflection on what partnerships are, and on what community development is within a new style of governance in rural areas. Two notions are introduced here in order to understand community development through partnerships: the 'heuristic system' and 'potential space'.

7.3.1. The process of community development as a heuristic system

What is community development? As discussed in Chapter 2, community development is the process of participatory activities, through which the local community produces community facilities and certain services that no individual can achieve alone. What has been seen through the case study is a 'heuristic' process in which decisions and actions were devolved by the members of partnerships – including public agencies, community groups and individuals. Chapter 5 showed some tangible outputs of the community development programmes launched in North Sutherland communities. In addition to this, intangible community capacity was built within the community, which strengthened community bonds. The Knowledge Resources found were socially constructed and shared amongst members through Relational Resources. Mechanisms underlying this heuristic process depend on power, but it is the power of networked relationships, shared information, identity, and meaning, which are spontaneously formed through the process of activities that stakeholders take. Actions taken through the heuristic process are inevitably contingent, since they are related to such complex networks rather than hierarchical structures.

In order to describe what emerges in this heuristic process of community development,
complexity theory is helpful. Complexity theory first appeared in the physical sciences, and describes how systems can mimic organisms in their behaviour in uncertain environments (Capra, 1996). In complex, adaptive systems, simple elements are governed by a few basic rules, or heuristics, and operate through trial and error. Where elements or agents have interaction and feedback, they can jointly produce persistent patterns that are unlike the original elements. The interactions amongst the simpler elements of the system produce higher or more complex levels of organization, which results in increasing competence of the system as a whole in the form of greater productivity, stability, or adaptiveness. An adaptive learning system emerges in nature when the environment is unstable, but not completely chaotic. Innes and Booher point out that “innovation and productive adaptation depends on information flows through linked networks of agents. Collaboration can provide such links and help participants to do their own part in the creation of a successful adaptive system” (2000: 178).

The strength of the institutional capacity of partnerships lies in the way the partnership members jointly internalize ideas and objectives so they can operate in a self-organizing, distributed way to achieve things they want both collectively and individually. Substantial activities taken between members provide each of them with information and feedback from the others. Moreover, activities taken by a partnership are often supported by other partnerships, for example, the North Sutherland Community Development Forum was supported, directly or indirectly, by the Initiative at the Edge Partnership, the Sutherland Partnership and the Wellbeing Alliance. Although these partnerships operate at different levels — local or regional/national strategic — and therefore presumably vary in political power in terms of political status and responsibilities, Innes and Booher argue that “it is necessary for them (members of each partnership) to be equally empowered to speak and express their interests in a dialogue” (ibid: 179). How does this empowered situation emerge in the process of community development?

Whatever hat partners wear - ‘sponsors’ or ‘receivers’, they must each have something others want and something others can offer them. In the case of community development programmes, this exchange occurs in the way in which a strategic partnership has authority or resources and a weaker player, in conventional terms, such
as a local community-led partnership, has legitimacy or supporters. Does this lead to ‘dependency culture’ for the communities or a more hierarchical power structure? It is likely to be so unless both players come to understand and cultivate their ‘interdependency culture’. Interdependency, rather than dependency culture, will emerge if players gain reciprocity: by participating in the community development programmes; by creating new opportunities; and by realizing they share what each uniquely can provide. It is, indeed, a difficult task to design the processes and mechanisms of community development, in which an interdependent culture can emerge, because community development involves a large number of stakeholders with a wide diversity of interests and resources. However, as the theory of complex adaptivity implies, the greater the diversity of interests, resources, and knowledge of each player, the stronger can be the bonds of interdependence and the wider the range of possible innovative solutions. Community development can build a network of interdependence amongst its participants and successfully produce tangible outcomes and also sustain itself over time.

7.3.2. Partnerships as potential space

What differentiates community development from conventional territorial-development programmes, such as infrastructure-based exogenous development, is that community development itself does not necessarily aim to resolve the problems of communities directly, but offer what psychologist, Donald W. Winnicott, called ‘a potential space’ (Winnicott, 1971) in which communities themselves could be activated. What is discussed here is a view of partnerships, analogous with the concept of ‘potential space’. Firstly, Winnicott’s ‘potential space’ is explained further. Then, its relationship to partnership is discussed.

Winnicott, a psychotherapist well-known in individual development, conceptualised the idea of an area of individual development and cultural experience, which could be used by analysts in their work and thinking. He argues that there is a place of living that is not properly described by either of the terms ‘inner’ and ‘outer’. Regarding inner psychic reality, the personal property of each individual seems to be a fixed quality deriving from heredity personal organisation, and environmental factors and from
personal factors projected outwards. Looking at external reality and the individual’s contact with it, one sees that external reality itself is fixed. However,

[by] contrast with these, I suggest that the area available for manoeuvre in terms of the third way of living (where there is cultural experience or creative playing) is extremely variable as between individuals. This is because the third area is a product of the experiences of the individual person in the environment that obtains. There is a kind of variability here that is different in quality from the variabilities that belong to the phenomenon of inner personal psychic reality and to external or shared reality. (Winnicott, 1971: 125)

In addition, Winnicott describes how the maturational processes occur in terms of “the idea of a journey from dependence to independence” (Winnicott, 1990: 84). Stating that each human being must start on this journey, he claims that many arrive somewhere not far from the state of independence. The point here is that this destination is not absolute independence, but ‘dependence with a built-in social sense’. He emphasises the value of an approach which concerns both the personal and the environmental factors, since health of human being means both health of the individual and health of society. Hence, Winnicott denies using simply ‘dependence-independence’, rather prefers three categories: ‘absolute dependence’; ‘relative dependence’; and ‘towards independence’.

In Winnicott’s term, ‘absolute dependence’ refers to the very early stages of the emotional development of every infant. At the beginning the infant is entirely dependent on the physical provision of the live mother and her womb or her infant care. The next stage ‘relative dependence’ is a stage of adaptation with a gradual failing of adaptation, which is “nicely geared to the rapid developments that the infant displays” (1990: 87). At this stage of relative dependence, the infant begins to be in some way aware of dependence, and this awareness becomes a more explicit one, by which the infant begins to know in his/her mind that mother is necessary. Getting through the stage in which the need for the actual mother becomes fierce, new developments begin in which the child begins to deal with loss. From this stage, environmental factors should be taken into consideration: there may be those qualified as mother-substitutes. The mother’s husband, or aunts and grandparents may be important people, helping to create
a home or giving the mother support and a feeling of security, which she can pass on to the infant.

One important development in the infant comes under the heading ‘identification’ (1990: 90). Winnicott emphasises the integrating tendencies of the infant, which bring about a state in which the infant is a unit with an inside and an outside. The infant’s growth takes the form of a continuous interchange between inner and outer reality: the state of ‘toward independence’. The arena for such a development is a ‘potential space’. In the ‘potential space’, the child is not only a potential creator of the world, but also the child becomes able to live the world with their inner life, by gaining control over external events as well as over the inner workings of their own self. Once this potential space is established, the child is able gradually to meet the world and all its complexities. The processes experienced in this potential space help the child to develop their own identity, because what is seen there reflects what is already present in the child’s own self. In this way, the child becomes able to live a personal existence that is satisfactory, which involved in society’s affairs. Winnicott argues that adults also experience similar processes.

*Adults must be expected to be continuing the process of growing and of growing up, since they do but seldom reach to full maturity. But once they have found a niche in society through work, and have perhaps married or have settled in some pattern that is compromise between copying the parents and defiantly establishing a personal identity, once these developments have take place, adult life can be said to have started, and the individuals one by one climb out of the area covered by this brief statement of growth in terms of dependence towards independence. (Winnicott, 1990: 92)*

Community development programmes aim to enhance a community’s institutional capacities, which are abilities to control external events as well as over their own ambitions and needs. The arenas that enable community groups to build these capacities are partnerships. In this context, partnerships can be seen as a ‘potential space’, which allows the maturational process of the individual, communities and any kind of combinations involved in the programmes. Hence, partnerships matter in the process of
community development as potential spaces. However, since they are never static, and formed and changed by community actions, is there any better ways to make these partnerships function? An implication of Winnicott’s ideas in planning is that facilitating an environment for partnership makes possible the steady progress of the maturational processes for partners by helping them to realize their potential (Winnicott, 1990: 85). Naturally communities vary a great deal in their capacity to use knowledge and relational resources, and often the process of acquiring capacities is delayed by the existence of a muddle in the way reality is presented.

There is an idea for emphasis here, for the whole procedure of infant-care has as its main characteristic a steady presentation of the world to the infant. This is something that cannot be done by thought, nor can it be managed mechanically. It can only be done by continuous management by a human being who is consistently herself [the mother]. There is no question of perfection here. Perfection belongs to machines; what the infant needs is just what he usually gets, the care and attention of someone who is going on being herself. This of course applies to fathers too. (1990: 87-88)

One question is who could play the role of ‘the mother’ in community development. Of course, it is hardly possible to rely on a single person in the longer time. It is a big challenge whether this mother’s role could be built the partnership structures as a mechanism. In rural areas, an increasing number of voluntary and community organizations play important roles in delivering services and filling gaps in existing statutory provision, including health and social care services, community transport, child care, youth projects, education and skills training (National Council for Voluntary Organizations, 2002). Some of their community activities, which develop consistency and stability, become community businesses. As Osborne et al. (2002) argued, by contrast with groups in urban areas, networks of community organisations in rural areas are often weak, less well funded with limited support structures. Lower levels of institutional capacity affect the ability of community groups to achieve their ambitions, negotiate contracts for delivering services and meet complex monitoring requirements by public funders. Therefore, the creation of better partnerships structures, which could be a potential space for those involved in the process of community participation, should be carefully considered. Three aspects of partnerships to be considered are:
tangible and intangible supports; and differentiation of institutional capacities.

Firstly, partnerships need outside resources. Requirements for joined-up projects, matched funding, community participation, or other forms of partnership working have been increasingly incorporated into regeneration programmes and initiatives operated by the European Union, governmental departments and local authorities. Through the participatory processes of community projects, various stakeholders get involved. Some community groups can be self-motivated, but the study of North Sutherland showed that community actions were able to go further more quickly through a partnership once it was carefully designed and fully supported by local authorities and the public sector. This is not a surprising result because such public funding enables local actions to produce tangible outputs.

However, benefits from intangible support should not be underestimated either. Informational contributions seem to be highly effective in expanding networks to other stakeholders, through which local communities themselves can gain knowledge and skills in order to achieve their objectives. Networking with broader stakeholders is essential for local communities. Partnerships can offer those opportunities, not only for local communities, but also for partner agencies. From this perspective, partnerships are also portrayed as a mechanism for mixing resources from the public, private and voluntary sectors with the local knowledge of communities, which adds up to more than the sum of the parts. This mechanism acts as a facilitator for 'endogenous development' (Ray, 1999). The more a partnership gets resources from outside its environment, the more network to that environment there will be, and vice versa. This leads to the more structured networks tending to be more autonomous, because their high connectivity demands much more interaction with the outside environment to reach the same level of relative openness than less connected networks (Alexander, 2000)

The second aspect of partnerships concerns the differentiation of institutional capacities between partnerships. Partnerships employed in implementing community development can be seen as both horizontal and vertical potential spaces. In terms of horizontal potential space, communities and other partners develop their own institutional capacities. The latter is associated with the first aspect of the partnership, networking
between partnerships. This study originally sought to assess the institutional capacities of partnerships as internal forces that influence the performance of community development programmes. However, it is not enough just to conclude that the institutional framework of each partnership varies in the shared ideas (Knowledge Resources) and the personal networks (Relational Resources). This differentiation potentially could lead to the fragmentation of policies in the area.

If partnerships are viewed as a potential space, the differentiation of institutional capacities would create opportunities where various partnerships with different remits supplement their weak points and proceed with their own or joined-up projects. The creation of such potential space is associated with the third element of institutional capacity, Mobilisation Capacity. This seems to reflect a particular feature of Winnicott's potential space which "depends for its existence on living experiences, not on inherited tendencies" (Winnicott, 1971: 127). While many dimensions of both Relational and Knowledge Resources can be obtained within each partnership and therefore viewed as inherent in the partnership itself, Mobilisation Capacity requires extra actions and mutual experiences beyond partnership boundaries.
7.4. Implications

Understanding community development through partnership as complex adaptive systems provides insight into how they emerge and implications for how they can be successful and evolve. This section summarises both policy and research implications for future community development.

7.4.1. Policy implications

Building a strategic spatial perspective and a new form of governance

Spatial planning aims to maintain spatial harmony within a changing environment. It is more specifically defined as a method or procedure to influence future allocations of activities to space or space to activities (Williams, 1996). It prepares and realizes large physical projects that can often take ten to twenty years to complete, but this does not necessarily mean that long-term planning perspectives remain stable. Strategic frameworks and visions for territorial development, with an emphasis on place qualities and the spatial impacts and integration of investments, complement and provide a context for specific development projects (Albrechts et al., 2003). What is essential in strategic planning is to create a situation of an ‘ongoing strategic perspective’ (Salet and Faludi, 2000).

The position of spatial planning is strongly affected by the political/administrative structure: “a movement to recompose governance relations, to break away from the functional/sectoral organisation typical of many national and regional/local governments, and to widen governance relations to incorporate in new ways significant economic and local community stakeholders” (Albrechts et al., 2003, 114). It is clear that sustainable development in a particular spatial context is no longer the exclusive responsibility of one public body, namely central/local governments or regional development agencies. Instead, it is being increasingly replaced by a new style of governance, in which many organisations - often sponsored by different levels of government from EU to local - constitute a complex network of policy making and implementation processes. When a spatial policy of a particular area is conducted in a
fragmented administrative context, where a profusion of national/regional/local
governments and public sectors set their own development priorities, it places the
unifying power of the collective plans under great strain. Hence, two aspects of
governance in spatial strategic policy are particularly important. One is the ‘horizontal’
aspect of governance and inter-organisational relations at each level, and the other, the
‘vertical’ aspect of multi-level governance and the interplay between different tiers.

It is important to emphasise that strategic spatial planning takes many different forms,
performing different kinds of governance work in different contexts, because the
chances of succeeding in building a new form of governance would still seem to depend
on prevailing political traditions (Cameron et al., 2000). There is a tendency, as Osborne
et al. (2003) point out, that the local authorities continue to dominate the process, with a
long-standing belief in the supremacy of public provision over other models in Scotland
in particular. This is also the case in the Highlands, in terms of the implementation of
‘Community Planning for Highland 2000’ at strategic/regional level and it remains to be
seen whether national/local governments will challenge this hegemony in order to
achieve genuine community involvement.

Positive evidence was found in the case study: that, at strategic level, there were other
public agencies, in particular Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE), playing
significant roles in this new form of governance. In the Highlands case, HIE and its
local network, Local Enterprise Companies (LEC), the leading agencies in charge of the
EU’s LEADER programmes, have played significant roles in community involvement.
In this context, local communities have often been by-passed in regeneration initiatives,
with money (especially EU money) flowing directly to the community organisations.
The HIE and LECs network had set up an innovative way in which they employ local
people as community development workers for the designated community development
programmes and let them work at home or in a nearby village.

There were a number of enthusiastic and skilled professionals working as intermediaries
in the area. They were working as a team, which consisted of those who were experts in
specific fields, namely marketing, business management, environmental science and
public health, and those who were known as local activists in the neighbourhood. This
way of working is itself an interactive learning process through which they take account of particular local problems in designing community development programmes, and make the best of local knowledge along with expertise in assisting in the implementation of the projects. This institutional setting can be understood as the place where ideas and methods could be generated on the basis of local knowledge to overcome social and economic disadvantages, and encourage those who have abilities to improve the quality of their own lives.

The presence of those who are neither public nor private in the traditional sense, and the emergence of a ‘development profession’ sharing common objectives for the programmes and ambitions for the future of the community, would seem to be driving force in the ‘bottom-up’ and ‘endogenous’ approaches.

**Sustaining multi-layered partnerships**

One could argue that in order to avoid duplication, one big partnership covering all areas and levels would be more efficient in its operation, rather than too many similar partnerships. It should be considered that the small pool of human capital available in rural areas can often lead to over-commitment, overwork and burn-out of this small pool. However, diversity is the key to sustaining a self-organising system within the partnership and between partnerships, since the distinctive aspects of each partnership require interdependency between partnerships, which enhances their own institutional capacities.

It is important to emphasize that ‘community involvement’ can mean different things at different structural levels of partnership (Osborne et al., 2002). The partnerships at the strategic (regional planning and funding) level often involve a proxy representing the community (perhaps a community leader or a community development worker), whilst at the community level of actual community projects it involves the direct participation of individual members of the community. Linking these two levels together is the intermediary level, through which ‘community proxies’ can be held accountable to their actual communities and through which local projects and partnerships can be linked to funding and planning at the regional level.
Different types of institutional settings of partnerships at different levels, therefore, are not a problem, if the intermediary function is retained throughout the partnership structure as a whole. The Wellbeing Alliance (WBA) at the Highland regional level was effective in working at the strategic level. On the other hand, at the community level, the North Sutherland Community Development Forum (NSCDF), which restructured its membership towards more genuine community involvement and community ownership, provided a good potential arena for local communities. At the intermediary level, the Sutherland Partnership linked the WBA and the NSCDF and encouraged and supported involvement at the community level.

The key implication here is to ensure that upward and downward linkages between these differing types and levels of partnerships are in place. Asserting a normative hegemony of one of these partnerships over the others should be avoided. Each partnership makes a different contribution to community development as a whole. The strategic level coordinates this involvement into the overall needs of the region and establishes funding regimes. The intermediary level links communities to this strategic level and nurtures community projects at the local level, and the local partnership provides arenas for direct involvement by individuals in community projects, and opportunities to develop skills that could enable them to operate at one of the other levels.

In addition to the above, four components of good practice that will enhance the long-term sustainability of community development can be identified. Firstly, strong local voluntary and community sector infrastructure is most essential to promote and support community development. To have long-lasting and robust effects on the quality life for the communities, the strategies and practices on the ground “have to be connected to accountable political levels of government and to formal, legal requirements that affect both regulatory and investment practices” (Albrechts et al., 2003: 128). This not only acts to promote individual and community learning but also to provide essential and solid links between the different levels of community development identified in this study. Coordinating the networks within each partnership and between partnerships needs to get the right type of individual, in the right project, at the right position or level of partnership – and at the right stage of its ‘life history’. They can be ‘centripetal
forces’, ‘diffusors’, or ‘bridges’.

The second element concerns funding. It is important to ensure that appropriate funding is available to support community development. A lack of funding can prevent local initiatives starting new projects or carrying out on-going activities. Nevertheless, this means that comparatively small-scale amounts of funding can have a far greater impact in rural areas than elsewhere. In the field of regeneration, European Union (EU) policy has in the recent past been dominated by the Structural Funds approach, which concentrated resources in areas of greatest need, emphasized coordination and partnership, expected significant additionality and leverage and which placed a strong emphasis on monitoring and evaluation (Roberts and Hart, 1996). However, the Structural Funds are now being replaced by other policy initiatives, as part of the process of accession to the EU by the transitional nations of eastern and central Europe (Osborne et al., 2002), and therefore funding put into the community initiatives will likely no longer favour communities in western European nations, and it would be a danger to keep relying on current funding from EU. The point to be emphasized here is that the impact of small-scale funding is maximized where there is a ‘catalytic’ element to the funding. The intermediary agents (or bodies), acting as a conduit for funds from the regional level, or above, to the local level, invariably can manage these schemes. They enable not only the development of a particular partnership or project to implement, but also individuals in the partnerships or the communities to gain skills and confidence in community development. Their impact cannot be overstated. They are one of the most effective ways to promote and sustain community development and subsequent partnership activities.

Thirdly, monitoring the process and evaluation of outputs/outcomes at each stage is essential. Without this, there is a danger that important lessons will be lost, as the membership of local communities change, the political environment changes, and therefore so do the forms of partnerships. Although there are various evaluative mechanisms in play in the community development projects and partnerships, the majority of these are mainly concerned with accountability mechanisms for public money. This is undoubtedly an important issue in its own right, but none of these mechanisms seems focused upon enhancing community learning and sustainable
community development in rural regeneration partnerships in the long term. Evaluation should be regarded as part of the community development process, focusing on the trajectory of the evolving partnerships. This is because continual renewal and adaptation is essential to build "strong spatial organising concepts and persuasive institutional alliances to carry a strategy across a diffused power context and through time" (Albrechts et al., 2003: 127).

7.4.2. Research implications

Continuous research

First of all, it should be acknowledged that research into new patterns of institutional change through community development and their effects is in the early stages of theoretical development. There are many issues surrounding the model of evolving partnerships at the local, regional, national and European levels and therefore further research of both a comparative and historical nature would increase the ability to identify where partnership is most liable to be sustainable and successful. Further continuous evaluation of the case study area should be conducted and comparisons may be considered between different socio-economic contexts, too. Since the main body of the analysis in the case study area was concluded, some changes have taken place in the policy frameworks which will affect the future of community development approaches.

- The European Union LIFE Project, the Duthchas ended its life in April 2001, and the final report was issued in June 2001. The web site of the programme is still alive along with various archives.
  (http://www.duthchas.org.uk/frameset1.html, on 02/09/2003)
- The Initiative at the Edge programme is still going on, but its independence seems to be reduced, in terms of pooling up-dated information on projects and disseminating those lessons by newsletters. Instead, the management of the programme is gradually being replaced by increasing links with the Highlands and Islands Enterprise and the relevant Local Enterprise Companies network.
- The Wellbeing Alliance is now assisted by a new Partnership Development officer
(since Spring 2002 as being on a two year secondment from the Crofters Commission), and has been awarded £2.5 million from the European Union's LEADER + Programme (2002-2006). These funds will enable young people and rural communities across the north and west of Highland to implement projects, namely 'youth development' and 'heritage'. The programme will be co-financed by a range of partners, including Scottish Natural Heritage, Highlands and Islands Enterprise, and The Highland Council, as well as private and charitable organisations, bringing the total project funding to around £5.7 million.

- The Local Government in Scotland Bill was passed by Scottish Parliament on the 8th of January 2003, and the main provisions of the Act (including Community Planning) came into force on the 1st of April 2003.
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(1) It is the duty of a local authority to initiate and, having done so, to maintain and facilitate a process (in this Act, called "community planning") by which the public services provided in the area of the local authority are provided and the planning of that provision takes place-

(a) after consultation-

(i) among all the public bodies (including the local authority) responsible for providing those services; and

(ii) with such community bodies and other bodies or persons as is appropriate; and

(b) after and by way of such co-operation among those bodies and persons as is appropriate.

Certainly, these changes in the lifecycles of programmes keep changing the picture of community development in the area. The arrival of the EU funded Community Economic Development programme and LEADER + will complement a number of community-based action programmes, including Community Planning, the Highland Youth Strategy, Social Inclusion Partnerships, new Community Schools, and the INTERREG IIIC programme

(http://www.highland.gov.uk/cx/service_management/cxoffice/policy_unit/leader+.htm).
Those programmes, which employ partnership mechanisms, have apparently become mainstream in social and economic development in rural Scotland.

**Future research**

Future research in this area could consider three questions. Firstly, is the encouragement of partnership through financial gain the most sustainable mechanism for rural social and economic development in all circumstances and environments, in terms of the level of ‘institutional capacity’? Encouraged by the European Union through the arrangements to access the Structure Funds, LEADER+, and the Community Economic Development programme, and by the Scottish Executive through Community Planning, the question is still unresolved. Would a prosperous community/partnership and their activities be achieved on the basis of knowledge and networks, rather than the financial resources mainly funded from outside? In addition to this, in the absence of any key significant resources from the private sector, partnerships in Scotland are very much led by the public sector under a ‘semi-coercive framework’ from the EU and Scottish Executive. This might prevent local initiatives developing ‘differentiation’ amongst different regions in the UK as well as in other European countries.

The second question concerns the level of ‘institutional thickness’ (Amin and Thrift, 1995). It is generally considered that the greater the density of organisations, the more a spatial area is capable of promoting economic development, with the potential to encourage enterprise development and learning. However, there is also a belief that there is a certain optimum level of institutional thickness. When the number of organisations within a partnership becomes prolific and bottom-up initiatives explode, the result is weakness rather than strength for the regional economy. The landscape becomes crowded and competitive through duplication of effort and policies. In the Highlands case, because of a limited number of existing public bodies, proliferation of memberships within a partnership will not cause an over crowded situation, at least, not yet.

The third question concerns the balance between ‘integration’ and ‘differentiation’. It is not yet clear that the proliferation of similar community development programmes and
partnerships definitely benefits local communities and can contribute to their sustainability in the longer term. Cameron et al. (2000) raise a question about the trends towards organisational isomorphism and strategic convergence. A Policy Officer of the Highlands and Islands Enterprise also commented that the current partnership working between public agencies in similar community development projects opened up an integrated policy framework, but what was originally a useful pooling of different resources can easily become a recipe for inter-organisational competition, and moreover, at the extreme end of this trend, they might not necessarily be different independent public agencies. It is a paradox that the official rationale for partnership and networking may itself be eroded because, when public agencies and any other organisations become more and more alike, they are less capable of making a distinct contribution to collaborative projects. The balance between 'integration' and 'differentiation' amongst organisations and how this would stabilise (or destabilise) the institutional evolution of partnerships should be monitored over time.

**Reflexive research and learning**

Research on governance and its process of evolution requires deep understanding of the contexts that vary in historical, political, economic, cultural and organisational terms between areas. Hence, such studies are often inductive. There is difficulty to generalise findings from case studies conducted, since most qualitative studies involve small numbers because data collection, transcription and analysis is so time consuming. It has also been suggested that 'the personal' inevitably affects the research process in terms of choice of topic, methods adopted, forms of analysis and conclusions reached (Gough and McFadden, 2001). Consequently, researchers conducting empirical studies are recommended to make their positions available so that the analysis can be judged from an informed perspective. In a word, 'reflexivity' is essential.

Reflexivity is signalled by the researcher's incorporation of information relating to the research context and to relevant 'personal' thoughts and feelings into the research report. There is an attempt to make visible those motivations, interests, attitudes and to reflect on how these have impacted on the research. Such subjective factors are typically construed as 'bias' or 'interference' within 'scientific' research, but recognition of the
inter-personal dimension to research is heralded as enriching and informative by qualitative researchers (Wilkinson, 1988). This personal reflexivity also affects the research process itself. The different identities presented within the research and the interactions between researcher and participants might become both catalyst and constraint. A key issue here concerns the distribution of power and status within the research process. It is virtually impossible to escape researcher-participant relationships structured by inequalities, although many qualitative researchers are committed to democratic forms of inquiry where the voices of participants are encouraged and respected. However, it is also important to bear in mind that interpretative resources and processes render the researcher more accountable for the analysis. Close reading of the text will highlight the multiple and shifting positions of the researcher during the data collection phase and enhance reflexivity through identifying positions not consciously adopted at the time. In addition to this, outlining existing concepts and traditions which have been important in shaping the research, the researcher can discuss the potential contribution of the research to a particular field in which the researcher develops their own ideas. The researcher should also place the reader of the research report in a better informed position from which to situate and assess the research as a whole: as much detail as possible about the study should be presented so that an assessment of procedures and format can be made.

To summarise, it is impossible and too idealistic to presume a fixed, knowable researcher-subject in advance, when diverse and conflicting positions may well become apparent upon retrospective analysis. Therefore, it is important for qualitative researchers to acknowledge a potentially numerous range of possibly competing interests and to return to the transcripts a number of times in order to achieve this end. So, it is important for researchers themselves to acknowledge the possibility that their research aims and stated orientation may be complicated or compromised, during interactions with participants and in the subsequent presentation of the research findings. The research itself is as much a process of learning and evolving as community development.
Global connection

Successful practices of community-led projects in rural Scotland can enhance sustainable development not only at the local level but also in the wider international links to local. Since local communities acquire social capital through practices of partnership and exchange of experience with various other global localities in similar situations, building a wider network between these communities is crucial. Interacting with other communities will enable them to exchange and discuss their experiences and knowledge with similar groups across the world. They can learn and understand the problems faced by the other groups and see how they were solved. This ability to interact could become a powerful new resource to help overcome their own problems. It is particularly important for smaller rural communities to break out of the physical blockade of remoteness, acquiring knowledge for sustainable growth and development of their communities. Although these community capacities and local knowledge are intangible and therefore less likely to be explicit, academic research can analyse and articulate what they are and how this local knowledge could contribute to global consideration, sustainability. Also the findings should be shared with rural communities across the globe.
## Appendix 1: The list of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership / Village</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation / Community Village Project</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing Alliance</td>
<td>Maggie Bochel, and Gordon Summers</td>
<td>Highland Council, Policy Officers</td>
<td>22 January 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing Alliance</td>
<td>Camron McDiamid</td>
<td>Scottish Home (now Communities Scotland)</td>
<td>24 January 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ileen-Jane MacLead</td>
<td>Lochaber Limited</td>
<td>17 April 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative at the Edge</td>
<td>Jennifer Robertson</td>
<td>Skye and Lochalsh Enterprise</td>
<td>18 April 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative at the Edge</td>
<td>Calum Maciver</td>
<td>Western Isles Enterprise</td>
<td>19 April 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative at the Edge</td>
<td>Ileen-Jane MacLead</td>
<td>Initiative at the Edge, Isle of Harris area coordinator</td>
<td>19 April 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing Alliance</td>
<td>Chris Higgins</td>
<td>Highlands and Islands Enterprise</td>
<td>10 April 2001, and 22 July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing Alliance</td>
<td>Polly Chapman</td>
<td>Highland Council, Policy Officer</td>
<td>29 July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing Alliance</td>
<td>Andy Dorin</td>
<td>Scottish National Heritage</td>
<td>29 July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing Alliance, and</td>
<td>Ann Keatinge</td>
<td>Voluntary Groups East Sutherland</td>
<td>24 July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland Partnership</td>
<td>Gordon Todd</td>
<td>Highland Council, Area Development Manager</td>
<td>30 August 2001, and 29 July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland Partnership</td>
<td>Eann Sinclair</td>
<td>Caithness &amp; Sutherland Enterprise</td>
<td>31 August 2001, and 25 July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland Partnership</td>
<td>David Bryan</td>
<td>Sutherland Partnership Manager</td>
<td>23 July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland Partnership</td>
<td>Jon Pridy</td>
<td>North Highland Forestry Trust</td>
<td>24 July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland Partnership</td>
<td>Terry Keatinge</td>
<td>Scottish National Heritage</td>
<td>24 July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathy</td>
<td>Jannette Mackay</td>
<td>Ecological toilet &amp; Information Cabin</td>
<td>1 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathbriddie</td>
<td>Sandy Murray</td>
<td>Village Hall Development</td>
<td>1 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathnaver</td>
<td>Andy Dawson</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
<td>3 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betylhill</td>
<td>Jim Johnston</td>
<td>Information Centre</td>
<td>3 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skerray</td>
<td>Cila Wallis</td>
<td>Local Produce</td>
<td>4 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durness</td>
<td>Kenny Macrae</td>
<td>Village Hall / Erribol Pier</td>
<td>5 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>John Barlow</td>
<td>Tongue Football Patch</td>
<td>10 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melness</td>
<td>Wilma Robertson</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>12 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melness</td>
<td>Andy Beveridge</td>
<td>Pier Development</td>
<td>12 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvich</td>
<td>Harry Bremner</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
<td>12 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armadale</td>
<td>Anna Macconnell</td>
<td>Housing Project, Caithness and Sutherland Enterprise</td>
<td>12 April 2001, 13 September 2001, and 26 July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duthchas and Initiative at</td>
<td>Meg Telfer and Kelly Conlon</td>
<td>Community workers for the Duthchas and Initiative at the Edge</td>
<td>12 April 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sutherland Community</td>
<td>James Mather</td>
<td>Chairperson, Durness</td>
<td>26 July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: The list of members of 4 partnerships for questionnaire survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC, Head of Policy</td>
<td>Ms Ann Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC, SIP Programme Manager</td>
<td>Mr. Bob MacKinnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC, Home Safety Liaison Group</td>
<td>Mr. Mike Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC, Road Safety Officer</td>
<td>Ms Cathie Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC, Housing Project Officer</td>
<td>Ms Jill Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC, Education Service</td>
<td>Mr. Fraser MacPherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Health Board</td>
<td>Ms Moira Paton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Health Board</td>
<td>Mr. Martin Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Health Board</td>
<td>Mr. Steve Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td>Mr. Nicholas Gubbins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIE</td>
<td>Ms Lome Macleod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIE</td>
<td>Mr. Chris Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reachout Highland</td>
<td>Ms Jackie Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reachout Highland</td>
<td>Mr. Kerr GreenLaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Homes</td>
<td>Ms Carron MacDaurmid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Homes</td>
<td>Mr. Mark Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Homes</td>
<td>Mr. Arvil Noack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Homes</td>
<td>Ms Amanda MacKay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Constabulary</td>
<td>Mr. Peter Sinclair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Constabulary</td>
<td>Mr. Robbie Smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Constabulary</td>
<td>Mr. Richard MacAuley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Constabulary</td>
<td>Mr. John MacDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Support Scotland</td>
<td>Harish Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Voluntary Sector Forum</td>
<td>Ms Ann Keatinge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Voluntary Sector Forum</td>
<td>Mr. Ivor Souter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Services</td>
<td>Mr. Simon Steer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverness New Community School</td>
<td>Mr. Colin Soutar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Voluntary Sector Forum</td>
<td>Mr. Christian Goskirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverness Women's Aid</td>
<td>Ms Jean Keogh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Domestic Abuse Forum</td>
<td>Ms I Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouts</td>
<td>Ms Marie Mackay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Co-ordinator</td>
<td>Ms Meg Roger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Mr. Arthur McCourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIE</td>
<td>Mr. Stuart Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td>Mr. Jeff Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Homes</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Burn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Homes</td>
<td>Mr. Nairi Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofter Commission</td>
<td>Mr. Shane Rankin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofter Commission</td>
<td>Mr. John Toal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armadale</td>
<td>Ms Anna Macconnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettyhill</td>
<td>Mr. Jim Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durness</td>
<td>Mr. Kenny Macrae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melness</td>
<td>Mr. Andy Beveridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melness</td>
<td>Ms Wilma Robertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvich</td>
<td>Mr. Harry Brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skerray</td>
<td>Ms Cela Wallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathalladale</td>
<td>Mr. Sandy Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathnaver</td>
<td>Mr. Andy Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathy</td>
<td>Ms Janette Mackay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>Mr. John Barkow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvich</td>
<td>Mr. Jan Ritchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>G.M. Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skernay</td>
<td>Ms Pat Rodlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Worker</td>
<td>Mr. John Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Worker</td>
<td>Ms. Yvonne Mackay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Worker</td>
<td>Ms. Veronica O'Hare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Mr. David Summers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Mr. Geoff Robson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Mr. David Polson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Mr. Gordon Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Ms. Sarah Allan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Mr. Gordon Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Mr. Nick Lindsay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Ms. Susan Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Ms. Mary Mackay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Mr. George Munro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Mr. Geordie Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Ms. Ann Sutherland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Mr. Simon Moodie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Mr. Euan Sinclair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Powell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Mr. J Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Mr. J Priddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNH</td>
<td>Mr. Terry Keatinge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNH</td>
<td>Ms. Valerie Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
<td>Mr. Willie Beattie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
<td>Mr. Bryce Reynard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Enterprise</td>
<td>Mr. C Nixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>Ms. Sandra Peterkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Agricultural College</td>
<td>Mr. Bob Tosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Agricultural College</td>
<td>Ms. Doreen Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSO COLLEGE</td>
<td>Ms R Thomson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH COLLEGE</td>
<td>Ms. Valerie Gale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofter Commission</td>
<td>Mr. John Toal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: The features of Local Agenda 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives of Sustainable Development</th>
<th>To ensure a better quality of life for everyone, now and for generations to come through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ effective protection of the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ effective use of natural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>➢ use energy, water and other natural resources efficiently and with care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ minimise waste, then re-use or recover it through recycling, composting or energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recovery, and finally sustainably dispose of what is left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ limit pollution to levels which do not damage natural systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ value and protect the diversity of nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social needs</td>
<td>➢ create or enhance places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ make settlements “human” in scale and form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ value and protect diversity and local distinctiveness and strengthen local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and cultural identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ protect human health and amenity through safe, clean, pleasant environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ emphasise health service prevention action as well as care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ ensure access to good food, water, housing and fuel at reasonable cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ meet local needs locally wherever possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ maximise everyone’s access to the skills and knowledge needed to play a full part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ empower all sections of the community to participate in decision-making and consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the social and community impacts of decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic success</td>
<td>➢ create a vibrant local economy that gives access to satisfying and rewarding work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>without damaging the local, national or global environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ value unpaid work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ encourage necessary access to facilities, services, goods and other people in ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which make less use of the car and minimise impacts on the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ make opportunities for culture, leisure and recreation readily available to all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Statement</td>
<td>➢ to identify the main sustainable issues and aims for the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ to set explicit objectives for both the state of the environment including biodiversity and for indicators of the quality of life in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plan</td>
<td>➢ to show which organisations or sectors will take what actions (and by when) to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>towards these objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actions should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ concrete, explicit and challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ realistic and practicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ firmly ranked in priority, with only very few given top priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Mechanisms</td>
<td>➢ how the actions will be made to happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ how performance and achievements will be assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ how the strategy itself will be reviewed and updated over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA21 Process</td>
<td>➢ managing and improving the local authority’s sustainability performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ integrating sustainability issues into the local authority’s policies and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ awareness raising and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ consulting and involving the wider community and the general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ working in partnership with others – central Government agencies, business, community groups and the general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ measuring, monitoring and reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DETR, 1998
### Appendix 4: Structural Funds 2000 onwards

#### The Community Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (ECU million)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Agricultural policy</td>
<td>40,920</td>
<td>42,800</td>
<td>43,900</td>
<td>43,770</td>
<td>42,760</td>
<td>41,930</td>
<td>41,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural operations</td>
<td>21,045</td>
<td>31,455</td>
<td>30,865</td>
<td>30,285</td>
<td>29,595</td>
<td>29,595</td>
<td>29,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other internal policies</td>
<td>5,930</td>
<td>6,040</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>6,370</td>
<td>6,480</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External actions</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenditure</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-accession Aid</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>3,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlargement</td>
<td>6,450</td>
<td>9,030</td>
<td>11,610</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>16,780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>92,025</strong></td>
<td><strong>93,475</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,405</strong></td>
<td><strong>102,245</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,345</strong></td>
<td><strong>105,325</strong></td>
<td><strong>107,440</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


#### Structural Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Funds</th>
<th>Year (ECU million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Support Frameworks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Measures and Innovation Schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to combat fraud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Social Fund (ESF)</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF)</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Instrument for Fisheries Guidance (FIFG)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>92,025</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Community Support Frameworks (CSFs)

- Documents approved by the Commission in agreement with the Member State concerned, containing both the Member State’s and the Funds’ strategy and priorities for action, their specific objectives, the contribution from the Funds and the other financial resources

#### Single Programming Documents (SPDs)

- Comprising a single document, approved by the Commission and gathering together the data contained in a Community support framework and an operational programme (integrated regional programme containing the programme’s priorities, a short description of the proposed measures and an indicative financing plan)

#### Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Initiatives</th>
<th>Year (ECU million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special financial instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A total of 9% of the Structural Fund is available to support CIs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a trans-national and inter-regional character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- bottom-up implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the opportunity to give the EU a high profile in the localities concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>92,025</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Williams, 1996; SACDPlus; EC 2000c
Appendix 5: Four themes for the new Structural Fund (2000-2006) across Scotland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Theme]</th>
<th>and Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Enterprise** | - "The Structural Funds should aim at fostering competitive development and sustainable and job-creating growth throughout the Union and the promotion of a skilled, trained and adaptable workforce" (p17, Agenda 2000, July 2000)  
- The capacity of individuals in these communities to be resourceful, innovative and enterprising should not be ignored but supported and channelled in ways in which they can actively and openly engage in the local and formal economy.  
- A requirement for ensuring co-ordination and effective business linkages between the range of existing and proposed risk capital funds, particularly at the lower end of the venture capital market.  
- Development of a more integrated and strategic approach to support provision for SMEs at a regional or sub-regional level, accompanied by professional development for those individuals who provide professional advice, consultancy and training support to SMEs. |
| **Learning** | - Through lifelong learning approach, key issues of employability, adaptability and equal opportunities in relation to participation in the labour market can be effectively tackled.  
- Lifelong learning and the acquisition of skills will play a crucial role in SME competitiveness, whilst the promotion of entrepreneurial skills will assist in SME creation. |
| **Infrastructure** | - Support for community transport provision has the added value and impact of creating new business and employment opportunities for remote and marginalised communities.  
- The provision of economic infrastructure, e.g. local workshops units, tourism facilities, can be readily justified on their ability to impact positively on the sustainability of the economic base of the local community.  
- All future infrastructure development will require to be linked to regional strategies and justified in terms of its implications for sustainable development and strategic spatial planning. |
| **Inclusion** | - To build the capacity within communities to better equip them to both engage in the regeneration effort, and to assume a greater role and responsibility in developing, managing, and delivering the economic and social regeneration of their community.  
- The process of empowerment must be promoted, recognised and legitimised by all the partner bodies. The public agencies should have a supporting role providing resources, technical input and administrative support.  
- By using the learner-focused approaches and the pivotal role of information and communication technologies, isolated communities and groups can access learning geared to their individual needs and circumstances.  
- The potential and value of the informal economy in these communities needs to be harnessed and channelled in ways that positively contribute to the local economy.  
- Community economic development may be more effectively achieved through the development and implementation of an area-based strategic development plan or mini-programme rather than a range of discrete and often unconnected projects. |
| **Sustainable development** | - Economic development does not occur in a social or environmental vacuum and sustainable development  
- To secure improvements in the local economy, in a way which does not undermine the capacity for renewal of environmental resources; makes use of non-renewable resources and tackles economic and social exclusion; minimises any adverse impacts on the environment whilst at the same time providing meaningful and additional employment opportunities for the worst affected areas. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Eligible areas</th>
<th>Aims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERREG 2 (INTERREG and REGEN)</td>
<td>Objective 1 (75%) Objective 2, 5b</td>
<td>Promoting crossborder co-operation, help isolated areas on internal and external EU frontiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADER, LEADER2</td>
<td>Rural localities in Objective 1, 5b</td>
<td>Stimulating rural development by helping rural associations, local authorities and rural action groups devise innovative strategies for local development, by helping local people acquire the skills necessary to establish integrated strategies for development based on realisation of the local potential of the areas concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIS</td>
<td>French overseas departments The Azores and Madeira (Portugal) The Canary Islands (Spain)</td>
<td>Fostering closer integration of the most remote island regions with the EU through economic development, transport and telecommunication links, and vocational training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>All EU areas Objective 1 (over 50%)</td>
<td>NOW; focuses on equal opportunities for women HORIZON; seeks to facilitate access to the employment market for the handicapped, migrants, homeless, former convicts and other disadvantaged groups YOUTHSTART; encourages the integration into the labour market of people under the age of 20, especially those without adequate qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistance for workers faced with changes in working practices and skill requirements, and support training programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECHAR, RECHAR2</td>
<td>Objective 1, 2 or 5b Areas with 1000 job losses</td>
<td>Supporting the economic conversion of coal-mining areas through the renovation of community infrastructure and the promotion of new economic activities and training programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting the economic conversion of the steel industry areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KONVER</td>
<td>Objective 1, 2 and 5b (50%)</td>
<td>Supporting the economic diversification in areas traditionally dependent on defence industries, through the conversion of the economic base to reduce such dependency and encourage the development from this base of commercially viable activities in all industrial sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETEX</td>
<td>Objective 1, 2 and 5b with 2000 job losses in textiles and clothing</td>
<td>Supporting the economic conversion of the textile industry areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles and Clothing in Portugal</td>
<td>In Portugal</td>
<td>A specific and exceptional form of supplementary provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEs</td>
<td>Objective 1 (80%) Objective 2 and 5b (20%)</td>
<td>Assistance of SMEs in any sector to become competitive in the SEM and international markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement of co-ordination of EU measures directed at urban problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESCA</td>
<td>All areas Objective 1, s and 5b (15%)</td>
<td>Assistance of the crisis of overcapacity in the fish industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 7: Main objectives of LIFE-Environment demonstration project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Other Community funds in the field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Land use development and planning** | Relevant environment policies | ➤ The Structural Funds  
➤ The Cohesion Fund  
➤ The Instrument for Structural Policies for Pre-Accession for candidate countries  
➤ Community Initiative (INTERREG, LEADER and URBAN)  
➤ 5th Framework Programme of Research and Technological Development (5thFP) |
| To integrate considerations on the environment and on sustainable development in land use development and planning, including in urban and coastal areas | ➤ Urban Environment  
➤ Quality of air and noise abatement  
➤ Integrated Coastal Zone Management |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water management</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>5thFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To promote the sustainable management of groundwater and surface water | Water management at the river basin level  
➤ Groundwater Protection  
➤ Wastewater treatment  
➤ Prevention and reduction of diffuse and disposal sources of pollution of water  
➤ Planning and organisational aspects of water management |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts of economic activities</th>
<th>Proposal projects</th>
<th>5thFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To minimise the environmental impacts of economic activities, notably through the development of clean technologies and by placing the emphasis on prevention, including the reduction of emission of gases having a greenhouse effect | ➤ Clean technologies  
➤ Integrated environment management  
➤ Reduction of emission of grass having a greenhouse effect  
➤ Sustainable tourism |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste management</th>
<th>Proposal projects</th>
<th>5thFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To prevent, reuse and recycle waste of all kind and ensure the sound management of waste streams | ➤ Packaging and plastics  
➤ Hazardous or problematic waste  
➤ Waste important in volume |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrated production policy</th>
<th>Proposal projects</th>
<th>5thFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To reduce the environmental impact of products through an integrated approach to production, distribution, consumption and handling at the end of their lifetime, including the development of environmentally-friendly products | ➤ Eco-design, eco-efficiency, green financial products  
➤ Eco-labelling |
Appendix 8: Partnership Network of the Wellbeing Alliance
Appendix 9: Partnership Network of the Sutherland Partnership
Appendix 11: Vertical Network of the Sutherland Partnership
Appendix 12: Vertical Network of the Initiative at the Edge
Appendix 13: Vertical Network of the North Sutherland Community Development Forum
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