



**A Critical Review of
Canadian, American, & European**

**Community Economic
Development Literature**

Jean-Marc Fontan, Ph.D.

A joint project of the Centre for Community Enterprise (CCE)
& the Institute for Community Economic Development (IFDEC)

Copyright © Centre for Community Enterprise, 1993

All rights reserved. No portion of this publication may be reproduced in any way whatsoever without the permission of the copyright-holder.

The publisher, Westcoast Development Group, is a division of the Centre for Community Enterprise, a nonprofit corporation which fights poverty through capacity-building and networking in the field of community economic development.

This work also appears under the title *Revue de la Littérature en développement local et en développement économique communautaire*, and is distributed by l'Institut en formation de développement économique communautaire (IFDEC), 420 rue St-Paul est, 2e étage, Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1H4.

Design/layout: Don McNair, Westcoast Development Group

Direct inquiries about this publication to

CCE/Westcoast Publications
2905-31st Street, Suite 5
Vernon, B.C. V1T 5H6
Tel (604) 542-7057
Fax (604) 542-7229 E-mail ccewdg@web.apc.org

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Fontan, Jean-Marc.

A Critical review of Canadian, American, & European community economic development literature

Translation of: *Revue de la littérature en développement locale et en développement économique communautaire*.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-895818-24-9

1. Community development. 2. Economic development projects. 3. Regional economics.
I. Centre for Community Enterprise (Vancouver, B.C.). II. Title.

HC79.E44F6513 1993 338.9 C93-091518-6

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is one of the products emanating from a joint research project undertaken by the Centre for Community Enterprise and IFDEC (l'Institut de formation en développement économique communautaire).

The research and writing, done over a period of almost eighteen months, focuses on the field of Community Economic Development in urban Canada. Primary research on forty-four CED initiatives provided the basis for a general overview of urban CED. More detailed case studies on ten of these yielded further learning with respect to some of the key practice and policy issues facing urban practitioners. The major report of the research is written up in a separate document entitled *Revitalizing Canada's Neighbourhoods: A Research Report on Urban Community Economic Development*.

This report, which reviews a significant segment of the North American and European literature, is primarily the result of the work of Dr. Jean-Marc Fontan of IFDEC. The critical comments of other members of the research team, Michael Lewis and Dr. Stewart Perry, were put to some use through the course of the review. Eric Shragge also assisted with the final editing and added his clarity to some of the formulations that arose from the review.

It is hoped that the availability of this literature review will be useful to both students and teachers, policy-makers and practitioners, in the years ahead.

The research project would like to acknowledge the support of the National Welfare Grants Program of National Health and Welfare Canada, which provided us with financial support and consultation. In particular, we thank Guy Brethour for his support throughout the months of work. Without financial and staff support from the National Welfare Grants, such research would not have been possible.

The opinions expressed in this literature review are of course those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of Health and Welfare Canada.

Mike Lewis

May, 1993

Project Director, Urban CED Research
Executive Director, Centre for Community Enterprise

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Status of the Literature	1
Principal Trends in Bottom-Up Development	3
Definitions and Characteristics of Bottom-Up Development Initiatives	7
Historical Overview of Community Economic Development	12
Dimensions of Community Economic Development Intervention	15
Intervention Models	17
Intervention Tools of Community Economic Development	21
The Methodology of Community Economic Development	29
Evaluation Methods and Major Achievements	30
Conclusion	36
Bibliography	38

Owing to the constraints inherent in this study, we have opted for a literature review that is qualitative and confined to works published in English and French. It is also limited geographically to the national territories of developed countries, and covers only the literature on European and North American experiences.

Furthermore, in selecting the titles, we have taken into account the objectives set for this study by Health and Welfare Canada and the main criteria used in the social sciences to describe a subject of study: the status of the literature, the principal definitions encountered, a historical overview, the dimensions, tools and models of intervention, the evaluation methods and the main achievements of the subject under study.

STATUS OF THE LITERATURE

An analysis of the literature concerning local and community development initiatives reveals a proliferation of documents, which may be grouped into four broad categories.

Firstly, most texts are descriptive in nature. They consist of thematic reviews or accounts of experiences that present historical, analytical and factual data. The series of publications on local initiatives (produced by the OECD),¹ on local development (produced by the Economic Council of Canada),² and on community economic development (produced by the Center for Community Economic Development)³ are good examples of this.

Secondly, there are documents of analytic nature: books, articles or lectures produced primarily by academicians and, in fewer cases, by practitioners. This literature covers broad issues, such as:

- The Polarization of the Economy: Local or community economic development initiatives fit within a macro-economic context of de-industrialization and polarization of incomes. They are one way of battling impoverishment by advocating a revival of the economy through economic development at the local level (Economic Council of Canada, 1991a and b).
- Endogenous Development: Local or community economic development initiatives work to set up institutions aimed at developing a community's resources (Brodhead, Lamontagne and Peirce, 1990; Dykeman, 1990; Perry, 1987; Chassagne and Romefort, 1987).

¹ For example, the series of six *Cahiers des ILE* produced between 1984 and 1986 by the secretariat of the OECD.

² The Council produced a series of seventeen booklets on local development in Canada between 1989 and 1990.

³ The CCEC in Cambridge has published more than 25 titles on community economic development.

- Social Regulation: Local and community economic development initiatives are among the institutional forms that replace the Fordist compromise shaped in 1930 around the New Deal. They are one component of a reformist approach to the transformation of mature economies (Laville, 1992; Lévesque and Bélanger, 1992; Gunn and Gunn, 1991; Fontan, 1991; Lipietz, 1989).
- Social Movements: Community economic development initiatives are part of a "progressive" social movement to change the way in which our societies' values and principles are conceived (Ninacs, 1992; Davis, 1991; Favreau, 1989).
- Urban Development: Local and community economic development initiatives have a role to play in promoting urban space as an autonomous economic space with control over its own socioeconomic development. The central idea is to produce locally what is consumed locally; any surplus can then be exported to other regions (Jacobs, 1984).
- A New Economic Order: Community economic development initiatives are part of the defining of a new economic order—based on self-determination at the community level and on a socialization of the State and the market, according to Bruyn (1987); combined with practices that reject the distinct separation of the economic and social spheres, according to Pecqueur (1989); linked to the generalization of democratic ideas through humanistic economics, according to Lutz and Lux (1988), social economics, according to Ellerman (1986), or New Age economics, similar to social economics,⁴ according to MacLeod (1986).

Thirdly, there are documents that are evaluative in nature. This category includes qualitative studies of an organization (Papineau and Kiely, 1992; Beale, 1988; Bateman, 1981) or of several experiences (Kelly, 1977; Berndt, 1977). It also includes quantitative evaluations, such as:

- the evaluation by Flett (1992) of the community economic development program of the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services;
- the evaluation by Vidal (1992), for the National Congress for Community Economic Development, of community economic development corporations in the United States (1991 and 1989);
- or even studies done of training businesses in France (Alphandéry, 1990) and of local enterprise agencies in England (BIC, 1987 and 1988).

A number of studies are not about organizations, but rather about the community economic development model. These focus on such issues as the lessons to be learned (Gareau, 1990) or the success factors to be adopted (Zalent and Schnitzer, 1987; Perry, 1984).

⁴ For a discussion of social economics in Europe and North America, see Defourny and Monzon Campos (1992).

Fourthly, there are texts of a technical nature, aimed at practitioners. These documents are designed for use in a context of basic self-instruction (Bonetti, Collan and Allen, 1991; Zalent, 1988). They may also be used to establish specific work strategies for business development (Gardner, 1983), or even to put in place specific intervention tools, such as a community land trust (White, 1982) or an early warning system (LeRoy, Swinney and Charpentier, 1988).

Technical texts may also be used in the context of customized training sessions or consulting contracts. In such cases, they are produced by technical resource groups.⁵ For example, we might mention the Canadian titles put out by the Westcoast Development Group (including Green and Lewis, 1992; Lewis, 1990), or those of L'Institut de formation en développement économique communautaire (including Lévesque and Fontan, 1992).

PRINCIPAL TRENDS IN BOTTOM-UP DEVELOPMENT

In the European and North American literature consulted, we found two main expressions for describing efforts to develop local resources from the bottom up: "local development," and "community economic development."

A number of authors and organizations have come up with or use hybrids of these two terms. For example, Brodhead, Lamontagne and Peirce (1990) use "local development agency," Bryant (1991) uses "sustainable community development," and Lemelin and Morin (1989) even use "local and community economic development." As for the terms used by organizations, in 1969 L'Institut Parallèle, in Pointe St-Charles, spoke of "regional and community development," while in 1984 the Montreal YMCA used "economic and community development." Finally, since the late 1980s, a new term has been in use in Europe to describe local and community initiatives in an urban setting: "urban social development" (Jacquier, 1991).⁶

Local development and community economic development, Newman, Lyon and Philp tell us, have the same origin.⁷ The model of development from on high, by large corporations and the Canadian government, which goes back to the mid-19th century, does not adequately ensure a fair distribution

⁵ Four technical resource groups are active in the area of CED in Canada: the Westcoast Development Group, in Vancouver; the New Economy Development Group, in Ottawa; L'Institut de formation en développement économique communautaire, in Montreal; and the Centre for Community Economic Development, in Sydney. There are several other groups that specialize in providing technical assistance for setting up and developing community enterprises and co-operative enterprises. We might mention the Community Business Centre, in Toronto. Finally, there are a relatively large number of private, community and university consultants.

⁶ Jacquier defines it as follows: "a global process, a comprehensive strategy, whose aim is to foster a new way of conceiving and building cities by stressing the notions of solidarity and citizenship and, above all, by attempting to combat the exclusionary mechanisms that, when not generated by bureaucratic and technocratic apparatus, all too often are broadened by them" [translation] (1991, page 121).

⁷ See the introduction to their book published in 1986, pages 1 to 5. We might point out that the finding presented by the authors is the result of a review of the literature on the subject.

of the wealth among the various regions of the country and the various segments of the population. In fact, the authors inform us, the vulnerability of urban or rural communities to phenomena such as concentration, disinvestment, the decline of industry, the depletion of natural resources, tertiarization or the obsolescence of production methods has given rise in these communities—both in Canada and in most developed countries—to a new concept of development.

The local development and the community economic development we examine in this literature review are essentially *part of this new approach to development*. Let us see how authors present the new approach of these intervention strategies.

The French journal *Pour* defines local development as:

a strategy of survival in distressed regions where "this cannot go on," "something must be done" It is therefore a response of solidarity to profound stress. Local development, beyond this sense of urgency, is the expression of social change characterized by the rise of partnership, the emergence of different actors, the search for alternative solutions to those of the macro-economic apparatus (States, large groups), the introduction of social and cultural criteria alongside purely economic rationalities.⁸

This definition stresses the social change aspect of local development which, according to *Pour*, is to set new game rules for thwarting, at the local level, the distorted effects of the market or the technocratic activities of the State. This view links local development with progressive action.

This progressive local development contrasts with liberal local development,⁹ which Blakely (1989) describes as follows:

Local economic development refers to the process in which local governments or community-based organizations engage to stimulate or maintain business activity and/or employment. The principal goal of local economic development is to develop local employment opportunity in sectors that improve the community using existing human, natural, and institutional resources.¹⁰

This type of local development, Blakely tells us, has existed since the last century. It refers to liberal activity in pursuit of growth, and promotes neither the alternative, nor reformist social change. At the very most, for the Community Futures Program of Employment and Immigration Canada, it is a means of improving local economies through employment development:

⁸ The journal *Pour*, in Chassagne and Romefort (1987), page 251.

⁹ We use the term "liberal" in the economic sense of the French and British traditions.

¹⁰ Page 15.

Local development is aimed at increasing the community's capacity to adapt to change and at encouraging and supporting entrepreneurship. This includes the identification of market niches that may be served competitively by these communities.

The fundamental principle of community-based economic development is the intervention of individuals who take steps at the local level to improve economic, social and environmental conditions. Job creation, in the context of local economic development, is a key element of this process which brings together those at the local level who have decided to take action and to innovate in order to combat unemployment.¹¹

We find appreciably the same distinction—progressivism versus liberalism—in community economic development practices: "There are two basic types of community economic development strategies: business development and community empowerment."¹²

Thus, Swack and Mason (1987) define community economic development as:

(. . .) an effective and unique strategy for dealing with the problems of poor people, powerless people, and underdeveloped community. As an intervention strategy in an underdeveloped community it does not seek to make the existing conditions in the community more bearable. Instead, community economic development seeks to change the structure of the community and build permanent institutions within a community. As a result, the community begins to play a more active role vis-à-vis the institutions outside the community, and the residents of the community become more active in the control of the community's resources.¹³

Similarly, Newman, Lyon and Philp describe community economic development as follows:

CED is both a movement and a process designed to marshall human, physical and financial resources to:

- integrate economic and social development at the community level;
- improve the community's environment, quality of services, and capacity to address its own socioeconomic problems;
- stimulate self-sustaining, socially-responsible economic growth;

¹¹ Employment and Immigration Canada, *Community Development* (1990), pages 24 and 25).

¹² McCormick, Howard, Wiewel and Siegel (1987), page 2.

¹³ Page 327.

- direct change and capture investment returns for the benefit of the community;
- engage in bottom-up planning and decision-making;
- promote community self-determination and control over basic economic decisions such as employment, investment and location;
- encourage collective self-reliance;
- develop organizations which are responsive and accountable to the community.¹⁴

In contrast, for the Economic Council of Canada (1990):

Community economic development is the improvement of job prospects, income and other aspects of the economy not only for our populations, but by these very populations themselves.¹⁵

The concept of community economic development proposed by the Council limits the scope of this intervention strategy and is consistent with the notion of liberal local economic development. In fact, this definition is based on the idea that a community is a homogeneous whole where the wealth generated by some has a ripple effect on all of the people and institutions in the community. Unfortunately, this is not so. Communities are made up basically of distinct units that benefit unequally from the advantages and disadvantages inherent in growth processes. For development to occur, the most disadvantaged, marginalized individuals, groups and institutions must have access to greater wealth and increased participation in the decisions that affect them.

In the Council's definition, community economic development, at the very most, generates economic growth in an area so that the population as a whole benefits from the effects of this growth. What is new is that the Council sees the population's participation and involvement in this recovery as a factor ensuring the greater effectiveness of the development initiative.

In short, liberal local initiatives are aimed solely at repairing the economic fabric of the private sector in order to create jobs:

Business development projects strive to revitalize targeted business in a local area and they assume that positive effects will result for the entire community. Possible benefits include new jobs, higher income, and improved housing conditions.¹⁶

¹⁴ Pages 25-26.

¹⁵ Page 3.

¹⁶ McCormick, Howard, Wiewel and Siegel (1987), page 2.

In contrast, progressive initiatives invest the economy with social concerns, in order to weave a socioeconomic fabric that takes social objectives into account with a view to creating new interdependencies and an economic democracy that fosters greater participation and control on the part of the community and individuals in the planning and development of their locality:

Community empowerment is to transcend purely economic issues and enable residents to increase their capacity to plan and coordinate the way in which their communities are run. Such increased control typically requires additional political power particularly as it relates to education; quality and quantity of housing; goods and services for residents; environmental issues; and local job opportunities.¹⁷

Progressive local and community initiatives offer a development model¹⁸ where the notions of social solidarity, individual and collective empowerment and actual control over local resources and their development are at the heart of the desired change, of the proposed social contract.

DEFINITIONS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF BOTTOM-UP DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

There are, then, important nuances between liberal local and community initiatives, designed simply to generate local entrepreneurship and some economic growth, and progressive local and community initiatives, designed to change the approach to development in order to bring about a vital, equitable, safe, quality socioeconomic environment that fosters the empowerment of the individual and the community.¹⁹

In order to describe the differences between the liberal option and the progressive option, we provide a synthesis of the distinctive features identified by several authors to describe these two types of initiatives.

Liberal local economic development initiatives are characterized as follows:²⁰

- the intervention site is part or all of a locality;
- the endogenous development of human, physical and financial resources is fostered;
- local resources are used to stimulate and direct private, public or social-sector investment;
- there is a special focus on co-operative activities (consultation, partnership) and joint action among the various actors with a view to using the community's resources more effectively;

¹⁷ *Ibid*, pages 2 and 3.

¹⁸ Authors such as Lipietz (1989) even speak of a new social contract; see, notably, the whole of chapter 9 of his book.

¹⁹ We borrow the terms used by Schramm (1987, pages 153 and 154).

²⁰ The characteristics are taken from Newman, Lyon and Philp (1986, page 2) and Pellegrin (1988, pages 44 and 45).

- intervention is divided between the promotion of local private entrepreneurship and measures to develop the employability of the population;
- the effect is the integration of the various aspects of employment (for example, the linking of job skills development and job creation).

The interventions that best illustrate the liberal local development initiative are the chamber of commerce, the "Corporation de développement économique" and the "Commissariat Industriel". It should be noted that the term "local" is used to describe an administrative or political district. It may refer to an urban area, a municipality or an administrative sub-unit of a region.

For clarification, we associate liberal local and community initiatives with the concept of local development. Blakely's definition (cited on page 4) represents this perspective well. We repeat it here:

Local economic development refers to the process in which local governments or community-based organizations engage to stimulate or maintain business activity and/or employment. The principal goal of local economic development is to develop local employment opportunity in sectors that improve the community using existing human, natural, and institutional resources.

Progressive local and community initiatives for economic development are characterized as follows:²¹

- the intervention site is part or all of a locality, to which the term "community" is applied to designate a specific location, a specific group, or both;
- social objectives are combined with economic objectives. Both types of objectives are pursued jointly through the ability of the said community to develop and implement an action plan;
- the delegation of responsibilities, mutual aid and autonomy are encouraged;
- a priority is accorded to alternative, nontraditional economic forms (co-operatives, alternative businesses, community enterprises, self-management, non-profit organizations);
- the aim is local control over ownership of resources and over institutions;
- projects are conceived to suit the community, consistent with its capacities and its short-, medium- and long-term needs;
- efforts are made to minimize the negative social and economic effects of change;
- the organizations created are intended to be representative of and accountable to their community;

²¹ Intergovernmental Committee on Urban and Regional Research (1992), page 5; Newman, Lyon and Philp (1986), page 3; Habersfeld (1991), pages 9 to 12.

- building a voice for community in order to get more resources from wider sources usually state but also other institutions.

The intervention that best characterizes progressive local and community initiatives is the community economic development corporation (CEDC) along the lines of New Dawn, in Nova Scotia, Le Regroupement pour la relance économique et sociale, in south-west Montreal, Quebec, and the Kitsaki Development Corporation, in Saskatchewan.

We make a connection between progressive local and community initiatives and the concept of community economic development. We provide the following definition:

Community economic development is a comprehensive, multi-faceted strategy for the revitalization of marginalized or distressed communities. Through the development of resources and alliances, organizations and institutions that are democratically controlled by the community are put in place. They mobilize local resources (people, finances, technical expertise, and real property) in partnership with resources from outside the community for the purpose of empowering community members to create and manage new and expanded socio-economic tools (businesses, specialized institutions and organizations, skills, and practices).

The Concept of Community

The word "community" as expressed in "community economic development" does not have the same meaning for all of the authors consulted. Newman, Lyon and Philp (1986) clearly state that the word "community" is used indiscriminately to designate a specific area, a specific group, or both. As we will see, there is no unanimity as to the definition of the word "community."

For European authors, such as Jacquier and Mendés-France (1992), the situation that exists in problem urban areas in Europe is one of the co-existence of populations. There is no strong social cohesion between the different components of the population of these problem areas. Intervention, they tell us, should therefore be based not on identification with the community, but on geographical identification with a problem area:

The English word "community" can lead to confusion. Problem areas rarely constitute communities in the sense of a human group united by interests and a common history. Nor are they generally territorial communities with a political or administrative identity This warrants territorialized policies that consider individuals in their life context.²²

²² 1992, page 20.

Area-based action is therefore preferable to action based on the notion of community (*community-based action*). The authors state, however, that the aim of area-based action is to prompt community-based action. In other words, it is designed to stimulate collective action, to develop an associative life, to promote the flourishing of initiatives based on social economics, and thus, to build a sense of community identity.

For Watchel and Chabassol (1986), with regard to young people, and Conn (1986), with regard to women, community economic development can coalesce around a particular group or social category. Young people and women would constitute communities that share a given territory with other communities.²³ The concept of community, according to Conn, takes into account the heterogeneousness of the populations found in an area—a heterogeneousness of communities resulting historically from a process of exclusion from the formal economy. It is therefore in order to counter this socioeconomic exclusion that the communities of women, young people, the homeless or the mentally ill are organizing and innovating:

Community groups that provide innovative structures are precisely those who have long been excluded from the formal economy: women, youth, native people, immigrants, the unemployed and the working poor.²⁴

For Perry (1987) and MacLeod (1986), community economic development occurs in a specific territory encompassing a population that shares an identity formed over time around a psychological dimension:

That dimension, in a perception of common destiny, common identity, offers the residents an essential mechanism for mobilizing themselves in a joint endeavour.²⁵

From this standpoint, a community that is not located in a defined area cannot engage in community economic development:

Community economic development must be based in a specific geographical locality, which then requires transferring power back to the local level.²⁶

According to these two viewpoints, unless there is a geographical base, a community cannot develop a broad institutional network, since there is no local level representative of the population as a whole to which power can be transferred back.

²³ Watchel and Chabassol develop the idea of the community of young people on page 6 of their document. Watchel (1987) published a document for SPARC in which she resumes the idea of community economic development for a community of young people by profiling 12 Canadian community economic development experiences that developed a youth-oriented approach in their intervention.

²⁴ 1986, page 51.

²⁵ Perry (1987), page 60.

²⁶ MacLeod (1986), page 56.

To summarize, we adopt a multiple approach to illustrate the meaning given the word "community" in the expression "community economic development." Community economic development, then, permits interventions in communities defined in terms of:

- A Geographical Base: a marginalized area in an urban or rural setting;
- A Social Base: a minority cultural group or a marginalized group (women, young people, the elderly, the disabled, the unemployed, etc.);
- A Community Base: a close association between a locality and a shared interest; that is, a population that shares, in a given area, a history, a sense of belonging, and that has common interests, notably regarding the socioeconomic revitalization of the community.

The Issues of Community Economic Development

In order to identify the main issues of community economic development, we turn to the ideas advanced by two sources representative of the North American and European traditions: Neamtan (1988), and Chassagne and Romefort (1987).

For Neamtan,²⁷ the fundamental issue of community economic development is to demonstrate through and in practice that it is a viable response to social or regional marginalization:

The traditional levers of our economy have been unable to meet the needs of increasingly marginalized populations and regions. Left to themselves, these populations have refused to be cast aside and have built local solidarity movements to promote the development of their localities. They have adopted measures that are suited at once to realities and larger markets. And these initiatives have not only proven themselves economically. They have also opened doors to the development of more global strategies, at the national, regional and municipal level, that are recognized by more and more governments.²⁸

Proving that community economic development is an appropriate model for solving the present-day problems of social and regional exclusion is central to the task at hand, Neamtan informs us.

As a second issue, Neamtan states the importance of the community economic development movement gaining recognition of the economic power of its intervention strategy and of ensuring that this power is manifested in positive ways for the communities that wield it.²⁹

²⁷ In her inaugural address to the symposium "Le Local en Action."

²⁸ 1989, page 16.

²⁹ Neamtan (1989), page 16.

Neamtan adds an interesting dimension to the issues: the legitimization of marginal social practices that constitute an international socioeconomic movement in response to the crisis caused by the approaches of traditional interveners³⁰—a movement that is building and gaining ground both economically and politically because it is influencing the intervention approaches of traditional interveners, as the experience of Montreal's economic development corporations shows.³¹

For Chassagne and Romefort (1987),³² the issues of progressive local initiatives are global, in the sense that they are at once:

economic: the development of local resources through numerous innovations of products, markets, actions and organizations . . .

social: local partnership, negotiation, interveners' learning of new relationships . . .

cultural: (. . .) initiative and solidarity, responsibility, citizenship, creation, innovation and solidarity, self-confidence, at both the individual and group level . . .³³

The progressive local initiative therefore works towards generating wealth, but does so in and through new social relationships aimed at equity and solidarity. The difficulty lies, then, in blending the economic, political, cultural, social and institutional aspects of development projects.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The term "community economic development" was used for the first time in the United States. As Peirce and Steinbach (1987) recall, community economic development in the U.S. originated, in urban settings, in three different intervention practices between the mid-1950s and the late 1960s.

Firstly, in the climate of the social movement surrounding civil rights, which began in the 1950s, community organizers were inspired by the conflict model of intervention developed by Saul Alinsky for demanding resources to initiate local socioeconomic development in ethnic neighbourhoods which were in a state of crisis. As a result, organizations were formed to demand more adequate social services, and then to initiate local development controlled by the residents.

Secondly, in the early 1960s, the issue of civil rights made way for more specific demands related to economic rights, such as the right to work or to vocational training. Black religious organizations then

³⁰ This idea of a movement also appears in the writings of Newman, Lyon and Philp, who present CED as both a movement and a process (1986, page 25).

³¹ For the history and development of Montreal's CEDCs, see Fontan (1991). For the influence of CEDCs on the levels of government, see Deland (1992).

³² The whole of chapter 2 of their book is devoted to this subject.

³³ 1987, pages 29 and 30.

set up initiatives to promote the hiring of blacks in private companies. Interventions were aimed primarily at raising the level of skill of the unemployed and at supporting them in their search for employment.

Around 1965, the demands related to economic rights rapidly evolved into demands related to company ownership. The issue was no longer just about blacks receiving vocational training in order to work in companies controlled by whites, but about their acquiring skills and mobilizing capital to start up their own companies.

Thirdly, in the mid-1960s, in the context of the war on poverty waged by a number of U.S. government agencies and several private foundations, community economic development was seen by the Ford Foundation and the Office of Economic Opportunity (a federal agency) as a way of responding to the problems of poverty and the breakdown of certain ethnic neighbourhoods. Financial resources were made available to local initiatives representative of their community:

- to begin a process of revitalizing residential and commercial areas;
- to stimulate job creation;
- to promote the creation of new companies in poor ethnic communities.

Peirce and Steinbach state that in 1970, about one hundred community economic development corporations were operating in the United States. Their intervention was intended to be global, since they were involved in housing development projects, the development of commercial spaces, the creation of new businesses, as well as vocational training, fundraising and the establishment of community services.

From 1970 to 1990, community economic development in the United States took off. In one survey conducted in 1991, the National Congress for Community Economic Development (NCCED) estimates there were 2,000 community economic development corporations. Of the 1,160 organizations that completed its questionnaire, the NCCED states that 88 percent intervened in the development of social housing for low-wage earners and in the revitalization of areas in serious financial difficulty. Other spheres of activity included the development of commercial and residential areas and business development through micro-business development assistance.

In Canada, according to Fontan (1991), MacLeod (1986), Newman, Lyon and Philp (1986), and Wismer and Pell (1981), community economic development experiences appeared in rural areas as far back as the early 1900s. They were closely linked to the Desjardins co-operative movement in Quebec (1900) and the Antigonish co-operative movement in Nova Scotia (1930).

The Canadian literature, from 1930 until the late 1960s, mentions no other notable experience of community economic development. It should be pointed out that an historical study would certainly reveal several.

From 1940 to 1970, the few Quebec experiences recorded, such as the 1940 initiative of Cité Jardin (Choko, 1988), were funded through private foundations or funds from religious communities. These experiences were few in number and little-known.

It was in the late 1960s that L'Institut Parallèle, the first community economic development corporation in Quebec, appeared in the Pointe St-Charles district of Montreal (Fontan, 1991). This may also have been Canada's first CEDC in an urban setting.

L'Institut Parallèle is an interesting initiative. It was created in 1967 within the scope of a social development organization. Interveners with the institute quickly drew on U.S. experiences, and in 1969 came up with a project for a community economic development corporation. The institute incorporated this component into its organization in 1970.

The institute was originally funded by foundations and religious organizations. In 1970, it gained access to various government programs for local employment development. Interveners at the institute have a privileged relationship with professors at McGill University³⁴ that enables them to keep abreast of the evolution of American community economic development corporations.

With respect to interventions, the institute has both a community organization dimension (mobilization and organization of individuals seeking social assistance and community services (1968-1978)) and a community development dimension (through the creation of a social housing development agency, *Loge Peuple* (1971-1976), and a community enterprise in Verchères that makes row boats, *L'Usine Autogérée* (1971-1972)).³⁵

The idea of investing the economic sphere with a community approach to finding solutions to the problems of poverty began to circulate within the federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion in 1970 (Tarasoff, 1973). Also, social interveners at the national level did not wait for government support before taking action; they experimented on their own, either drawing on the American experience or innovating (Fontan, 1991; Wismer and Pell, 1981). During this period, the provincial and federal governments decided to introduce employment development programs at the regional and local levels. Thus, community economic development projects were conceived in communities grappling with serious socioeconomic problems, and the funding for these projects was made possible through the various government programs that appeared.³⁶

³⁴ This close collaboration between community economic development and the university community is very evident in the recent evolution of CEDCs in Montreal. We note the following examples of collaboration: the partnership established in 1990 between a coalition of community groups in south-west Montreal, under the leadership of RESO (a CEDC) and McGill University; the partnership between the Service aux collectivités of Université du Québec à Montréal and L'Institut de formation en développement économique communautaire.

³⁵ Weiner (1972).

³⁶ Brodhead, Lamontagne and Peirce present the various public programs launched in this period (1990, page 13). It should be noted that not all projects received program funding; sometimes these were pilot projects, as in the case of the assistance initially given both to New Dawn and the Human

Among the community economic development initiatives in Canada that drew attention in the 1970s, we might mention:

- *Opérations Dignité*, in Quebec (Gagnon, 1985), including one particular project, JAL,³⁷ which started in 1973 (Carrier, 1990);
- the community economic development corporation *New Dawn*, of Sydney, Nova Scotia, also begun in 1973 (Hanratty, 1981; MacLeod, 1986);
- the *Nanaimo Community Employment Advisory Society*, in British Columbia (1975), a community economic development corporation created in 1975.

The 1980s and 1990s saw a large number of community economic development initiatives in Canada. However, we do not have the data for determining the exact number. The study by Brodhead, Lamontagne and Peirce (1990) is one of the few recent studies to present a national profile of community economic development. It is incomplete, however, as it fails to present a significant number of Quebec experiences. There is therefore room for such a study, which would not only enable us to draw a general profile for both the rural and urban setting, but would also facilitate the development of a typology of community economic development experiences in Canada.

DIMENSIONS OF COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTION

The dimensions of community economic development intervention are varied. From our analysis of the data presented in the North American and European literature, we offer the following synthesis of the various dimensions of intervention encountered in the field. We wish to point out that the list of sub-themes is intended as only a partial synthesis.

- I. *Land Use Planning*: Any initiative by the community to gain direct control over land use or any initiative to revitalize the physical and cultural infrastructure affecting:
 - **Housing**: a community initiative to renovate or develop new residential or commercial units;
 - **Zoning**: a community initiative that controls the orientation of land use in a given area (transportation, recreation, parks and residential, commercial or industrial development);

Resource Development Association by Health and Welfare Canada.

³⁷

Acronym of the first letters of the three towns involved in the project (Saint-Juste, Auclair and Lejeune).

- Collective Land Ownership: for environmental, residential, commercial or industrial purposes.
- II. *Employment*: Any measures for developing human resources related to:
- The Development of Employability: any initiative that promotes the development of an individual's job skills (from literacy through on-the-job training to pre-employability measures and vocational training initiatives);
 - Job Training: community initiatives that provide a given clientele with an opportunity to receive vocational training through an internship with a community enterprise.
- III. *Private or Collective Entrepreneurship*: Any measures to assist in the strengthening and development of businesses in a community, such as:
- Private or Collective Business Development Assistance: initiatives such as the technical resource group that facilitate the training of private or collective entrepreneurs;
 - The Development of Community Enterprises: community-controlled initiatives that own or co-own production or service ventures;
 - Business Incubators: tools used in conjunction with new business development;
 - Early Warning Systems: coalitions that identify plants in difficulty and intervene to keep them in operation.
- IV. *Private or Collective Investment*: Any initiatives to mobilize financial resources for the development of a community, such as:
- The Private, Socially-oriented Bank or the Co-operative Bank: tools for the local management of loans and credit;
 - Community Loan Funds: tools for the community management of loans of venture capital for social initiatives.

These dimensions may overlap. Thus, the Bromley Heath Management Corporation (BHMC) is a community enterprise for the management, by the tenants, of social housing owned by the Boston Housing Authority. The board of directors is made up of tenants, and BHMC employs 60 people, most of whom are tenants. BHMC offers various services, including maintenance and investment

programs, the purchase of supplies, tenants services and the awarding of service contracts.³⁸ BHMC's intervention therefore has three dimensions: local employment, the development of a stock of social housing, and the creation of a community enterprise.

INTERVENTION MODELS

According to Pellegrin, it is still very difficult to develop a typology of intervention models, for the simple reason that:

The extreme diversity of these initiatives, the incomplete information, the imprecise terminology (distinction between local and regional, or local and micro, for example), the lack of coherence between local policies and global (or macro-) policies, local approaches and sector-based approaches (or through networks), make it impossible to draw any very definite conclusions in this regard.³⁹

Intervention models may be developed in different ways. They may be constructed on the basis of a study that identifies, analyses and classifies current practices. This was the approach of Newman, Lyon and Philp (1986), and of Brodhead, Lamontagne and Peirce (1990). They may also be constructed on theoretical foundations, as Bruyn (1987) suggests, or using a pragmatic approach linked to a long experience of intervention in the field, as Lewis and Green (1992) suggest.

Newman, Lyon and Philp (1986) refer to several models in characterizing community economic development as it existed in rural Canada at the time of their survey:

Rural development organizations in Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Quebec, Manitoba and Alberta offer several different models, some more akin to conventional local initiatives (i.e., promotion, private sector recruitment) than others. Some examples include:

The Alberta Regional Resources Project in the Drumheller area which combined *regional development planning and coordination with locally-based development companies* designed to encourage residential, commercial and industrial activities under the direction of elected boards and with equity raised from their communities.

JAL, Project Contact and La Société d'exploitation des ressources de la Vallée (SERV) in Quebec, involved in *economic stimulation through direct support for cooperatives and private enterprises*, or undertaking their own projects, or in the case of Contact providing technical assistance.

³⁸ Information taken from the journal *Pour*, 1989, page 135.

³⁹ 1987, page 31.

The *regional development associations* in Newfoundland, born out of the resistance to government resettlement policies, and now functioning as intermediaries between residents and government in the absence of a dynamic system of local government. Most are oriented to *facilitating private entrepreneurship, and have mixed records in terms of community participation and local control* of economic development.

Further evolution of CED in Canada is associated with New Dawn Enterprises Ltd. in Sydney, N.S., a *community development corporation with similarities to the American model*; the Community Employment Strategy Association of Guysborough County, N.S., with its subsidiary MGCDIL Corporation which invests loan and equity in local projects; and the *development initiatives* pursued by Indian, Metis and Inuit economic organizations.⁴⁰

The same survey would today produce a very different profile. First of all, examples such as JAL attest to a retreat from the co-operative formula, as they no longer promote the development of the local economy through worker co-operatives (Carrier, 1990). Secondly, since 1986, a significant number of initiatives have emerged in Canadian urban communities.

Brodhead, Lamontagne and Peirce (1990) propose model building based on concrete experiences grouped according to spheres of intervention. The models were developed using data taken from the series of basic surveys by the Economic Council of Canada on local development:

A local development organization may take one of *three* distinct forms, though it may at times present characteristics common to two, or all three. *Community development corporations* are usually designed to achieve broad objectives such as increasing the stock of low-rental housing, while *local financial institutions* attempt to facilitate the access of local small businesses to financial services, and *local training institutions*, to provide training to local managers and administrators and to serve as intermediaries for job creation and training programs created by the government in response to local conditions and needs.⁴¹

In addition to empirical model building, based on a profile of actual experiences, researchers or practitioners propose other ways of developing intervention models. There are theoretical models, such as those proposed by Bruyn; and there are technical models, such as those proposed by Lewis and Green.

For Bruyn (1987), community economic development reflects a new approach to economics. It establishes a new economy based essentially on the development of autonomous communities:

⁴⁰ Newman, Lyon and Philp (1986), pages 27 and 28 (our italics).

⁴¹ Page 15 (our italics).

The authors of this book see a new economic order emerging, albeit with a very complex transition.⁴²

Our concern here is to offer a vision of self-reliant communities developing beyond the traditional laws of the competitive market and beyond traditional government controls.⁴³

To achieve the desired local autonomy, Bruyn states the importance of creating viable democratic institutions, that is, institutions that are controlled by community representatives and serve the local population. These different institutions are planned and "governed" by a central structure, the community economic development corporation: "The CDC is a planning and governance vehicle organized in the private sector to help meet local needs."⁴⁴ In such a model, each CEDC conceives and orchestrates the links between four broad areas of intervention, each of which has one or more work tools.⁴⁵ These four dimensions and their respective tools are:

- *capital*, and community financial institutions such as community loan fund associations;
- *employment*, and self-managed enterprises such as worker co-operatives;
- *land*, and community land trusts;
- *the consumer*, and consumer corporations.

The model proposed by Bruyn relies essentially on the establishment of democratic economic institutions at the local level. The community economic development corporation is, in his view, the ideal tool for work planning, while steering the resulting institutions in the same direction.

Lewis and Green (1992) propose a technical approach based on twenty years of practice:

From twenty years of CED experience, four main strategic options emerge. They are not cast in stone. Rather, they are like clothing patterns to which planning teams can refer as they tailor an approach which is realistic and workable in their community and region.⁴⁶

⁴² Page 8.

⁴³ Page 4.

⁴⁴ Page 16.

⁴⁵ Themes presented on pages 13 to 18.

⁴⁶ Page 38.

The following four options are presented:

The Growth/Equity Model has a major emphasis . . . on building equity, or wealth-generating assets. It is concerned with establishing an ownership stake in the economy in order to build an economic base.

The Loan/Technical Assistance Model is focused on debt financing and also on training and support to small business persons.

The Employment Development Model has a major emphasis on human resource development, training, job creation, and job placement.

The Planning and Advisory Service Model is primarily concerned with providing planning, advisory, and technical assistance services to a defined membership.⁴⁷

These four models, they tell us, suit any situation where a community wants to initiate economic development. Not all communities, however, need to develop the same tools. Strategic choices should be made based on the vision put forward, the needs encountered and the resources available.

As Lewis and Green point out, the synthesis of these models within a single organization or affiliated organizations is the favoured route to community economic development:

When co-ordinated within a single organization (a rarity in Canada) or between several linked organizations, each with its own speciality, one can say there is the basis for a comprehensive approach to community development.⁴⁸

This last concept of community economic development attributes less importance to the issues raised by Bruyn concerning local control and economic democracy. Rather, it favours a pragmatic approach based on a process of resource development using a decision-making method that relies on one main tool: strategic planning.

The proposed models reveal four areas of tension that clearly reflect the heterogeneity of both the aims of and design approaches to practice—elements that point to orientations organizations must take into account when developing a vision or an employment strategy and when carrying out interventions.

The first relates to the function of the institutions set up. Should these institutions have a general vocation and touch on a variety of themes, or should they be specialized in order to be more effective in a particular field?

⁴⁷ Page 39.

⁴⁸ Page 41.

The second relates to the role of these institutions. Should they contract the intervention to others, or intervene themselves? Should they adopt the community enterprise approach and confine themselves to the operationalization of one or more projects? Or should they adopt a function of continual experimentation and incubation, development, and spin off of new projects?

The third relates to the standing point of intervention. Some begin from a theoretical base and attempt to build an ideal model while others begin with a pragmatic approach and respond to specific situations with limited preconceptions.

The fourth relates to the problems of financing initiatives. What should the position be on public funding? How can an initiative maintain its autonomy when public funding is tied to achieving objectives other than those of the initiators? Should self-financing be favoured? And if so, how does one reconcile the economic benefits of an initiative with the social benefits of a project of individual and collective empowerment?

INTERVENTION TOOLS OF COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Since the 1960s, social activists have devised several innovations in their efforts to operationalize community economic development. They have developed tools that, while adapted to a local reality, not only are highly portable, but also they have been effectively transferred to other contexts. These tools do not in themselves guarantee the principles of democracy and empowerment advanced by community economic development. Nor do they ensure conclusive results straightaway. For while the tool is a means to an end, basically it must be used in a context that promotes the idea of local control, individual and collective empowerment and the effective exploitation of local resources for the community's most disadvantaged. Therefore, as revealed by the Neamtan and Fontan study (1989) of municipal strategies for establishing local development policies, it is difficult to create an appropriate work environment in a community unless the traditional actors, i.e., public administrators and the business sector, change their attitudes about community economic development and engage, with the interveners in promoting this strategy, in a *true partnership*.⁴⁹

We present briefly the main intervention tools of community economic development described in the literature. These tools may be grouped under two headings: those that offer a plural, or global, approach, and those that offer a singular, or specialized, approach.

⁴⁹

See Lévesque and Fontan, chapter 3, 1992, on the notion of partnership.

Global Intervention Tools

A community economic development corporation is the ideal tool of the global approach.

CDCs offer the most comprehensive mechanism for revitalizing distressed communities. They engage in a wide range of activities: housing development, commercial revitalization, business financing and assistance, daycare centres, job training and placement, social service delivery, cultural activities, advocacy, and the creation of other institutions such as credit unions, co-ops, and loan funds.⁵⁰

A CED organization is a non-profit organization whose board of directors is composed of local representatives from the social, business and private sectors. CEDCs allow some degree of direct representation of the residents on their board of directors. The financing of such organizations varies: it may be dependent on government subsidies, grants and loans from foundations or religious organizations, and self-financing in the form of fundraising and revenue related to the production of goods and services.⁵¹ CED organizations are direct intervention structures, do not confine themselves only to the development of an action plan, but assume part or all of its implementation.

In Canada, we find these organizations in both urban and rural settings. These organizations sometimes receive "pilot" public financing, as has been the case with Montreal's CEDCs since 1985. We might point out that Montreal has seven CEDCs, and an eighth is currently being established.

It is important to distinguish, particularly in Québec, CED organizations from community development corporations (CDCs) and Community Futures Committees (CFCs).

CDCs are a Quebec creation. There are about twenty, in every region of Quebec except metropolitan Montreal. The oldest CDC is the Corporation de développement communautaire des Bois-Francs, established back in 1984. CDCs have two types of general objectives: development of the community network, and partnership for community development. CDCs are divided between the task of consulting and planning, and intervention activity related to the support and development of community initiatives. One intervention strategy of CDCs is to purchase and manage a building to accommodate community enterprises and services.

CFCs are federally funded consulting agencies for defining the broad orientations of local employment development. Generally, the role of CFCs is to assess the community's needs in terms of development and adjustment of the local economy and to formulate a strategy for meeting these needs through the fostering of partnership and strategic planning. CFCs generally are involved in development planning, coordination of local actors and labour market initiatives. However, through provisions of CFC program, there is significant funding to establish Business Development Centres (BDCs) which provide loans and technical assistance to aid new venture creation. In addition, there

⁵⁰ Zdenek (1987), page 115.

⁵¹ For a detailed profile of the various forms of financing, see Newman, Lyon and Philp, pages 62 to 72.

is a program that is directed to self employment initiatives involving welfare and UIC recipients. This program enables these clients to work at starting their business and still receive welfare or UIC income support. Most of these programs are administered by BDCs. Almost every Community Futures region in Canada has established a BDC.

A technical resource group for community economic development is an intervention tool designed to set up institutions that advocate a global approach. The resource group may fall within the authority of a non-profit organization, such as L'Institut de formation en développement économique communautaire, the Center for Community Economic Development, or the Westcoast Development Group. It may be affiliated with a university, as is the local development task force at Guelph University in Ontario, and the community economic development department of New Hampshire College, in the United States.

Technical resource groups are active in:

- research and development;
- the training of interveners and volunteers;
- consulting for intervention groups or public administrations;
- publishing and documentation;
- facilitating consultation and the establishment of networks among practitioners.

We would point out that some groups focus less on the establishment of intervention structures than on the assistance to be provided to the community or co-operative enterprise in terms of:

- project development;
- management and administrative support;
- financial structure;
- help in setting up sound accounting practices.

Independent corporations, such as Le Groupe de consultation de Montréal,⁵² the Community Enterprise Centre of Ottawa-Carleton, and a similar agency being set up in Toronto,⁵³ or even groups affiliated with an educational institution, such as the Community Business Centre, affiliated with George Brown College, in Toronto, are engaged in this type of intervention.

⁵² This initiative is sponsored by the second largest central labour body in Quebec, the CNTU.

⁵³ It should come into being in the spring of 1993.

Specialized Intervention Tools

A *community land trust* is an organization created by representatives of a community to purchase and manage land and buildings. The objective of a land trust is to control and develop this land consistent with the needs of a community. A land trust can be industrial, commercial or residential.

A community land trust is a democratically structured not-for-profit corporation, with an open membership, created to hold land for the benefit of a community and of individuals within the community. A CLT acquires land through purchase or donation, with the intention of holding it in perpetuity.⁵⁴

A *community loan fund association* is both an investment fund and a group providing development assistance to economic projects in a community.

A community loan fund is a not-for-profit corporation, or a program within a not-for-profit corporation, that accepts loans from individuals and institutions and uses this capital to make loans for community development projects within its own geographic area.⁵⁵

Micro-enterprise projects combine credit, basic management training and the formation of mutual support groups or associations as a strategy to create and strengthen very small, income generating businesses. The approach grew out of the third world and attempts to reach the large and growing number of people who make their living in the informal sector of the economy. It is being experimented with throughout North America in a wide range of rural and urban settings.

The loan circle, or peer lending group as it is sometime referred to, is a major feature of the approach. It is made up of between four and seven people who guarantee each others loans and provide mutual support. Each individual becomes eligible for a loan as the first borrower makes his or her payments regularly. It is the circle, and thus all of its members, that approves and grants loans to each individual.

100,000 new jobs must be provided each day to employ the masses of people entering the labour market in the developing world. The formal economies are saturated and can offer nothing to those migrating to the overcrowded cities in search of work. With no resources but their own hard work and determination to survive, the unemployed have created an "invisible economy." Called micro-enterprises, these businesses are family-owned and operated, often run by women, usually employing one or two people, and started with a minimum capital investment. To give the poor a chance to work within the system, instead of being beaten by it, programs offering speedy and convenient credit with good management techniques have been operating with astounding success in Third World countries.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ White and Matthei (1987), page 41.

⁵⁵ Swack (1987), page 82.

⁵⁶ Calmeadow Foundation (1991).

A *community land use corporation* is a non-profit organization that manages the development of economic projects in a community. Such a corporation favours decentralized political rights to manage issues such as zoning and the right to expropriate in its area. The primary example of such a corporation is the Dudley Street Neighbourhood Initiative (DSNI):

DSNI has pursued an aggressive strategy to control the 4.5 million square feet of vacant land in the neighbourhood. DSNI has obtained eminent domain authority over 15 acres of private vacant land. An additional 15 acres of city owned land has been committed to DSNI's land trust. DSNI is also working closely with the city of Boston to assemble and dispose of additional public and private parcels. DSNI, with the assistance of a team of planning consultants, DAC International, has created a comprehensive revitalization plan. Over 100 local residents worked with DAC to create 13 revitalization strategies. These strategies include the construction and rehabilitation of 2,000 affordable housing units and programs to stop displacement, improve social services (especially child care, recreation, and job training), fight drugs and crime, and create business opportunities for local entrepreneurs. DSNI is now working to implant these strategies.⁵⁷

A *régie de quartier (neighbourhood board)* is an adaptable, autonomous local entity that assumes the management and execution of certain technical tasks: maintaining the habitat and environment, maintenance, repairs, and so on. It employs people from the neighbourhood in order to redistribute, as widely as possible, the financial resources these tasks generate.

It is logical that this new development tool, the neighbourhood board, arose out of the breakdown of disadvantaged urban contexts to meet a three-fold concern of the inhabitants: to improve their daily life, to increase their resources, and to be full-fledged citizens. In assuming the management of certain tasks related to the life context, they have instituted a new type of functioning with institutions.⁵⁸

A *human resources development initiative* is a non-profit organization or a program of a community economic development corporation. Such an initiative is devoted to the social and vocational training of the community's unemployed.

Community-based organizations operating job training and placement programs often focus their efforts to meet unemployment problems that are most severe in their neighbourhoods. Some groups view youth unemployment—and the attendant problems of delinquency, crime, and increasing school drop-out rates—as most pressing among area residents Other community groups may view employment difficulties of welfare recipients—usually women heads of households—as top priority Finally, displaced workers make up a major group to whom job re-training programs may be targeted.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ DSNI (1989), page 1.

⁵⁸ Saragoussi (1989), page 9.

⁵⁹ McCormick, Howard, Wiewel and Siegel (1987), page 24.

A *training business* is a non-profit organization that combines the social objectives of job training and vocational training with the economic objectives of the production of goods and services. Some business provides follow-up for several months after the training course and sensitizes the employers to the problems of job entry experienced by the unemployed. One training business defines itself as follow.

The training business is a business that targets mainly individuals (young people and adults) who experience repeated failure and who usually are in an unstable situation (loss of rights, no income, homeless, no job experience, marginalized or becoming marginalized). In general, these individuals are targeted by agencies in the social or judicial sector With the exception of the business' permanent structure, the individuals undergoing training are employed in this type of business for a specified period of time (the average is 9 months, but it may vary from 6 to 18 months). Their job is covered in an employment or training contract and their pay is determined according to this contract.⁶⁰

A *school-business compact* is an agreement signed between a sponsor and a school with a view to facilitating the transition of students from the school environment to the working world. The best-known example is the Boston Compact, introduced in 1982.

Businesses, individuals or non-profit organizations may sponsor a school. The sponsorship complements a schools resources with know-how and outside financial resources. The nature of the activity or contribution varies: industrial tours, courses on company premises, donation of materials or equipment, sharing of know-how through seminars, training clinics, presentations, on-the-job training, summer employment, and permanent employment on graduation for some graduates.

The London Compact was an initiative of local enterprises whose purpose was to improve the conditions of urban life while training skilled manpower. It was created in 1987. The London Compact is an agreement between heads of local businesses and a group of schools whereby the former give priority to training courses and jobs for graduates of this compact. The latter promise to improve training methods and the results of their students and to lower the school drop-out rate.⁶¹

An *alternative business* is basically a business with a democratic system of management. It may be one of co-operative management or community management, along the lines of a non-profit corporation or a profit-oriented corporation with a social charter that institutionalizes social policies and provides mechanisms for the redistribution of profits in the community.

⁶⁰ CNEI (1990), page 10.

⁶¹ Praderie (1991), in *Fiches de cas tirées des auditions et des rencontres*, page 5.

What is important is to ensure that the enterprise remains responsible and accountable to the community. In turn, the community will have a reciprocal collective responsibility to all its institutions, including business. Businesses must be seen as tools for empowerment. It is not enough to own and manage them; rather, their goals and activities must be oriented to achieving collectively agreed upon social and ethical objectives. In this way, alternative business development can be a legitimate key component of a community development strategy.⁶²

A community business incubator nurtures the start-up and development of newly created businesses by providing services as reduced rents, sharing reception, copying, book keeping, marketing, etc. The incubators are usually owned by public administrators or private firms. There are, however, examples of non-profit business incubators, such as Chicago's Fulton-Carroll Center for Industry.

The Industrial Council of Northwest Chicago opened the Fulton-Carroll Center for Industry in the depressed neighborhood surrounding the intersection of these two streets in October of 1980. Their goal was to create small business opportunities and jobs for the area's residents.⁶³

Fulton-Carroll is designed as a tool to develop employment through the creation of businesses. It promotes the nurturing of projects of a marginalized clientele, such as women's businesses and businesses created by representatives of ethnic groups.⁶⁴

Strategies related to actual or potential plant closures

An *early warning system* is an intervention structure set up in a community to monitor companies in difficulty. It is usually made up of union representatives and community organizations.

The main goal of coalitions is to fight the closure of a factory, to ease the impact of worker dislocation. Coalitions draw upon an arsenal of tactics to achieve their purposes. If it appears the company's intentions to close are not serious, the coalition may want to pressure the firm to negotiate for conditions under which the plant will remain open. If the firm is facing internal difficulties, the coalition may work with the firm to obtain public assistance, create a new market or new products, or develop other plans to help the company stay in business. For instance, job training funds may be used to essentially subsidize a plant's wage costs for some time. If it appears a move is certain, the coalition will want to press for company assistance to ease the impact of the closing on the community and/or identify alternative options for retaining jobs, e.g. through finding a new owner, through a worker buyout, and so forth. Other tactics include gathering community support through publicity, public forums, rallies,

⁶² Ninacs (1991), page 6.

⁶³ Temali and Campbell (1984), page 70.

⁶⁴ Fontan, Gareau and Neamtan (1989), pages 50 to 52.

and demonstrations, boycotts of the company's products or of firms with which it does business; suing the company; labour strikes; and use of city eminent domain powers.⁶⁵

Worker investment in companies is another strategy for preventing plant closures. It takes two forms, Employee Stock Ownership and Worker cooperatives.

There are two basic types of employee ownership practiced in the United States today, although variations exist. First, The Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOP) is a legal and tax mechanism which may or may not include worker control. In this type of plan, employees make stock contributions to their employers in order to receive tax benefits. It is essentially an employee-benefit plan and is often given in lieu of salary increases and other employee benefits. An ESOP need not confer voting rights with stock ownership to the company's workers.

The second type of employee ownership is the worker cooperative, a legal business structure mandating [that the] worker gets one share, one vote, and an equal voice on company matters. A democratic ESOP is a hybrid structure that retains the tax advantages of the ESOP while also ensuring the one person/[one] vote principle.⁶⁶

Resource groups that support business development

The *Local Enterprise Agency*, from England, and the *Boutique de gestion*, located in France, support business development initiatives. A local enterprise agency attempts to start a new network of enterprises in a poor community. It provides information and advice to small businesses. It offers practical assistance to young business people in finance, project evaluation, production methods and sales techniques. It also sets up training programs in accounting, the tax system, law, management, data processing, labour relations and physical layout. It is intended as a permanent link between business incubators, technical colleges, technology institutes, training centres and employment agencies.

As for the "Boutiques de gestion":

The aims of *boutiques de gestion* are: to contribute to the creation of activities and jobs; to promote new forms of business; to participate in local development; to encourage awareness of appropriate technology; to suggest instruments for collective management.⁶⁷

Similar experiences in Canada are the Business Development Centre from the Community Futures Program of Employment Immigration Canada.

⁶⁵ McCormick, Howard, Wiewel and Siegel (1987), page 13.

⁶⁶ McCormick, Howard, Wiewel and Siegel (1987), pages 15 and 16.

⁶⁷ Le Marois (1983), page 77.

THE METHODOLOGY OF COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The principal working tool used by volunteers and staff of community economic development initiatives is strategic planning. A number of authors present this method, including Lewis and Green (1992), Vachon and Coallier (1992), Bryant (1991), CDPID (1991), Bonetti, Conan and Allen (1991), and Mico (1981).

According to the authors, the first step of a community economic development intervention is the formation of a sponsoring group representative of the community to analyze a socioeconomic situation needing correction.

Although there are different starting points, one of the early steps taken is the development of a vision of where the community wants to be at some point in the future, usually 20+ years in the future. The vision is holistic in its orientation and embodies the economic, political, social, cultural and institutional elements of community life.

The next step is an analysis of the communities situation. The community is profiled, its strengths and weaknesses determined and the opportunity structure analyzed. While this stage often focuses on economic and institutional factors, the social, cultural, political factors are taken into account.

With the vision cast and a clearer and more comprehensive analysis of the community circumstances completed, the mission of the development organizations(s) are assessed or revised, or in the case of a new development organization being put in place, the mission is defined. Mission formulation often involves assessing a range of strategic options which communities have for focusing their CED efforts, options which are shaped by the realities and priorities that flow from the situation analysis and the vision and the resources able to be mobilized to move forward. Based on all of this, strategic goals are formulated (usually for a five year period) from which flows more detailed operational planning. The strategic goals, depending on the strategic options(s) selected, typically define major programmatic foci of action to quantify results, for example, the investment base to be established, the size of the loan portfolio, the number of people to be trained, the number of housing to be constructed, etc.

Strategic planning calls for the use of other management tools, such as the creation of development indicators⁶⁸ and operational management (allowing for the annual review of the general action plan). It also calls for a mechanism of evaluation and community consultation to determine whether the interventions carried out are satisfactory to the community.

⁶⁸

A practical guide to development indicators was developed in Canada for the native community by the Steering Committee of the Development Indicators Project (1991).

Strategic planning also involves the building of partnerships with both the State and other institutions or organizations in the community, including the business or labour sector.⁶⁹

Finally, strategic planning must include some training process; training not only of the clients of the services offered, but also of the staff and volunteers of the community economic development initiative.⁷⁰

EVALUATION METHODS AND MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

Evaluation is an important component of a community economic development process. From the United States, through Canada, to Europe, evaluation is a constant concern not only of governments, but of groups in the field as well.

The literature reveals two main methods of evaluation. The first is quantitative, involving the kind of assessments done by the National Congress for Community Economic Development (1989 and 1991), Flett (1992) or Vidal (1992). The NCCED assessment, for example, provides basic information about the number of groups in existence, the number of housing units managed and built, the number of jobs created, the number of micro-business development projects that received assistance. The Vidal assessment is based on a limited sampling of 130 CEDCs in 29 American cities; it provides a thorough analysis of the activities of the CEDCs studied.

The second is qualitative. It is designed to measure the experience and process of the recipients of the services dispensed by a community organization. Meetings with a target population yield information about the experience from the standpoint of the service recipient and the intervener (Papineau and Kiely, 1992).

Mixed, so-called dynamic, evaluations that combine both the qualitative and the quantitative approach fall somewhere in between.⁷¹

There is a second division: The evaluation may be along the lines of a social assessment. It may profile only the internal aspects of the organization under review⁷², or it may focus on residents of the area and their perception and social status, it may be contextual and examine both the internal and external aspects of the organization being assessed, in which case it takes into account the conditions in which the intervention is carried out.

⁶⁹ For a general discussion of partnership, see Bonetti, Conan and Allen (1991), Dommergues (1988). For a discussion of partnership with the business community, see OECD (1989 and 1987). For a discussion of partnership with trade unions, see Brecher and Costello (1991).

⁷⁰ In this regard, see Mico (1981), chapter 10.

⁷¹ Viveret (1989) provides an example of such an evaluation for training businesses in France.

⁷² Lauzon (1981) presents a social assessment method; Alphantéry (1990) presents the results of such an assessment for one type of initiative, the training business.

The role of the State as an element of support of the intervention undertaken is thus considered and evaluated as well (EIC/PDC, 1990; Canadian Council on Social Development & al., 1992). This may lead to evaluations not only of policies and programs related to the funding of community economic development or local development organizations, but also of any other policies or programs influencing micro-social interventions (Bonetti, Fraisse and Gaujelac, 1987).

In discussing the evaluation and achievements of community economic development, we opt for an approach that will answer one central question: What evidence is there in the evaluative literature that community economic development produces conclusive results?

To answer this question, we look at six aspects of intervention.

Job Creation and Retention

The oldest and most often cited evaluation is that of the American firm Abt Associates (1973). Between 1970 and 1973, this firm evaluated a group of American community economic development corporations receiving federal government subsidies. The results of the study show that the CEDCs promoted job creation in the companies assisted, that 29 percent of the jobs were for the unemployed and that 65 percent of new employees of the companies helped were from the community served by these CEDCs. Furthermore, the proportion of the companies that stayed in the market was high, about 50 percent after the fourth year in existence. One study conducted in 1980 by the National Center for Economic Alternatives (1981) confirmed, several years later, the data and analyses advanced by the Abt group.

An evaluation done by Labonté (1989) of Montreal's CEDCs for the Office de planification et de développement du Québec shows that technical assistance and investment funds managed by CEDCs from 1986 to 1989 resulted in the creation/retention of 744 jobs.⁷³

From such evaluation reports, Perry (1989) is able to draw the following conclusions:

- 1) a business development program in disadvantaged regions can produce good results;
- 2) it is not necessary to concentrate resources solely in regions or centres of high economic growth;
- 3) it is not necessary to encourage people to leave disadvantaged communities in order to help them find work.⁷⁴

CEDCs therefore promote job creation in disadvantaged communities for individuals who are unemployed, and in doing so create long-term employment.

⁷³ For a breakdown of jobs created and jobs retained, see the table on page 3.

⁷⁴ 1989, page 24.

Return on Investment

Community economic development initiatives must rely on public funding for their operations. Few are entirely self-financing. This, then, raises the question of the benefits for the State and the groups subsidized. The State must determine whether the investment made is a good one, while the groups must demonstrate to the State that the money they receive to start training, business development or housing development is a viable investment.

Few studies examine these issues. We might mention the evaluation of a group of CEDCs by the National Center for Economic Alternatives (1981), which, Perry (1990) tells us, presents the following results:

The NCEA evaluated the capital loss resulting from bankruptcies and deducted it from the overall earnings of the businesses sponsored by the CEDCs studied. Even then, the balance showed a profit, though small, of \$1,751,000, after deducting \$39 million for the businesses that had disappeared, just slightly more than 10 percent of the capital invested by these CEDCs in businesses.⁷⁵

In addition, Labonté (1989), in his evaluation of Montreal's CEDCs, considers State assistance to these organizations to be a good investment. First of all, he informs us that:

Programs of financial assistance to businesses administered by CEDCs are as effective as government programs.⁷⁶

Secondly, the investment resulted in a savings for the State. In fact:

The businesses that are financially backed by CEDCs probably would not have been created, because there is almost no venture capital for very small businesses. Now, the jobs created as a result of this intervention lower the costs of social programs. Since we know that each welfare recipient costs the Quebec government about \$7,000 a year, the jobs created result in an annual savings of \$1.58 million for government subsidies of \$845,000 paid out from 1986 to 1989.⁷⁷

Some community economic development groups have devised tools to show the State its return on investment. We might mention the American example of the Kentucky Highlands Investment Corporation, which, in 1980, constructed a method of evaluation around an index of the return on the capital invested by taxpayers.⁷⁸ We might also mention the Quebec example of the Boulot Vers

⁷⁵ Page 24.

⁷⁶ Page 5.

⁷⁷ Labonté (1989), page 18.

⁷⁸ Perry (1989) describes this evaluation on pages 18 to 20.

training business, which constructed its own profitability index based on an accounting method. The positive results of its self-evaluation were confirmed the following year by a private accounting firm:

A recent study by the firm Mallette, Major, Martin shows the exceptional return on government business subsidies, confirming the similar conclusions of an internal review done in 1987. It is now known that, taking overall results into account, Boulot Vers enables governments to recover their investment by the end of the first year. The analysis shows, by mere extrapolation, that this recovery becomes additional revenues for the State in the second year. It is actually more a matter of a social investment than of subsidies.⁷⁹

State subsidies, in a context of sound administration and of compatible social and economic objectives, are not subsidies, but rather a social investment that pays off in the medium and long terms for the State. When the social objectives become less important, because the clientele become less marginalized, then the return in social terms decreases and subsidies are simply subsidies.

Democracy and Economic Effectiveness

The works of Kelly (1977) clearly show that democratic leadership within organizations does not detract from performance. On the contrary, the more the community is involved and participates in a community enterprise, the more effectively the enterprise performs.

Qualification of the Population and Sponsors

Several studies examine the issue of qualification of the population. We might mention one recent, very innovative study by Papineau and Kiely (1992):

The present study documented the early outcome of a community development program that seeks to empower low income community members including immigrants and refugees, single parents, the unemployed and those on social assistance. A qualitative methodology was used to explore the personal repercussions of participation in the CED project for both clients and practitioners. Their personal and collective evolution was analyzed in relation to the initial strategic objectives of the project and in relation to five dimensions of an empowerment process.⁸⁰

The five dimensions identified and the main results are as follows:

Self-efficacy through increased self-respect and self-confidence: Program participants have indeed progressed in this area. Close to half of the respondents specifically referred to the increased self-confidence that resulted from their participation in the project.

⁷⁹ Rodriguez (1991), page 14. Documents in support of the arguments made are included in the appendix.

⁸⁰ Page 2.

Development and validation of the individual and the group's knowledge, skills and resources: Two-thirds of the respondents, including virtually all the entrepreneurs specifically mentioned that their experience in the project had an influence on their skills. It enabled them to increase their awareness of and to validate the skills they already possessed, as well as to acquire new work-related skills.

Authority and enablement: With the CDÉP-GP's help, many potential entrepreneurs are now in the process of planning and actualizing their business, some have started operating. Sustaining them in realizing all their potential is a slow process because our clients face many barriers, but it is being achieved.

Critical consciousness: Taken as a whole, the results of this study tend to suggest the beginnings of a critical consciousness among group members in relation to poverty and its causes as well as potential solutions. There is a renewed hope that it is possible to do something when community members work together to set up concrete vehicles such as CDÉC-GP and start a dialogue with levels of government and granting agencies as well as other community members with specialized knowledge. CED is seen as a model to link social and economic community development.

Multi-dimensionality: Individual participants reported wanting to improve the quality of life for their family through business ownership. Both practitioners and potential entrepreneurs consider themselves to be members of a support group, are active within the group and ready to contribute their energies and their experience to help other community members. Nonetheless, the numbers of people involved in the project are still low and outreach to the community organizations is a major goal. For example, the project has recently started actualizing a new program objective of funding housing alternatives as well as business, and is creating links to community organizations and organizers active in the housing domain.⁸¹

Measuring empowerment is a tricky operation. The method developed by Papineau and Kiely is of interest in that it is based on the accounts of the people directly involved in a community economic development endeavour. The results reveal a positive self-evaluation in which, as actors in a process, the individuals consulted felt something could be achieved—i.e., that an immigrant woman could become an entrepreneur—in areas from which these individuals were excluded straightaway by consultants and traditional economic development resources.

Rodriguez (1991) presents a very positive evaluation of the effects of the intervention of Boulot Vers (a Montreal training business) on the organization's clientele. Compared with government job entry programs, Boulot Vers achieves a 70-percent entry rate, while government programs achieve only 50 percent.⁸² Boulot Vers accepts an average of 50 young people a year. By the end of 1992, 400 young

⁸¹ Papineau and Kiely (1992), pages 21 to 25.

⁸² Data presented in a table in Appendix III.

people will have completed a training course. The overall evaluation shows that from the time a training contract is signed to completion of the training course, 55 percent of trainees enter the job market, 20 percent go back to school, 15 percent are referred to specialized agencies, and 10 percent drop out along the way.⁸³

Mobilization of Capital

A recent study by the National Association of Community Development Loan Funds shows that not only is it possible to mobilize capital at the community level, but that this capital, once invested, translates into benefits for the community. The economic and social effects of community loan funds are as follows:

- 14,000 housing units were financed: 93 percent for low-income earners, 89 percent on a permanent basis;
- the creation or retention of 3,700 jobs: 65 percent for low-income earners, 50 percent for women and 35 percent for members of a minority group;
- 940 borrowers were first-time borrowers;
- 1,000 borrowers acquired new skills in the process;
- \$643 million was mobilized, directly or indirectly, over a 5-year period.⁸⁴

There are 40 community loan funds in the United States. They hold a portfolio valued at \$73 million, and their annual growth rate is estimated at 10 percent.⁸⁵

⁸³ Lévesque and Fontan (1992); cumulative results for a request for information from Boulot Vers for the preparation of a fact sheet about the organization.

⁸⁴ NACDLF (1991), page XV.

⁸⁵ Rock and Klinedinst (1992), page 341.

Organization

Vidal (1992), in a study of 130 American CEDCs in urban settings, was able to analyze the performance of the CEDCs in relation to five organizational characteristics:

Size. CDCs that are currently large, particularly those with annual budgets exceeding \$2 million, have produced more than smaller groups have

Priorities. A strong relationship exists between the amount of any good or service a CDC produces and the importance the group attaches to it. In each activity examined, the groups that view that activity as a major one consistently have produced far more than groups for which the activity is not central.

Experience. A CDC's level of accomplishment in a program area increases with experience

Leadership Stability. The average total output of CDCs that have enjoyed stable leadership is consistently greater than the output of other groups. It falls as the degree of leadership instability increases.

Strategy. CDCs that operate with a clearly defined strategy have produced substantially more than groups without one. For example, community developers with a clear housing strategy have produced, on average, over 40 percent more dwelling units than groups without a strategy or with one poorly defined.⁸⁶

The five characteristics analyzed clearly show the effectiveness of community economic development in initiating socioeconomic revitalization and the increasing community's control over its development.

CONCLUSION

Community economic development initiatives have definite potential for social or regional communities grappling with major socioeconomic problems. Community economic development is an intervention strategy that has proven itself in the past, and continues to do so in the present.

This literature review has enabled us to clarify definitions, to characterize community economic development, to identify key elements of its background and to consider its dimensions, tools and methods. It has also demonstrated the effectiveness of this intervention strategy, as measured by various studies.

⁸⁶ Vidal (1992), page 9.

Throughout, we have seen that community economic development is not homogeneous, but rather a heterogeneous world of practices that undertake action to give a social or regional community control over the development of a locality.

Similarly, the evaluation of community economic development initiatives have not been undertaken in general; rather, specific projects or a group of projects have been evaluated.

It is therefore not possible to generalize about the success or lack of success of community economic development initiatives in achieving social and economic objectives. At the very most, it is possible to assess the compatibility of these objectives in each particular experience.

Just as the private venture can achieve economic objectives related to profitability, so the community economic development enterprise can, as the evaluative literature clearly shows, satisfactorily achieve social and economic objectives when the conditions are right. It therefore seems to be a viable formula, but in applying it, great care must be taken not to reproduce a model or impose from on high a vision of the interventions to be carried out.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abt Associates**, *An Evaluation of the Special Impact Program*, Abt Associates, Cambridge, 1973.
- Action-gardien**, *Des choix pour La Pointe : un quartier à améliorer, une population à respecter*, Regroupement des organismes communautaires Action-gardien, Pointe-St-Charles, 1986.
- ALDEA**, *Vers la démocratie économique*, La revue de l'économie sociale, # 20, 1990.
- Allaire, G.**, *Le développement rural et la politique agricole de transition : quel paradigme alternatif au productivisme?* Revue internationale d'action communautaire, # 22/62, 1989.
- Alphandéry, C.**, *Les structures d'insertion par l'économie*, La Documentation Française, Paris, 1990.
- Arocena, J.**, *Le Développement par l'initiative locale : le cas français*, l'Harmattan, Paris, 1986.
- Arocena, J. et al.**, *Initiative locale et développement*, Groupe de sociologie et de création institutionnelle, Paris, 1984.
- Association communautaire d'emprunt**, *Association communautaire d'emprunt de Montréal*, ACEM, février 1991.
- Aydalot, P.**, *Réalités et illusions de l'économie locale*, Autrement, # 47, 1983.
- Bateman, P.G.**, *Who Can Represent East Boston? a Case Study of the East Boston Community Development Corporation*, Institute for New Enterprise Development, Cambridge, 1981.
- Beale, E.J.**, *Regional Development in Canada: A Case Study of the Human Resources Development Association*, directions for Regional Development Project, Economic Council of Canada, 1988.
- Bekemans, L.**, *Local Employment Initiatives*, European Center for Work and Society, Vangorcum-Assen, Maastricht, 1983.
- Bélanger, P.R.**, *Développement local et latéralisation du social : la contribution des mouvements sociaux*, in **Gagnon, C. et al**, *Le local en mouvements*, Groupe de recherche en interventions régionales, Université du Québec à Chicoutimi, Chicoutimi, 1989.
- Berger, R., Steinbach, C.**, *A Place in the Marketplace*, National Congress for Community Economic Development, Washington, 1992.
- Berndt, H.E.**, *New Rulers in the Ghetto: the CDC and Urban Poverty*, Greenwood Press, Westport, 1977.
- Baron, L.I, Watson, N.**, *Loan Funds for Small Business: Lessons for Canadian Policy Makers, A Case Study of Colville Investment Corporation*, Local Development Paper #1, Economic Council of Canada, 1989.

Bertolini, G., *Emplois d'initiative locale, économie sociale et tiers-secteur*, Économie et Humanisme, Lyon, # 264, avril 1982.

BIC, *Key Factors Contributing to the Successful Development of Small Business, The Enterprise Agencies' Experience*, Business in the Community, 1988.

BIC, *Small Firms: Survival and Job Creation, the Contributions of Enterprise Agencies*, Business in the Community, London, 1987.

Birch, D., *Job Creation in America*, Free Press, New-York, 1987.

Birch, D., *The Job Generation Process*, MIT program on neighborhood and regional change, Cambridge, 1979.

Blakely, E.J., *Community Economic Development: Tomorrow's Economy Today*, International Forum on Community Economic Development, Toronto, 1992.

Blakely, E.J., *Planning Local Economic Development*, Sage Library of Social Research, London, 1989.

Bonetti, M., Conan, M., Allen, B., *Développement social urbain, stratégies et méthodes*, l'Harmattan, Paris, 1991.

Brecher, J., Costello, T., *Building Bridges, the Emerging Grassroots Coalition of Labor and Community*, Monthly Review Press, New-York, 1990.

Brodhead, D., Lamontagne, F., Peirce, J., *L'organisme de développement local, une perspective canadienne*, document sur le développement local # 20, Conseil économique du Canada, Ottawa, 1990.

Brodhead, D., Decter, M., Svenson, K., *Community-Based Development: a Development System for the 1980's*, Labour Market Studies Series # 3, Ottawa, 1981.

Bruyn, S.T., Meehan, J., *Beyond the Market and the State: New Directions in Community Development*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1987.

Bryant, C.R., *Le développement communautaire durable, les partenariats et la préparation de propositions de projets réussies*, Estrateg Communications Inc., Hudson, 1992.

Bryant, C.R., Preston, R.E., *Un schéma pour les initiatives locales en développement économique*, Programme de développement économique, Faculté des études de l'environnement, Université de Waterloo, Waterloo, 1987.

Calmeadow Foundation, *Micro-Enterprise: Give Credit Where Credit is Due*, Toronto, 1991.

Campfens, H., *Rethinking Community Development in a Changing Society, Issues, Concepts and Cases*, Ontario Community Development Society, Guelph, 1983.

Canadian Council on Social Development, Coopers & Lybrand Consulting Group, Norton Group, *Employability Resources Network, Helping People Succeed...in a Changing Labor Market*, Final Report, CCSD - CL - NG, Ottawa, winter 1992.

Carrier, R., *Les expériences coopératives du JAL*, Coopératives et développement, Presses de l'Université du Québec & Presses HEC, vol. 21, # 2, 1990.

CCE DG V, *Europe sociale, le Développement social urbain supplément 1/92*, Commission des Communautés européennes, Direction générale de l'Emploi, des Affaires Sociales et de l'Éducation, Bruxelles, 1992

CCE DG V, *La création d'emploi par le développement local*, Commission des Communautés européennes, Direction générale de l'Emploi, des Affaires Sociales et de l'Éducation, Bruxelles, 1988.

CDPID, *Les indices du développement*, Comité de direction du Projet sur les Indices du développement, Ottawa, 1991.

Chanan, G., *Social Change and Local Action: Coping with the Disadvantage in Urban Areas*, Shanhill, Dublin, 1990.

Chassagne, M.E., Romefort, A., *Initiatives et solidarités pour le développement local : l'affaire de tous*, Syros/Adels, Paris, 1987.

Choko, M.H., *Une Cité-jardin à Montréal : la cité-jardin du tricentenaire 1940-1947*, Méridien, Montréal, 1988.

City of Toronto, *Consultant Study on Community Economic Development*, Cooperative Work Ltd., Development Initiatives Inc., Price Waterhouse, Toronto, 1987.

City of Toronto Planning and Development Department, *A Selective Economic Development Strategy for the City of Toronto*, City of Toronto, Toronto, 1980.

CNEI, *Les idées germent ou 135 manières de conjuguer économique et social*, Comité national des entreprises d'insertion, Paris, 1990.

Comité intergouvernemental de recherches urbaines et régionales, *Colloque international sur le Développement économique communautaire, compte-rendu*, ministère des Affaires sociales, Toronto, 1992.

Commission du développement économique, *Rapport de la Commission du développement économique sur la revitalisation des quartiers anciens de Montréal*, CDE, Montréal, 1987.

Community Business Centre, *Immigrant Women's Introduction to Self Employment, Financial Assistance Service Handbook*, CBC, Toronto, 1991.

Conn, M., *A Feminist Perspective on Community Economic Development; Community Economic Development as a Strategy for Change*, in **Women's Skill Development Society**, *Women and the Economy: Building Our Own Agenda*, Conference proceedings november 1986, Douglas College, New Westminster, 1986.

Conseil économique du Canada, *L'emploi au futur, tertiarisation et polarisation*, CEC, Ottawa, 1990a.

Conseil économique du Canada, *La relance locale, pour une approche communautaire du développement économique*, CEC, Ottawa, 1990b.

Cormick, L., Howard, W., Wiewel, W., Siegel, W., *Community Economic Development Strategies, a Manual for Local Action*, UIC Center for Urban Economic Development, University of Illinois, Chicago, 1987.

Corporation de développement communautaire des Bois-Francis, *Actes du colloque sur le développement communautaire*, Corporation des Bois Francs, Victoriaville, 1987.

Coulmin, P., *La décentralisation, la dynamique du développement local*, Syros, Paris, 1986.

Davies, L., Shragge, E., *Bureaucracy and Community: Essays on the Politics of Social Work Practice*, Black Rose Books, Montréal, 1990.

Davis, J.E., *Contested Ground, Collective Action and the Urban Neighborhood*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1991.

Defourny, J., Monzón Campos, J.L., *Économie sociale, entre économie capitaliste et économie publique; The Third Sector Cooperative, Mutual and Nonprofit Organizations*, CIRIEC & De Boeck Université, Bruxelles, 1992.

Deland, P., *Les interventions du gouvernement du Québec dans les quartiers défavorisés et la Stratégie gouvernementale en matière de développement régional*, Office de planification et de développement du Québec, Québec, 1992.

Dommergues, P., *Questions en suspens*, in **OCDE**, *Les mécanismes de la création d'emplois*, OCDE, Paris, 1989.

Dommergues, P. (dir.), *La société de partenariat : économie-territoire et revitalisation régionale aux États-Unis et en France*, Afnor-Anthropos, Paris, 1988.

Dorsey, C.J., Ticoll, E., *The Nuts and Bolts of Community Based Economic Development*, Edmonton Social Planning Council, Edmonton, 1982.

DSNI, *Information Packet*, Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, Dudley, 1989.

Durning, A.B., *Mobiliser les communautés de base*, in **Brown, L.**, *L'État de la planète*, Economica, Paris, 1989.

Dykeman, F.W., *Entrepreneurial and Sustainable Rural Communities*, Mount Allison University, Sackville, 1990.

Ehrensaft, P., Freswater, D., Thruston, L., *Buts et mesures : le Programme Développement des Collectivités*, Emploi immigration Canada, 1991.

Ellerman, D.P., *Worker Ownership: Economic Democracy or Worker Capitalism?* Industrial Cooperative Association, Somerville, 1986.

Eme, B., *Initiatives locales et État, Paris, CRIDA, 1990.*

Emploi et immigration Canada (EIC) / Programme Développement des collectivités (PDC), *Rapport de l'examen du programme développement des collectivités*, Ottawa, 1990.

Evoy, L., *Réclamer ce qui nous appartient : la création de fiducies foncières communautaires*, Centre de ressources de la troisième avenue & Regroupement des organismes du Montréal-ethnique pour le logement, novembre 1990.

Evoy, L., Mendell, M., *Alternative Investment and the Democratization of Capital*, Université Concordia, Montréal, 1992.

Favreau, L., *Mouvement populaire et intervention communautaire de 1960 à nos jours, continuités et ruptures*, Centre de formation populaire et Éditions du Fleuve, Montréal, 1989.

Fairbain, B., et al., *Co-operatives and Community Development, Economics in Social Perspective*, Center for the Study of Co-operatives, University of Saskatoon, 1991.

FNARS, *Face à l'exclusion : quel contrat social?*, Fédération nationale des associations d'accueil et de réadaptation sociale, Paris, 1988.

Fontan, J.M., *Les Corporations de développement économique communautaire montréalaises. Du développement économique communautaire au développement local de l'économie*, thèse de doctorat, Université de Montréal, distribution IFDEC, 1991.

Fontan, J.M., *Les corporations de développement économique communautaire : une des avenues du mouvement social dans l'économie*, Coopératives et développement, vol. 21, # 2, 1990.

Fournier, P., *La concertation au Québec : étude de cas et perspectives*, Commission consultative sur le travail, gouvernement du Québec, Québec, 1986.

Fréchette, P., Vézina, J.P., *L'économie du Québec*, Éditions HRW, Montréal, 1985.

Freeman, H., Rossi, P.H., Wright, S.R., *Évaluer des projets sociaux dans des pays en voie de développement*, OCDE, Paris, 1980.

Friedmann, J., *Empowerment, the Politics of Alternative Development*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1992.

FTQ, *La FTQ se mobilise contre le mouvement sauvage d'acquisitions, de fusions et de fermetures d'entreprises*, Fédération des travailleurs du Québec, Montréal, 1989.

Gagnon, A.G., *Développement régional, État et groupes populaires*, Éditions Asticou, Hull, 1985.

Gagnon, C., et al., *Le local en mouvements*, GRIR, Université du Québec à Chicoutimi, Chicoutimi, 1989.

Ganzglass, E., Heidkamp, M., *State Strategies to Train a Competitive Workforce: The Emerging Role of State-Funded Job Training Programs*, Center for Policy Research, Washington, 1987.

Gardner, L.M., *Community Economic Development Strategies, Creating Successful Businesses*, volume one to three, National Economic Development and Law Center, Berkeley, 1983.

Gareau, J.M., *L'implantation de l'Université McGill dans le Sud-ouest : de l'affrontement au partenariat*, IFDEC, Montréal, février 1991.

Gareau, J.M., *Le programme économique de Pointe Saint-Charles, 1983-1989, la percée du développement économique communautaire dans le Sud-ouest de Montréal*, IFDEC, Montréal, 1990.

Gaspard, M., *Les services contre le chômage*, Syros, Paris, 1988.

Gaudin, J., *Les grandes sociétés et la création d'emplois au niveau local*, Initiatives locales de création d'emplois, OCDE, 1986.

Gaudin, J., *Initiatives locales et création d'emplois*, Rapport au ministre, La documentation française, Paris, 1982.

Giloth, R.P., Mier, R., *Spatial Change and Social Justice : Alternative Economic Development in Chicago*, in **Beauregard, R.A.**, *Economic Restructuring and Political Response*, Sage Publication, Newbury Park, 1989.

Greffé, X., *Décentraliser pour l'emploi : les initiatives locales de développement*, Economica, Paris, 1988.

Gunn, C., Gunn, H.D., *Reclaiming Capital, Democratic Initiatives and Community Development*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1991.

Hamel, P., *Action collective et démocratie locale, les mouvements urbains montréalais*, Presses de l'Université de Montréal, Montréal, 1991.

Hamel, P., *Le développement local en milieu urbain : la nécessité d'un partenariat-privé-public?* *Coopératives et développement*, vol. 21, # 2, 1990.

Hanratty, J., *The New Dawn Story, an Experiment in Economically Based Community Development*, Health and Welfare Canada, Ottawa, 1981.

IFDEC, ANDLP, *Le Local en Action*, Éditions de l'Épargne, Paris, 1989.

Institut des Sciences du Travail, *Les entreprises alternatives, mythes et réalités*, Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-LaNeuve, 1983.

Jacquier, C., *Voyage dans dix quartiers européens en crise*, l'Harmattan, Paris, 1991.

Jacquier, C., Mendés-France, P., *Une politique européenne de revitalisation des zones urbaines en difficulté*, in **CCE DG V**, *Europe sociale, le Développement social urbain supplément 1/92*, Commission des Communautés européennes, Direction générale de l'Emploi, des Affaires Sociales et de l'Éducation, Bruxelles, 1992.

Jessop, J., Weaver, C., *La coopération communautaire : une stratégie pour le développement local*, Revue internationale d'action communautaire, # 13 - 53, 1985.

Joyal, A., *L'émergence d'un troisième secteur*, Autogestions, # 20-21, 1985.

Joyal, A., Bherer, H., *L'entreprise alternative, mirages et réalités*, St-Martin, Montréal, 1987.

Kelly, R.M., *Community Control and Economic Development*, Praeger Publishers, New-York, 1977.

King, M., George, S., *The Future of Community : from Local to Global*, in **Bruyn, S.T., Meehan, J.**, *Beyond the Market and the State*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1987.

Klein, J-L., *Développement régional et espace local : vers une régulation territorialisée*, Revue internationale d'action communautaire, # 22/62, 1989.

Klein, J-L., Gagnon, C., *Le social apprivoisé par qui? : le mouvement associatif, l'État et le développement local*, Asticou, Hull, 1989.

Labonté, P., *Les corporations de développement économique et communautaire, rapport d'évaluation de l'expérience-pilote*, OPDQ, Direction générale de Montréal, 1989.

Labonté, P., *Les corporations de développement économique et communautaire, rapport d'évaluation de l'expérience-pilote*, OPDQ, Direction générale de Montréal, 1987

Lamontagne, F., *Le développement des régions canadiennes : la nécessité d'une approche alternative*, Revue canadienne de santé mentale communautaire, vol. 8 # 2, automne 1989.

Lauzon, L.P., *La comptabilité sociale : concepts et applications*, Sciences et culture, Montréal, 1981.

Laville, J.L., *Les Services de Proximité en Europe*, Syros-Alternatives, Paris, 1992.

Leiterman, M., Roberts, B.F., *HOME: A guide for CDC's*, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Policy and Program Development, Washington, 1992.

Le Marois, H., *La création d'emplois aux États-Unis*, ILE # 2, OCDE, Paris, 1984.

Le Marois, H., *Assistance for Local Employment Initiatives, Experiences in France and America*, in **Bekemans, L.**, *Local Employment Initiatives*, European Center for Work and Society, Vangorcum-Assen, Maastricht, 1983.

Lemelin, A., Morin, R., *Le développement économique local et communautaire : éléments d'analyse pour une stratégie municipale*, INRS-Urbanisation, Montréal, 1989.

LeRoy, G., Swinney, D., Charpentier, E., *Early Warning Manual Against Plant Closings*, Midwest Center for Labor Research, Chicago, 1988.

Lévesque, A., Fontan, J.M., *Initiation au développement économique local et au développement économique communautaire*, Institut de formation en développement économique communautaire, Montréal, 1992.

Lévesque, B., Joyal, A., Chouinard, O., *L'autre économie, une économie alternative*, Études d'économie politique, Presses de l'Université du Québec, Montréal, 1989.

Lewis, M., *The Development Wheel: A Workbook to Guide Community Analysis & Development Planning*, Westcoast Development Group, Vancouver, 1990.

Lewis, M., Green, F., *Strategic Planning for the Community Economic Development Practitioner*, Westcoast Development Group, Vancouver, 1992.

Lindberg, M., *Partnership for community problem solving, failure and promise*, in **Redburn and Buss**, *Public Policies for Distressed Communities*, Lexington books, Lexington, 1982.

Lipietz, A., *Choisir l'audace : une alternative pour le XXI^e siècle*, La Découverte, Paris, 1989.

Lloyd, J. A., *Community Development in Canada*, Canadian Research Centre for Anthropology, St-Paul University, Ottawa, 1967.

Loughran, N.E., *Development Corporations and Cooperatives*, Loughran, Winnipeg, 1985.

Lutz, M.A., Lux, K., *Humanistic Economics: The New Challenge*, The Bootstrap Press, New York, 1988.

MacLeod, G., *New Age Business, Community Corporations that Work*, Canadian Council on Social Development, Ottawa, 1986.

Marée, M., *Quels moyens pour les agences de développement local?* Université de Liège au Sart-Tilman, CIRIEC, Liège, 1985.

Marée, M., Saive, M.A., *Économie sociale et renouvellement coopératif, définition et problèmes de financement*, Université de Liège au Sart-Tilman, CIRIEC, Liège, 1983.

Matthieu, R., Bourque, R., Vaillancourt, Y., *Les entreprises communautaires dans les services sociaux au Québec*, Comité conjoint UQAM-CSN-FTQ, Université du Québec à Montréal, 1988.

Maurel, E., *Agir pour l'insertion, pratiques d'une fédération*, Groupe d'étude et de formation sur le sanitaire et le social, Institut d'études politiques de Grenoble, Saint-Martin d'Hères Cedex, 1989.

Mayer, N.S., *Neighbourhood Organizations and Community Development, Making Revitalization Work*, The Urban Institute Press, Washington, 1984.

McCormick, L. et al., *Community Economic Development Strategies, a Manual for Local Action*, UIC Center for Urban Economic Development, University of Illinois, Chicago, 1987.

Mier, R., Wiewel, W., *Business Activities of Not-For Profit Organizations*, APA Journal, summer 1983.

Mico, P.R., *Developing your Community-Based Organization*, Third Party Publishing Company, Oakland, 1981.

Mormont, M., *Le local convié au développement*, Revue internationale d'action communautaire, # 22/62, 1989.

Murray, R., *Europe and the New Regionalism*, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, 1991.

National Association of Community Development Loan Funds, *Building the Foundation for Economic, Social and Political Justice, a 5-Year Profile of the Membership of the National Association of Community Development Loan Funds 1986-1990*, NACDLF, Philadelphia, 1991.

National Congress for Community Economic Development, *Changing the Odds*, NCCED, Washington, 1991.

National Congress for Community Economic Development, *Against all Odds*, NCCED, Washington, 1989.

National Economic Development and Law Center, *Community Economic Development Introductory Readings*, Berkeley, 1977.

Neamtan, N., *Discours de Nancy Neamtan*, in IFDEC et ANDLP, *Le Local en Action*, Éditions de l'Épargne, Paris, 1989.

Neamtan, N., Fontan, J.M., *Stratégies et politiques municipales de revitalisation socio-économique et de développement local*, in **Lemelin, A., Morin, R.**, *Le développement économique local et communautaire : éléments d'analyse et pistes de réflexion pour une stratégie municipale*, INRS-Urbanisation, Montréal, 1989.

Nesher, A., *The Effects of Public Services Provision on the Quality of Urban Life*, University Microfilm International, Ann Arbor, 1990.

Newman, L.H. Lyon, D., Philp, W., *Community Economic Development, an Approach for Urban-Based Economies*, University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg, 1986.

Ninacs, W.A., *Réflexions sur le mouvement communautaire et le développement local et régional*, Université populaire d'été, Rawdon, 1992.

Ninacs, W.A., *Pratique d'intervention communautaire dans la région québécoise des Bois-Francs*, Colloque international sur les communautés rurales innovatrices, Charlottetown, 1991.

Ninacs, W.A., *Business Development as a CED Strategy*, Making Waves, Westcoast Development Group, Vancouver, July 1991.

Ninacs, W.A., *L'intervention communautaire : une alternative à l'intervention sociale*, Revue canadienne de santé mentale communautaire, vol. 9, # 1, printemps 1990.

Oakley, P., *Projects with People: the Practice of Participation in Rural Development*, International Labor Office, Geneva, 1991.

OCDE, *Réussir le changement : entrepreneuriat et initiatives locales*, OCDE, Paris, 1990.

OCDE, *Les mécanismes de la création d'emplois, l'exemple américain*, OCDE, Paris, 1989.

OCDE, *Le partenariat au coeur des dynamiques de l'emploi*, Feedback Elise, # 1 et 2, Paris, 1987.

OCDE, *La grande entreprise en 1986 : au carrefour de l'emploi, du développement local et de l'innovation*, Feed Back ILE, # 3, mars 1986.

OCDE, *Méthodes et procédures d'évaluation de l'aide : un recueil des pratiques et expériences des donneurs*, Paris, 1986b.

OCDE, *Créer des emplois au niveau local, initiatives locales de création d'emplois*, OCDE, Paris, 1985.

OCDE, *Entreprises d'intérêt collectif et création d'emplois au niveau local*, OCDE, Paris, 1984.

Osborne, D., *Laboratories of Democracy: a New Breed of Governors Creates Models for National Growth*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, 1988.

Outrequin, P., Potier, A., Sauvage, P., *Les entreprises alternatives*, Syros, Paris, 1986.

Papineau, D., *À partir du quartier, évaluation par les usagers d'un modèle de prise en charge de la communauté et des impacts sur les familles*, CDÉC-GP, Montréal, 1990.

Papineau, D., Kiely, M.C., *Citizen Empowerment Through Community Economic Development in a Multiethnic Neighbourhood*, Université de Montréal, Département de psychologie, Montréal, 1992.

Parallel Institute, *Proposal for a Community Development Corporation in a Depressed Urban Area*, Montréal, 1969.

Peirce, N., Steinbach, C., *Corrective Capitalism: the Rise of America's Community Development Corporation*, Ford Foundation, New York, 1987.

Pellegrin, J-P., *Initiatives locales, promotion de l'emploi et développement*, in **Chassagne, M-E., Romefort, A.**, *Initiatives et solidarités*, Syros/ADEL, Paris, 1987.

Perry, S.E., *Le développement régional par l'engagement communautaire*, document sur le développement local # 17, Conseil économique du Canada, Ottawa, 1989.

Perry, S.E., *Communities on the Way, Rebuilding Local Economies in the United States and Canada*, State University of New York Press, Albany, 1987.

Perry, S.E., *Federal Support for CDCs Some of the History and Issues of Community Control*, *The Review of Black Political Economy*, vol. 3, # 3, spring 1973.

Piore J., Sabel, C.F., *The Second Industrial Divide*, Basic Books, New York, 1984.

Polèse, M., Coffey, W.J., *Les politiques de développement local : éléments de définition*, INRS-Urbanisation, études et documents # 34, Montréal, 1982.

Pour, *Les régies de quartier*, hors série, décembre 1989.

Pour, *L'évaluation du pouvoir*, # 107, juin-juillet 1986.

Praderic, M., *Entreprises et quartiers «L'Insertion c'est aussi notre affaire»; «Fiches de cas tirées des auditions et des rencontres»*, Ministère de la Ville et de l'Aménagement du Territoire, Paris, 1991.

Redburn, S.F., Buss, T.F., *Public Policies for Distressed Communities*, Lexington books, Lexington, 1982.

Regroupement des ressources alternatives en santé mentale du Québec, *La participation des ressources alternatives à l'élaboration des plans régionaux d'organisation des services en santé mentale*, RRASMQ, Montréal, 1991.

Remenyi, J., *Where Credit is Due, Income-Generating Programmes for the Poor in Developing Countries*, IT Publications, London, 1991.

Revue internationale d'action communautaire, *De l'espace pour le local*, # 22/62, 1989.

Rhodengaugh, T., *Human Services: An Economic Development Opportunity*, National Congress for Community Economic Development, Washington, 1992.

Rock, C., Klinedinst, M., *In Search of the "Social Economy" in the United States: a Proposal*, in **Defourny, J., Monzon Campos, J.L.**, *Économie sociale, entre économie capitaliste et économie publique; The Third Sector Cooperative, Mutual and Nonprofit Organizations*, CIRIEC & De Boeck Université, Bruxelles, 1992.

Rodriguez, P., *Entreprises d'insertion projet de développement*, Boulot Vers, Montréal, 1991.

Rodriguez, P., *Insertion sociale et économique des jeunes adultes, les entreprises d'insertion une réponse à la marginalisation*, Boulot Vers, Montréal, 1990.

Sanyika, M., *A Perspective on the Context of the U.S. Experience with Community Economic Development (CED) or Local Development*, National Economic Development and Law Center, Berkeley, 1989.

Saragoussi, P., *Enrichir le champ du social par l'économique*, in **Pour**, *Les régies de quartier*, hors série, décembre 1989.

Savary, J., *L'économie-territoire à la conquête de l'économie-monde*, in **Dommergues, P.**, *La société de partenariat*, Afnor-Anthropos, Paris, 1988.

Savoie, D. J., *Le développement régional au Canada : un aperçu historique*, in **Savoie, D.J., Raynauld, A.**, *Essais sur le développement régional*, Presses de l'Université de Montréal, Montréal, 1986.

Scheie, D.M., Markham, J., Mayer, S.E, Slettom, J., Williams, T., *Religious Institutions as Partners in Community Based Development, Findings from Year One of the Lilly Endowment Program*, Rainbow Research, Minneapolis, 1991.

Schweke, W., Jones, D.R., *La responsabilité sociale des entreprises en Europe*, Feedback Elise 1 & 2, OCDE, 1987, p. 24-28.

Schramm, R., *Local, Regional and National Strategies*, in **Bruyn S.T., Meehan, J.**, *Beyond the Market and the State: New Directions in Community Development*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1987.

Sibille, H., *Données de base et facteurs d'explication*, in **OCDE**, *Les mécanismes de la création d'emplois*, OCDE, Paris, 1989.

Stratton, C., *Pourquoi des partenariats?* in **OCDE**, *Les mécanismes de la création d'emplois*, OCDE, Paris, 1989.

Surpin, R., *Enterprise Development and Worker Ownership: A Strategy for Community Economic Development*, New York Affairs, vol. 9, # 1, 1985.

Swack, M., Mason, D., *Community Economic Development as a Strategy for Social Intervention*, in **Bennett, E.M.**, *Social Intervention: Theory and Practice*, Lewinston, New York, 1987.

Swinney, D., *Towards a New Vision of Community Economic Development*, Midwest Center for Labor Research, Chicago, 1990.

Tarasoff, K.J., *Review of Community Development Corporations in the U.S.A., Implications for Canadian Development*, Social and Human Analysis Branch, Planning Division, Department of Regional Economic Expansion, Ottawa, 1973.

Temali, M., Campbell, C., *Business Incubator Profiles, a National Survey*, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1984.

Tremblay, D.G., Van Schendel, V., *Économie du Québec et de ses régions*, Télé-université et Éditions St-Martin, Montréal, 1991.

Twelvetrees, A., *Organizing for Neighbourhood Development*, Avebury, Aldershot, 1989.

Vachon, B., Coallier, F., *Le développement local, théorie et pratique, réintroduire l'homme dans la logique du développement*, Gaëtan Morin, Chicoutimi, 1992.

Vidal, A.C., *Rebuilding Communities: A National Study of Urban Community Development Corporations*, Community Development Research Center, Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy, New School for Social Research, New York, 1992.

Ville de Montréal, *Partenaires dans le développement économique des quartiers*, Ville de Montréal, Montréal, 1990.

Viveret, P., *L'évaluation des politiques*, Paris, La documentation française, 1989.

Watchel, A., *Youth Employment Projects in Canada, Examples in a Community Economic Development Context*, SPARC, Vancouver, 1987.

Watchel, A., Chabassol, A., *Les jeunes et le développement économique à caractère communautaire : compte rendu des tendances internationales*, Direction de l'analyse des tendances sociales, Secrétariat d'État, 1986.

Weiner, A., *L'Usine de chaloupes*, Institut Parallèle, Montréal, 1972.

Weiner, A., *Criteria for the Selection of Projects for Community Development Corporations: a Preliminary Report*, Institut Parallèle, Montréal, 1970.

Weistart, C. (editor), *Community Economic Development, Problems and Potentials for Minority Groups*, Oceana Publication, New York, 1972.

Westcoast Development Group, *An Annotated Bibliography of CED Resources*, Vancouver, B.C., 1991.

Wismer, S., Pell, D., *Community Profit: Community-Based Economic Development in Canada*, Is Five Press, Toronto, 1981.

Wuhl, S., *Du chômage à l'exclusion, l'état des politiques? l'apport des expériences*, Syros Alternatives, Paris, 1991.

Zalent, K., *Economic Home Cooking, an Action Guide for Congregations on Community Economic Development*, Community Workshop on Economic Development, Chicago, 1988.

Zalent, K., Schnitzer, D., *Digging in Community-Grown Business Ventures: Lessons from the Community Ventures Working Group*, Community Workshop on Economic Development, Chicago, 1987.

Zdeneck, R., *Community development corporations*, in **Bruyn, S.T., Meehan, J.**, *Beyond the Market and the State*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1987.