

Purpose of the research:

- Profile community development
- How is community development best interpreted? *As a democratising force within civil society that redeems the claims recently made of the third sector? Or as a vehicle for the reinvention of governance?*

This presentation focuses on the former.

Method

- Questionnaire to membership of Community Workers Co-operative (CWC) in 2001.
- Membership at the time was 559.
- 177 questionnaires were returned.
- Response rate of 31.66%.

The CWC:

- National organisation
- Established 1981.

“[W]ork[s] collectively with its members and other community sector organisations to address the causes of poverty, inequality and injustice in Irish society and bring these issues to the attention of government in a considered way.” (www.cwc.ie)

- Membership is at individual and organisational level.

This gave the potential for duplication of responses (i.e. that two or more people from the same organisation might end up responding, thereby “double counting” the profile of their organisation). However, in surveying the responses, no such duplication was found.

The CWC also claims membership from throughout Ireland, North and South, however no respondent identified herself as being active in Northern Ireland.

Roles of respondents:

Description	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
unpaid activist / volunteer	24	13.6	14.8	14.8
C.E. participant	2	1.1	1.2	16.0
full-time co-ordinator / manager / project leader	76	42.9	46.9	63.0
full-time worker (non-managerial)	37	20.9	22.8	85.8
part-time worker	14	7.9	8.6	94.4
board member	8	4.5	4.9	99.4
other	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	162	91.5	100.0	
dnr	3	1.7		
n/a	12	6.8		
Total	15	8.5		
Total	177	100.0		

Frequency table of respondent's role in their group or organisation

Semi-structured interviews:

- Non-probability sample $n=19$
 - 14 Community Development Project staff *of which*
 - 9 co-ordinators
 - 5 full-time workers*all from different projects.*

At the time this represented approximately 11% of the CDPs in Ireland.

2 x Heads of Community and Enterprise in local authorities.

3 x partnership staff in charge of community development sections, all from different partnerships.

ORGANISATION PROFILE

Longevity & finance

Length of time	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
less than 1 year	6	3.4	3.8	3.8
1 - 3 years	23	13.0	14.4	18.1
4 - 6 years	47	26.6	29.4	47.5
7 - 10 years	30	16.9	18.8	66.3
11 - 15 years	23	13.0	14.4	80.6
16 - 25 years	15	8.5	9.4	90.0
26 - 50 years	13	7.3	8.1	98.1
51 - 100 years	2	1.1	1.3	99.4
101 + years	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	160	90.4	100.0	
dnr	5	2.8		
n/a	12	6.8		
Total	17	9.6		
Total	177	100.0		

Frequency table of the length of existence of respondent's group

- Relatively even across last 25 years

- 65.9% since 1990 (CDP began in 1991)

Level of income

Amount per annum	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
less than £5,000	19	10.7	13.6	13.6
£5,001 - £10,000	8	4.5	5.7	19.3
£10,001 - £20,000	2	1.1	1.4	20.7
£20,001 - £50,000	13	7.3	9.3	30.0
£50,001 - £100,000	42	23.7	30.0	60.0
£100,001 - £250,000	32	18.1	22.9	82.9
£250,001 - £500,000	13	7.3	9.3	92.1
£500,001 - £1,000,000	7	4.0	5.0	97.1
more than £1,000,000	4	2.3	2.9	100.0
Total	140	79.1	100.0	
dnr	22	12.4		
n/a	15	8.5		
Total	37	20.9		
Total	177	100.0		

Frequency table of approximate level of income of respondent's group.

- 70% of groups received > €63,500
- 40% of groups received >€127,000
- 17.1% received >€317,500
- 2.9% received >€1.27m

Main source of income

Source of income	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Dept. of Health & Children (or Health Board)	35	19.8	24.3	24.3
FAS	17	9.6	11.8	36.1
Local authority	2	1.1	1.4	37.5
Partnership Company	8	4.5	5.6	43.1
Leader Company	3	1.7	2.1	45.1
V.E.C.	3	1.7	2.1	47.2
DSCFA	47	26.6	32.6	79.9
Dept. of Justice, Equality and Law Reform	2	1.1	1.4	81.3
Dept. of Education and Science	6	3.4	4.2	85.4
ADM	8	4.5	5.6	91.0
Peace and Reconciliation Fund	4	2.3	2.8	93.8
Combat Poverty Agency	1	.6	.7	94.4
Dept. of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development.	2	1.1	1.4	95.8
other	6	3.4	4.2	100.0
Total	144	81.4	100.0	
dnr	17	9.6		
n/a	16	9.0		
Total	33	18.6		
Total	177	100.0		

Frequency table of main source of income of respondent's group.

Three main funders:

- DSCFA (32.6%)
- Health & Children (24.3%)
- FÁS (11.8%)

Secondary source of income

Source of income	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Fundraising / donation	44	24.9	51.8	51.8
Private trust	8	4.5	9.4	61.2
fees for work carried out	8	4.5	9.4	70.6
EU	2	1.1	2.4	72.9
Combat Poverty Agency	1	.6	1.2	74.1
International Fund for Ireland	1	.6	1.2	75.3
Partnership Company	5	2.8	5.9	81.2
DSCFA	3	1.7	3.5	84.7
FAS	1	.6	1.2	85.9
Peace and Reconciliation Fund	4	2.3	4.7	90.6
other	8	4.5	9.4	100.0
Total	85	48.0	100.0	
dnr	69	39.0		
n/a	23	13.0		
Total	92	52.0		
Total	177	100.0		

Frequency table for secondary source of income for respondent's group.

- 52% dnr or n/a – suggests many groups have no other source of funds but the state

Staffing

Volunteer/paid

Description

Volunteers

<i>Part-time</i>	1380		
<i>Full-time</i>	372	1752	(38.1%)

Paid

<i>C.E.</i>	459		
<i>Part-time</i>	283		
<i>Full-time</i>	1065	1807	(39.2%)

Board/steering group		1043	(22.7%)
----------------------	--	------	---------

- If board discounted, paid outnumber volunteers/activists.
- Compared to a 1988 An Foras Forbaithe report, volunteers numbers may actually have increased.
- Question: has professionalisation helped support voluntarism?

Gendered analysis

DESCRIPTION	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	RATIO
part-time unpaid activists or volunteers	1102	278	1380	3.96 : 1
part-time paid employees (non CE)	220	63	283	3.49 : 1
community employment participants	343	116	459	3.14 : 1
full-time paid employees	793	272	1065	2.92 : 1
full-time unpaid activists/volunteers	271	101	372	2.68 : 1
board / management / steering group members	629	414	1043	1.52 : 1
Total	3358	1244	4602	2.70 : 1

Frequency table of gendered division of roles in respondent's group.

- Women outnumber men in all areas
- Women's involvement proportionately lower in positions of increased influence or power

ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE

Description	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
We are a completely informal group: we don't have a board of management, a steering group or a project leader. Work roles are allocated as we need them.	6	3.4	3.7	3.7
We are a largely informal group: we don't have a board of management or a steering group, but we do have a group leader. Some roles within the group are specified.	7	4.0	4.3	8.0
Our group is somewhat formalised: we have a recognisable management structure, including a board of management or a steering group. The majority of work roles are allocated.	26	14.7	16.0	24.1
Our group is formalised: we have a recognisable structure, including a board of management or a steering group, a project leader or manager, and specific staff roles.	123	69.5	75.9	100.0
Total	162	91.5	100.0	
dnr	4	2.3		
n/a	11	6.2		
Total	15	8.5		
Total	177	100.0		

Frequency table of the statements that best describe how respondents' group or organisation is structured.

- **75.9% formally structured**

Decision-making

Description	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Decisions are made within the group, with everybody's opinion sought and taken into account. The final decision always rests with the group as a whole.	34	19.2	21.0	21.0
We always consult widely within the group, but ultimately the final decision rests with the group leader and/or manager.	17	9.6	10.5	31.5
We always consult widely within the group, but ultimately the final decision rests with the board of management and/or steering group.	42	23.7	25.9	57.4
The project leader or manager generally takes decisions; or they delegate responsibility to someone to take a decision.	4	2.3	2.5	59.9
The board of management and/or steering group generally makes decisions on behalf of the group/organisation as a whole.	23	13.0	14.2	74.1
We have a board of management or a steering group, but in practice decisions are taken by the project leader or manager.	17	9.6	10.5	84.6
We have a board of management or a steering group, but in practice decisions are taken by the group as a whole.	19	10.7	11.7	96.3
We have another way of making decisions	6	3.4	3.7	100.0
Total	162	91.5	100.0	
dnr	5	2.8		
n/a	10	5.6		
Total	15	8.5		
Total	177	100.0		

Frequency table of the statements that best described the way decisions are made in respondents' group or organisation.

3 modes emerge:

- participative (32.7%)
- consultative (36.4%)
- representative (28.2%)

Cross-tabbing the previous two tables:

- the more formalised the group in terms of structure, the less likely they are to have participative decision-making

Process & product

Description	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Great importance. The process of decision-making is as important as the decision itself.	90	50.8	57.3	57.3
Some importance. Whilst the process is important, getting the right decision for our group is the main aim.	54	30.5	34.4	91.7
Of little importance. Getting the right decision for the group/organisation is our priority.	13	7.3	8.3	100.0
Total	157	88.7	100.0	
dnr	11	6.2		
n/a	9	5.1		
Total	20	11.3		
Total	177	100.0		

Frequency table of the level of importance that respondents' group/organisation places on the way (i.e. the process) that decisions are made.

“Process over product” – 57.3%

“Equally valid” – 34.4%

“Product over process” – 8.3%

THE WORK

Groups

Frequency table of the descriptions that best describe the people that respondents' groups work with.

Description	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
women	91	11.6	59.1
people experiencing poverty	88	11.2	57.1
disadvantaged young people	86	11.0	55.8
adults experiencing educational disadvantage	77	9.8	50.0
people experiencing unemployment	76	9.7	49.4
Travellers	72	9.2	46.8
children and families	70	8.9	45.5
people with disabilities	52	6.6	33.8
refugees or asylum-seekers	45	5.7	29.2
ex-offenders	27	3.4	17.5
illegal drug and/or alcohol misusers	24	3.1	15.6
people who are homeless	19	2.4	12.3
environmentalists	19	2.4	12.3
lesbians and/or gay men	16	2.0	10.4
other	11	1.4	7.1
victims of crime	10	1.3	6.5
Total responses	783	100.0	508.4

- Women's groups most numerous (59.1%)
- Anti-poverty work suffuses categories
- Travellers (46.8%)
- Refugees and asylum-seekers (29.2%)

Numbers ‘using’ community development ‘services’

Number of clients (weekly)	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1 - 10	17	9.6	23.9	23.9
11 - 25	20	11.3	28.2	52.1
26 - 50	15	8.5	21.1	73.2
51 - 100	11	6.2	15.5	88.7
101 - 250	6	3.4	8.5	97.2
501+	2	1.1	2.8	100.0
Total	71	40.1	100.0	
dnr	63	35.6		
n/a	43	24.3		
Total	106	59.9		
Total	177	100.0		

Frequency table of the number of clients that respondent's group works with, on average, on a weekly basis.

- Relatively low, if conceived of as a social service (73.2% less than 50 service-users per week)
- Quite high if viewed as movement activity!

GROUP ACTIVITIES

Frequency table of the descriptions that best describes respondent's group's main day-to-day work.

Description	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
training and skills development	101	13.2	62.7
advice and information to the public	75	9.8	46.6
community education	75	9.8	46.6
advocacy or lobbying	67	8.7	41.6
personal development	65	8.5	40.4
community work	58	7.6	36.0
women's support groups	50	6.5	31.1
Travellers' support groups	38	5.0	23.6
disadvantaged youth work	38	5.0	23.6
creche and/or childcare	36	4.7	22.4
campaigning or protest	23	3.0	14.3
counselling and/or therapy	24	3.1	14.9
recreational and sporting activities	20	2.6	12.4
community arts	18	2.3	11.2
home visits	18	2.3	11.2
men's support groups	14	1.8	8.7
mainstream youth work	13	1.7	8.1
other	13	1.7	8.1
housing assistance	12	1.6	7.5
residential care	8	1.0	5.0
Total responses	766	100.0	475.8

16 missing cases; 161 valid cases

- Development programmes for individuals dominate
- Identity-based groups important
- General social services important also, not as central

MOTIVATION & VALUES

Value statements

Description	Count	Pct of Responses	Pct of Cases
Our work is about trying to accomplish fundamental social change.	96	18.4	59.3
Our work comes from a belief that society is unequal. We are working for equality.	88	16.9	54.3
Our work is about promoting self-help.	85	16.3	52.5
Our work is about working in solidarity with those we work with.	62	11.9	38.3
Our work comes from a concern for other people.	53	10.2	32.7
Our work is about providing a general service to our community.	52	10.0	32.1
Our work is primarily about providing a service to a certain category of people.	37	7.1	22.8
Our work is a way of expressing protest against an unfair society.	31	6.0	19.1
Our work comes from our religious beliefs.	4	.8	2.5
Other	13	2.5	8.0
	-----	-----	-----
Total responses	521	100.0	321.6

Multiple response frequency table of the value statements that best describes the work of respondents' group.

- “Social change” & “equality” dominate, but surprisingly low?
- Self-help & solidarity critical
- Predominantly secular
- ‘Non-radical’

Narratives of involvement

- **Religion and respect**
- **Care and ‘activist mothering’**
- **Formalised politics**
- **Experience of poverty**
- **Classed analyses**

Arguably linked – framed – by a notion of social justice

Relationship with state

Description	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Our group is completely independent and does not work with the state in any form.	12	6.8	7.8	7.8
Our group has some links with the state, but this is on an occasional basis.	46	26.0	30.1	37.9
Our group works with the state on specific projects.	54	30.5	35.3	73.2
Our group works very closely with the state on many issues.	41	23.2	26.8	100.0
Total	153	86.4	100.0	
dnr	8	4.5		
n/a	16	9.0		
Total	24	13.6		
Total	177	100.0		

Frequency table of the description that best describes respondent's group's working relationship with the state and or its agencies or departments.

Considerable organisational integration with state

Approx 1/3 of groups “anti-state”

Question

How can community development be best conceptualised?

Is it a social service?

Or a social movement?

Or, partially, a counter-public sphere?

Clearly there are overlaps and difference of intentions, motives and forms.

Recent events (CWC etc.) suggest the state does at least partly see 'community development' as a threat.

This recognition implicitly suggests ‘community development’ is counter-public in orientation.

It also suggests that ‘community development’ self-imposed integration with the state comes partly at the cost of skills-building. e.g. in terms of analysis.

Even the most radical rhetorical voices within community development still assume the basic tenet “state as community”.

This makes the argument for counter or proto-hegemonic positions impossible to make:

“community” simply isn’t available in Ireland as a starting point for this.