



Home Office

BUILDING A SAFE, JUST
AND TOLERANT SOCIETY

What works in community involvement in area-based initiatives?

A systematic review of the literature

Paul Burton

Jacqui Croft

Annette Hastings

Tom Slater

Robina Goodlad

Jo Abbott

Geraldine Macdonald

Home Office Online Report 53/04

What works in community involvement in area-based initiatives? A systematic review of the literature

Paul Burton, Robina Goodlad, Jacqui Croft, Jo Abbott, Annette Hastings, Geraldine Macdonald and Tom Slater

University of Bristol
and
University of Glasgow

Online Report 53 /04

Contents

Executive summary	iv
1. Introduction	1
2. Methodology	3
Defining terms	3
The search and selection process	4
3. An overview of the literature	7
Methodological issues in the evaluation of area based initiatives.....	7
Methodological and epistemological approaches.....	9
Research methods.....	10
Focus of the literature.....	12
Aims and objectives	12
Outputs	13
Funding.....	14
4. What the literature says	15
What aims are held for community involvement	15
Local contexts	17
What techniques, methods and support?.....	19
Structures and processes	20
The involvement of particular groups.....	22
Impact.....	24
5. What Works? Lessons and good practice advice	30
Lessons	30
Guidance to policy makers and professionals	33
What does not work?	36
6. Conclusions and future research	38
What works with regard to achieving effective community involvement?	38
What are the quantifiable beneficial outcomes?	40
How robust are the evaluation methodologies?	40
What is the balance of costs and benefits?	41
Future research.....	41

Annex and appendices	44
Annex 1: Protocol.....	45
Appendix A: Search strategies	48
Appendix B: Proper nouns of area-based initiatives	51
Appendix C: Numbers of findings	52
Appendix D: Bibliography of Stage 1 findings	53
Appendix E: Bibliography of Stage 3 findings	75
Part 1. Papers and reports of studies (representing 26 studies).....	75
Part 2. Review papers, reports and books (8 items).....	77
Appendix F: Additional cited references	79

Executive summary

Introduction

This report was commissioned by the Home Office to build the evidence base for Civil Renewal. Increasing community involvement is seen as key to this agenda which seeks to put active citizens at the heart of tackling social problems. This report is the product of a systematic review of research evidence on the effectiveness of community involvement in Area Based Initiatives (ABIs).

Methodology

The research questions and definitions were set out in the project protocol (Annex 1). The methodology of systematic review was adapted to enable reporting to take place within the funders' timescales. This was informed by expertise on systematic review and was driven partly by the research topic and partly by the nature of the social science literature and the technology used to locate it.

ABIs were understood as publicly funded initiatives targeted on areas of social or economic disadvantage, which aim to improve the quality of life of the residents through multi-faceted programmes. Three meanings of community involvement were distinguished: involvement by individuals or representatives of community or voluntary organisations in public policy design and implementation; participation in voluntary and community organisations, and informal involvement with family, friends and neighbours. Studies of involvement by any categories of people were included and so were ABIs in specific policy fields. The search terms, strategy and bibliography are set out in the Appendices. The final selection was based on a typology that helped focus on material of central interest to the review, as identified in the protocol. Thus 26 empirical studies and eight reviews were selected for inclusion.

An overview of the literature

Evaluating the impact of community involvement on the outcomes of ABIs is complex and creates many methodological difficulties. Many of the studies reviewed lacked specificity about their methodology and approach to determining 'what works'. Some reports focussed on the negative and examined 'what did not work' in relation to community involvement.

What the literature says

What are the aims held for community involvement?

Community involvement in public policy and ABIs in particular appears to have increased in recent years but studies detect more change in the promotion of policy on community involvement than in practice. Broadly the reasons advanced by government for promoting community involvement can be summarised as:

- it aids social cohesion through its developmental or educational effect on individuals and hence on society, and it fosters social capital;
- the planning and delivery of services is effective and decisions are accorded legitimacy since they reflect the interests of participants; and
- it is a right of citizenship that is justified on the grounds of due process, irrespective of outcome.

Most studies take involvement as a given, neither defining its meaning nor investigating what informants say it is for. Authors' own views can be hard to distinguish from those of informants.

Local Contexts

The importance of local contexts is a feature of many studies. Key features are:

- previous history and patterns of community involvement;
- the low levels of involvement that might be expected in ABI areas;
- demographic structures (with young people likely to be less involved);
- community organisations and their suitability as vehicles for participation;
- controversial issues in the area, such as a threat to a service;
- geographical aspects such as transport problems; and
- national institutional and financial regimes.

What techniques, methods and support?

Studies vary in how far they set out what techniques and methods are used and in how far they evaluate their effectiveness. Techniques range from those for publicity and consultation to community control of assets, projects or services. Innovative methods such as drama may not be seen as legitimate. A wide range of support and resources are reported, including skilled and experienced staff, training and skills development for local residents and others, grants schemes for community and voluntary organisations, technical and research support, and research and development funding for new initiatives. Flexibility and variety are recommended.

The role and effect of community representatives

The role of community and voluntary groups varies, with mixed evidence showing both little involvement in direct management of projects and extensions of direct management into new initiatives. Intermediate bodies can do much to stimulate community involvement and provide practical help to community groups.

The difficulty of the role of community representatives on ABI groups is acknowledged. Expectations about the role can be high and a variety of measures to resolve the difficulties of representation can create their own problems. Authors endorse the view that structures alone cannot engender involvement and that a variety of channels and activities is required. Few authors provide a systematic discussion of how far community involvement met the aims of the ABI.

The Involvement of particular groups

The literature recognises the diversity of most 'communities' and some reports focus on difficulties and achievements in reflecting this diversity in the work of ABIs. Particular groups said to be excluded include working class people, members of black and ethnic minority groups, disabled people, young people, women and homeless people.

A recurring issue is whether to integrate or separate particular groups such as those defined by youth, race and gender in ABI processes and strategies. Universal strategies address these issues as part of a wider programme, but questions are raised about the prominence achieved by particular groups in this approach. Alternatively, specific policies can lead to other problems. Several authors agree that ABIs should adopt a mix of universal and targeted initiatives.

Impact

The impact of community involvement is frequently discussed but few authors provide a systematic discussion of how far it met the aims of the ABI or the aims set for it by actors or authors.

There is mixed evidence about whether community involvement has a positive or negative effect on social cohesion. Some authors report that the outcome can be frustration and alienation. However, although there is no definitive evidence about relative weights, most authors appear to agree that positive impacts on social cohesion outweigh negative and include:

- co-operation, communication and contact between participants and others, which fosters trust and further communication in future;
- ownership of the outcome of involvement and subsequent developments;
- a greater sense of identification with the local area;
- greater mutual tolerance of the constraints faced by the others involved; and
- a sense of partnership and some changed working practices.

Many authors report that community involvement has had a positive impact on public policy and service delivery. Although some practical difficulties are found these are insufficient to overturn the generally positive findings that impacts include:

- policy and service effectiveness and realism;
- inclusion of new issues on agenda;
- direct employment and training; and
- enhanced visibility of the area and its needs.

Evidence that the due process of community involvement can generate a sense of inclusion, self-respect and self-esteem comes from several studies although few authors make explicit this aspect. A sense of empowerment, a levelling of power between community representatives and other stakeholders, and a sense of inclusion were all reported.

What works? Lessons and good practice guidance

Processes, structures and methods for involvement

Many authors conclude that ABIs could have planned better for involvement in relation to approach, structures, roles, processes, methods and resources. Ideally, policy is developed with community input and should build on existing community activity. Flexibility is needed to allow change and development.

Partnerships have things to learn about methods and the conduct of meetings. The effectiveness of involvement appears to vary by policy area. Officials are criticised for being inadequately committed to community involvement and for not understanding community development and the importance of respecting different contributions and backgrounds.

Attitudes and expectations

The expectations held of community representatives by fellow citizens and by officials can be higher than apply to the other partners. The motivation for involvement for local people is likely to be policy, service or other tangible changes rather than personal development, though that may be the outcome.

The nature of 'community'

The need to acknowledge the diversity of communities is one of the key lessons. Local residents who are not involved may have little idea of the ABI or of the involvement of local peers. There is disquiet at the longevity of some people's participation, but high turnover can have adverse consequences too.

Evaluating involvement

Lessons can be learned about the need to ensure that appropriate measures of success are built into monitoring and evaluation frameworks. These should be concerned with measures of success with community involvement per se, and also the impact it has had on wider ABI objectives.

Support and resources for community involvement

There is wide agreement about the need to provide and sustain resources to support community involvement, though little is said about what adequate levels would be. All participants require support, not just community members.

Guidance to policy makers and professionals

Good practice guidance is offered to particular types of participants in ABIs, particularly professionals and policy makers and this includes suggested changes that could be made to improve the involvement of particular groups. Changes to the working practices of professionals suggested include:

- improved communication;
- avoiding domination by powerful groups;
- encouraging cross-sector collaboration;
- acknowledging the importance of process as well as product;
- releasing the energies of communities;
- building trust among partners;
- the need for equality of formal powers;
- clarity about roles and responsibilities;
- accessible and transparent decision making structures; and
- empowerment training, skills development and education for all stakeholders.

What does not work?

The 'limits' of involvement are said to be:

- methodological;
- timing;
- lack of consistency in officer commitment sometimes due to staff turnover;
- duplication with other consultation exercises; and
- a perception by some agencies that they are carrying an unfair burden of the costs of consultation.

Obstacles to involvement detected include:

- community partners with little tangible to offer the community;
- poor specification of purpose and objectives;
- central commitment to particular policies that leads to accusations of 'community; intransigence';

- too speedy and complex decision making processes;
- failure to build on existing structures of community representation; and
- inadequate support.

Conclusions and future research

In order to answer the question ‘what works with regard to achieving community involvement’? a number of further questions require to be answered.

Effectiveness at what?

The research is not often very clear about the answer to this question, while providing a lot of advice on lessons learned and ‘good practice’. Residents appreciate being involved and hence support the idea of due process: community involvement for its own sake. However, residents want to see a more tangible outcome from their participation and more attention is given in the literature to the community and personal development aims and outcomes of community involvement, and to the instrumental gains it may bring about, for example to service planning. On all three, mixed impacts are reported.

Involvement in what?

Most of the literature deals with community involvement in public policy design and implementation rather than in voluntary and community organisations or through neighbourliness, family and friends. There appears to be more involvement in strategic and service planning than on service delivery or the implementation of ABI programmes but this may reflect the timing or focus of studies. A degree of opposition and conflict is inevitable.

What form of involvement?

Local circumstances strongly influence the form of involvement. These include the history of initiatives; the purpose of involvement; how far practice matches purpose; the type of people targeted; resources; planning; and the type of activities or decisions involved. Processes are as important as structures for involvement. What might work in any particular setting depends on careful analysis of context, and careful selection and application of technique and process to a high standard.

Involvement by whom?

Professionals and others in addition to residents are involved in ABIs and need support and training. Authors claim that not enough is done to include minority or disadvantaged groups, or ‘ordinary residents’. However, ABIs extend the range of people normally participating in governance.

What are the quantifiable beneficial outcomes?

Many studies report beneficial outcomes. However, few attempted to develop quantifiable measures and inevitably much reliance is placed on perceptions of impact. Few provide evidence from less active residents. This makes it hard to weigh evidence to reach a view. Benefits cannot be easily quantified or associated causally with particular forms of involvement, given the research methods used.

How robust are the evaluation methodologies?

The relative reliance on qualitative methods enabled studies to achieve a deep understanding of processes but few had survey data to supplement their analysis. In some cases the

evidential base for conclusions was not apparent. There is a need for more high quality qualitative research and for quantitative research.

What is the balance of costs and benefits?

Only one study reported views on the balance between benefits and costs, and that was confined to professionals' views. Many studies argue that the costs of involvement should be recognised more, but do not quantify what is provided or needed.

Future research

The studies reviewed in this report provide partial and mixed answers to the questions that arise when considering what works in community involvement in ABIs. There is a need for more high quality studies of specific aspects of involvement. This requires larger sums of money than are generally available. Essential components to future research are:

- research expertise in evaluation and in social and democratic theory;
- development of a set of hypotheses for testing about the purpose and effects of community involvement;
- careful design of a set of case studies with common research instruments used to explore qualitative aspects of ABIs;
- collection of data on impacts in case studies to include identifiable instrumental effects as well as developmental and 'due process' effects of involvement; and
- use of a detailed survey instrument to collect data for a representative sample of the population.

1. Introduction

This report is the product of a systematic review of research evidence on the effectiveness of community involvement in area based initiatives (ABIs). It was commissioned by the Home Office to inform its contribution to forthcoming spending reviews and in support of the Home Secretary's commitment to democratic renewal as a centrepiece of the government's reform agenda. In its work on civic renewal, the Home Office is concerned with both the extent and effectiveness of community involvement in all aspects of civic life. The Active Community Unit (ACU) provides a focus for the delivery of the Home Office's aim: 'To support strong and active communities in which people of all races and backgrounds are valued and participate on equal terms by developing social policy to build a fair, prosperous and cohesive society in which everyone has a stake ... and to ensure that active citizenship contributes to the enhancement of democracy and the development of civil society.' The ACU is also charged with increasing community involvement by five per cent by the year 2006.

Area based initiatives (ABIs) are not new. Measures designed to alleviate poverty, and associated problems such as ill health and poor housing in specific areas, have been used for at least one hundred years in Britain. The Home Office itself sponsored a major scheme of this type, the Community Development Projects, from the late 1960s onwards.

An important feature of many of these initiatives, and one that has become even more prominent in recent years, is the belief that bottom-up approaches are better than top-down ones. Typical of this approach is the Social Exclusion Unit's attitude to community involvement:

neighbourhood renewal starts from a proper understanding of the needs of communities. Communities need to be consulted and listened to, and the most effective interventions are often those where communities are actively involved in their design and delivery, and where possible in the driving seat (Social Exclusion Unit, 2001: 19).

In other words, it is assumed that schemes which reflect the views and aspirations of the people who live in the areas targeted by ABIs will be more effective than schemes that are driven more by the views of others – civil servants or politicians from elsewhere and local state professionals who do not live in the area even if they work there.

These assumptions have rarely been tested in a systematic and rigorous way, although many studies of ABIs and of community involvement exist. This review provides a welcome opportunity, therefore, to review a wide range of literature, particularly a selection of studies of relevance to the question of what works in community involvement in ABIs.

Systematic reviews have become increasingly popular over the last decade as researchers, policy makers and practitioners have come to realise the importance of establishing the most comprehensive picture of current best evidence before moving on to commission new work. They represent an important part of the wider process of modernisation in government, which has given greater emphasis to evidence based policy making.

Originating in reviews of interventions in health, systematic reviewing has extended to many other fields of social policy and is now one of the most rapidly developing forms of policy research, with almost constant methodological and technical advances. These rapid and often profound developments do not necessarily make the task of reviewing any easier, nor does the fact that an expanding array of databases is becoming available all the time. While mechanistic forms of searching certainly save much time and make possible more extensive searches than were previously possible, to a great extent they rely on systems that classify and describe studies accurately. It is estimated that electronic databases will pick up only between 40 and 50 per cent of available studies. Further, in many fields of social policy

intervention, studies and papers are not described in summary form in sufficient detail to be able to rely on mechanistic search techniques. There is often a paucity of detail on the research methods used, on research design and sample sizes and on methods of analysis. This means in practice that large numbers of papers often have to be reviewed manually in order to find the few that conform to the criteria for inclusion in the review. This usually has significant implications for the resources required to carry out reviews and often necessitates adjustments in either the total time required or in the scope of the review. This was certainly the case in this review. Although the team drew on their expertise and knowledge of research in the field to identify literature, there was no time to conduct fuller handsearching.

A critical stage in conducting a systematic review occurs early in the process, when the focus of the review is determined and the key questions to be answered are agreed. In this case, the review was focused on the processes of community involvement within area-based initiatives. This covers a wide spectrum of activities and a further round of specification was required and is described in the next section. The review was particularly concerned with studies of effectiveness, as the brief required us to try to answer the question: what works?

It is worth at this stage commenting in more detail on the relationship between ABIs in general and regeneration initiatives in particular. Although the 1998 report of the Social Exclusion Unit, *Bringing Britain Together*, brought a renewed emphasis to the issue of deprived areas, the question of the extent and causes of spatial concentrations of poverty and deprivation had been exercising policy makers and academic analysts for many years. Some of the early attempts to address the multiple causes and consequences of concentrated deprivation in the 1960s were influenced by questionable notions of 'cultures of poverty' and 'cycles of deprivation' and paid less attention to the connections between the chosen areas and their surroundings. A greater emphasis on the economic aspects of deprivation characterised many policy initiatives of this type in the 1980s, with less attention being paid to the social and environmental factors that might exacerbate or alleviate the impacts of poverty. However, most recently the pendulum has swung again to embrace the full range of economic, social, environmental and political factors that influence the patterns and experience of social exclusion in particular places.

While the emphasis given to specific aspects of concentrated deprivation have changed within different policy regimes over the last 40 years, the importance of spatial targeting has remained much more constant. There has been a similar degree of consistency in the criticisms levelled at spatial targeting (see Smith, 1999, for example). In this sense, although the expression 'area-based initiative' is relatively recent, it refers to a form of policy intervention that has existed for much longer.

The next chapter describes the approach and methods used in this review. Chapter 3 provides an overview of the literature, initially by discussing methodological issues in researching community involvement in ABIs, then by describing the material reviewed in broad terms. Chapter 4 outlines what the literature tells us under a series of headings and the last chapter draws conclusions about the main findings and the methodological issues that arise in researching community involvement in ABIs.

2. Methodology

This review focuses on area-based initiatives and community involvement. This section on methodology sets out how the literature reviewed was selected and discusses the general approach, showing some of the practical consequences of the initial and actual approach. The research questions and definitions are set out in the project protocol (Annex 1).

Given the focus of the project, there was strong justification for the research to use a methodology of systematic review and this was the aim as far as possible. However, in practice, the methodology of systematic review was adapted to enable reporting to take place within the funders' timescales, using a process of real-time review to adapt the strategy according to the level and quality of the findings.

This was driven partly by the nature of the research topic and the very broad range of area-based initiatives that exist in the UK. But it was also due partly to the nature of the social science literature, where meanings attached to descriptive terms can be ambiguous and the same concept can be referred to by a variety of terms and combinations. Overlaying this, the technology-based system that is used to locate the literature involves the systematic layering of search terms, but this relies heavily upon the capacity of the technology being used (Kleinman *et al.*. 2002; Wallace *et al.*. 2003).

As it became clear that generic cataloguing and imprecise search engines produce large search results for this topic, a mode of working was adopted that combined systematic review with a more traditional social science literature review, drawing on expertise within the team. The outcome is therefore a systematised, rather than a systematic, review in the sense of the traditional model.

The literature searches were developed, drawing on the expertise of members of the research team from the Cochrane Developmental, Psychosocial and Learning Problems Group (CDPLPG) at the School of Policy Studies. This group, part of the international Cochrane Collaboration, was established to produce, maintain and make accessible systematic reviews of the effects of social and health care interventions relevant to children, adolescents, people with learning disabilities, personality disorders and young offenders. Using resources through the ESRC Centre for Neighbourhood Research, a member of the ESRC Evidence Network, it was possible to draw upon expertise within the Evidence Network and, in particular, associates from the British Library.

Defining terms

ABIs have been described as publicly funded initiatives targeted on areas of social or economic disadvantage, which aim to improve the quality of life of the residents of that area through multi-faceted programmes of intervention. This review was concerned mainly with programmes targeted on sub-city areas and does not generally include studies of regional programmes, unless these have more spatially focused components. Ninety-three such current and past area initiatives were identified in the United Kingdom and these are listed in Appendix B.

Community involvement has several meanings, and typologies commonly distinguish several forms of community involvement. Goodlad (2002) draws on the Social Exclusion Unit's approach to distinguish three. The first type is involvement by individuals or representatives of community or voluntary organisations in public policy 'both in designing what is to be done and in implementing it' (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998, para. 2.3). Second, community involvement may refer to the participation of people in a variety of types of voluntary and community organisations, for their own or others, benefit; this sort of community involvement can 'have the triple benefit of getting things done... fostering community links and building the skills, self-esteem and networks of those who give their time' (SEU, 1998: 68). Thirdly,

community involvement can be informal, in 'social support mechanisms based on family, friendship and neighbourliness' (Goodlad, 2002: 72).

Community involvement can set out to include all the population of an area though some studies focus particularly on the effectiveness of initiatives in involving particular types of individuals, groups and representatives. Studies of any particular categories of people were to be included in this review, including those focusing on women, members of minority ethnic groups, children and young people, disabled people and older people, as well as people in general. Studies focused on ABIs in specific policy fields were included as long as they were multi-faceted in the sense of involving more than one type of intervention.

The search and selection process

The expertise of the CDPLPG and the Evidence Network associates was sought at the beginning of the research process, in drawing up a comprehensive set of search terms (Appendix A) and a shortlist of the most suitable databases on which to focus the early searches. A further list of proper nouns for specific ABIs (Appendix B) was drawn up by the team. This was designed to ensure the capture of those studies that are catalogued by their proper names.

The databases used were:

- ASSIA (1987-2003)
- Public Affairs Information Services (1983-2003)
- Sociological Abstracts (1963-2003)
- EconLit (1969-2003)
- IBSS/BIDS (1980-2003)
- GeoRef (1983-2003)
- Social Science Abstracts (1996-2003)
- Websites of Renewal.net and Joseph Rowntree Foundation
- Inside (1993-2003)
- Planex (1983-2003)
- Acompline (1974-2003)
- SIGLE (1976-2003)
- Criminal Justice Abstracts (1968-2003)

The complex search string (Appendix A, Strategy 1) resulted in large results sets in some cases while, in others, the databases could not process the search string at all. A range of refined search strategies therefore developed to suit the differing levels of complexity within the individual database search interfaces (Appendix A, Strategies 2 and 3).

Eventual search results from individual databases ranged in number from 25 to over 4000 (Appendix C). Results were imported into an EndNote database where possible and duplicates eliminated before a manual evaluation was undertaken. Some entries could be immediately identified as irrelevant; others needed more careful review, reading abstracts or finding papers and books. EndNote was used to track this process and as a means of sharing findings between the research team. Where results would not import into EndNote (as was the case with many databases and all websites), other paper and electronic means were used as appropriate.

The findings from the databases were sorted in a three-stage system, shown in Table 2.1. The bibliography for the first stage findings is attached as Appendix D.

Table 2.1 Stages of review

	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
Stage	Initial sort to discount material which was obviously of no relevance	Second-level sort to examine more closely the literature of which the relevance was less certain	Final stage of finding and reviewing literature which appeared to be of particular relevance.
No. of finds remaining	369	283	43 (26 studies and 8 reviews)

In moving to Stage 3, some further strategic decisions needed to be made to retain control over the workload. The strategy for identifying relevant studies was unavoidably influenced by the expressions chosen to use in searches of data-bases. The expression 'area-based initiative' was not on its own especially helpful and it was necessary to rely more on the specific or proper names given to particular ABIs, such as City Challenge or Urban Programme or New Deal for Communities. It was therefore decided to focus upon the results which were gained from the searches conducted on the proper nouns of specific ABIs. In addition, the expressions 'regeneration initiative' and 'area-based regeneration initiative' were found to be useful since most regeneration initiatives over the last three decades have involved a degree of spatial targeting, and most area-based initiatives have been said to be concerned with regeneration.

The final selection was based on a typology of material that helped in the management of the review and brings to it a greater degree of focus. The typology is presented at Figure 2.1, which shows how it was intended to focus on material closer to the bottom right hand area of the matrix and to devote less attention to the much greater volume of material in the top left area. Indeed, the search strategy adopted was designed specifically to exclude material closer to the top left sector in favour of material towards the bottom right sector.

The protocol for this review describes how it was agreed to include three types of study:

- studies of the impact of community involvement on the effectiveness of ABIs;
- studies of community involvement in a wide range of policy initiatives with some degree of spatial targeting;
- studies of ABIs that make only passing reference to community involvement and its significance.

Figure 2.1 A simple typology of studies of community involvement in ABIs

	Public policy and area targeting	Involvement in ABIs	ABIs
The case for involvement			Relevant
The incidence, methods and nature of involvement			
The effectiveness of involvement <i>per se</i>			
The impact of involvement on ABI objectives	Relevant		Prime concern

In relation to the typology, the bottom right sector (studies of 'prime concern') refers to the first of these types. However, insofar as this suggests many studies were found in which there is an explicit (if not exclusive) research focus on the impact of community involvement on the overall success of an ABI, then only a few were found that touched on this. Studies that focused explicitly on community involvement in ABIs came nearest but tended to have little to say about the overall impact of community involvement on the achievement of the ABI's objectives in general. These studies often focus on a specific aspect of community involvement such as partnership (Carley *et al.* 2000; Hughes and Carmichael, 1998), rural location (Osborne *et al.* 2002) or disability (Edwards, 2001).

The third category of study for review proposed in the protocol consisted of those studies focusing on ABIs but which were not exclusively concerned with community involvement. A number of studies fell into this category and it was difficult in practice to discriminate rigorously between

them, but two dealing with recent major ABIs were selected for review. These focus on Health Action Zones (HAZ) and the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB).

Thus the 26 empirical studies and eight reviews selected for inclusion (the core studies) cluster at the bottom and right hand sectors of Figure 2.1 (both labelled 'Relevant'). The studies selected as part of Stage 1 and Stage 2 bunch at the top left sectors of Figure 2.1. The final bibliography is at Appendix E. It is in two parts with outputs from the 26 empirical studies listed in Part 1 and from the eight reviews listed in Part 2. Before discussing the characteristics of these studies in the next chapter, there are three final points to be made about the literature identified in Stages 1 and 2.

First, the task of reviewing and selecting material was complicated by the fact that many documents make only passing reference to the research design and methods used to collect data. For studies that synthesise the work of others, there was sometimes the added difficulty of an absence of description of the rationale for and steps taken to select the items to be reviewed. It proved impossible to impose any selection criteria related to method during the early stages of searching as in many of the studies information of this type was absent, or was provided in a sketchy, partial or idiosyncratic way.

Second, in considering the literature identified in Stages 1 and 2, a number of themes were found running through it. The documents located included one or more of the following elements:

- writings about the concepts of democracy, participation, public policy and ABIs;
- data and commentary on civil society, voluntary organisations and community participation in general, including national surveys of attitudes and experiences of participation;
- data on user participation in specific public services;
- general studies of area initiatives that do not focus on involvement or participation;
- data and commentary on community involvement in ABIs, covering topics such as purpose and value; techniques, methods and approaches; extent and pattern; and impact and effectiveness of community involvement in ABIs; and
- guidance on 'what works' and how to generate (better) community involvement in public service planning and delivery and in a number of policy initiatives including ABIs.

Much of this literature could have important lessons for what works in community involvement in ABIs. In focusing on the intersection between area-based initiatives and community involvement, there was a danger of excluding evidence from research that might be relevant to the development of community involvement in ABIs but was focused on community involvement in other settings. The review team was able to draw on some of this wider literature (see Appendix F) but the limits of the review did not permit any systematic review of it. This necessitated systematically discounting literature which, while theoretically or empirically connected with issues on which the study touched, provided no direct empirical evidence which assisted in answering the research questions.

Third, some reports and papers take the form of critical reviews of government policy documents – broadly defined – and while there is nothing inherently wrong with this, some do not rise above the more rudimentary forms of rhetorical analysis. The impression gained of some of the literature is that it 'is narrow in scope and often contains as much normative advocacy as it does empirical analysis', as Burton wrote in a review of community involvement in neighbourhood regeneration (2003). This literature asserts or assumes (or, less usually, questions) the importance of community involvement and lists a range of potential benefits (or pitfalls). Advocacy is an important aspect of any policy literature, but some authors do not base their advocacy on robust empirical evidence – whether quantitative or qualitative – of the *perceived* rather than the *potential* benefits of involvement.

3. An overview of the literature

This section provides a broad overview of the literature reviewed but starts with a discussion of the methodological issues that arise in researching what works in community involvement in ABIs.

Methodological issues in the evaluation of area-based initiatives

There are many epistemological and methodological challenges in evaluating area-based initiatives and in trying to establish the contribution that community involvement might make to any positive outcomes associated with them. Bradford and Robson (1995: 39-40) provide a succinct yet incisive account of the methodological problems associated with evaluation in the context of long running and multi-faceted urban policy initiatives. Adapting to ABIs more generally, the six factors that make evaluations difficult are:

i. Counterfactuals

The most difficult problem lies, they say, in assessing what would have happened in the absence of the intervention. One approach could be to take a set of areas that had been subject to intervention and compare them with control areas that had not been subject to the same measures. But this usually proves difficult, if not impossible in the UK at least, because all similar areas would have been included within the programme.

ii. Confounding evidence

In order to be able to claim a causal connection between a set of policy impacts and a set of outputs and outcomes, it is often claimed that it is necessary to partition off the impact of other factors. In the case of ABIs, a great variety of possible confounding factors might operate such as the effect interest rates have on the performance of the local economy.

iii. Contextual factors

Different conditions provide very different starting points for ABIs. While the establishment of baseline conditions can provide a starting point for measuring the value added by policy interventions, many of the baseline factors are difficult to measure with enough precision to allow robust comparison between areas. For example, the history of previous policy initiatives, and the personal characteristics of key local actors, are significant but difficult to measure.

iv. Contiguity

A perennial problem in the design and effectiveness of ABIs lies in the drawing of boundaries. As critics of area-based approaches to poverty have long argued (e.g. Smith, 1999), more poor people live beyond the boundaries of the targeted area than live within them and usually substantial proportions of those living within the area are not themselves poor. Evaluating interventions is therefore complicated by 'spillover' effects into other areas and 'shadow' effects from beyond the boundary that in both cases should be counted but are often not.

v. Combinatorial problems

Evaluation and research problems arise when different combinations of factors lead to different outcomes in different areas. Thus a combination that worked well in one area may not work so well in another, for a whole host of locally contingent reasons that can be difficult to establish.

vi. Change

Over the course of years or even decades, the priorities of policies will almost inevitably change, as may the volume and focus of funding, the rules by which resources are distributed and perceptions of what constitutes good practice. Insofar as these constitute the broad context and in some cases the detailed criteria against which interventions are evaluated, there is a problem in trying to hit a moving target.

A further set of methodological issues arising from the nature of community involvement is identified by some of the studies reviewed. This revolves around questions such as 'who are the

evaluators?’ and ‘can community involvement be judged without reference to the views of the community?’

The case for more participatory approaches to evaluation is rarely disputed in the field of evaluation and favoured even more strongly in relation to evaluating community involvement itself (Dobbs and Moore, 2002). Duncan and Thomas (2000) for example, argue for a more diverse approach to evaluation, moving beyond reliance solely on professional evaluators and those already employed by the programme to include local residents themselves as part of more participatory approaches. Dobbs and Moore (2002) draw on their experience of helping to manage a series of projects in the north-east of England which set out to ‘encourage community involvement in evaluation by employing, training and supporting local residents to carry out a range of baseline and impact surveys’ (p. 157). They began with the assumption that by building local resident participation into these evaluations, they would be assisting community-led policy development and increasing local capacity and capital.

Finally, for research into community involvement in ABIs the issue of the timing of research or evaluation arises. This can be addressed fully if evaluation is commissioned before an initiative commences. The evaluations of SRB and HAZ both had long timescales and some opportunity to consider the issue of timing. Many of the studies reviewed, however, provided snapshots of involvement at a fairly arbitrary point in the life of initiatives. Although most authors do not discuss the implications of the timing of their studies, Duncan and Thomas (2000: 30) argue that it is an important issue:

Evaluation which takes account of community involvement should be carried out at key points in the process of area regeneration. There are various stages at which a greater or lesser level of evaluation could be usefully applied.

These stages include:

- at the end of the process of bidding for funds or recognition, in order to ascertain the quality and quantity of community involvement in the bidding process;
- at the conclusion of the production of the delivery plan, to assess the impact of the proposed programme on the local communities;
- at the point of establishing formal partnership structures, to gauge the extent to which there are genuine opportunities for community involvement in the formal management of an initiative;
- at the end of each substantive project, to learn any lessons for future project development and management;
- at the end of each year of the programme, to review overall progress and develop guidelines for the next phase of work. (ibid: 30)

However, the complexity of the public policy context, including history, can make it hard to define the start or finish of particular ABIs. In one Scottish SIP, for example, the area had been the subject of a previous partnership initiative founded in 1990, nine years before SIPs were launched. This provided a ready-made organisational structure at neighbourhood level to which the SIP devolved responsibility for allocation of funding for community projects. This example of community involvement could only be properly understood in the light of knowledge of that history (Docherty *et al.* 2001).

In summary, a number of challenges are faced by researchers seeking to research community involvement in ABIs. These include issues that arise in any research seeking to understand the impact of public policy on complex social processes and others more specific to the particular case of researching community involvement. The next section considers what approach the researchers took to address and meet these challenges.

Methodological and epistemological approaches

'An approach should be recognised as distinct from research methods, as it can encompass multiple methods' (Bauld and Judge, 2002: 10). Several methodological approaches can be detected in the studies selected for review although many are silent on the general approach to be taken to resolve methodological problems and discover 'what works'.

Two broad approaches have dominated much evaluation of public policy initiatives such as ABIs, and each is represented by one major study reviewed, while other smaller studies are more or less explicit in following these approaches. The two approaches are 'before and after' studies and 'realistic' evaluation, applied respectively in the SRB and HAZ studies. These are unusual in the clarity they provide about the approach they take to evaluation. These are large publicly funded studies of high profile programmes, which may explain why they have been so explicit.

These two approaches are derived from positivism and critical realism, two of the dominant scientific approaches of the social sciences (Sayer, 2000). They are outlined here in sharp contrast to each other but in practice elements of both approaches are found in many studies.

First, 'before' and 'after' methodology applies a set of methods to the task of seeking to attribute change over time to the policy or programme and to other potentially confounding factors. Baseline, monitoring and final data can be collected in relation to key features of an area that a programme is intended to change. The approach tends to be dominated by quantitative methods but qualitative methods are not eschewed. Confounding and other problems are tackled by use of data that allows estimates to be made of the impact of non-policy factors on outputs and outcomes. Changes are attributed to the policy initiative, once other factors and changes are taken into account. This requires reference to the programme or policy objectives, which require to be reasonably clearly specified. Statistical data can be analysed to provide simple descriptions of change and also to explore the nature of associations between different variables using various forms of multi-variate analysis. The key issue is summarised by McArthur as:

One of the problems faced by a researcher when considering the impact of community involvement is in separating out the distinctive influence attributable to the community representatives. Many of the outcomes are the result of joint decisions which have been shaped by a number of partners. Furthermore, it is often difficult to achieve agreement on the community's influence. (1995: 69)

The 'before' and 'after' approach is illustrated in the major study of the impact of schemes funded under the SRB Challenge Fund which is being conducted by a team at the Department of Land Economy at the University of Cambridge. An interim report (Brennan, Rhodes and Tyler, 1998) and a mid-term report (Rhodes *et al.* 2002, summarised in ODPM, 2002b) have so far been published. The team is tracking the progress of 20 case studies over an eight-year period, using a variety of methods and sources of data. The study uses a 'before' and 'after' design, discussed at some length by Rhodes *et al.* (2002). Here a variety of evidence is brought to bear on the issue of the nature and direction of change in areas targeted by SRB. Taking account of changes in the social, economic and policy environments during the period of the initiative is not easy:

Assessing the impact of regeneration schemes on the net outcome changes produced is complicated by the fact that over the period of change there will have been movement into and out of the study area. (ODPM, 2002b: 3)

Nevertheless, an attempt is made to measure the impact (outputs and longer term or broader outcomes) of the policy, using qualitative as well as quantitative methods. These include baseline surveys of existing social and economic conditions, social surveys of residents' perceptions of many aspects of regeneration, and administrative data emanating from the schemes themselves and from other local agencies. The authors draw the methodological conclusion that 'at least at the present time, there is no alternative but to undertake social surveys in the areas that are the subject of multi-faceted regeneration policies if the key impacts on the required outcomes are to be assessed' (Rhodes *et al.* 2002: 169). Their case study evaluations provide the main source for outputs data. Their summary of outcome changes includes discussion of changes in the extent

and nature of community involvement but no discussion of the interactions between involvement and other outcomes or outputs.

The second common approach to knowing what works in complex public policy areas is known as realistic evaluation. This approach stresses the need to understand the process and mechanisms at work within the implementation of public policy, by comparing empirical evidence about processes with a set of hypotheses or theories about the possible interactions taking place (Pawson and Tilley, 1997). Such 'theory-based' studies tend to favour qualitative methods but there is no necessary association between them and qualitative methods, just as qualitative methods can be used in 'before' and 'after' studies. Case studies provide a common device for collecting the rich data that may reveal contextual factors and mechanisms that may be undetectable using quantitative survey methods. In theory-based studies, participants and programme designers as well as literature and other sources of ideas can be drawn on to suggest the contexts and mechanisms (theories) needed if the potential of the programme is to be achieved. As Pawson and Tilley suggest, embeddedness in a particular social, economic and cultural context is an essential maxim of this approach: 'a programme is its personnel, its place, its past and its prospects' (1997: 65).

This approach is illustrated by the national evaluation of HAZ, which adopts a 'theory-based approach':

Knowledge is required regarding the ways in which different configurations of contexts, strategies, interventions and their associated consequences contribute to tackling health inequalities and promoting population health (Judge and Bauld, 2001: 28-29)

Other studies hint at the realistic approach but rarely spell out the hypotheses implicit in the research design. An example of this being done is a paper that uses hypotheses derived from democratic theory to reveal systematic patterns, consistencies and inconsistencies in the practice of community involvement through housing in two Scottish SIPs (Goodlad *et al.* 2003: 6). Elsewhere this study also attempts to hypothesise about and test the possible interactions between community participation, civic culture and other factors (Docherty *et al.* 2001: 2228), while also recognising the complexities involved:

If a culture supportive of active participation exists in particular places – a modernised 'civic culture' – then it will be easier, we hypothesise, to establish there the new institutions and practices that foster participation. ...(however) The pattern and level of citizen participation will not be explained only with reference to civic culture or only by reference to political structures and policies intended to bring it about.

This appears to be the only study to use multi-variate (ordered logistical regression) analysis. This is combined with qualitative case studies involving semi-structured interviews and focus groups. The remainder of the studies reviewed were rarely explicit about general approach although hypotheses were apparent from time to time. The way that case study methods were used and the style of reporting suggests that a realistic evaluation approach is implicit in at least some of this work. For example, studies for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's regeneration programme place a good deal of emphasis on qualitative methods and lessons for practice. These often appear to be based on implicit assumptions about the configurations of contexts, strategies and interventions that contribute to success or failure in case studies (for example, Fitzpatrick *et al.* 1998; Farnell *et al.* 2003). The focus, though, is often on what will generally help community involvement to develop more effectively in future rather than on what specifically will help it to have a greater impact on the area's social, environmental or economic circumstances. The next section considers the research methods used.

Research methods

Most of the studies reviewed rely on qualitative data. For example, Farnell *et al.* (2003) and Carley *et al.* (2000) provide fairly typical approaches from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's regeneration programme. Carley *et al.* conducted a major study of the factors influencing the

effectiveness of urban regeneration partnerships, drawing on case studies carried out in 27 partnerships in eight city-regions in England, Scotland and the Welsh Valleys. They developed a 'partnership evaluation framework' (p. 4) comprising a number of dimensions along which some assessment could be carried out. The study consisted mostly of in-depth interviews in each of the case study areas but these were supplemented with focus group discussions with local residents. Quantitative methods are typically used in one of two ways. First, a number of studies use postal or telephone surveys to gain an overview or impression of the field under study by surveying initiatives, projects or managers (for example, Anastacio *et al.* 2000; Edwards, 2001; Foley and Martin, 2000a; Duncan and Thomas, 2000; Newburn and Jones, 2002). Unusually, Foley and Martin (2000a) rely on the views of managers of community led SRB schemes and civil servants for their discussion of community representatives' perceptions, but this is unusual. Usually surveys of this type are accompanied by qualitative work. For example, Anastacio *et al.* (2000) explore the question of community involvement from the point of view of residents. Their research used four case study areas, a major literature review and a survey of 110 regeneration partnerships. They say they carried out three to six focus groups and between 30 and 50 interviews in each case study location.

The second use of quantitative methods is in the administration of household surveys, a relatively expensive method. Only three household surveys are mentioned (Docherty *et al.* 2001; McGregor *et al.* 1992; and Rhodes *et al.* 2002). Two of these were funded by government departments or agencies, the other by ESRC. McGregor *et al.*'s (1992) study of community participation in urban regeneration, carried out on behalf of Scottish Homes, had the intention of exploring the most effective means of engaging the community in area regeneration, looking at the consequences of participation and at factors that might explain any significant variation in patterns of participation and impact. Rhodes *et al.*'s DOE/ODPM-funded survey is justified with reference to its value to several parts of this overall evaluation. The third survey, ESRC-funded, was also justified because of its value to several aspects of a regional case study concerned with social cohesion and economic competitiveness. In each case the surveys are accompanied by qualitative methods, such as semi-structured interviews and focus groups, since these are considered better at showing the nature of complex processes of involvement. These are the only three studies that attempt to develop any form of quantitative analysis of the relationship between variables of ABI outcomes and forms of community involvement. This is not necessarily to suggest that quantitative forms of analysis are more appropriate for answering the question of what works in community involvement, but simply to highlight that most studies found were more discursive and reliant on qualitative forms of research.

All but one of the 26 studies appear to have used some form of case study as a key feature of their method. Many describe in various degrees of detail how the choice of case study location was made. In using case studies, whether single or multiple, researchers typically conduct semi-structured interviews with a range of key local actors, often though not always including community activists or citizens and sometimes supplementing these with focus group discussions with the same. The number of interviews carried out varied from Duncan and Thomas's 22 (2000), through Edwards' 80 (2002) and Farnell *et al.*'s 95 (2003) to Anastacio *et al.*'s estimate of between 120 and 200, while Osborne *et al.* (2002), for example, do not relate how many interviews took place.

The eight documents listed in Part 2 of Appendix E vary in the approach they take to reviewing literature. Few are explicit about the criteria used to select for review. Most adopt a thematic approach, reviewing literature in relation to issues that the authors or funders considered important. For example, Brownill and Darke (1998) review evidence about involvement or influence by diverse populations in strategy development, consultation mechanisms, target-setting, and outcome measurement. Burton, in contrast, uses evidence from literature reviewed to answer a series of questions such as 'what degree of participation?' and 'what type of planning or decision making?' Others provide a synthesised diagnosis or prescription of what works as in Botes and van Rensburg's nine plagues and 12 commandments (2000). Finally, Cooke and Kothari (2001) provide an edited collection of chapters with disparate aims and content.

Focus of the literature

The documents reviewed fall into two categories. First are 26 empirical studies of ABIs or of community involvement in ABIs. Any classification of the key focus of these studies is open to dispute, but a useful categorisation into four types is provided in Table 3.1. Some of these studies could have been placed into more than one category and their placing is intended to reflect the needs of this review rather than necessarily their primary focus.

Specific examples of community involvement in area initiatives generate their own evaluations or attract independent researchers and these provide the largest category of study (12), into community involvement in a particular type of ABI. The focus is often on the effectiveness of community involvement mechanisms, rather than on their impact on the ABI more generally. ABIs studied include City Challenge, the SRB, Scottish SIPs, and New Deal for Communities. A further seven studies are of community involvement in ABIs but cover more than one type of ABI. They have many similarities with the studies of community involvement in specific ABIs in method and content. Two studies of ABIs provide the next category and these are reports from general evaluations of specific government programmes, Health Action Zones (HAZ) (Bauld and Judge, 2002) and SRB (Rhodes *et al.* 2002), commissioned by government departments. Finally, five studies of regeneration focus on particular types of social group or geographical area: two report on the involvement of young people, one on disabled people, one on faith communities and the fifth on rural area regeneration partnerships (Table 3.1).

Table 3.1 Focus of 26 empirical studies (review team's categorisation)

Focus of study	No. of studies	References (most recent or comprehensive report)
Community involvement in a variety of types of ABI	7	Anastacio <i>et al.</i> (2000); Carley <i>et al.</i> (2000); Dobbs and Moore (2002); Duncan and Thomas (2000); Edwards <i>et al.</i> (2003); Hastings <i>et al.</i> (1996); McGregor <i>et al.</i> (1992)
Community involvement in a particular type of ABI or policy initiative with some degree of area targeting	12	Ashworth (2000); Brown (2002); Chapman <i>et al.</i> (2001); Dibben (2001); Docherty <i>et al.</i> (2001); Foley and Martin (2000a); Hughes and Carmichael (1998); Newburn and Jones (2002); Ouf (2002); Parkes (2000); Ram (1995); Shaw and Davidson (2002)
Overall, specific type of ABI	2	HAZ: Bauld and Judge (2002); SRB: Rhodes <i>et al.</i> (2002)
Involvement by particular groups in ABIs	5	Farnell <i>et al.</i> (2003); Edwards (2001); Fitzpatrick <i>et al.</i> (1998); Osborne <i>et al.</i> (2002); France and Crow (2001)
Totals	26	46 documents (see Appendix E, Part 1)

Secondly, eight reports, books and papers that review literature on community involvement in ABIs were reviewed (not included in Table 3.1, but listed in Appendix E, Part 2). These draw on one or more of the 26 studies or on other literature to provide some kind of overview of relevance to community involvement in ABIs. This second category is a disparate collection of documents. Their general aim is to review past experience in order to say something about future practice or the significance of the literature for the understanding of community involvement. Further details are provided in the next section which outlines what the studies set as their aims.

Aims and objectives

A categorisation of the 26 studies based on their own statements of aims and context would show they fall broadly into five categories. A large majority, 19, are primarily focused on one or more aspect of community involvement in ABIs or other policy initiatives, many of which focus on urban regeneration initiatives in particular. These vary from studies intended to describe and evaluate particular contexts or target groups for community involvement, as in Fitzpatrick *et al.*'s (1998) study of young people, to others focused on aspects of community involvement in particular types

of ABIs, as in Chapman *et al.*'s (2001) study of community participation in SIPs and Osborne *et al.*'s study of rural regeneration partnerships (2002).

The remaining seven studies fall into four categories: *overall* evaluations of specific ABIs (Bauld and Judge, 2002; Rhodes *et al.* 2002); studies of partnership, that feature community involvement amongst other issues (Carley *et al.* 2000; Hughes and Carmichael, 1998); papers on methodological issues in participation practice or research (Dobbs and Moore, 2002; Ram, 1995) and one study of user-led innovation in local government (Dibben and Bartlett, 2001).

The eight reviews have a variety of aims. In one case the aim is to provide a 'handbook' for 'auditing' community participation (Burns and Taylor, 2000), in another, a book seeks to challenge the very idea of participation in development projects overseas (Cooke and Kothari, 2001), and a third provides a personal view from a professional of what works in community forum development in ABIs (Khamis, 2000). Burton seeks to describe the literature on public involvement in regeneration and to develop a model of the essential elements of such involvement (2003). A review commissioned by the ODPM aims to 'review guidance and literature on community involvement and pull out implications for the implementation of urban policy' (ODPM, 2002b: 1).

Botes and van Rensburg (2000: 42) seek to 'expose the impediments or obstacles to community participation ... in urban development projects'. Finally, Foley and Martin (2000b) examine past experience of community involvement in ABIs over three decades in order to anticipate the challenges that will arise in New Deal for Communities and Best Value.

Many statements of aims are either very general or very specific. For example, Chapman *et al.*'s study had the aim 'to investigate good practice in relation to building more effective partnerships, including: community membership of partnerships; management of partnerships; training and information needs of community participants and organisations; the role of support organisations; ways of reaching the wider community; and working with communities of interest' (2001: 2). And Osborne *et al.*'s two-year study had three purposes: to examine the differing institutional and policy contexts of rural regeneration partnerships in England, Scotland and Northern Ireland and the implications for community involvement; to examine the influence of rurality on community involvement; and to highlight 'best practice' in facilitating and supporting community involvement (2002). Very specific aims include Brownill and Darke (1998), who seek to identify strategic approaches that 'can best meet the aim of promoting wider equality..' (1998: v), best practice and future research needs.

Many studies seek to use empirical research to inform 'good practice' guidance. This is particularly apparent in Joseph Rowntree Foundation reports in the housing and area regeneration series which invariably contain 'good practice' guidance. One such report (Burns and Taylor, 2000) is exclusively concerned with providing an audit tool for practitioners or others evaluating community involvement. The link to the fieldwork on which its guidance is based is not explicit and this is said to be written up in the separately authored report by Anastacio *et al.* (2000).

Outputs

The studies are written up in a variety of ways. The 43 documents listed in Appendix E, Part 1, consist of a mix of research reports (22, six of which are unpublished) and articles in refereed journals (16) with the addition of one book, one conference paper and three book chapters. While many studies are written up in conventional research report style with brief descriptions of aims and methods and fuller reports of findings, others are published through articles that focus on part of the study or seek to contribute to theory rather than to provide a full description of study aims, methods and findings. Four papers are written by professionals with experience of promoting community involvement, and the papers reflect on that experience (Ashworth, 2000; Ram, 1995; Parkes, 2000 and Khamis, 2000). For several studies, more than one output is listed at Appendix E and for some studies reviewed other outputs are available but were not located for this review. In this report the most recent report or paper is usually used in referring to studies. The variety of types of output represented by the final selection of documents partly explains why it is impossible

to be precise about the methods of research used: publishers and editors do not necessarily require full details to be provided.

Funding

Finally, the source of funding for the 26 studies and eight reviews was considered. It was not clear for ten of the 34 who the funder was but for the remaining 24 the funder or funders could be identified. One study is a chapter based on research funded partly by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and partly by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) (Edwards *et al.* 2003). A further 11 studies and reviews were funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, of which eight have their origins in the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's recent programme of research into area regeneration. A total of six studies were ESRC funded, including one already mentioned. Government departments and agencies funded a further seven studies and reviews. Although nothing could be claimed about the significance of the statistical breakdown, it seems likely that current local policy and practice in community involvement in ABIs is being influenced by government-sponsored and Joseph Rowntree Foundation publications in particular.

Only one of the studies selected contains evidence from the ESRC's current 'democracy and participation' research programme (Edwards *et al.* 2003). This may be because many outputs from that programme are still to see publication, or that the programme's focus on theories of democracy and participation and lack of explicit focus on ABIs precluded the review team from identifying or selecting the studies. However, the list of projects in this programme suggests that very valuable and relevant findings will emerge even if they are not explicitly focused on ABIs.

Finally, it is clear that some of the reports reviewed describe and try to explain what *does not* work. In other words their accounts of the relationships between community involvement and ABIs are mainly negative. Of course there is much that can be learnt from the study of failure and in some respects the principle of falsification provides an epistemological basis for focusing research on negative outcomes. What results is a paradox in the empirical literature in that there is a degree of pessimism in relation to what works, while at the same time authors seem convinced of the value of participation. What their findings suggest as an explanation of this puzzle is one of the questions addressed in the next chapter.

4. What the literature says

Given the disparate aims and character of the studies reviewed, it is inappropriate to expect each to shed light on all of the wide range of ways of approaching the question of what works in community involvement in ABIs. Below is therefore presented a summary of the main findings of the studies selected as appropriate for each topic. But first, evidence is emerging that community involvement in ABIs, in local government planning and service delivery and in public policy at local level more generally, has been increasing in recent years (for example, Lowndes *et al.* 1998). As one recent review of community involvement in regeneration initiatives concludes:

There is evidence to suggest that in the past ten years, and perhaps the past five in particular, there has been a marked increase in community involvement at least of the relatively surface kind. The multiplication of regeneration partnerships or area forums of one kind or another must mean that one could show an increase in the number of individuals drawn into this process. (ODPM, 2002d: 4)

However, some authors (for example, Foley and Martin, 2000b; Brownill and Darke, 1998; and Anastacio *et al.* 2000) have detected a positive change in the *promotion* of policy on community involvement but remain sceptical about the speed at which this makes a difference on the ground.

What aims are held for community involvement?

Public policy since 1997 has made clear the government's aim of promoting community involvement. For example, in the local government white paper, *Strong Local Leadership – Quality Public Services* (DTLR, 2001), the Prime Minister talked of people wanting 'their voices heard when decisions are made about how these services are delivered' (Foreword). The document goes on to state:

Effective community engagement leads to better decisions and better implementation. Community involvement is a key component of best value. Area consultation and decision making arrangements have a valuable role to play in helping to involve citizens in decisions which affect them, particularly on neighbourhood issues. (p. 20)

In a similar vein, in his foreword to the White Paper on urban policy (Prescott, 2000) the Deputy Prime Minister sets out the importance attached to engaging the public:

We will only achieve real, sustainable change if local people are in the driving seat from the start, tailoring strategies to local needs. (p. 6)

The Home Office leads the government's civil renewal efforts. Civil renewal is 'about negotiating a new relationship between citizen and state, seeking to empower people to be active in furthering not only their own interests but those of other people in their community (whether a community of place or interest)'. This is to be done 'for a variety of reasons':

*in recognition that the state, even at local government level, can only ever provide part of the solution to the issues that matter most to people ... and that, with the right support and motivation, local people and community groups will readily play an active role in partnership with the state.
.. as a contributor to social capital ... Building strong, active communities reinforces a virtuous circle with a healthy civil society. (Home Office website)*

Community involvement is given particular prominence in policy to tackle social exclusion in deprived areas and additional resources are directed to assisting excluded groups to participate. The National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (SEU, 2001) claims the importance of community engagement to the achievement of its goals to create a more integrated and less unequal society.

The ODPM-commissioned review usefully distinguishes six principles or purposes of community involvement in urban policy:

- i. involvement is people's right;
- ii. involvement overcomes alienation;
- iii. involvement makes the community stronger in itself;
- iv. involvement maximises the effectiveness of services and resources;
- v. involvement helps 'join-up' different contributions to development; and
- vi. involvement helps sustainability. (2002d: 2-3)

In summary, and in the language of democratic theory, three reasons are advanced by government for promoting community involvement:

- it aids social cohesion through its developmental or educational effect on individuals and hence on society; and it fosters social capital;
- it makes a difference to the planning and delivery of public services and aids decision making processes; further, decisions are more likely to be effective and are accorded legitimacy since they reflect the interests of those who participated in the process of decision-making; and
- it is a right that is justified on the grounds of due process, irrespective of outcome, and that demonstrates the exercise of citizenship rights and obligations.

Research into community involvement in ABIs might be expected to explore the extent to which key actors at area level share these views of the purpose of community involvement. But most studies take involvement as a given, neither defining how they understand its meaning nor investigating what informants say it is for. Newburn and Jones (2001) and Osborne *et al.* (2002) provide two of the few accounts of this. Crime and disorder partnerships named the identification of local issues as the main aim of their consultation efforts (Newburn and Jones, 2001). However, Osborne *et al.* (2002) find that, although community involvement is an often sought component of rural regeneration, The range of policy initiatives is characterised by a lack of clarity about what is meant by 'community involvement' (p. 37).

The taken-for-granted nature of community involvement in much of the literature is illustrated by a handbook for auditing community participation, based on fieldwork reported in Anastacio *et al.* (2000). Following a paragraph that states that it is worth rehearsing the arguments for community participation, Burns and Taylor provide a list, the source of which is unclear, headed 'Why community participation is essential':

- community definitions of need, problems and solutions are different from those put forward by service planners and providers;
- community knowledge is an important resource and widens the pool of experience and expertise that regeneration and renewal strategies can draw on;
- community participation gives local residents the opportunity to develop skills and networks that they need to address social exclusion;
- active participation of local residents is essential to improve democratic and service accountability;
- central government requires community participation in regeneration and renewal strategies. (2000: 2)

The impression is created that these are the authors' views and that these views were not necessarily reflected in the attitudes and actions of interviewees. Similarly, Burton has difficulty knowing how to judge the claims made for and against greater involvement in neighbourhood regeneration by the authors he reviews. How far these claims are based on empirical evidence, theoretical writings or normative judgements of authors is not clear. The authors he reviews perceive the main benefits of participation as being:

- that the public at large ... provide a contrasting perspective to the views of the professional or political elite;
- that the public offer greater scope for generating more creative proposals and solutions – for thinking outside the box, in the parlance of ‘modern’ policy making;
- that lay people can provide the application of common sense to policy proposals – an important form of reality check;
- that residents of an area subject to intervention will have important knowledge and expertise – as consumers, as residents in a locality, as victims of crime, as people who are long term unemployed or chronically sick or disabled.

Equally the sources for the pitfalls and reservations identified by various authors and summarised by Burton are not clear:

- that lay people are unknowing or ignorant, especially about complex or difficult policy issues;
- that they are likely to be subjective and self interested and unable to see the wider or public interest;
- that they might be biased or prejudiced;
- that they might be too emotive and incapable of rigorous and rational analysis. (2003: 8)

Local contexts

The importance that particular features of local contexts may have on community involvement is a feature of many studies. The previous history and pattern of community involvement emerges as a key issue. For example, Ashworth (2000) describes an environment in which the history of local regeneration and involvement had led to deep rooted suspicion and cynicism among the local population, such that a door knocking campaign in the area ‘resulted for the most part in reactions that ranged from indifference to outright hostility’ (p. 256). Nevertheless, a new approach was developed in which the principles of collaboration and consensus were paramount and a serious effort was made to involve people from all sectors of the local community, including residents, members of local groups, business people and public sector workers. Councillors were also involved as the formal representatives with many statutory decision making responsibilities. In a study of neighbourhood participation in two Scottish SIPs, previous initiatives in community involvement had created:

Many formal mechanisms for citizen participation at neighbourhood level ... area committees .. , community councils, ... the devolution of responsibility for service delivery ... and the establishment of local economic development agencies ... (Docherty et al. 2001: 2234)

This study points to the low levels of community involvement that might be expected in the types of areas that are often the focus of ABIs. However, although higher levels of political participation are associated with high educational attainment, psychological attachment to a political party, and not being young, such factors do not determine behaviour and local factors may generate involvement (Parry *et al.* 1992).

McGregor *et al.* (1992) point also to the nature of the population as well as local histories of participation as important determinants of the capacity of communities to get involved. The age profile of the local population can be important as there is some evidence to suggest that participation is greatest among those aged over 30:

This does not imply that community participation cannot take root in areas like Fairfield and Ferguslie Park (i.e. with relatively youthful profiles); rather that it may require long gestation periods and greater supportive resourcing. (p. 110)

This study identifies existing formal community organisations as part of the context and suggests that it cannot be assumed they are representative or necessarily the best vehicles for participation. However, the capacity of these organisations is susceptible to change and development, both positively and negatively. In other words, community organisations can be

overburdened to the point of collapse or can be supported with training and development to help them cope with the pressures of managing involvement.

Khamis (2000) points to the difference that can be made by local perceptions of issues. Thus he argues that while in many areas, an immediate threat to existing services (a school or a post office for example) often serves to mobilise some sections of the local population, in others a more gradual and patient approach is necessary:

starting with community surveys and one-off consultations around particular issues, sometimes using Planning for Real techniques, and building community involvement around particular projects or through tenants' and residents' associations before moving on to the establishment of community forums. (p. 265)

Parkes also suggests that the prominence of the cause helps to get and keep people involved:

there is nothing like one of the highest profile and long running regeneration dramas in the UK to keep local people involved, and interest from researchers and the media has rubbed off onto KXRLG (Kings Cross Railway Lands Group) (2000: 262)

This case illustrates well that adversity or external threat can foster community spirit and involvement. While in some cases the external threat might be perceived by others to be illegitimate (campaigns to exclude asylum seekers, or to oppose the provision of mental health services in a locality, for example), this case has shown that the prospect of major redevelopment can galvanise local people to take collective action over a long period of time in defence of their interests.

Finally, Osborne *et al.* (2002) make four points about wider institutional and geographical contexts:

- In Northern Ireland, the familiar distinction between communities of interest and communities of place takes on added significance where many rural partnerships are committed to working with communities of place rather than communities of interest because of the association with conflict and sectarianism in many of the latter.
- Rural geography provides three types of influences: *scale*, reflected in challenges to transport, for example; *rural demography*, especially low population densities; and the *strength of identification* with some communities of place to the extent that cooperative relations with neighbouring areas can be difficult to realise.
- There is no Scottish or Irish equivalent of the English Countryside Agency but various devolved structures exist in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and regional development offices and government offices operate in England. Community regeneration is given greater prominence in Scotland, economic development is more to the fore in England, while peace and reconciliation dominates in Northern Ireland. And there are differences in models of local governance in the four parts of the UK.
- Fourthly, financial regimes are also significant. For example, the Peace and Reconciliation Programme in Northern Ireland provides funds for the community sector unmatched in England and Scotland. However, Osborne *et al.* claim that the resources available for rural regeneration do not match those for urban regeneration, but that this somewhat paradoxically means that relatively small amounts of money can have a large effect. It is also worth noting the greater significances of EU funding regimes in the rural context.

In summary, many local contextual factors are said to be implicated in the prospects for and experience of community involvement in particular ABIs. These include the history of previous ABIs and community involvement initiatives, the geographic, demographic, socio-economic and political characteristics of the area, the institutional and funding context, and the capacity of community organisations to respond to involvement opportunities.

What techniques, methods and support?

There are no simple answers to questions such as whether grants schemes, citizens' panels, the employment of community development officers, public meetings or forums of community group representatives are best for achieving community involvement in ABIs – it depends. Studies vary in how far they set out clearly what techniques and methods are used to generate or foster involvement and in how far they evaluate the effectiveness of particular methods at achieving their purpose. The effect is that the literature is scattered with general references to techniques and methods but details of how they operate and what they achieve are sparse.

Techniques range from those for *publicity* and *consultation* to community *control* of assets, projects or services. Newburn and Jones (2001) review good practice in consultation by crime and disorder partnerships. A list of methods includes citizens' panels, citizens' juries, public opinion surveys, crime prevention panels, focus groups and public meetings. Brown (2002) provides a typology based on the purposes detected in different methods. These are described in a review of 13 'Working for Communities Pathfinder' schemes funded under the Scottish Executive's programme of that name. Four purposes of community involvement are distinguished:

- consultation and awareness raising; for example, community newspapers, 'fun days', information fairs, community conferences and direct approaches to service users and community groups;
- developing community capacity; for example, training, including joint training of community representatives and professional officers, provision of accommodation to be used as a base by community groups, and support by dedicated ABI officers for community representatives;
- community involvement in project management; for example, by membership of committees and boards, through the employment of local people, and through direct community control of projects or services; and
- widening participation; for example, by setting up a youth council, using newsletters and other 'advertising' to attract new participants, and providing community work support in planning transitions from 'old' to 'new' representatives.

Some of the literature reports on innovative methods of involvement. For example, Ram (1995) provides an unusual example of a novel mechanism for involving young people, using drama for researching needs as part of a regeneration initiative. He draws on his experience as a consultant to a City Challenge scheme and notes:

the use of drama...offered a novel means of bringing the reality of young people's lives to the attention of policy makers. However, the City Council, and in turn the Department of the Environment, appeared more interested in gathering 'facts', perhaps reflecting the positivistic predilections of such institutions and the way they define 'problems' (p. 83)

This paper highlights many of the tensions that can exist not least when community involvement requires political negotiation between different forms of involvement. Thus the conventional public meeting or questionnaire survey may be welcomed by some, while others are prepared to experiment with more innovative forms such as consensus conferences, community visioning exercises, drama and so on.

Similarly, a wide range of support and resources is reported, including skilled and experienced staff, training and skills development for local residents and others, grants schemes for community and voluntary organisations, and what might be described as 'venture social capital' or research and development funding for new initiatives that have yet to reach the stage of being fully developed proposals.

The varied role that specialist staff may play is stressed in Holden and Craig's (2002) account of the use of five community health development workers in the Hull and East Riding Health Action Zone, supported by the Community Development Foundation. They focus on the impact the workers have had on health service workers and on organisational change in health services

rather than on the community. But community development staff are not universally acknowledged as useful. Osborne *et al.* (2002) report that some respondents in their study raised questions about the value of professional community development workers. Professionals of this type were felt to inhibit as well as enhance community leadership skills, although the study team concluded that so long as their role was clearly defined and focused the risk of this could be minimised.

Parkes (2000) refers to another type of specialist advice and asserts the importance of technical and research support in the Kings Cross area. In this case, staff and students at the Bartlett School at the University of London provided a variety of technical support over the years. Ouf (2002) also suggests that initiatives require the free flow of simple technical knowledge about alternative development decisions. However, he supports also the view that initiatives are best executed with the support of enthusiastic local leaders who have a degree of independence from the organising or sponsoring body.

In his personal account, Parkes (2000) argues for recognition of the widest range of methods, techniques and support. He draws on his experience of working with the Kings Cross Group throughout the 1990s as it battled to secure community involvement in plans for the major redevelopment of this key site in central London. He focuses on what was done to keep a relatively large group of people (180 individuals and 90 group members) involved in the project over the course of a decade or more. A panoply of participation techniques were tried:

We have therefore involved almost every possible means of community participation in planning, from 'Planning for Real' in 1990 to a design game for 6 and 7 year olds more recently....Our members have become so knowledgeable about the technical aspects of planning and transport that we are now 'capacity building' the planning officers who call our members for advice! Who says community organisations are always the weaker partner? (2000: 262)

In summary, a wide variety of techniques, methods and support is available to foster community involvement but there is no simple way of knowing which is best. Flexibility and variety are recommended by studies that focus on this aspect of involvement.

Structures and processes

Accounts tend to emphasise community and voluntary groups, on the one hand, and specially created structures such as area forums and partnership boards, on the other, as the basis for community involvement. Brennan, Rhodes and Tyler (1998) recognise the potential link between these two types of structure in describing the extent and pattern of community involvement in the establishment and management of SRB schemes. They found that only a handful could be said to be led by community or voluntary groups. In some areas, programmes of community capacity building were set up prior to seeking the active engagement of community groups, but it is not clear whether these were found to have generated more involvement.

Accounts stress the role of well-resourced community based organisations, including those with representative roles. For example, the case studies in the McGregor *et al.* study illustrate that some community organisations, community-based housing organisations in particular, were well resourced in comparison with others. This allowed progress on the housing front and a degree of extension into other fields, such as local economic development, that was not possible elsewhere. McGregor *et al.* suggest that it might, therefore, be more productive to build on the relatively strong base of involvement they provide when looking to expand into other issues.

Osborne *et al.* (2002) argue that intermediate bodies that serve as conduits for funds from above can take on an added importance in a rural setting and can do much to stimulate community involvement. They can help in:

- targeting funds directly to rural communities;

- managing the burden of bureaucratic requirements associated with particular funding streams;
- developing local community capacity and confidence;
- linking different community involvement initiatives;
- representing community views on more strategic level bodies; and
- ensuring that community representatives on strategic and other bodies remain accountable to their local communities.

In contrast, many studies focus on the participation of community representatives on area-wide partnerships established to manage the ABI. Such partnership structures are typically at the pinnacle of the work of specific ABIs. One key issue is the extent to which community representatives serving on such partnership structures can be expected to be representative of the diversity of communities. The difficulty of the role of representative is described by a 'community professional' interviewed by Anastacio *et al.* as 'stuck in the middle' between professionals and the community (p. 23). Different measures to resolve the difficulties of representation can create their own problems. Two types of measure were most commonly reported.

First, community forums can bring community and voluntary organisations together to appoint community representatives onto partnership or other structures involving individual agencies. These forums can find it hard to build consensus or find a way of representing diversity. For example, McGregor *et al.* saw dangers in both *filtering* (where certain views are excluded, either intentionally or otherwise) and *silting up* (where channels are unable to cope with the volume or diversity of views) (1992: 112).

In another case, Ashworth (2000) describes a Partnership Council established and fed by seven forums representing different interests in Nottingham. A constitution ensured that no single group could outvote the others and progress could only be made through consensus. While this approach was in general felt to be successful, there were difficulties and tensions. These include the fact that some residents saw partnership working as 'nothing short of collusion' (p. 259), while many saw 'the business sector as the enemy and public and voluntary sectors as not much better' (ibid). The working groups were often difficult to manage, especially in the early days and the first meeting of the Voluntary Sector Forum led to fights in the street outside the meeting. She also notes that the need for capacity building was not limited to local residents, and many other representatives needed training and support in learning to work in a less adversarial way.

Khamis (2000) also draws on personal experience in writing about 'what works in establishing community forums that make a difference'. He establishes his criteria for success as:

Ultimately, the success of community forums and other consultative mechanisms needs to be judged against whether such forums enable communities in a deprived area to gain greater control over the quality of their lives. This comes down to a greater capacity to draw more resources into their area and to shape services and developments to meet local residents' needs more effectively. (p. 266)

The second approach to securing involvement from minority groups is through the development of separate channels for involvement by particular groups (defined by factors such as age or ethnicity). Some authors say that these are as likely to be divisive as they are to promote more widespread involvement. Fitzpatrick *et al.* argue that the appropriate choice is not between *either* separate structures for minority interests *or* integration into partnership structures but instead there is a need for attention to the range of channels and activities required to secure inclusion. They conclude that youth forums 'are not the solution to securing effective youth participation, although they can play a useful role if they are well organised and resourced, and integrated into wider structures' (1998: 33).

Finally, other authors endorse this view that structures alone cannot be expected to engender involvement. Osborne *et al.* for example, explored the role of local leadership as an important component of building community skills and conclude that different leadership roles were required

at different stages in the development of local initiatives. At the outset, inspirational leadership was often most needed, with this giving way to managerial competencies as projects became more established. Eventually the skills of working in and with more complex networks came to the fore as projects expanded their operations from a relatively secure base. It is worth noting that projects often found it difficult to adjust to these different requirements as they developed, not least because training and development opportunities were not always available to key project staff.

Further, a range of different approaches to developing these skills and competencies were needed, but were not always available. The approaches included the use of 'animateurs', formal and more conventional training courses and some relatively novel and experiential approaches to learning. The study team conclude that:

Formal training is perhaps more effective at developing strategic skills in individuals, while experiential learning has most impact at the community project level. (p. 40)

Ouf (2002) argues that flexibility is more important than structure in discussing the use of a technique known as Disjointed Site Management (DSM) as a means of involving members of the local community in the redevelopment of older districts in Cairo. DSM involves the management of site based redevelopment work and is disjointed in the sense that it does not have to follow a set pattern of activity or even a standard approach.

McGregor *et al.* (1992) also emphasise the potential of informal as well as formal mechanisms, using a case study of Maryhill (Glasgow). This demonstrated the value of informal channels of community participation, in which dialogue could be developed and private conversations between community activists and officials could take place without the need to adopt more public postures that might hinder effective discussion. The downside of this informality lay in its exclusivity and the potential it had for creating divisions between representatives and the wider community. Additional channels were also required to ensure communication with non-activists:

More specifically, the surveys pointed to the relative ineffectiveness of public meetings and to the benefits of engaging directly with individuals through personal correspondence. (p. 111).

The involvement of particular groups

Many of the studies included in this review have acknowledged the importance of recognising that most 'communities' are in fact diverse and not homogenous and report difficulties in reflecting this diversity in the work of ABIs. Reports refer to the exclusion experienced by working class people, members of black and ethnic minority groups, disabled people, young people, women and homeless people (for example, Brownill and Darke, 1998; Anastacio *et al.* 2000; Fitzpatrick *et al.* 1996; Ram, 1995; and Edwards, 2001). A few reports and papers focus explicitly on the involvement, or otherwise, of particular groups. This report has already drawn on some of these and here reviews some more of their key findings.

In a series of unpublished research reports and in a synthesis report, Fitzpatrick, Hastings and Kintrea (1998) describe the difficulties faced by young people in disadvantaged communities and investigate the extent to which regeneration projects have met their needs. They also examine the extent to which young people had become active participants in these initiatives. The research involved case studies of 12 initiatives across the UK, with six followed up in greater depth. In total 200 people were interviewed, including around 80 young people.

They found that young people and adult decision-makers typically had very different views about the priorities of regeneration and the position of young people within regeneration plans and initiatives. Adults tended to focus on the perceived training and education needs of young people, while young people themselves were more concerned with changing the perceptions that adults had of them and of improving their relations with the police. Young people in the 14-19 year age range appeared to be most well catered for, while those who were over 20 felt neglected.

Drawing on the principle that young people warranted attention both in their own right and as the next generation of active citizens, local professionals rather than current activists initiated most activity to draw young people into the process. The study reports that the most common mechanism to secure the involvement of young people was the creation of young people's forums. These ranged from formal structures with relatively generous funding, to looser groupings of young people with no independent resources.

In many respects, the involvement of young people required greater support than their adult equivalents because young people were generally less confident and less experienced. The level of turnover in young people's engagement with youth forums was also often quite high, which created problems of sustainability.

The report concludes that forums – typically comprising around 15 active members – did provide a visible and relatively formal channel for communicating with young people. Further, the profile of most forums reflected the ethnic, class and gender composition of the local population of young people, mainly due to the proactive stance taken by the youth workers who supported their development. However, they were not without problems, such as:

- the lack of a sense of purpose;
- a lack of integration with other decision making structures of the initiative;
- a lack of democratic structures of accountability to the wider constituency of young people; and
- a perception among both adults and other young people that forums constituted a token device to legitimise decisions taken by adults rather than to allow young people's involvement to make an impact on projects.

Nevertheless, it was also clear that these initiatives had a very positive impact on the individual young people who were involved. In this their experience represents something of a microcosm of the experiences of anyone involved in ABIs.

Edwards (2001; 2002) analysed the experiences of and position within SRB initiatives of another excluded group: disabled people. She conducted a national postal survey and 80 interviews with regeneration managers, local authority officers, disabled people and people working for disability groups in three London boroughs between 1998 and 2000. She notes at the outset that disabled people are not prominent in the policy documents of regeneration in general or SRB in particular:

disabled people are noticeably absent from the regeneration agenda at the national and local level. Disabled people tend not to be identified as consultees of regeneration schemes or indeed decision-makers in the policy process. Despite moves by the government to construct citizens as stakeholders, therefore, paternalistic attitudes, and the exclusivity of political processes still persist. (p. 124)

Edwards identifies a number of barriers that face disabled people who want to get involved in regeneration:

- i. officers and managers of SRB schemes do not see disability as a key issue, even when they have a general commitment to work with excluded groups;
- ii. budget constraints within schemes would be challenged if adequate provision was made for disabled people;
- iii. disability is often felt to be beyond the technical capacity of most of those working within regeneration projects;
- iv. those working within disability groups often have poor knowledge of regeneration policies and programmes;
- v. many disabled people know little about the world of regeneration;
- vi. few disabled groups have the resources to engage effectively with regeneration organisations, especially in bidding for funds;
- vii. disabled people who are active in regeneration arenas often face considerable difficulties of accessibility;

- viii. disabled people can face multiple forms of exclusion on account of their age, gender, ethnicity or class as well as their disability.

She concludes by referring to the 'disconnected worlds' of disability and regeneration in which:

The processes through which the SRB operates would seem to reinforce this exclusion, as centrally defined funding criteria and outputs constrain attempts by regeneration managers to target or involve disabled people. (p. 133)

whilst at the same time:

Disabled people's involvement is also circumscribed from below by the lack of access to information and knowledge about the SRB. (ibid)

Another review, focused on ethnic and gender diversity, chimes with Edwards' conclusions. Brownill and Darke (1998) reviewed the evidence about the focus of local regeneration strategies and found that although women and members of minority ethnic groups are over-represented in areas targeted for regeneration, race and gender are rarely prioritised within regeneration policy at any level. They also found that women were often excluded or unable to participate effectively because of a combination of lack of confidence, economic discrimination and domestic responsibilities, while members of minority ethnic groups were excluded by the application of stereotypes and in some instances by language and cultural differences.

They found two approaches to placing race and gender on the agenda of regeneration bodies were prominent. Firstly, universal strategies address these issues as part of a wider programme of tackling social exclusion, although questions are raised about the prominence achieved by race and gender in this approach. Secondly, specific policies are developed to tackle the exclusions and inequities of racism and patriarchy. They share Fitzpatrick *et al.*'s (1998) view that ABIs are best placed if they adopt a mixture of universal and targeted (on particular groups) initiatives.

Finally, in a recent study, Farnell *et al.* (2003) examine the 'neglected dimension' of faith communities in area initiatives. Their research in Bradford, Coventry, Newham and Sheffield comprised mainly in-depth interviews with national faith leaders, local activists from faith communities and others from non-clerical positions. Their main findings show that diversity can pose many types of challenges to policy processes:

- i. faith communities bring important resources to policy processes, including a strong commitment to social action over time, a commitment to listen to people, and spaces for informal activities, although there are significant inequalities in the extent to which different faith groups are willing and able to do this;
- ii. due to their highly diverse theologies, values and forms of organisation, effective engagement with faith communities usually requires a high degree of 'religious literacy' of officials and can present major challenges in reconciling religious and secular principles;
- iii. many active members of faith communities require more proactive forms of engagement than others and cannot simply be enlisted for relatively passive consultation events; and
- iv. differences of faith can lie at the heart of long term divisions within geographical communities and create fundamental problems for effective policy.

Impact

The impact of community involvement is frequently discussed but few authors provide a systematic discussion of how far it met the aims of the ABI or the aims set for it by actors or authors. This is not too surprising, given the low level of resources available to many studies, the complexity of measuring impacts and the long timescales over which impacts emerge.

One of the most systematic accounts of impact is provided by Newburn and Jones (2002), who make clear that it is 'outputs' rather than 'outcomes' that are reported – the latter must come later, since the crime and disorder partnerships started work only after 1998. They document a number

of impacts on the priorities set by strategy documents and on early stages of implementation as a result of consultation by crime and disorder partnerships. These show achievements in relation to two of the three possible aims of community involvement identified in the earlier summary of government objectives for community involvement. Overall, Newburn and Jones report that 36 per cent of partnerships said that benefits outweigh disadvantages, 41 per cent said that costs and benefits were roughly equal and 19 per cent felt that costs outweighed benefits.

In relation to social cohesion and social capital, Newburn and Jones identify 'facilitating co-operation and communication' as an important impact. This extended beyond the immediate impact on crime and disorder strategies to foster further forms of communication. As one divisional commander commented: 'I would say that on the back of this we (the police) have strengthened our relationship with other agencies, and we have made new links with others' (p. 45).

It was in the development of crime and disorder strategies that Newburn and Jones identify most impact. This in some cases involved strategies being altered to accommodate needs identified through consultation. More commonly and, they say, just as important, the priorities in draft strategies were re-ordered or confirmed through consultation. Some of the examples they cite are about acknowledging 'minority' issues, such as attacks on gay and lesbian people, domestic violence and racist crime.

Below are discussed the impacts detected by other studies under the three headings identified earlier.

Social cohesion

There is mixed evidence about whether community involvement has a positive or negative effect on social cohesion, partly because this is often the area where authors feel least satisfied with what has been achieved and focus on communication and other barriers. Instead of social capital and cohesion the outcome can be frustration and alienation. For example, there are several accounts of ways in which community involvement has been marred by barriers such as 'lack of accessible information, inappropriate times for meetings, lack of childcare provision, lack of transparency in decision making, and lack of tangible results from the process' (Anastacio *et al.* 2000: 43). Dobbs and Moore (2002) also report some instances of existing tensions being exacerbated by working together.

However, more positive impacts on social cohesion are detected by many authors. For example, Dobbs and Moore's (2002) account of involving local people in surveys required for planning purposes reports that impacts on the community included greater ownership by local people of the findings and any subsequent local policy developments, and a greater sense of identification with the local area – especially areas that had been artificially constructed to suit the requirements of the regeneration process.

Further, providing information enables them 'to begin to understand their current position and ultimately to act on issues which have a direct impact on their own lives' (p. 168). While established cultures of bureaucratic working were not fundamentally challenged, there were instances of a greater commitment to community empowerment and the establishment of more trust. The overall impression was of improvement:

on the whole there was evidence of individuals beginning to embrace the new culture of openness and being willing to be tolerant of the constraints that agency and voluntary sector representatives might be facing within their own organisations. (p. 169)

Trust is a major issue in Docherty *et al.*'s (2001) study that tests whether lower levels of trust in local government exist in poor areas. The highest level is in a mixed area, not the subject of a Social Inclusion Partnership, but levels of trust are similar in the two SIPs and in another mixed area higher trust is strongly associated with a belief that the area is improving and with housing association tenure (Goodlad *et al.* 2003). However, the household survey shows lower levels of

trust between residents and community activists in SIP areas compared with non-SIP areas, a worrying finding given the emphasis in public policy on community groups as representatives of the community.

Ouf also finds benefits in bringing people together through DSM:

- the fact that it is site-based allows different people to get involved in the work at different times of the day to suit the rhythms of their daily lives;
- it allows for informal communications with a variety of groups, many of whom are likely to be marginalised and unlikely to respond positively to more formal means of communication such as written requests or invitations to attend formal meetings.

Shaw and Davidson (2002) also detect positive impacts in their study of the use of non-statutory elections to provide community representation on NDC Partnerships in Newcastle. In the West Gate area of Newcastle, the turnout in NDC elections exceeded that in the preceding local elections by up to 23 percentage points and also succeeded in producing a more diverse set of representatives than is often found on local councils: of the nine elected, four were women and three were from the area's Asian communities (p. 10). These elections contribute to a 'continuum' whereby residents have greater choice in the nature and extent of their involvement and:

- enhance the legitimacy of the community representatives elected to the Board;
- have an educative role in respect of elections and the NDC; and
- allow different sub areas of the NDC area to have direct and formal representation. (p. 10)

Similarly, from the social surveys of local perceptions Rhodes *et al.* point to the way that involvement can foster further involvement:

Although changes in community perceptions cannot be directly linked to participation rates in SRB initiatives, it is suggested that communities exhibiting a more positive attitude towards the social fabric and operation of their community are more likely to participate in further regeneration activities. (2002: 59).

Hughes and Carmichael (1998) reach similar conclusions, drawing on research from the Shankill area of Belfast. Their case study examines the practicalities of partnership work around the initiative of 'Making Belfast Work' (MBW). The success of MBW in securing funding from the European Union's URBAN initiative demonstrated that, at least superficially, it satisfied the requirement to develop a genuine partnership between various interests, including those of local communities.

McArthur (1995) also suggests that there is evidence of some changes to the working practices of officials following community involvement. They had become more accessible to local groups; and had adopted a more local focus to some aspects of their work. Further, they had begun to communicate in a more open style and used less jargon. However, he suggests that these marginal changes have been confined mainly to the level of individuals and have not been systemic.

In summary, although the evidence is mixed and not definitive about the relative weight of positive and negative impact, most authors appear to agree that positive impacts on social cohesion outweigh negative and include:

- greater co-operation, communication and contact between participants and others, which fosters further communication in future;
- ownership of the outcome of involvement and any subsequent policy developments;
- a greater sense of identification with the local area;
- a greater tolerance by all of the constraints under which public and community representatives operate;
- some positive signs of trust being developed; and
- a sense of partnership and some changed working practices in official agencies.

Public policy and service delivery

Many authors report that community involvement has had a positive impact on planning, service delivery and other aspects of ABIs' objectives. As Anastacio *et al.* recount:

A community representative ... commented: "We do have some influence on the board", and continued to provide examples of groups, such as refugees and homeless children whose needs had been placed on the agenda (2000: 30).

However, amidst the positive reports, some problems are identified in the literature. Many authors see practical difficulties with the way that involvement is organised but are generally positive about the potential of involvement to achieve instrumental gains for the community. Despite the difficulties, most authors reviewed here are reluctant to give up on community involvement (for example, McArthur, 1995: 64; McGregor *et al.* 1992; and Anastacio *et al.* 2000).

In contrast, some authors see such dangers in community involvement that they are unsure whether the balance lies in its favour. Cooke and Kothari's collection (2001) is the main example in this review. One such danger is said to be that of incorporation, whereby those who were once vociferous in their protests are sucked into a more docile position either by rewards or by the burdens of overwork. One current view about the value of the emphasis on community involvement in public policy sees it as a device for obscuring both social exclusion and the inadequacy of public policy in tackling it (Imrie and Raco, 2003). A variation of this problem lies in the possibility of some grass roots organisations losing direct contact with some key statutory bodies at the expense of less focused representative structures and hence finding that their capacity to press for improvements is compromised.

Despite the perceived weaknesses of community involvement processes and structures, many authors report positive impacts on public policy and service delivery. Dobbs and Moore, for example, describe how:

community involvement in evaluation by employing, training and supporting local residents to carry out a range of baseline and impact surveys ... (led to) the data (going) beyond the initial requirements of the partnerships to provide an insight into issues identified as significant by the community (2002: 157).

Further, the members of the teams were paid at the going (university) rate for the job; they were employed, albeit temporarily; their skills were enhanced; and their self confidence and sense of self-esteem increased. Within three months, 50 per cent of all the individuals involved had found further work, and in several cases they were exploring ways of acquiring additional qualifications to be able to continue with research work.

More prosaically, Rhodes *et al.* report that:

Where community involvement has been significant in SRB schemes there has often been a definable impact in terms of the effectiveness of the scheme in meeting its targets and developing a more robust forward strategy. (2002: 46)

McArthur (1995) also suggests there is evidence of community involvement helping to shape regeneration strategies. Often this involved a broadening of the regeneration agenda to include a wider range of social as well as economic goals. On the Wester Hailes estate, local concerns with childcare and crime were incorporated into the work of the Partnership and McArthur argues that this appears to be repeated in other areas. Further, initiatives involving community partnerships almost inevitably produce unintended consequences and spin-offs that can sometimes be harnessed for the benefit of the local community. However, McArthur also cites cases where community groups have taken up positions completely at odds with both national policy and the goals of the Partnership and failed to achieve their wishes – for example, in resisting stock transfers and tenure change.

Kintrea's (1996) conclusion of a case study of a Paisley neighbourhood is also that community involvement made a positive difference:

It is not fanciful to suggest that community action did much to keep Ferguslie Park in the vision of politicians and officials, and may have been instrumental in its identification as an Urban Partnership in the first place. (p. 299)

McGregor *et al.* (1992) agree that in some of their case study areas the profile of the area had been raised 'and almost certainly secured additional investment and resources for the area as a result' (p. 115). While acknowledging the limitations of drawing on only a few case studies, McGregor *et al.* conclude that their research has demonstrated the potential for community involvement to make a positive difference:

The community-based housing initiative at Dalskeith and the formal participation of the community in the Ferguslie Park Partnership may bring lasting gains where other initiatives have failed in the past. (p. 115)

Dibben and Bartlett (2001) focus on best value in their study of the extent to which public involvement resulted in change in the ways that local authorities deliver services. They report mixed outcomes about impact on service from semi-structured interviews with a range of actors in four contrasting local authority areas. This study has been included because of its relatively robust research design and the richness of the empirical data generated.

They found some correlation with the extent and type of community involvement used in each case study area. In one area, small changes in service were aimed for and achieved through dialogue with some service users. Those involved felt that, by and large, their views had been heard and had been influential but, because the anticipated changes had been substantially constrained from the outset, the exercise as a whole was felt to be little more than a 'talking shop'. In another case, a community development approach was taken with a view to developing additional services and this was felt to be successful by all parties. The service users felt a real sense of achievement. The third case study achieved less change. A postal survey was used to elicit suggestions for changes to existing services and also to further enhance the council's reputation for being responsive to users. Although individual participants gained little personally from the exercise, either in terms of services that they proposed or through being more involved in decision making, they found this level of engagement acceptable.

In the final case, public meetings were held as part of a consultation exercise with tenants. Many tenants felt their views were not taken into account. Moreover, officers concerned saw the exercise as mainly about driving through a set of proposals to which the authority was already committed.

In conclusion, Dibben and Bartlett suggest that their analysis shows:

an association between clarity of purpose, an intention to empower service users, careful selection of methods, innovative changes in provision and the extent to which the users felt empowered through the process. (2001: 56)

In summary, although authors report some practical difficulties with the way that involvement is organised these are insufficient to overturn the generally positive findings of most authors of the impacts on public policy and service delivery that include:

- policy and service effectiveness and realism;
- inclusion of issues such as childcare as well as economic aims into strategies and action;
- employment and training; and
- enhanced visibility of the area and its needs.

Due process

The third positive impact of community involvement is in the sense of inclusion, self-respect and self-esteem that comes from active citizenship. Hughes and Carmichael provide a reminder of how hard this can be to achieve in many ABIs:

The task of engaging the local community was beset with difficulty. The main objective...was creating a climate of inclusively and maintaining the co-operation of the more marginalised members of the community. (1998: 216)

Nevertheless, their research was able to develop some comparative measures and allow them to conclude that:

Whilst the arrangements in Greater Shankill for community involvement and development are acknowledged to be less than perfect, the relative success of the approach is highlighted by the failures of similar attempts at community consultation through partnership in an adjacent district of the city. (1998: 219)

They conclude that the Greater Shankill partnership demonstrates that it is possible to secure community involvement and that:

the sense of ownership and extent of empowerment generated augurs well for the project's successful implementation. (1998: 222)

Dobbs and Moore also found evidence of positive impacts on local residents who were able to feel more involved in processes of regeneration:

there was also an obvious levelling of power between community representatives and other previously dominant stakeholders...this helped to level the field. (2002: 168-9)

Docherty *et al.* show that adverse local contexts can be overcome and they provide evidence that one of the SIPs succeeded in generating relatively high levels of involvement because of the combination of physical improvements and efforts to support participation. A sense of inclusion was strongly associated with a feeling that the area was getting better:

residents' engagement with the governance process was influenced by the political institutions and public policies affecting the area. Broadly, people felt it worthwhile to participate because such participation was having an effect in securing improvements and because they felt they were listened to. (2002: 2245)

In summary, evidence that community involvement can generate a sense of inclusion, self-respect and self-esteem comes from several studies although few authors make explicit this aspect of impact. A sense of empowerment, a levelling of power between community representatives and other stakeholders, and a sense of inclusion were all reported.

This conclusion suggests that the beneficial impacts of community involvement are mutually reinforcing. Social cohesion, a perception that material improvements are resulting from community involvement and a sense of self-respect from inclusion generate a feedback loop that encourages further involvement.

5. What works? Lessons and good practice guidance

Many authors suggest that there are lessons to be learned from their findings. The first is that lessons can be learned, as Kintrea concludes from a case study of a regeneration partnership. He says that lessons of previous attempts to engender involvement had not been learnt and that to some extent an opportunity was wasted: 'As far as community participation is concerned the Partnership considered here seems to have taken few if any lessons from that experience in its early years' (1996: 304).

Here these are outlined under five topic headings:

- processes and structures for involvement;
- the nature of community;
- evaluating involvement;
- attitudes and expectations; and
- support and resources for community involvement.

Lessons

Processes, structures and methods for involvement

Many authors conclude that ABIs could have planned better for involvement. Aspects to be thought about in advance include approach, structures, roles, processes, methods and resources. Ideally, policy for community involvement is developed with community input (Chapman *et al.* 2001). Osborne *et al.* say it is important to clarify the nature of community involvement across a range of activities from direct engagement in project management to more selective involvement in strategic planning. The role expected of the community should be clearly articulated at the outset (Carley *et al.* 2000) and several authors argue that ABIs should map out and build on existing community activity (for example, Chapman *et al.* 2001).

That said, many authors also stress the need for flexibility. ABIs will not achieve their community involvement goals unless they develop an approach to programme and project development that allows strategic goals to be changed in the light of community involvement (Chapman *et al.* 2001). Structures should remain transparent and open to increasing participation over the lifetime of the ABI.

Osborne *et al.* also suggest that the pattern of community involvement will inevitably be uneven. They stress the need to use different organisations and structures in developing involvement mechanisms and ensuring good upwards and downwards links between them. Getting the right type of person, in the right project, at the right level of engagement and at the right stage of the project is hard and chance is likely to play a major part in the alignment of all of these aspects (Osborne *et al.* 2002).

Many authors feel they can offer lessons about the formal structures that exist for community involvement, such as partnership boards. Newburn and Jones provide a useful summary of lessons learned about particular consultation methods (2002: 47-50). Partnerships were most likely to report difficulties with methods such as questionnaires and surveys when engaging in consultation. Hastings *et al.* (1996) and Fitzpatrick *et al.* (1998), for example, argue that meetings of ABI partnership boards are often run like meetings of private sector companies: with very formal agendas, limited discussion, rapid decision-making, and use of jargon. This style of meeting is usually not conducive to the active or effective involvement of community representatives. Certain individuals in key roles – the chair of a local partnership board for example – can be very influential in determining the style of and scope for effective community involvement.

Further, complex structures of formal representation do not always capture the enthusiasm and commitment of local residents and hence can be counter-productive to the wider goals of involvement. They may provide arenas of involvement but these may not be the most significant arenas of decision making. They may also lead to concerns among local residents that existing mechanisms for involvement will be by-passed (Hastings *et al.* 1994; and Fitzpatrick *et al.* 1998).

The effectiveness of involvement appears to vary by policy area and there is some evidence that topics such as housing, poverty and young people's prospects are more susceptible to effective involvement than economic development, employment and training (McGregor *et al.* 1992; Docherty *et al.* 2001). This may be because local residents have greater confidence in their own expertise and practical experience in these areas.

Attitudes and expectations

Implicit or explicit in some authors' accounts of lesson learned is criticism of officials for being inadequately committed to community involvement (Anastacio *et al.* 2000; Brownill and Darke, 1998, for example). Some writers suggest that partners, especially public sector partners, do not understand the processes and consequences of a community development approach (Carley *et al.* 2000). Ashworth (2000) and several others see a need for greater recognition of the principles underlying the process of involvement, in particular the importance of respecting the different but equally valuable contributions that people from different backgrounds can make. Some partners do not always welcome a strong community voice, especially if there are difficulties in reaching agreement on issues of local concern. Nor do they always welcome being held to account by articulate and self-confident community representatives. In summary, Burns and Taylor, in presenting an audit tool to measure community participation, argue that more can and should be done:

to ensure that public bodies and others involved in partnerships give more priority to community involvement (2000: 1).

The expectations held of community representatives by fellow citizens and by officials can create difficulties. Officials can expect higher standards of representativeness and accountability than apply to the other partners (Hastings *et al.* 1994), while citizens can expect their representatives to be altruistic and selfless (Docherty *et al.* 2001). Ashworth (2000) points to the importance of officials taking the risk of being honest with local residents, especially about the real limits on change, about the comparative costs of different activities and about the likely timescale for seeing meaningful change.

Further, local residents do not always share the perception of some local professionals about the purpose of involvement. Officials may feel that the primary benefits of involvement lie in the personal development of community activists. However, it is likely that the priority for local people is to achieve policy or service or other tangible gains for their area (Docherty *et al.* 2001). These instrumental motivations to secure local improvements drive many of the community members who become involved, though the *outcome* may well include personal development (Goodlad, 2002).

The nature of community

The need to acknowledge the diversity of communities is one of the key issues on which consensus is apparent. ABI managers should consult and involve a wide spectrum of community views including excluded groups and pursue participation at different levels simultaneously. Chapman *et al.* (2001) are among several authors who see 'valuable lessons' to be learned about the need for ABIs to be clear about what constitutes the local community and should seek to be as inclusive as possible.

Edwards (2001), Brownill and Darke (1998), Anastacio *et al.* (2000) and Fitzpatrick *et al.* (1998) are amongst those who argue for particular groups to be taken into account. The prescriptions for improvements to policy and practice derived from studies of involvement by particular groups – that clarity of purpose is important, that dedicated support staff are needed and that the particular

group can learn much from other schemes – apply to many involvement activities regardless of which group is involved. Newburn and Jones report that crime and disorder partnerships were concerned that they did not have appropriate methods to consult ‘hard-to-reach’ groups.

Further, in seeking to involve a range of community members, it needs to be remembered that local residents who are not active or involved often have little idea of the nature of the ABIs or of the more active involvement of some of their local peers (Hastings *et al.* 1994).

Some authors point to the way in which successful community involvement can lead officials to be concerned that a small number of people (‘the usual suspects’) are dominating involvement. However, while there is evidence of local professionals expressing disquiet at the longevity of some people’s role as representatives, there can also be a problem of turnover and the consequential loss of community memory and experience (Fitzpatrick *et al.* 1998).

Osborne *et al.* (2002) draw a helpful distinction between those who are likely to be involved from the community at the strategic level and at ‘grassroots’ level. In the former, reliance is often placed on proxy representatives of the community such as a community leader or community development worker. At the more grassroots level there is greater scope for the involvement of local residents in project work, while linking the two levels is the position of ‘community proxies’ who can be held accountable by their communities. They conclude that:

The key lesson here is not to counterpose these differing types and levels of community involvement in rural regeneration partnerships, but rather to ensure that inward and downward linkages between them are in place. (2002: 38)

Evaluating involvement

Monitoring and evaluation is considered poor in ABIs. Several authors say lessons can be learned about the need to ensure that appropriate measures of success are built into monitoring and evaluation frameworks. These should be concerned with both measures of success with community involvement per se, and also the impact it has had on wider ABI objectives. The absence of such rigorous evaluation frameworks makes it difficult to measure final outcomes and to identify precisely the key contributing factors, such as community involvement.

Evaluation should cover the range of aims seen for community involvement, including those concerned with community capacity building, confidence building, skills development and training, as well as community involvement in the wider aims of the ABI (Chapman *et al.* 2001). Osborne *et al.* (2002) highlight the important contribution of evaluation in supporting involvement. It can help to measure not only the impacts of involvement but also the processes by which it works. Carley *et al.* (2000) consider it essential to measure success in relation to community confidence, skills and experience, and residents’ views of the impact of involvement.

Finally, some authors take issue with the perception of some of their interviewees that community involvement delays the operations of ABIs. They argue that it does not appear to prevent the achievement of final outcomes (Hastings *et al.* 1994; Fitzpatrick *et al.* 1998).

Support and resources for community involvement

There is probably more unanimity on the importance of providing resources to stimulate and sustain effective community involvement than there is on any other issue. A number of lessons are set down, though little is said about what adequate levels of funding would be. Carley *et al.* (2000) call for a budget and plan for community development, training and capacity building to be adopted from the start of partnerships. In rural areas small scale funding can often make a major impact not least in helping to overcome the costs of living and travelling in areas of population sparsity (Osborne *et al.* 2002).

Individuals playing representative roles on more formal regeneration bodies require very focused support to maximise their effectiveness, including help in understanding policy jargon, discussion

of agenda items prior to formal meetings, and the development of strategies for intervention at meetings. Community representatives can take a long time to find their feet and feel able to perform effectively. Sometimes this coincides with a growing sense of disillusionment with the pace of and scope for change in the locality (Anastacio, 2002).

Carley *et al.* make a useful distinction between resources for supporting community involvement per se and resources for the ABI. In doing so they make a point about the connection between these two types of resources since community involvement, no matter how well resourced, will not deliver what people want unless the ABI can ensure that resources are deployed to make the changes people want. They call for devolved budgets and local budgeting mechanisms so that local areas are properly empowered to affect local service planning and quality assessment (others would see the need as being more to 'bend' mainstream budgets).

Osborne *et al.* see evidence that resources have to be sustained over time. They note that many participants in their rural study felt that too much emphasis in policy and practice was devoted to encouraging community involvement in the early stages of an initiative and not enough to ensuring its sustainability. In particular the often small pool of committed individuals was prone to exploitation and to burn-out.

Ashworth (2000) and several other authors see a need to build the capacity of all participants, not just community members, not least in helping to challenge the prejudices that many people hold about those from different sectors. Community work staff can have a positive impact on other officials (Holden and Craig, 2002) as well as on the formation of new community groups, their effective operation and their influence in other more formal political arenas. This support can be needed for a number of years before it bears fruit (Hastings *et al.* 1994; Fitzpatrick *et al.* 1998).

Guidance to policy makers and professionals

There are many overlaps between the lessons learned and the guidance about good practice provided in the research. Here we concentrate on guidance offered to particular types of participants in ABIs, particularly professionals and policy makers. Most guidance is explicitly or implicitly directed at them; however, a few authors target a greater number of audiences and one such example is Fitzpatrick *et al.*'s (1998) 'practical suggestions' in four parts, aimed at regeneration practitioners and decision makers, youth workers, community organisations and young people, respectively.

Edwards recommends a number of changes that professionals and policy makers could make to improve the involvement of disabled people:

- re-defining disability, more in favour of the social rather than medical conception and thereby allowing disabled people and the barriers they face to be recognised as relevant to what ABIs do;
- identifying disabled people at a strategic level, especially in national and regional policy documents that invite bids for regeneration funds and provide the context in which such bids will be judged;
- ensuring that all programme managers are aware of their responsibilities under the Disability Discrimination Act;
- providing more time for consultation, especially in defining priorities at a local level so that more genuinely inclusive programmes can be developed; and
- ensuring that information is available in accessible formats so that disabled people can know of participation opportunities and what are seen as local issues.

Whilst recognising the specificities of these recommendations, it would appear that if they were to become accepted within the mainstream of ABI policy and practice, a much wider range of people would also benefit.

Botes and van Rensburg's (2000) review of community participation in urban development, from South Africa, offers a list of nine 'plagues' that blight participatory development and 12

'commandments' that try to overcome them. The 'commandments', apparently aimed at development workers, include:

- demonstrating an awareness of one's outsider status (as a development professional);
- respecting the contribution of indigenous communities;
- becoming good facilitators and communicators;
- promoting co-decision making;
- being prepared to communicate both project successes and failures;
- believing in principle such as solidarity, compassion, respect and collective unity;
- listening especially to the most vulnerable members of communities;
- guarding against the domination of some interest groups;
- encouraging cross-sector collaboration;
- acknowledging the importance of process as well as product;
- releasing the energies of communities;
- helping communities share the fruits of their development equitably. (p. 53-54)

Nearer home, Chapman *et al.* (2001) set out a number of principles deemed important in achieving effective community participation in ABIs and these read as if they are mainly aimed at policy makers and practitioners:

- trust among all partners;
- equality of formal powers;
- clarity of roles and responsibilities;
- agreement to listen;
- power sharing;
- accessible and transparent decision making structures;
- empowerment; and
- training, skills development and education for all partners.

Carley *et al.*'s (2000) factors that contribute to the effectiveness of partnerships seem to be targeted at a variety of types of partner as well as partnership managers:

- effective political and executive leadership;
- the use of visioning techniques to enable all relevant stakeholders to construct a shared vision of the future they hope to achieve;
- the translation of the broad vision into workable objectives, through the systematic preparation of an action plan;
- drawing local businesses into the partnership;
- achieving a reasonable balance between inclusiveness and efficiency in the day to day operations of partnership and management structures;
- fostering a culture of partnership in which all members are tolerant of the different emphases of their fellow partners and of their different capacities;
- allowing time for the skills and attributes of effective partnership working to develop among all members;
- building the community into partnership structures. (vi-viii).

Khamis (2000) identifies a further set of factors affecting the success of community involvement measures. These include:

- ensuring that any involvement structures have legitimacy in the eyes of local residents;
- achieving this by deciding on the formal basis for representative involvement and accountability, whether by election or by giving all residents a direct vote on, for example, a community forum;
- clarifying the precise powers of any involvement mechanisms, such as the power to make decisions or to express opinions that are non-binding;

- ensuring that forums and other opportunities for involvement are transparent and accessible to all sections of the local population, including not holding too many meetings or holding them at times that some people would find difficult;
- establishing a clear institutional position for any forum or equivalent, especially in relation to other formal managerial mechanisms;
- recognising the social diversity that is likely to exist in any area, including diversity in views about proposed developments and in inclination to get involved.

Finally, Khamis emphasises the importance of good communication in developing effective and sustainable structures of involvement:

The key to all this is good communication, and there can almost never be too much communication in this context. Consultation events and community forum meetings need to be well advertised, authoritative sources of information established and progress reported widely.
(p. 266)

In a review of 13 'pathfinder' schemes funded under the Scottish Executive's Working for Communities programme, Brown (2002) presents findings on four aspects of community involvement. Firstly, in respect of community consultation and awareness raising carried out during the early stages of a programme, the main good practice points include:

- careful planning and preparation of consultation processes and events; consultation methods should be chosen to suit the circumstances;
- time for consultation should be built into the lead times for project and programme development;
- it is important to use skilled and experienced facilitators, including those experienced in working with particular groups;
- it is important to feed back the results as promptly as possible; and
- working with and through existing groups can be particularly effective.

Secondly, in relation to training and capacity building, an important message is that a variety of different opportunities for training and support is needed by most 'communities' that contain diverse populations with different needs:

- training and capacity building benefits from operating from a local base, usually at which other activities take place; in other words it can be unrealistic to expect local residents to travel far in order to receive training and support of this type;
- ICTs such as video can be especially effective in developing self-confidence and the capacity to express local issues in imaginative and engaging ways;
- there is a need to offer the opportunity to move on to more advanced and sophisticated forms of training; and
- joint training for residents and members of local communities and local professionals can be especially effective.

Thirdly, in respect of project management, good practice advice is:

- that direct employment of local residents is valuable, not least in demonstrating the capacity of local people to cope with such jobs;
- be aware of the possible dangers of out of hours pressures on local resident workers and the risk of intimidation;
- it is beneficial to have residents serving on project management boards or committees; and
- a variety of levels or degrees of involvement is required and there is a need to provide ongoing and variable types of support.

Finally, in terms of widening involvement beyond a relatively narrow range of people, the review found some instances of good practice such as a local youth council that provided young people

to help manage a local youth service and a steering group that drew up an action plan that attracted new people to join the group running a community health shop.

What does not work?

Some authors provide fairly lengthy commentary on the lessons learned from 'bad' experience of community involvement in ABIs. Newburn and Jones, for example, discuss the 'limits' of consultation. These can be summarised as: methodological limitations; timing limitations; lack of consistency in officer commitment, sometimes due to staff turnover; duplication with other consultation exercises leading to a feeling of overload in the community; and a perception by some agencies that they are carrying an unfair burden of the costs of consultation.

Kintrea (1996) offers six reasons why community involvement was not as effective as it might have been in a neighbourhood regeneration ABI:

- i. community partners had little tangible to offer the formal Partnership, because it was not a statutory body with clearly defined roles and responsibilities;
- ii. the location, purpose and objectives of the Partnership were not established from the outset and in the environment of tough negotiating and bargaining that ensued, community interests did not often prevail;
- iii. the agenda was dominated by a central commitment to tenure change and opposing views were treated as 'community intransigence' and ignored;
- iv. community organisations, even experienced ones, were 'left trailing in the wake of a speed and complexity of decision making it could not keep up with' (p. 302);
- v. the Partnership chose not to build on existing structures of community representation, but to develop its own complex arrangements; and
- vi. the main community forum was expected to represent a population of over 5000 on numerous committees with virtually no professional back up or training.

Hence, although Kintrea draws positive overall conclusions about the impact of community involvement, many of his more specific observations and findings are rather more negative:

the analysis of this paper is not just that the officials and politicians in Ferguslie Park needed more experience in the techniques of participation, but that the whole process of identifying and progressing the partnership was antipathetic to effective community involvement. (p. 304)

Anastacio *et al.* (2000) make the observation that approaches to community involvement will tend to engage effectively only with the most powerful groups and interests in a community unless the local patterns of diversity are recognised from the outset. They also make a number of mainly critical observations based on the views of local participants, including:

- a feeling that agendas are often set in advance and are not in practice open to change through community involvement or consultation;
- the priorities of local groups are often subordinated to the priorities of those managing involvement activities;
- local groups feel that they are defined according to the extent to which their agendas coincide with those of the local authority or with private sector (usually developer) interests;
- residents often experienced great pressures on their time from involvement in representative or consultative mechanisms; and
- ABI programmes can make or break 'community stars' depending on factors such as the extent to which they are able to act as mediators between the community and the ABI.

Foley and Martin's (2000b) consideration of the scope for effective community involvement more generally in the context of the introduction of Best Value leads them to observe that:

While community involvement is therefore seen as an important means of delivering on many of the present government's key manifesto commitments, the experience of previous

regeneration initiatives, and of attempts to decentralise local services, suggests the need for caution. (p. 485)

This need for caution is supported in their citing of the results of a survey conducted in a Best Value pilot authority, in which only 20 per cent of residents said they would like to have more say in how their local services were run. The survey also found that those who wanted to be more involved tended to favour relatively passive forms of consultation such as postal surveys, rather than more interactive approaches such as meetings, citizens' juries or 'consensus conferences' (p. 486).

Other surveys have found that the public as a whole does not necessarily want to devote substantially more time to public affairs although it wants to be kept informed and given the opportunity to participate, even though people do not often take it up. National surveys report that most people 'just vote' (Parry *et al.* 1992; Docherty *et al.* 2001). This raises questions about the expectations of community involvement held by public policy and whether they are reasonable – questions that are not well-answered by the literature. It is possible that the sense of disappointment and accusations of apathy that can characterise discussions of community involvement reflect unrealistic aspirations by policy makers and professionals. However, the skewed nature of civic participation in which certain groups such as better-educated citizens tend to dominate is rightly a matter for public policy attention.

Given this, it is a notable if qualified advance that ABIs can make a difference to civic engagement, as occurred particularly in one of the two SIPs studied by Docherty *et al.*:

'residents' engagement with the governance process was influenced by the political institutions and public policies affecting the area. Broadly, people felt it worthwhile to participate because such participation was having an effect in securing improvements and because they felt they were listened to. (2001: 2244-2245)

6. Conclusions and future research

The specification for this review asked for conclusions to be drawn about the following questions:

- What works with regard to achieving effective community involvement?
- What are the quantifiable beneficial outcomes regarding community involvement?
- How robust are the evaluation methodologies used to assess these outcomes?
- What is the balance of costs and benefits in securing these outcomes?

The following brief discussion shows that the review has made more progress with answering some of these than others, largely as a consequence of the limitations of research in this area.

What works with regard to achieving effective community involvement?

This question begs a number of other questions. These are addressed in turn.

Effectiveness at what?

The research is not often very clear about the answer to this question, while providing a lot of advice on lessons learned and 'good practice'. The research literature is particularly and surprisingly silent on the purposes seen for community involvement by officials and other stakeholders at ABI level. The taken for granted character of community involvement and the personal commitment of many researchers and funders of research seem to have got in the way of more rigorous empirical research design. The research reviewed tends to conflate different types of impact without distinguishing clearly between developmental, instrumental and due process purposes. That said, the sheer volume of usually qualitative case study research, and its broad agreement on what constitutes good practice in this field, provides an impressively large body of overlapping and similar advice on aspects such as appropriate processes and techniques of involvement.

The simplest approach to saying what works with regard to achieving effective community involvement is to see the issue as one of achieving community involvement for its own sake. This 'due process' purpose of community involvement is not given much prominence in the literature reviewed yet it is very apparent in the comments that interviewees provide in many studies. There is evidence that residents who get involved appreciate being accorded respect, they want to feel that their involvement is welcomed, they feel marginalised if no one appropriate is listening, and they resent barriers that prevent their involvement. However, residents also want to see a more tangible outcome from their involvement, since that is likely to be why they got involved in the first place.

More attention is given in the literature to the community and personal development aims and outcomes of community involvement, and to the instrumental gains it may bring about, for example to service planning. Mixed impacts are reported, with evidence of positive impact on activists and professionals who learn a lot, including about one another's needs, if circumstances are favourable. However, there is also evidence of participants feeling frustrated and disillusioned if they do not feel their involvement is welcomed or if they do not achieve their policy and area improvement objectives. The largely qualitative evidence about impact is therefore contradictory in pointing to positive as well as negative impacts of involvement. Further, insofar as there is evidence of the personal development benefits enjoyed by activists, this needs to be qualified by the evidence that non-activists do not make such gains. However, in contrast, the impact that community involvement makes on tangible programmes and service improvements does extend beyond the activists to all who benefit, for example from improved services.

Few studies are able to relate the impacts they observe systematically to the wider objectives and outcomes of the ABI concerned. For some this is because outcomes are still in the future. For

others it is because they focus on community involvement and how to improve it rather than on wider objectives. Overall evaluations of ABIs were limited in the attention they gave involvement.

Involvement in what?

Most of the research reviewed deals with community involvement that is concerned with individuals or representatives of community or voluntary organisations getting involved in public policy 'both in designing what is to be done and in implementing it' (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998, para. 2.3). Much less attention is given in this literature to the participation of people in a variety of types of voluntary and community organisations, for their own or others' benefit. Some attention is given to how ABIs can ensure an infrastructure of support for the voluntary sector but the research does not go on to examine what effect this has on the development of the voluntary sector itself or the extent to which this leads to more voluntary participation. The third, informal, form of community involvement through neighbourliness, family and friends is given very little attention.

In relation to involvement in strategy, implementation, service planning, and service delivery the evidence suggests that there is more involvement in *strategy* and *service planning* than on *service delivery* or the *implementation* of ABI programmes. This may be because of the timing or focus of studies, although some gave specific accounts of impact in particular policy areas such as crime prevention and housing. Or it may be because it is harder for ABIs to bring about user involvement in long-established mainstream services that paradoxically offer some of the most promising opportunities for extending civic engagement.

What form of involvement?

In terms of what forms of involvement are most effective at getting people and groups involved, the conclusion has to be that this varies significantly according to local circumstances. These include the history of previous initiatives and relationships; the purpose of the current involvement; how far practice matches purpose for different groups; the type of people targeted for involvement; the level of resources devoted to the exercise; the degree of planning achieved so that activities are not rushed; and the type of activities or decisions that local residents are being invited to get involved with.

In areas with a long history of regeneration programmes, community involvement was quicker to set up, but was more likely to be dogged by burnout, suspicion of short-term initiatives, the complexity of structures, disillusionment, and local politics (Brown, 2002: 5).

Many authors emphasise that processes of involvement are as important as structures for involvement. However, some of the most systematic evidence about what works is found in studies (such as Newburn and Jones, 2002; Brown, 2000; and Dobbs and Moore, 2002) that provide data on particular methods and structures for involvement. However, it is not possible to conclude that community visioning events, for example, are inherently effective or more effective than public meetings, for instance. It depends on the circumstances in which they are being used. What might work in any particular setting depends on a very careful analysis of what is intended to be achieved, the careful selection of an appropriate technique and its application to a very high standard. For example, in areas where regeneration programmes have been run in the past it can be easier to identify and recruit local community leaders or representatives, but more difficult to overcome the disappointments of past failures and the complexities of local relations.

Involvement by whom?

Several authors emphasise that many people in addition to residents are affected by community involvement. For example, France and Crow (2001) argue that the 'community' is not just made up of local people who live in the area where a programme is to be run, it also includes professional workers who have either managerial responsibility for services in the area or who provide front line service. Others emphasise the need for professionals to be supported in their

community involvement work and others see specific training needs such as in designing surveys (Newburn and Jones, 2002).

Several authors argue that there is evidence that not enough is yet being done to include minority or disadvantaged groups in ABIs. Further, greatest success is being achieved in attracting activists rather than ordinary residents into community involvement in ABIs. Whether this is inevitable or not is possibly less important than the support provided to assist community groups to extend the number of people involved in them. Nevertheless, there is a good deal of evidence that ABIs are extending the range of people who would normally participate in local or central governance.

Finally, if part of the rationale for community involvement is that it allows alternative views and priorities to emerge, then a degree of opposition and conflict is inevitable. The effective management of these conflicts is important to the success of any ABI: effective management does not equate with the repression of conflict or with the transfer of key decision making arenas to other settings. It requires a patient and collaborative ethos among local professionals in which disagreement and conflict is dealt with in a mature manner.

What are the quantifiable beneficial outcomes?

Many studies reported beneficial outcomes of community involvement. However, few attempted to develop quantifiable measures and inevitably much reliance was placed on perceptions of impact. There is a tendency for studies to concentrate either on community activists or on officials for their reports on outcomes, and relatively few provide evidence from less active residents. Others raised the issue of the possible divergence between activist and citizen perceptions, sometimes drawing on focus groups as a way of judging that. Perceptions of the case for involvement and more significantly the consequential impacts of involvement often vary substantially among and between different groups. This makes it hard to weigh what is often qualitative evidence to reach a view about impact, efficacy, benefits of involvement and so on. For examples, officers may develop more positive views of the benefits of involvement in ABIs than residents:

Officials were very positive about the community involvement in the Great Northern pathfinder, but community partners had mixed views. After two years, they felt that there was little to show the community in terms of practical outcomes, and that a culture change was still required throughout departments and agencies. (Brown, 2002: 4)

Many authors acknowledge that community activists may be motivated by the desire for instrumental gains from their involvement. Impacts on policy processes, projects, public services and other aspects of ABIs are therefore discussed but not *measured*. Some authors would consider it their task to *understand* how these benefits were achieved rather than *measure* them.

In summary, it is in the nature of this difficult aspect of evaluation that any benefits cannot be easily quantified or associated causally with particular forms of involvement. However, the review team does not hold the view that no useful research can be done, but nor does it underestimate the practical difficulties of designing robust studies of this type. None of this is surprising, given the disparate aims of the studies, few of which set out to document outcomes in any quantifiable way.

How robust are the evaluation methodologies?

Many studies did not discuss the general approach they were taking to methodology and left implicit the view that their authors held of the role and purpose of community involvement. Although some of the studies allowed a more robust form of comparative analysis, it was much more common among the studies reviewed for the methodology to be poorly articulated. This does not, of course, mean that the methodology was poor, simply that it was not always fully described. Government departments or agencies usually funded the studies that provided the fullest accounts of approach as well as method.

The most common methods used were depth interviews and focus group discussions, applied in a small number of case studies. Several studies drew on postal surveys of officials such as partnership managers and this method was usually combined with case studies to provide a more rounded picture. Three studies used household surveys as part of a wider range of methods. This enabled them to achieve a deeper understanding of the processes at work that had created statistical associations in the survey data.

It would be inappropriate to make any simplistic comparison of the inherent strengths and weakness of different approaches or of quantitative and qualitative methods, since they are designed for different purposes. However, it would be fair to conclude that in some cases of qualitative research reviewed here the evidential base for passionately advanced conclusions was not always apparent. There is therefore a need for more high quality qualitative research to support the claims made for the benefits of community involvement and to explore the outcomes more systematically. In addition there is sometimes an essential need for household survey or other data to enable policy effectiveness to be assessed more comprehensively.

What is the balance of costs and benefits?

As already indicated, studies included in this review did not set out to compare the costs and benefits of community involvement. Many studies set out to illustrate the benefits of involvement that had been established *a priori*. Few even considered the possible costs, let alone set them against the possible or actual benefits. Only one study reported what managers felt about the balance between benefits and costs. It is not clear that the conclusion of other studies would be the same or that community members would reach the same conclusions as officials. However, several authors focused on costs to support the argument that resources are required to make involvement effective. Some studies describe the consequences of poor involvement, both in theory and in practice, and argue that the costs of providing support for community involvement should be recognised more in public policy. But they did not go far in quantifying what resources were used in the ABIs they studied or in suggesting what levels of what types of resources are required.

A more robust study would require a clearer framework for considering these and other issues than is currently available. Alongside the costs of involvement, consideration could be given to the difficult issues of the costs of poor involvement and the costs of non-involvement. It is now time to move beyond the findings of the review to consider the issue of future research.

Future research

Burton (2003) has argued that a more differentiated conception of community involvement in neighbourhood regeneration is required if more sophisticated notions of what works in this field are to be developed. This differentiation consists of developing each of the three relevant dimensions: which community or public? what degree of participation? what type of decision making? These reflect the questions used above to break down the general question of what works with regard to achieving effective community involvement:

- Effectiveness at what?
- Involvement in what?
- What form of involvement?
- Involvement by whom?

In thinking of future research, there is scope for more of the same type of study of specific aspects of participation and involvement reviewed here. More care could be taken in some study designs and more effort could be made to learn from general literature about democratic theory and practice, social capital, attitudes towards and practices of civic engagement and so on. However, studies will remain marginal in their impact on policy and open to challenge if they cannot be conducted using more robust methods and forms of analysis.

Larger scale research is required that combines qualitative and quantitative methods and advanced statistical as well as qualitative analysis, while taking advantage of some existing research instruments and expertise. In view of the complex nature of community involvement, qualitative methods are essential as part of any research design. Quantitative data is required too to measure public attitudes and behaviour. But quantitative methods cannot attribute cause and effect to statistical associations or identify the subtle and intangible factors that case studies so regularly identify. Such extensive research techniques and more quantitative forms of analysis require larger sums of money than are generally available to studies of the type reviewed.

Such studies would have to be designed in such a way as to be able to test relationships between the various practices of community involvement and the outcomes of area-based initiatives. One possible approach would be to design a study that contained the following components:

- construction of a research team of experts in the evaluation of complex social programmes, ABIs in particular, but also with expertise in democratic theory and community involvement;
- development of a set of hypotheses for testing about the purpose and effects of community involvement in ABIs;
- careful design of a set of case studies with common research instruments used to explore qualitative aspects of ABIs with citizens, officials and other stakeholders and involving focus group discussions with citizens;
- collection of data on impacts in case studies to include identifiable instrumental effects as well as developmental and 'due process' effects of involvement; and
- use of an existing survey instrument such as the British Social Attitudes Survey to collect data for a representative sample of the population, extended to include questions about community involvement at *neighbourhood* or other area level; and to provide a boosted sample from areas that are the subject of ABIs.

Finally, it would be an important starting point for such research to be clearer about the hypotheses about community involvement in ABIs than much of the research reviewed here. Such hypotheses about the effects of community involvement in ABIs would be generated from accounts in social theory that stress the integrating effect of social interaction and from democratic theories about the value of participation (Held, 1995). It would be hypothesised that coming together with neighbours, friends, associates or officials has a vital effect in three mutually reinforcing ways:

- It fosters social connectedness, demonstrated in social capital and enhanced trust in government and fellow citizens, and improved government performance, measured by responsiveness to citizens' aspirations.
- Social interaction enhances the prospects for social equality (or inclusion), directly by improving living conditions and life chances and indirectly by the personal development and increased confidence that participation can bring.
- Community involvement restrains disorder and redirects individual lives into socially and economically productive roles (Buck, forthcoming).

Democratic theory emphasises the first and second of these three effects of involvement, seeing community participation as a fundamental feature of democratic governance. Crudely, three rationales for participation are advanced, one 'developmental', another 'instrumental' and a third characterised as due process. The developmental or educational effect of involvement on individuals and hence on society is said to foster a democratic political culture conducive to further participation and has an integrative effect in aiding the acceptance of collective decisions. Second, the outcomes of democratic political processes – decisions – are accorded legitimacy since they reflect the interests of those who participated in the process of decision-making and in a democracy of equal citizens that should mean all have their interests represented. Third, the process of participation is justified on the grounds of due process. Citizens should be given an opportunity to participate, irrespective of outcomes: participation is a right.

Empirical research could identify which rationales for involvements are detectable in the attitudes and actions of key actors or citizens generally in two ways. First, what do stakeholders consider the purpose of community involvement to be in ABIs? Second, what is the impact of involvement

on social capital, social inclusion and social order? Does it make a difference to the quality of life of participants and if so in what ways?

Finally, recent political theory has argued that embedded inequalities in society are reproduced in governance processes and this is echoed in the findings of many studies, including those reviewed here. The efforts made by ABIs to recognise and support particular groups would therefore be an important feature of any research.

In summary, the studies reviewed in this report provide partial and mixed answers to the questions that arise when considering what works in community involvement in ABIs. Important research gaps remain and could be filled by more robust studies as well as more of the same type reviewed here.

Annex and appendices

- **Annex 1:**
 - **Appendix A:**
 - **Appendix B:**
 - **Appendix C:**
 - **Appendix D:**
 - **Appendix E:**
 - **Appendix F:**
- Protocol**
Search strategies
Proper nouns of area-based initiatives
Numbers of findings
Bibliography of Stage 1 findings
Bibliography of Stage 3 findings
Additional cited references

Annex 1

Protocol - Home Office Review of Community Involvement in Area-Based Initiatives

Background

As part of its work on civic renewal, the Home Office is concerned with both the extent and effectiveness of community involvement in all aspects of civic life. The Active Communities Unit (ACU) within the Home Office is charged with increasing community involvement by five per cent by the year 2006.

Although a large number of government schemes, including area-based initiatives (ABIs), have as an objective greater community involvement, there is a lack of evidence of what works in this field. Therefore, to inform its contribution to the forthcoming spending review, the Home Office wishes to commission a more focused and systematic review of research evidence on the effectiveness of community involvement ABIs.

ABIs are not new. Measures designed to alleviate poverty, ill health and poor housing in given areas have been used for at least one hundred years in Britain and the Home Office itself sponsored a major scheme of this type, the Community Development Projects, from the late 1960s onwards.

An important feature of many of these initiatives, and one which has been even more prominent in recent years, is the belief that bottom-up approaches are better than top-down ones. In other words, it is assumed that schemes which reflect the views and aspirations of the people who live in the targeted areas will be more effective than schemes that are driven more by the views of others – civil servants or politicians from elsewhere and professionals who do not live in the area even if they work there. It is also commonplace to assume that the involvement of local residents in the management and development of ABIs is an effective way securing this bottom-up perspective.

However, these assumptions have rarely been tested in any systematic and rigorous way. Many studies comment on the desirability of achieving greater community involvement and some have analysed the consequences of failing to engage local communities. Most studies take the form of evaluations, both formative and summative, in which the focus is on the overall impact of the initiative and the value for money achieved. Few studies set out exclusively or systematically to measure the effectiveness of community involvement in meeting these broader objectives. Hence this review provides a welcome opportunity to collect and analyse a wide range of studies that address in one way or another the connections between community involvement and the effectiveness of ABIs.

Objectives

This review will assess the literature on community involvement in area-based initiatives and attempt to identify what works, what does not work, what is promising and what is unknown.

Criteria for considering studies for this review

A preliminary consideration of the field suggests that few studies have been designed specifically and exclusively to investigate the impact of community involvement on the effectiveness of ABIs. There are probably few studies designed according to experimental principles with control cases and before and after measurement. It is more likely that studies of the overall impact of ABIs will have considered the issue of community involvement in passing. Similarly, more general studies of community involvement are likely to examine a wider range of policy initiatives, including but not limited to ABIs.

ABIs have been described as publicly funded initiatives targeted on areas of social or economic disadvantage, which aim to improve the quality of life of the residents of that area through multi-faceted programmes of intervention. This review is concerned mainly with programmes targeted on sub-city areas and will not generally include studies of regional programmes, unless these have more spatially focused components.

Community involvement can cover a range of possibilities and the review will include studies of initiatives to involve individuals, groups, populations and representatives in various aspects of the planning, design and delivery of programmes. The review is interested in studies of any particular categories of people involved in some way in ABIs, including those focusing on women, members of minority ethnic groups, children and young people, and older people.

The review will, therefore, include:

- studies of the impact of community involvement on the effectiveness of ABIs;
- studies of community involvement in a wide range of policy initiatives with some degree of spatial targeting;
- studies of ABIs that make only passing reference to community involvement and its significance.

The review will not be limited by study design.

The review will only include material published after 1980.

The review will only include studies (including their summaries) published in English.

Search strategy for identification of studies

The review will draw on the following sources of information about relevant studies:

Databases

Various, but including ASSIA, Sociological Abstracts, EconLit, IBSS/BIDS, Planex, SIGLE and Acompline

Web sites

UK government departments
NDPBs e.g. Audit Commission, NAO, Countryside Agency/Commission
Local authority associations e.g. LGA, LARIA
Non-statutory bodies e.g. Urban Forum, BTEG, CDF, NCVO etc

Manual searching

Contents pages of relevant journals, post 1980

Professional contacts

If possible, draft results will be sent for comment to key professionals in the policy, academic and practice fields.

Methods of review

From the key word search of databases and other sources, titles and abstracts will be obtained. These will be screened wherever possible by two readers against the selection criteria described above.

Full text versions of all relevant studies will be obtained and subject to a second screening. A coding form will be used to collect specific information about each study judged to be relevant to the review.

Results

It is anticipated that the final report will be organised around two broad themes:

- what do the studies say about the most effective means of involving people in ABIs, ranging from general principles to specific techniques;
- what do studies identify as the benefits of effective involvement, in general and in their particular cases(s).

The review will be presented to the Home Office by July 2003 and publication is anticipated shortly after.

It is possible that the review will be updated in the future as new evidence accumulates and funding becomes available.

Statement concerning conflicts of interest

While members of the team have contributed to research in this field, they have no vested interest in the outcomes of this review or any incentive to present the findings in a biased manner.

Appendix A

Search strategies

1. Preferred strategy where appropriate for the search engine

((((((((((development near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))))))

OR (((((((redevelopment near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))))

OR (((((re-development near (initative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))

OR (((((((area* near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))))

OR (((((((communit* near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))))

OR (((((((urban near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))))

OR (((((((rural near (initative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))))

OR (((((((local* near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))))

OR (((((((zon* near (initative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))))

OR (((((((neighbo?rhood* near (initative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))))

OR (((((((district* near (initative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))))

OR (((((((social near (initative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))))

OR (((((((regenerat* near (initative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))))

OR (((((((renewal near (initative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))))))))

AND
((((((((local* near (involve* or engage* or paticipat* or consult* or empower* or develop*))))))))

OR (((((voluntary near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*))))))

OR (((((district* near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*))))))

OR (((neighbo?rhood* near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*))))

OR (((citizen or citizens) near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*)))

OR (((group or groups) near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*)))

OR (((popular near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*))))

OR (((public near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*))))

OR (((communit* near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*))))

2. Alternative combination for less sophisticated search engines

((development or redevelopment or re-development or area* or communit* or urban or rural or local* or zon* or neighbo?rhood* or district* or social or regenerat* or renewal) near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*))

AND

((local* or voluntary or district* or neighbo?rhood* or citizen or citizens or group or groups or popular or public or communit*) near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*))

Notes:

a) If databases did not use NEAR, this needed to be replaced with AND

b) If the database could not AND these two sections together, they should be searched separately

3. Strategy for more basic search engines, using multiple individual searches

development near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*)

(redevelopment or re-development) near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*)

area* near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*)

communit* near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*)

urban near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*)

rural near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*)

local* near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*)

zon* near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*)

neighbo?rhood* near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*)

district* near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*)

social near (initative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*)

regenerat* near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*)

renewal near (initiative* or scheme* or project* or program* or activit* or partnership* or action or strateg*)

local* near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*)

voluntary near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*)

district* near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*)

neighbo?rhood* near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*)

(citizen or citizens) near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*)

(group or groups) near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*)

popular near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*)

public near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*)

communit* near (involve* or engage* or participat* or consult* or empower* or develop*)

Appendix B

Proper nouns of area-based initiatives

(Action on Estates Programme*)
(Action Team for Jobs)
(Action Teams for Jobs)
(Active Community Programme*)
(Business Brokers)
(Business Start-Up Scheme*)
(Capital Modernisation Fund*)
(Childrens Fund*)
(City Action Team*)
(City Challenge*)
(City Growth Strategy*)
(City Pride)
(Coalfields)
(Communities Against Drugs)
(Community Champion*)
(Community Chest*)
(Community Development Project*)
(Community Development Trust*)
(Community Empowerment Fund*)
(Community Initiative*)
(Community Legal Service Partnership*)
(Community Programme*)
(Community Strategy*)
(Comprehensive Community Programme*)
(Creative Partnership*)
(Crime Reduction Programme*)
(Developing Local Voluntary Action Programme*)
(Drug Action Team*)
(Education Action Zone*)
(Educational Priority Area*)
(Employment Zone*)
(Estate Action*)
(Ethnic Minority Outreach Service*)
(European Regional Development Fund Area*)
(European Social Fund Area*)
(Excellence Challenge*)
(Excellence in Cities)
(Fair Share*)
(Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action)
(Health Action Zone*)
(Healthy Living Centre*)
(Healthy Schools Programme*)
(Home Zone*)
(Housing Action Area*)
(Housing Action Trust*)
(Housing Market Renewal Fund*)
(Initiative at the Edge)
(Inner City Partnership*)
(Local Initiative Fund*)
(Local Strategic Partnership*)
(Low Demand Pathfinder Scheme*)
(Market Towns Initiative*)
(Neighbourhood Learning Centre*)
(Neighbourhood Management)
(Neighbourhood Nursery Centre*)
(Neighbourhood Renewal Fund*)
(Neighbourhood Support Fund*)
(Neighbourhood Warden*)
(New Community School*)
(New Deal* for Communities)
(New Entrepreneur Scholarship*)
(New Housing Partnership*)
(New Life for Urban Scotland)
(New Start)
(Opportunities for Volunteering)
(Partnership Development Fund*)
(Playing Fields and Community Green Spaces)
(Positive Futures)
(Priority Estates Project*)
(Priority Partnership Area*)
(Recovered Assets Fund*)
(Regional Centre* for Manufacturing Excellence)
(Safer Cities)
(Safer Communities Initiative*)
(Single Regeneration Budget*)
(Smaller Retailers in Deprived Areas)
(Smaller Urban Renewal Initiative*)
(Social Inclusion Partnership*)
(Spaces for Sports and Arts)
(Sports Action Zone*)
(StepUP*)
(Street Warden*)
(Sure Start Plus)
(Sure Start*)
(Tenant Management Cooperative*)
(Urban Partnership*)
(Urban Programme*)
(Urban Regeneration Company*)
(Urban Task Force*)
(Warm Zone*)
(Working for Communities Pathfinder*)
(Youth Inclusion Programme*)
(Youth Music Action Zone*)

*used in search processes to allow for possibility of plurals.

Appendix C

Numbers of finds by database

Databases searched using main search terms and ABI terms

Database	Main search terms	ABI terms
ASSIA	3143	306
EconLit	1765	796 ⁱ
IBSS/BIDS	4386	312
Planex	4632	3828
Sociological Abstracts	103	ii

Notes:

- i. Combined with Sociological Abstracts
- ii. Combined with Econlit

Databases searched using customised search terms

Database	No. of finds
Acompline	2300 ⁱ
Criminal Justice Abstracts	116
GeoRef/Social Science Abstracts together	8
Inside	374
Joseph Rowntree findings	102
Public Affairs Information Services	20
Renewal.net	Not calculated
SIGLE	19

Notes:

- i. Estimated figure. Printed copies only received and entries not hand counted.

Appendix D

Bibliography from Stage 1 - 369 items

Abelson, J., Lomas, J., Eyles, J., Birch, S. and Veenstra, G. (1995) 'Does The Community Want Devolved Authority? Results of deliberative polling in Ontario', *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 153, (4), 403-412.

Ahmad, Y., Dalrymple, J., Daum, M., Griffiths, N., Hockridge, T. and Ryan, E. (2003) *Listening to Children and Young People*, Bristol: University of the West of England.

Aigner, S., Flora, C., Tirmizi, S. and Wilcox, C. (1999) 'Dynamics to Sustain Community Development in Persistently Poor Rural Areas Development in the United States', *Community Development Journal*, 34, (1), 13-27.

Al-Kodmany, K. (2001) 'Online Tools for Public Participation', *Government Information Quarterly*, 18, 329-341.

Ames, J. and Mair, G. (1993) 'Just Deserts Or Just Growing Up? Community initiatives with young people in trouble', *British Journal of Criminology*, 33, (3), 471.

Anastacio, J., Gidley, B., Hart, L., Keith, M., Mayo, M. and Kowarzik, U. (2000) *Reflecting Realities: Participants' perspectives on integrated communities and sustainable development*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Arai, S. (1996) 'Benefits of Citizen Participation in a Healthy Communities Initiative: Linking community development and empowerment', *Report of Canadian Congress On Leisure Research, University of Ottawa*, 1-3.

Arnold, P. and Cole, I. (1998) 'Community Involvement and Sustainable Neighbourhood Regeneration', Ch. 10 in Cooper, C. and Hawtin, M. (Eds) *Resident Involvement and Community Action: Theory to practice*, Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing.

Arnstein, S. (1971) 'A Ladder of Participation in the USA', *Journal of the Royal Town Planning Institute*, April, 176-182.

Ash, J. (1996) 'Regenerating Estates-Rebuilding Communities', *Housing Review*, 45, (6), 112.

Ashworth, C. (2000) 'Changing Cultures and Shared Ownership', *Local Economy*, 15, (3), 256-261.

Assi, E. (2002) 'Community Involvement in a Housing Renewal Project in the Old City of Jerusalem', *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 8, (1), 74-85.

Atkinson, R. and Lejeune, S. (2001) 'Area-based Urban Policy Initiatives: The role of resident participation in England and France', Paper presented to EURA Conference *Area Based Initiatives in Contemporary Urban Policy: Innovations in city governance*, Copenhagen, 17-19 May.

Atkinson, R. and Moon, G. (1994) 'The City Challenge Initiative: An overview and preliminary assessment', *Regional Studies*, 28, (1), 94-97.

Attwood, M., Pedler, M., Pritchard, S. and Wilkinson, D. (2003) *Leading Change: A guide to whole systems working*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

- Audit Commission and IDeA (2002) *Measuring Community Involvement: Developing indicators to support the Quality of Life set, and for inclusion in the Library of Local PIs*, London: Audit Commission.
- Bailey, N., Mabbott, N. and Galloway, M. (1993) 'Partnerships in Regeneration', *Town and Country Planning*, 62, (6), 136-145.
- Banks, S. and Shenton, F. (2001) 'Regenerating Neighbourhoods: A critical look at the role of community capacity-building', *Local Economy*, 16, (4), 286-298.
- Barnes, M., Sullivan, H. and Matka, E. (2001) *Context, Strategy and Capacity: Initial findings from the strategic level analysis*, Health Action Zones Strategic Overview Report, University of Birmingham.
- Barr, A., Stenhouse, C. and Henderson, P. (2001) *Caring Communities: A challenge for social inclusion*, York: York Publishing Services.
- Bauld, L. and Judge, K. (2002) *Learning from Health Action Zones*, Chichester: Aeneas Press.
- Baum, F., Santich, B., Craig, B. and Murray, C. (1996) 'Evaluation of a National Health Promotion Program in South Australia', *Australian And New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 20, (1), 41-49.
- Beetham, D. (Ed.) (1994) *Defining and Measuring Democracy*, London: Sage.
- Bennett, K., Beynon, H. and Hudson, R. (2000) *Coalfields Regeneration: Dealing with the consequences of industrial decline*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Berkeley, N. and Collis, C. (1997) *Involving The Local Business Community in Developing and Implementing a Town Centre Regeneration Strategy: The case of Atherstone in North Warwickshire*, Seaford: Regional Studies Association.
- Bichard, M. (1999) *Modernizing the Policy Process*, London: PMPA.
- Birch, D.(2002) *Public Participation in Local Government: A survey of local authorities*, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- Blake, G. (2001) *Getting Set for Citizenship: Using participative approaches in regeneration*, Paper produced for the Kings Fund Participatory Approaches Network. Available online at <http://www.participatory-london.org.uk/news.htm>. Accessed 25 February 2002.
- Blunkett, D. (2003) 'Civil Renewal: A new agenda', *The CSV Edith Kahn Memorial Lecture*, London: Home Office/CSV.
- Boaz, A. and Ashby, D. (2003) *Fit for Purpose? Assessing research quality for evidence based policy and practice*, ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice, Working Paper 11, London: ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice.
- Boaz, A., Ashby, D. and Young, K. (2002) *Systematic Reviews: What have they got to offer evidence based policy and practice?*, ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice Working Paper No. 2, London: ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice.
- Botes, L. and Van Rensburg, D. (2000) 'Community Participation in Development: Nine plagues and twelve commandments', *Community Development Journal*, 35, (1), 41-58.

Bradford, M. and Robson, B. (1995) 'An Evaluation of Urban Policy', in Hambleton, R. and Thomas, H. (Eds) *Urban Policy Evaluation: Challenges and change*, London: Paul Chapman.

Bradshaw, T. (2000) 'Complex Community Development Projects: Collaboration, comprehensive programs, and community coalitions in complex society', *Community Development Journal*, 35, (2), 133-145.

Brecht, N. (1991) 'Citizen Participation in Community Health: Principles for effective partnerships', in Badura, M. and Kickbusch, I. (Eds) *Health Promotion Research: Towards a new social epidemiology*, World Health Organisation Regional Publications, European Series No. 37, Geneva: World Health Organisation.

Brennan, A., Rhodes, J. and Tyler, P. (1998) *Evaluation of the SRB Challenge Fund – a partnership for regeneration: An interim evaluation*, London: DETR.

Brown, A. (2002) *Findings from Working for Communities*, Scottish Executive Development Department Research Programme Research Findings No. 137, Edinburgh.

Brown, G. (2003) 'New Localism – empowering local communities', *Speech made at the opening of the Millennium city building, University of Wolverhampton*, 7th February. Available online at http://www.hmtreasury.gov.uk/newsroom_and_speeches/press/2003/press_16_03.cfm Accessed 27 June 2003.

Burns, D. and Taylor, M. (1998) *Mutual Aid and Self-help: Coping strategies for excluded communities*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Burns, D. and Taylor, M. (2000) *Auditing Community Participation: An assessment handbook*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Burns, D., Hambleton, R. and Hoggett, P. (1994) *The Politics of Decentralisation: Revitalising local democracy*, London: Macmillan.

Burrows, R. and Bradshaw, J. (2001) 'Evidence-Based Policy and Practice', *Environment and Planning A*, 33, 1345-1348.

Burton, P. (1997) 'Urban Policy and the Myth of Progress', *Policy and Politics*, 25, (4), 421-436.

Burton, P. (2003) *Community Involvement in Neighbourhood Regeneration: Stairway to heaven or road to nowhere?*, Centre for Neighbourhood Research Paper 13. Available online at <http://www.neighbourhoodcentre.org.uk/research/cnrpaperspdf/cnr13pap.pdf>. Accessed 27 July 2003.

Byrnes, W. (1990) 'Foreword' in Judd, D. and Parkinson, M. (Eds) *Leadership and Urban Regeneration: Cities in North America and Europe*, Urban Affairs Annual Reviews, London: Sage.

Cabinet Office (2000) *Code of Practice on Written Consultation*, London: Cabinet Office.

Cambridge Policy Consultants (1999) *An Evaluation of the New Life for Urban Scotland Initiative in Castlemilk, Ferguslie Park, Wester Hailse and Whitfield*, Edinburgh: Scottish Office Central Research Unit.

Camiletti, Y. (1996) 'A Simplified Guide to Practising Community-Based/Community Development Initiatives', *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 87, (4), 244-247.

- Campbell, M., with Sanderson, I. and Walton, F. (1998) *Local Responses to Long-term Unemployment*, York: York Publishing Services.
- Canavon, M. and Smith, P. (2001) *Representing The People: Democracy And Diversity*, London: LGA.
- Carley, M. (2002) *Community Regeneration and Neighbourhood Renewal: A review of the evidence*, Communities Scotland, Research Report No. 5, Edinburgh.
- Carley, M. and Kirk, K. (1998) *Sustainable by 2020? A strategic approach to urban regeneration for Britain's cities*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Carley, M., Chapman, M., Kirk, K., Hastings, A. and Young, R. (2000) *Urban Regeneration Through Partnership: A study in nine urban regions in England, Scotland and Wales*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Carley, M., Kirk, K. and McIntosh, S. (2001) *Retailing, Sustainability and Neighbourhood Regeneration*, York: York Publishing Services.
- Chalal, K. (2000) *Ethnic Diversity, Neighbourhoods and Housing*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation Foundations Report 110, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Chapman, M., Kirk, K. and Carley, M. (2001) *Community Participation in Social Exclusion Partnerships*, Scottish Executive Development Department Research Programme Research Findings No. 117, Edinburgh.
- Chaskin, R. (2001) 'Building Community Capacity: A definitional framework and case studies from a comprehensive community initiative', *Urban Affairs Review*, 36, (3), 291-323.
- Chaskin, R. and Abunimah, A. (1997) *A View from the City: Local government perspectives on neighborhood-based governance in community-building initiatives*, Chaplin Hall Center for Children, University of Chicago.
- Chaskin, R. and Garg, S. (1997) 'The Issue of Governance in Area-Based Initiatives', *Urban Affairs Review*, 32, (5), 631-661.
- Church, C. and Elster, J. (2002) *Thinking Locally, Acting Nationally: Lessons for policy from local action on sustainable development*, York: York Publishing Services.
- Clapham, D. and Kintrea, K. (1994) 'Community Ownership and the Break-up of Council Housing in England', *Journal of Social Policy*, 23, (2), 219-245.
- Clapham, D., Kintrea, K. and Kay, H. (2000) 'User Participation in Community Housing: 'Is small really beautiful?'' Ch. in Stoker, G. (Ed.) *The New Politics of British Local Governance*, London: Macmillian Press.
- Clarke, R. and Combe, V. (2001) 'Public Involvement – A missed opportunity?', *In Progress*, 12, 4-5.
- Community Development Foundation (1996) *Regeneration and the Community in Rural Areas: Guidelines to the community involvement aspects of Rural Challenge*, London: CDF.
- Conner, R. and Tanjasiri, S. (1999) 'Communities Evaluating Community-Level Interventions: The development of community-based indicators in the Colorado Healthy Communities Initiative', *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 14, (1), 115-136.

- Cook, D. (2002) 'Consultation, for a Change? Engaging users and communities in the policy process', *Social Policy and Administration*, 36, (5), 516-531.
- Cooke, B. and Kothari, U. (Eds.) (2001) *Participation: The new tyranny?*, London: Zed Books.
- Cooper, C. and Hawtin, M. (1998) 'Understanding Resident Involvement': Turning theory into practice', Ch. in Cooper, C. and Hawtin, M. (Eds) *Resident Involvement and Community Action: Theory to practice*, Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing.
- Cooper, C. and Hawtin, M. (Eds.) (1998) *Resident Involvement and Community Action: Theory to practice*, Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing.
- Corry, D. (2003) 'The Brown-Milburn Frontline', *The Guardian*, 6 March.
- Coulson, A. and Sullivan, H. (2000) 'Developing the Representational Role of Elected Members: Local involvement, local action in a Birmingham ward' *Local Government Studies*, 26, (4), 49-57.
- Craig, G. (2001) 'Partnerships, Partnerships, Partnerships?', *Community Development Journal*, 36, (3), 249-252.
- Craig, G. and Manthorpe, J. (2000) *Fresh Fields: Rural social care - research, policy and practice agendas*, York: York Publishing Services.
- Craig, G., Taylor, M., Szanto, C. and Wilkinson, M. (1999) *Developing Local Compacts: Relationships between local public sector bodies and the voluntary and community sectors*, York: York Publishing Services.
- Curtice, J. (1999) *Public Opinion and Local Government: The crisis of local democracy in Britain*, CREST Working Paper No. 77, Department of Sociology, University of Oxford.
- Dahl, R. (2000) *On Democracy*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Davies, A. and Downs, E. (1997) 'Managing for a Change: How to run community development projects', *Development in Practice*, 7, (4), 520-521.
- Day, M. (1981) 'The Contribution of Sir Raymond Unwin and R. Barry Parker to the Development of Site Planning Theory and Practice c. 1890-1918', Ch. in Sutcliffe, A. (Ed.) *British Town Planning: The formative years*, Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Deakin, N. and Edwards, J. (1993) *The Enterprise Culture And The Inner City*, London: Routledge.
- DeFilippis, J. (2001) 'The Myth of Social Capital in Community Development', *Housing Policy Debate*, 12, (4), 781-806.
- del Tufo, S. and Gaster, L. (2002) *Evaluation of the Commission on Poverty, Participation and Power*, York: York Publishing Services.
- Demos (2003) *Inside Out: Rethinking inclusive communities*, London: Demos.
- Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (2000) *Joining It Up Locally: Report of Policy Action Team 17*, London: Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions.
- Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (2001) *Strong Local Leadership – Quality public services*, Cmd 5237, London: The Stationery Office.

Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (2002) *Neighbourhood Regeneration: Lessons from evaluation evidence from ten Single Regeneration Budget case studies*, London: Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions.

Dibben, P. and Bartlett, D. (2001) 'Local Government And Service Users: Empowerment through user-led innovation?', *Local Government Studies*, 27, (3), 43-58.

DiGaetano, A. (2000) 'The Changing Nature of the Local State: A comparative perspective', *Policy and Politics*, 30, (1), 61-77.

Dobbs, L. and Moore, A. (2002) 'Engaging Communities in Area-based Regeneration: The role of participatory evaluation', *Policy Studies*, 23, (3/4), 157-171.

Docherty, I., Goodlad, R., and Paddison, R. (2001) 'Civic culture, community and citizen participation in contrasting neighbourhoods', *Urban Studies*, 38, (12), 2225-2250.

Dolan, P., Cookson, R. and Ferguson, B. (1999) 'Effect of Discussion and Deliberations on the Public's Views of Priority Setting in Health Care: Focus group study', *British Medical Journal*, 318, 916-919.

Dorling, D. (2001) 'Anecdote is the Singular of Data', *Environment and Planning A*, 33, 1335-1340.

Dryzek, J. (1990) *Discursive Democracy: Politics, policy and political science*, Cambridge University Press.

Duncan, P. and Thomas, S. (2000) *Neighbourhood Regeneration: Resourcing community involvement*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Dwelly, T. (1991) 'Too Much Trust', *Roof*, 16, (Mar/Apr), 22-25.

Eaton, L. (1997) Protest v. Progress, *Community Care*, 3 Apr, 16-17.

Edelman, I. (2000) 'Evaluation and Community-based Initiatives', *Social Policy Magazine*, 31, (2), 13-23.

Edwards, B., Goodwin, M. and Woods, M. (2003) 'Citizenship, Community and Participation in Small Towns: A case study of regeneration partnerships', Ch. 9 in Imrie, R. and Raco, M. (Eds) *Urban Renaissance? New Labour, community and urban policy*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Edwards, C. (2001) 'Inclusion in Regeneration: A place for disabled people?', *Urban Studies*, 38, (2), 267-286.

Edwards, C. (2002) 'Barriers to Involvement: The disconnected worlds of disability and regeneration', *Local Economy*, 17, (2), 123-135.

Edwards, J. (1997) 'Urban Policy: The victory of form over substance?', *Urban Studies*, 34, (5-6), 825-843.

Elliott, R. and Nicholls, J. (1996) *It's Good to Talk: Lessons in public consultation and feedback*, Police Research Series Paper 22, London: Home Office Police Research Group.

Evans, R. and Long, R. (2000) 'Estate-Based Regeneration in England: Lessons from Housing Action Trusts', *Housing Studies*, 15, (2), 301-317.

- Exworthy, M., Berney, L. and Powell, M. (2000) 'How Great Expectation in Westminster May Be Dashed Locally': The local implications of national policy on health inequalities', *Policy and Politics*, 30, (1), 79-96.
- Farnell, R., Furbey, R., Shams al Haqq Hills, S., Macey, M. and Smith, G. (2003) *'Faith' in Urban Regeneration? Engaging faith communities in urban regeneration*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Fearnley, R. (2000) 'Regenerating the Inner City: Lessons from the UK's City Challenge experience', *Social Policy and Administration*, 34, (5), 567-583.
- Fernie, K. and McCarthy, J. (2001) 'Partnership and Community Involvement: Institutional morphing in Dundee', *Local Economy*, 16, (4), 299-311.
- Feuerstein, M., Sommerlad, E. and Willoughby, S. (1995) 'Partners in Evaluation: Evaluating development and community programmes with participants', *Evaluation* 1, (1), unknown.
- Fitzpatrick, S. and Kintrea, K. (1998) *Young Batley: Young people and urban regeneration*, Department for Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.
- Fitzpatrick, S., Hastings, A. and Kintrea, K. (1998) *Including Young People in Regeneration: A lot to learn?*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Fletcher, A., Elder, G. and Mekos, D. (2000) 'Parental Influences on Adolescent Involvement in Community Activities', *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 10, (1), 29-48.
- Foley, P. and Martin, S. (2000a) 'Perceptions of Community Led Regeneration: Community and Central Government Viewpoints', *Regional Studies*, 34, (8), 783-787.
- Foley, P. and Martin, S. (2000b) 'A New Deal for the Community? Public participation in regeneration and local service delivery', *Policy and Politics*, 28, (4), 479-491.
- France, A. and Crow, I. (2001) *CTC - the story so far: An interim evaluation of Communities That Care*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation Findings No. 671, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Franklin, M., Lyons, P. and Marsh, M. (2001) *The Turnout Paradox: Why changing electoral experiences trump changing social characteristics in driving voter turnout in advanced democracies*, Canterbury: Congress of the European Consortium for Political Research.
- Gamarnikow, E. and Green, A. (1999) 'The Third Way and Social Capital: Education Action Zones and a new agenda for education, parents and community', *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 9, (1), 3-22.
- Geddes, M. (1999) 'Partnership and Local Development in the European Union', Ch. in Haughton, G. (Ed.) *Community Economic Development*, London: The Stationery Office.
- Geller, W. (1998) 'As a Blade of Grass Cuts through Stone: Helping rebuild urban neighborhoods through unconventional police-community partnerships', *Crime and Delinquency*, 44, (1), 154-177.
- Gill, T. (1997) 'Home Zones', *Children and Society*, 11, 268-270.
- Glass, N. (1999) 'Sure Start: The development of an early intervention programme for young children in the United Kingdom', *Children and Society*, 13, 257-264.

- Glendinning, C. (2002) 'Partnerships between Health and Social Services: Developing a framework for evaluation', *Policy and Politics*, 30, (1), 115-127.
- Goodlad, R. (2002) 'Neighbourhood regeneration policy: rebuilding community?' in: *Reclaiming Community*, Nash, V. (Ed.), Institute for Public Policy Research, London, 65-84.
- Goodman, R. (1988) 'Crafting Urban Partnerships: Implementing neighborhood assistance programs', *Administration and Society*, 20, (3), 251-274.
- Gray, A. (1999) 'The Community Programme Revisited - Lessons for the New Deal era? Aaronovitch and Local Economic Policy', *Local Economy*, 14, (1), 96-109.
- Green, A. (2001) 'Unemployment, Nonemployment, and Labour Market Disadvantage', *Environment and Planning A*, 33, 1361-1364.
- Green, J. and Chapman, A. (1992) 'The British Community Development Project - Lessons for today', *Community Development Journal*, 27, (3), 242.
- Gregory, S. (1998) *Transforming Local Services: Partnership in action*, York: York Publishing Services.
- Greveson, G. (1994) 'In the Community', *Age and Ageing*, 23, Supp. 3, 15-17.
- Groves, R., Middleton, A., Murie, A. and Broughton, K. (2003) *Neighbourhoods that Work: A study of the Bourneville estate*, Birmingham, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Habermas, J. (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hall, D., Stewart, J., Barnes, M., Leurs, R. and McIver, S. (1997) *Citizen Participation: A framework for evaluation*, University of Birmingham, School of Public Policy Occasional Paper No. 11, Birmingham.
- Hall, S. (1995) 'The SRB: Taking stock', *Planning Week*, 3, (17), 16-17.
- Hall, S. (2000) 'The Way Forward for Regeneration?: Lessons from the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund', *Local Government Studies*, 26, (1), 1-14.
- Hall, S. and Mawson, J. (1999) *Challenge Funding, Contracts and Area Regeneration: A decade of innovation in policy management and coordination*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Hall, S., Mawson, J. and Nicholson, B. (1995) 'City Pride: The Birmingham experience', *Local Economy*, 10, (2), 108-116.
- Hambleton, R. (1995) 'Lessons from the Empowerment Zone', *Planning Week*, 3, (44), 18-19.
- Hamilton Gurney, B. (undated) *Public Participation in Health Care: Involving the public in health care decision making: A critical review of the issues and methods*, Health Services Research Group, University of Cambridge.
- Hastings, A. and Fitzpatrick, S. (1996) *Dingle 2000 SRB: Young people and urban regeneration case study report*, unpublished report, Department for Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.
- Hastings, A. and Fitzpatrick, S. (1998) *The Moss Side Initiative: Young people and urban regeneration*, unpublished report, Department for Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.

Hastings, A., Fitzpatrick, S. and Kintrea, K. (1997) *The Greater Shankill Partnership: Young people and urban regeneration case study report*, unpublished report, Department for Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.

Hastings, A., McArthur, A. and McGregor, A. (1994a) *Community Participation and Partnership in Estate Regeneration Project Case Study Report No. 6: Cruddas Park Community Trust*, TERU, University of Glasgow.

Hastings, A., McArthur, A. and McGregor, A. (1994b) *Community Participation and Partnership in Estate Regeneration Project Case Study Report No. 3: The Greater Easterhouse Initiative*, TERU, University of Glasgow.

Hastings, A., McArthur, A. and McGregor, A. (1994c) *Community Participation and Partnership in Estate Regeneration Project Case Study Report No. 2: The Wester Hailes Partnership*, TERU, University of Glasgow.

Hastings, A., McArthur, A. and McGregor, A. (1994d) *Community Participation and Partnership in Estate Regeneration Project Case Study Report No.4: The Castlemilk Partnership*, TERU, University of Glasgow.

Hastings, A., McArthur, A. and McGregor, A. (1994e) *Community Participation and Partnership in Estate Regeneration Project Case Study Report No. 1: The Drumchapel Initiative*, TERU, University of Glasgow.

Hastings, A., McArthur, A. and McGregor, A. (1996) *Less than Equal? Community organisations and estate regeneration partnerships*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Hawtin, M. (1998) 'User Friendly', *Community Care*, 1228, 24-25.

Hayton, K. (1998) 'Using Construction Projects to Create Jobs and Training Opportunities: The City Challenge experience', *Town Planning Review*, 69, (2), 115-134.

Health Development Agency (2000) *Participatory Approaches in Health Promotion and Planning: A literature review*, Summary Bulletin, London: Health Development Agency.

Held, D. (Ed.) (1993) *Prospects For Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Higgins, J. (1998) 'HAZs Warning: The lessons of area-based past initiatives should be heeded if health action zones are to avoid pitfalls', *Health Service Journal*, 16, Apr, 24-25.

Hildebrandt, E. (1994) 'A Model for Community Involvement in Health (CIH) Program Development', *Social Science and Medicine*, 39, (2), 247-254.

Hildebrandt, E. (1996) 'Building Community Participation in Health Care: A Model and Example from South Africa', *Image*, 28, (2), 155-159.

Hill, M. (1995) 'Regenerating the Five Estates in Peckham', *Housing Review*, 44, (2), 35-37.

Hill, S. and Barlow, J. (1995) 'Single Regeneration Budget: Hope for "those inner cities"', *Housing Review*, 44, (2), 32-35.

Hirschfield, A., Johnson, S. and Bowers, K. (2001) *Review of Major Policy Developments and Evidence Base: Crime domain*, National Evaluation of New Deal for Communities: Scoping Report, Department of Civic Design, University of Liverpool.

Hoggett, P. and Bishop, J. (1986) *Organising Around Enthusiasms: Mutual aid in leisure*, London: Comedia.

Hollywood, B., Kelly, A., Kevany, J., McCarthy, J., McSweeney, M. and O'Dowd, T. (1998) 'Getting Control of the Planning Process: A community initiative in health care planning', *Administration*, 46, (2), 65-76.

Home Office (undated) *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team*, London: Home Office.

Hughes, J. and Carmichael, P. (1998) 'Building Partnerships in Urban Regeneration: A case study from Belfast', *Community Development Journal*, 33, (3), 205-225.

Hull, A. (2001) 'Neighbourhood Renewal: A toolkit for regeneration', *GeoJournal*, 51, 301-310.

Hulls, D. (1999) 'Tackling Social Exclusion: What role for area-based policies?', *New Economy*, 6, (4), 183-187.

Hutchinson, J. (1997) 'Regenerating the Counties: The case of the single regeneration challenge fund', *Local Economy*, 12, (1), 38-54.

Jeffres, L., Atkin, D. and Neuendorf, K. (2002) 'A Model Linking Community Activity and Communication with Political Attitudes and Involvement in Neighborhoods', *Political Communication*, 19, (4), 387-422.

Jones, M. and Gray, A. (2001) 'Social Capital, or Local Workfarism? Reflections on Employment Zones', *Local Economy*, 16, (3), 178-186.

Jones, P. (2003) 'Urban Regeneration's Poisoned Chalice: Is there an *impasse* in (community) participation-based policy?', *Urban Studies*, 40, (3), 581-601.

Jones, R. (2002) 'Partnerships in Action: Strategies for the development of voluntary community groups in urban parks', *Leisure Studies*, 21, (3/4), 305-326.

Jordan, J., Dowswell, T., Harrison, S., Lilford, R. and Mort, M. (1998) 'Whose Priorities? Listening to users and the public', *British Medical Journal*, 316, 1668-1670.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (1999) *Developing Effective Community Involvement Strategies: Guidance for SRB bids*, Foundations Report, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (2000) *Key Steps To Sustainable Area Regeneration*, Foundations Report, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Joshi, H. (2001) 'Is There a Place for Area-Based Initiatives?', *Environment and Planning A*, 33, 1349-1352.

Judd, D. and Parkinson, M. (1990) 'Patterns of Leadership' in Judd, D and Parkinson, M (Eds) *Leadership and Urban Regeneration: Cities in North America and Europe*, Urban Affairs Annual Reviews, London: Sage.

Judge, K. (2000) 'Testing Evaluation to the Limits: The case of English Health Action Zones', *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy*, 5, (1), 3-5.

Kemp, R. and Fordham, G. (1997) *Going the Extra Mile: Implementing 'Housing Plus' on five London housing association estates*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Kennedy, E. (1999) 'University-Community Partnerships: A mutually beneficial effort to aid community development and improve academic learning opportunities', *Applied Developmental Science*, 3, (4), 197-198.

- Khamis, C. (2000) 'Establishing Community Forums That Make a Difference', *Local Economy*, 15, (3), 264-267.
- King, D. (1999) 'Conclusion', Ch. in King, D. and Stoker, G. (Eds) *Rethinking Local Democracy*, London: Macmillan.
- King, D. and Stoker, G. (Eds) (1999) *Rethinking Local Democracy*, London: Macmillan.
- Kintrea, K. (1996) 'Whose Partnership? Community interests in the regeneration of a Scottish housing scheme', *Housing Studies*, 11, (2), 287-306.
- Kintrea, K. and Fitzpatrick, S. (1998) *Sandwell SRB3 'Young People in Focus': Young people and urban regeneration*, unpublished report, Department for Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.
- Kirby, P. and Bryson, S. (2002) *Measuring the Magic? Evaluating and researching young people's participation in public decision-making*, London: Carnegie Young People Initiative.
- Kleinman, M. (1999) 'There Goes the Neighbourhood: Area policies and social exclusion', *New Economy*, 6, (4), 188-192.
- Knox, M., Alcock, D., Roderick, A. and Iles, J. (2002) *Approaches to Community Governance: Models for mixed tenure communities*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Lane, M. and Henry, K. (2001) 'Community, Development, Crime and Violence: A case study', *Community and Development Journal*, 36, (3), 212-222.
- Lawson, L., Mackenzie, M., Mackinnon, J., Meth, F. and Truman, J. (2002) *Health Action Zones: Integrated case studies – preliminary findings from fieldwork in Spring 2001*, Health Promotion Policy Unit, University of Glasgow.
- Leach, S. (undated) *Starting to Modernise: Balancing good government and open decision making*, London: New Local Government Network.
- Lepofsky, J. and Fraser, J. (2003) 'Building Community Citizens: Claiming the right to place-making in the city', *Urban Studies*, 40, (1), 127-142.
- Levitas, R. (2000) 'Community, Utopia and New Labour', *Local Economy*, 15, (3), 188-197.
- Lewis, J. (2001) 'Evaluating Community Initiatives', *Children and Society*, 12, 188-189.
- Lewis, J. and Utting, D. (2001) 'Made to Measure? Evaluating community initiatives for children: Introduction', *Children and Society*, 15, 1-4.
- Lindsey, E. and McGuinness, L. (1998) 'Significant Elements of Community Involvement in Participatory Action Research: Evidence from a community project', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 28, (5), 1106-1114.
- Lloyd, P. and Ramsden, P. (2000) *Local Enterprising Localities: Area based employment initiatives in the United Kingdom*, European Communities, Brussels.
- Local Government Association (1999) *Some Early Lessons from Area-Based Initiatives: Messages for today and tomorrow – from action zones and other initiatives*, Local Government Association Working Paper for Consultation, London.

- Local Government Association (2000) *Let's Talk About It: Principles for consultation on local governance*, London: Local Government Association.
- Local Government Association (2002) *Guidance on Community Cohesion*, London: Local Government Association.
- Lowndes, V. (1995) 'Citizenship and Urban Politics', Ch. in Judge, D., Stoker, G. and Wolman, H. (Eds) *Theories of Urban Politics*, London: Sage.
- Lowndes, V., Pratchett, L. and Stoker, G. (2001) 'Trends in Public Participation: Part 1 – Local government perspectives', *Public Administration*, 79, (1), 205-222.
- Lowndes, V., Pratchett, L. and Stoker, G. (2001) 'Trends in Public Participation: Part 2 – Citizens' perspectives', *Public Administration*, 79, (2), 445-455.
- Lowndes, V., Stoker, G., Pratchett, L., Wilson, D., Leach, S. and Wingfield, M. (1998) *Enhancing Public Participation in Local Government*, London: DETR.
- Lowndes, V., Stoker, G., Pratchett, L., Wilson, D., Leach, S. and Wingfield, M. (1998) *Guidance on Enhancing Public Participation in Local Government*, London: DETR.
- Lucas, K., Ross, A. and Fuller, S. (2003) *What's in a Name? Local Agenda 21, community planning and neighbourhood renewal*, York: York Publishing Services.
- Lyons, M., Smuts, C. and Stephens, A. (2001) 'Participation, Empowerment And Sustainability: (How) do the links work?', *Urban Studies*, 38, (8), 1233-1251.
- Mabbott, J. (1993) 'The Role of Community Involvement', *Policy Studies*, 14, (2), 27-35.
- Mackinnon, J., Bauld, L., Judge, K. and Lawson, L. (2001) *National Evaluation of Health Action Zones Monitoring Interviews: Autumn 2001 Summary Report*, University of Glasgow.
- Malpass, P. (1994) 'Policy Making and Local Governance: How Bristol failed to secure City Challenge funding (twice)', *Policy and Politics*, 22, (4), 301-312.
- Martin, S. (1998) *Achieving Best Value Through Public Engagement*, Warwick/DETR Best Value Series, Paper No. 8, Coventry: University of Warwick Local Government Centre.
- Martin, S. and Boaz, A. (2000) 'Public Participation and Citizen-Centred Local Government: Lessons from Best Value and Better Government for Older People pilot programmes', *Public Money and Management*, Apr-Jun, 47-53.
- Marx, G. (1989) 'Commentary: Some trends and issues in citizen involvement in the law enforcement process', *Crime and Delinquency*, 35, (3), 500-519.
- Matka, E., Barnes, M. and Sullivan, H. (2002) 'Health Action Zones: 'Creating alliances to achieve change'', *Policy Studies*, 23, (2), 97-106.
- Mattinson, D. (1998) 'Public Consultation for Strategic Development in the New Political Climate: Creating the people's government', *Annual Conference - Market Research Society*, 41, 69-72.
- Maxwell, J., Rosell, S. and Forest, P-G. (2003) 'Giving Citizens a Voice in Healthcare Policy in Canada', *British Medical Journal*, 326, 1031-1033.
- Mayo, E., Fisher, T., Conaty, P., Doling, J. and Mullineux, J. (1998) *Small is Bankable: Community reinvestment in the UK*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

- Mayo, M. (1997) 'Partnerships for Regeneration and Community Development: Some opportunities, challenges and constraints', *Critical Social Policy*, 17, (3), 3-26.
- McAleavey, S. (1997) *Sectarianism, Participation and Community Partnerships*, University of Ulster, Ulster: Community Research and Development Centre.
- McArthur, A. (1993) 'Community Partnership: A formula for neighbourhood regeneration in the 1990s?', *Community Development Journal*, 28, (4), 305.
- McArthur, A. (1995) 'The Active Involvement of Local Residents in Strategic Community Partnerships', *Policy and Politics*, 23, (1), 61.
- McArthur, A., Hastings, A. and McGregor, A. (1994) *An Evaluation of Community Involvement in the Whitfield Partnership*, Edinburgh: Scottish Office Central Research Unit.
- McCall, C. and Williamson, A. (2000) 'Fledgling Social Partnership in the Irish Border Region: European Union 'community initiatives' and the voluntary sector', *Policy and Politics*, 28, (3), 397-410.
- McCarthy, J. (1997) 'Empowerment or Exclusion?', *Town and Country Planning*, 66, (1), 20-21.
- McCulloch, A. (2001) 'Ward-Level Deprivation and Individual Social and Economic Outcomes in the British Household Panel Study', *Environment and Planning A*, 33, 667-684.
- McGregor, A., Clapham, D., Donnison, D., Gemmell, B., Goodlad, R., Kintrea, K. and McArthur, A. (1992) *Community Participation in Areas of Urban Regeneration: A report to Scottish Homes*, Edinburgh: Scottish Homes.
- McGregor, A., Glass, A., Richmond, K., Ferguson, Z. and Higgins, K. (1999) *Employer Involvement in Area Regeneration*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- McIver, S. (2001) 'Preparation and Training: The key to better patient involvement', *Quality in Health Care*, 10, (3), 3.
- McKinlay, J. (2002) 'Women Get Involved Locally: A project that helps women to play a more effective role in regeneration initiatives', *Voluntary Voice*, Apr, 12-13.
- Middleton, J. and Dimond, C. (1998) 'Sandwell Health Action Zone Puts on Its 'SHOES'', *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*, 14, (4), 331-336.
- Milburn, A. (2003) 'Localism: From rhetoric to reality', *Speech by the Rt Hon Alan Milburn MP, Secretary of State, to the New Health Network and the New Local Government Network, 5 February, 2003*. Available online at <http://www.doh.gov.uk/speeches/milburnfeb03localism.htm>. Accessed 1 August 2003.
- Miller, C. (1999) 'Community Organizing: Building social capital as a development strategy', *Community Development Journal*, 34, (3), 260-262.
- Ministry of Housing and Local Government (1969) *People and Planning: Report of the Committee on Public Participation and Planning (Skeffington Report)*, London: HMSO.
- Mitchell, R. (2001) 'Multilevel Modeling Might Not Be the Answer', *Environment and Planning A*, 33, 1357-1360.

- Modarres, A. (2002) 'Persistent Poverty and the Failure of Area-based Initiatives in the U.S.', *Local Economy*, 17, (4), 289-302.
- Morrison, N. (2000) 'Introduction: Social exclusion and community initiatives', *GeoJournal*, 51, 277-279.
- Murdoch, J., Abram, S. and Marsden, T. (2000) 'Technical Expertise and Public Participation in Planning for Housing: 'Playing the numbers game'', Ch. in Stoker, G. (Ed.) *The New Tactics of British Local Governance*, London: Macmillan Press.
- Murray, M. (2000) 'Social Capital Formation and Healthy Communities: Insights from the Colorado Healthy Communities initiative', *Community and Development Journal*, 35, (2), 99-108.
- Murray, R. (2002) 'Citizens' Control of Evaluations: Formulating and assessing alternatives', *Evaluation*, 8, (1), 81-100.
- Murtagh, B. (1999) 'Urban Segregation and Community Initiatives in Northern Ireland', *Community Development Journal*, 34, (3), 219-226.
- Murtagh, B. (2001) 'The URBAN Community Initiative in Northern Ireland', *Policy and Politics*, 29, (4), 431-46.
- National Consumer Council (2002) *Involving Consumers: Everyone benefits*, London: National Consumer Council.
- Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (2002) *Collaboration and Co-Ordination in Area-based Initiatives*, Research Report No. 1, London: Neighbourhood Renewal Unit.
- Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (2003) *Neighbourhood NiBs: News in brief from the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit*, London: Neighbourhood Renewal Unit.
- New Economics Foundation (1998) *Participation Works! 21 Techniques of community participation for the 21st Century*, London: New Economics Foundation.
- Newburn, T. and Jones, T. (2002) *Consultation by Crime and Disorder Partnerships*, Briefing note/Police Research Series Paper No. 148, London: Home Office.
- Newcombe, R., (1998) *Not Too Big, Not Too Small: Strategies for medium-sized housing associations*, Centre for Housing Policy, York: University of York.
- Nixon, J., Walker, M. and Baron, S. (2002) 'From Washington Heights to the Raploch: Evidence, mediation, and the genealogy of policy', *Social Policy and Society*, 1, (3), 237-246.
- No author (1998) 'Award on the Wild Side: Why community involvement is the key to developing viable park regeneration schemes', *Leisure Manager*, 16, (3), 22.
- No author (1999) 'Down-to-Earth Vision, Community Based IT Initiatives and Social Inclusion, by IBM and Community Development Foundation', *Journal of Technology in Human Services*, 16 (1), 87.
- No Author (undated) *Resident Services Organisations: A new tool for regeneration*, Manchester: Priority Estates Project.
- North, P. (2000) 'Community Capacity Building: Maintaining the momentum', *Local Economy*, 15, (3), 251-267.

- Nutley, S., Percy-Smith, J. and Solesbury, W. (2003) *Models of Research Impact: A cross-sector review of literature and practice*, London: Learning and Skills Research Centre.
- Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) (2002a) *Community Involvement: The roots of renaissance?*, Urban Research Summary No. 5, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- ODPM (2002b) *Neighbourhood Regeneration: Lessons and evaluation evidence from 10 SRB case studies*, Urban Research Summary No. 1, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- ODPM (2002c) *Turning Areas Around – The Impact of SRB on Final Outcomes*, Urban Research Summary No. 4, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- Ong, P., Birch, K. and Cropper, S. (2000) *Nottingham Social Action Research Project (SARP): Process evaluation, Second Report*, Centre for Health Planning and Management, Keele University.
- Ong, P., Birch, K. and Cropper, S. (undated) *Salford Social Action Project (SARP): Process evaluation First Report*, Centre for Health Planning and Management, University of Keele. Available online at http://www.phel.gov.uk/sarpdocs/sal_eval1.pdf. Accessed 17 July 2003.
- Osborne, S. and Ross, K. (1998) 'Local Development Agencies and Public-Private Partnerships in Local Communities: The policy-practice interface', Ch. in Harris, M, Rochester, C and Billings, C (Eds) *Third Sector Organisation in a Changing Policy Context: Proceedings of the 20th Anniversary Conference of the Centre for Voluntary Organisation*, London: London School of Economics and Political Science, Centre for Voluntary Organisation.
- Osborne, S., Beattie, R. and Williamson, A. (2002) *Community Involvement in Rural Regeneration Partnerships in the UK: Evidence from England, Northern Ireland and Scotland*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Osborne, S., Williamson, A. and Beattie, R. (2002) 'Community Involvement in Rural Regeneration Partnerships in the UK: Key issues from a three nation study', *Regional Studies*, 36, (9), 1083-1092.
- Ouf, A. (2002) 'Community Development Projects in Older City Districts: User participation mechanisms in Egypt', *International Development Planning Review*, 24, (3), 299-314.
- Packer, J., Spence, R. and Beare, E. (2002) 'Building Community Partnerships: An Australian case study of sustainable community-based rural programmes', *Community Development Journal*, 37, (4), 316-326.
- Painter, C. and Clarence, E. (2001) 'UK Local Action Zones and Changing Urban Governance', *Urban Studies*, 38, (8), 1215-1232.
- Parke, C., Sillman, T. and Anderson, J. (2002) 'Building Healthy Communities', *Community Practitioner*, 75, (2), 43-45.
- Parkes, M. (2000) 'Maintaining Momentum through Community Activism in Kings Cross', *Local Economy*, 15, (3), 261-263.
- Parkinson, M. (1996) 'Twenty Five Years of Urban Policy in Britain – Partnership, entrepreneurialism or competition?', *Public Money and Management*, Jul/Sep, 7-14.
- Parkinson, M., (1998) *Combating Social Exclusion: Lessons from area-based programmes in Europe*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

- Pattie, C. (2001) 'On Reinvented Wheels', *Environment and Planning A*, 33, 1353-1356.
- Pattie, C. and Johnston, R. (2001) 'Losing the Voters' Trust: Evaluations of the political system and voting at the 1997 British general election', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 3, (2), 191-222.
- Pearson, S. and Craig, G. (2001) 'Community Participation in Strategic Partnerships in the United Kingdom', Ch. in Pierson, J. and Smith, J. (Eds) *Rebuilding Community: Policy and practice in urban regeneration*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- People for Action (2003) *Ensuring the Quality of Community Investment*, Birmingham: People for Action.
- Pepinsky, H. (1989) 'Issues of Citizen Involvement in Policing', *Crime and Delinquency*, 35, (3), 458-470.
- Petrosino, A. (undated) *Standards for Evidence and Evidence for Standards: The case of school-based drug prevention*, review essay, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Harvard.
- Petts, J. (1995) 'Waste Management Strategy Development: A case study of community involvement and consensus-building in Hampshire', *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 38, (4), 519-536.
- Pierre, J. (1998) 'Public-Private Partnerships and Urban Governance: Introduction' in Pierre, J. (Ed.) *Partnerships in Urban Governance: European and American experience*, Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Pinto, R., (1991) 'An Analysis of the Impact of Estate Action Schemes', *Local Government Studies*, 19, (1), 37-55.
- Pinto, R. (1991) 'Central/Local Interaction in Renovating Run-down Estates - The view of housing authorities on the estate action initiative', *Local Government Studies*, 17, (1), 45-62.
- Popham, J. (1995) 'Urban Regeneration and the Single Regeneration Budget', *Housing and Planning Review*, 50, (1), 11-12.
- Potter, T. (1998) *Planning for Real Participation: Community participation and capacity building work of the Neighbourhood Initiatives Fund*, Telford: Neighbourhood Initiatives Foundation.
- Power, A. (1987) 'The Priority Estates Project in the Isle of Dogs', *Housing Review*, 36, 11-12.
- Power, A. (1988) 'Dismantling the Fiefdoms', *New Statesman and Society*, 1, 28-29.
- Prescott, J. (2000) 'Foreword' to *Our Towns and Cities: The future – delivering urban renaissance*, Cmd 4911, London: The Stationery Office.
- Prime, D., Zimmeck, M. and Zurawan, A. (2002) *Active Communities: Initial findings from the 2001 Home Office Citizenship survey*, London: Home Office.
- Purdue, D. (2001) 'Joining up the Community: The third sector in the coordination of area-based initiatives', Ch. in Taillieu, T. (Ed.) *Collaborative Strategies and Multi-organizational Partnerships*, Garant, Leuven, Netherlands.

Purdue, D., Razzaque, K., Hambleton, R. and Stewart, M., with Huxham, C. and Vangen, S. (2000) *Community Leadership in Area Regeneration*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Putnam, R. (2001) *Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American community*, New York: Touchstone.

Raco, M. and Flint, J. (2001) 'Communities, Place and Institutional Relations: Assessing the role of area-based community representation in local governance', *Political Geography*, 20, 585-612.

Ram, M. (1995) 'The Politics of Research: Local consultation in a City Challenge context', *Sociology*, 29, (2), 275-292.

Rao, N. (2000) *Reviving Local Democracy: New Labour, new politics?*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Regional Co-Ordination Unit (2002) *ABI Review: The newsletter of the Area Based Initiative Forum*, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Regional Co-Ordination Unit (2002) *Review of Area-Based Initiatives*, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Revans, L. (2001) 'Building Partnerships', *Community Care*, 20 Sep, Supp, VIII-IX.

Rhodes, J., Tyler, P., Brennan, A., Stevens, S., Warnock, C. and Otero-Garcia, M. (2002) *Lessons and Evaluation Evidence from Ten Single Regeneration Budget Case Studies: Mid term report*, London: Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions.

Rich, M., Giles, M. and Stern, E. (2001) 'Collaborating to Reduce Poverty: Views from city halls and based organizations', *Urban Affairs Review*, 37, (2), 184-204.

Richards, D. (1990) 'Local Initiatives Make a Difference: The importance of citizen involvement and new knowledge in solving local problems', Paper in *Report of Symposium in Honor of Glen C. Pulver: Values of a community economic developer*, Wisconsin, USA: University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Richardson, L. and Le Grand, J. (2002) *Outsider and Insider Expertise: The response of residents of deprived neighbourhoods to an academic evaluation of social exclusion*, CASE Paper 57, London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics.

Rittel, H. and Webber, M. (1973) 'Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning', *Policy Sciences*, 4, 155-159.

Roberts, F. (1998) *Community Development in South Leytonstone: An evaluation of the South Leytonstone Single Regeneration Budget community development programme*, Commentary Series Paper 71, London: Centre for Institutional Studies, University of East London.

Roberts, R. and Pietsch, J. (1996) 'Community Management and Social Action: Politicisation or parochialism?', *Community Development Journal*, 31, (2), 143-152.

Robinson, F., and Colenutt, B. (1998) 'The City Challenge Experience', *Local Economy*, 12, (4), 383-384.

Robson, B., Peck, J. and Holden, A. (2000) *Regional Agencies And Area-Based Regeneration*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

- Robson, P., Begum, N. and Lock, M. (2003) *Developing User Involvement: Working towards user-centred practice in voluntary organisations*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Roddick, A. (2002) 'Revitalizing Communities through Partnerships', *Community Development Journal*, 37, (2), 188-193.
- Roe, K. and Scarnell, H. (2001) 'Public Involvement: Concrete action', *Health Service Journal*, 5 Apr, 30-31.
- Romice, O. (2000) 'New Developments in and Reflections on, the Use of Visual Literacy and Environmental Evaluation for the Participation of Community Groups in Design', *GeoJournal*, 51, 311-319.
- Rosenbaum, D., Lurigio, A. and Lavrakas, P. (1989) 'Enhancing Citizen Participation and Solving Serious Crime: A national evaluation of Crime Stoppers programs', *Crime and Delinquency*, 35, (3), 401-420.
- Rosenthal, L. (1996) 'Employment Effects of Community Programme Participation: Evidence from matched samples', *Manchester School*, LXIV, (1), 54-69.
- Rupasingha, A., Wojan, T. and Freshwater, D. (1999) 'Self-Organization and Community-Based Development Initiatives', *Journal of the Community Development Society of America*, 30, (1), 66-82.
- Rydin, Y. and Sommer, F. (1999) *Evaluation of Stages 1 and 2 of the Litmus Project: An evaluation of the public participation dimensions of a local sustainability indicators project*, Report to London Borough of Southwark, London School of Economics and Political Science, London.
- Salford Social Action Research Project (undated) *Involving Lay Publics in Developing Policy and Services: Lessons from Salford Social Action Research Project (SARP)*. Available online at http://www.phel.gov.uk/sarpdocs/lay_publics.pdf. Accessed 17 July 2003.
- Sanderson, I. (1999) 'Participation and Democratic Renewal: From instrumental to communicative rationality?', *Policy and Politics*, 27, (3), 325-341.
- Sanderson, I. with Walton, F. and Campbell, M. (1999) *Back to Work: Local action on unemployment*, York: York Publishing Services.
- Satterthwaite, D. (2002) 'Local Funds - and their potential to allow donor agencies to support community development and poverty reduction in urban areas and cities', *Environment and Urbanization*, 14, (1), 179-188.
- Savage, J. (1995) 'Astroturf Lobbying Replaces Grassroots Organizing', *Business and Society Review*, 95, 8-10.
- Scott, J. (1996) 'How to Internationalize the Community Involvement Program', in *Report of the Conference Board of the Strategic Opportunities in Corporate Community Activity Conference*, New York: The Conference Board.
- Shafer, D. (2001) '2000: The Year in Review: Dee Naquin Shafer revisits the major issues that affected housing and community development programs last year', *Journal of Housing and Community Development*, 58, (1), 26-34.
- Sharkey, M. (1993) 'Newcastle's West End - Monitoring the City Challenge Initiative', *Local Economy*, 8, (1), 91.

- Shaw, K. and Davidson, G. (2002) 'Community Elections for Regeneration Partnerships: A new deal for local democracy?', *Local Government Studies*, 28, (2), 1-15.
- Sherman, L., Farrington, D., Welsh, B. and Layton MacKenzie, D. (2002) *Evidence Based Crime Prevention*, London: Routledge.
- Simpson, D. and Cieslik, M. (2002) 'Education Action Zones, Empowerment and Parents', *Educational Research*, 44, (2), 119-128.
- Skinner, S. and Wilson, M. (2002) *Assessing Community Strengths: A practical handbook for planning capacity building*, London: Community Development Foundation.
- Slatter, P. (Ed.) (2001) *After the Crossroads: Housing associations as community investors*, York: York Publishing Services.
- Smith, G. (1999) *Area-Based Initiatives: The rationale and options for area targeting*, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, CASE Paper 25, London: London School of Economics.
- Smith, G., Noble, M. and Wright, G. (2001) 'Do We Care about Area Effects?', *Environment and Planning A*, 33, 1341-1344.
- Smith, L. (1991) 'Community Participation in Health: A case study of World Health Organization's Healthy Cities project in Barcelona and Sheffield', *Community Development Journal*, 26, (2), 112-117.
- Smith, M. (1987) 'Area Action - has it a future: Fighting a losing battle', *Housing*, 23, 28-33.
- Smith, M. (1999) *Evaluating Community Involvement: Tools and techniques for multi-sector partnerships*, University of Birmingham, School of Public Policy Occasional Paper No. 24, Birmingham.
- Smith, M. and Beazley, M. (2000) 'Progressive Regimes, Partnerships and the Involvement of Local Communities: A framework for evaluation', *Public Administration*, 78, (4), 855-878.
- Smith, N. (1997) 'The Single Regeneration Budget - Problems and solutions', *Housing and Planning Review*, 52 (2), 12-13.
- Social Exclusion Unit (1998) *Bringing Britain Together: A national strategy for neighbourhood renewal*, London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Social Exclusion Unit (2000) *Report of Policy Action Team 4: Neighbourhood management*, London: The Stationery Office.
- Sollosi, D. (2001) 'Redevelopment that Works', *Journal of Housing and Community Development*, 58, (4), 29-33.
- South, J. and Green, E. (2001) 'Learning from Practice: Evaluating a community involvement team within a Health Action Zone', *Research Policy And Planning*, 19, (3), 1-10.
- Splash, C. (2001) 'Editorial: Broadening democracy in environmental policy processes', *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 19, 475-481.
- Staples, L., Hanna, M. and Robinson, B. (1995) 'Strategies for Community Empowerment: Direct action and transformative approaches to social change practice', *Journal of Community Practice*, 2, (3), 130-133.

- Steelman, T. and Ascher, W. (1997) 'Public Involvement Methods in Natural Resource Policy Making: Advantages, disadvantages and trade-offs', *Policy Sciences*, 30, 71-90.
- Stewart, M. (1996) 'Competition and Competitiveness in Urban Policy', *Public Money and Management*, Jul/Sep, 21-26.
- Stewart, M. and Taylor, M. (1995) *Empowerment and Estate Regeneration*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Stoker, G. (Ed.) (2000) *The New Politics of British Local Governance*, London: Macmillan Press.
- Stone, C. (1999) 'Voices from the Field: Learning from the early work on comprehensive community initiatives', *Urban Affairs Review*, 34, (6), 843-856.
- Sullivan, H., Barnes, M. and Matka, E. (2002) 'Building Collaborative Capacity through 'Theories of Change': Early lessons from the evaluation of Health Action Zones in England', *Evaluation*, 8, (2), 205-226.
- Taylor, M. (1995) 'Unleashing the Potential: Bringing Residents to the Centre of Regeneration', *Joseph Rowntree Foundation Policy Options, Supplement to Housing Research Summary No. 12*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Taylor, M. (1998) 'Combating the Social Exclusion of Housing Estates', *Housing Studies*, 13, (6), 819-832.
- Taylor, M. (2000) *Top-down Meets Bottom-up: Neighbourhood management*, York: York Publishing Services.
- Taylor, M., Zahno, K., Thake, S. and Nock, M. (2002) *Exploring the Field of Residents' Consultancy*, Research Report No. 382, London: Department for Education and Skills.
- Thake, S. (1995) *Staying the Course: The role and structures of community regeneration organisations*, York: York Publishing Services.
- Thake, S. (1999) *Tollington Initiative: Towards a Community-Led Strategy for Regeneration: A report by the University of North London for the London Borough of Islington and the residents of the Tollington Initiative area*, London: University of North London.
- Thake, S. (2001) *Building Communities, Changing lives: The contribution of large, independent neighbourhood regeneration organisations*, York: York Publishing Services.
- The Annie E Casey Foundation (2000) *Transforming Neighborhoods into Family-Supporting Environments*, Report of The Annie E Casey Foundation Research Evaluation Conference, March 1999, Baltimore.
- Tiesdell, S. (2001) 'A Forgotten Policy? A perspective on the evolution and transformation of housing action trust policy, 1987-99', *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 1, (3), 357-383.
- Tilley, N. (1993) 'Crime Prevention and the Safer Cities Story', *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, (1), 40-57.
- Tilson, B., Mawson, J., Beazley, M., Burfitt, A., Collinge, C., Hall, S., Loftman, P., Nevin, B. and Srbljanin, A. (1997) 'Partnerships for Regeneration: The Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund Round One', *Local Government Studies*, 23, (1), 1-15.
- Trott, T. (2002) *Best Practice in Regeneration: Because it works*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

- Truman, C. and Raine, P. (2001) 'Involving Users in Evaluation: The social relations of user participation in health research', *Critical Public Health*, 11, (3), 215-229.
- Turner, R. (1999) 'Entrepreneurial Neighborhood Initiatives: Political capital in community development', *Economic Development Quarterly*, 13, (1), 15-22.
- van Wersch, A. and Eccles, M. (2000) 'Involvement of Consumers in the Development of Evidence Based Clinical Guidelines: Practical experiences from the North of England evidence based guideline development programme', *Quality in Health Care*, 10, 10-16.
- Voyle, J. and Simmons, D. (1999) 'Community Development through Partnership: Promoting health in an urban indigenous community in New Zealand', *Social Science and Medicine*, 49, 1035-1050.
- Wagle, U. (2000) 'The Policy Science of Democracy: The issues of methodology and citizen participation', *Policy Sciences*, 33, 207-223.
- Waite, M. (1999) 'Resident Involvement and Community Action: Theory to practice', *Community Development Journal*, 34, (4), 380-381.
- Walker, K. (2002) *Successful Government Funded Projects in Rural Alaska: The 3 C's: Challenges for Community Involvement*, Paper given to International Conference on Cold Regions Engineering, Anchorage, Alaska.
- Warner, M. and Robb, C. (1996) 'Strategic Development Planning at the Community Level: A modification to participatory planning', *Community Development Journal*, 31, (4), 330-342.
- Waters, J. (1997) 'A Lonestar is Reborn: A down-and-out Dallas center is brought back to life through a public-private partnership, community involvement, and a lot of hands-on management', *Journal of Property Management*, 62, (1), 38-41.
- Webster, A. (2001) 'Client Involvement is the Sure Way to Better Health', *Nursing Times*, 97, (40), 36-37.
- Weinberger, K. and Jutting, J. (2001) 'Women's Participation in Local Organizations: Conditions and constraints', *World Development*, 29, (8), 1391-1404.
- White, L. (2003) 'The Role of Systems Research and Operational Research in Community Involvement: A case study of a Health Action Zone', *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 20, 133-145.
- Wiebe, A. (2000) 'Who Participates? Determinants of Participation in a Community Development Project in Guatemala', *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 21, SPI/1, 579-604.
- Wilcox, D. (1994) *The Guide to Effective Participation*, Brighton: Partnership Books.
- William Roe Associates (1994) *An Evaluation of Community Involvement in the Ferguslie Park Partnership*, Edinburgh: The Scottish Office Central Research Unit.
- Williams, G. (1995) 'Local Governance and Urban Prospects: The potential of city pride', *Local Economy*, 10, (2), 100-107.
- Williams, G. (1995) 'Manchester City Pride - A focus for the future?', *Local Economy*, 10, (2), 124-132.

Williams, M. (2002) 'Why Doesn't the Government Respond to the Participating Public?', *Vanguard Online*, Dec. Available online at <http://www.vanguard.f9.co.uk/030101.doc>. Accessed 30 June 2003.

Woodward, R. (1991) 'Mobilising Opposition: The campaign against Housing Action Trusts in Tower Hamlets', *Housing Studies*, 6, 44-56.

Young, S. (1993) 'Assessing the Challenge's Local Benefits', *Town and Country Planning*, 62 (1/2), 3-5.

Young, S. (2000) 'Participation Strategies and Environmental Politics: Local Agenda 21', Ch. in Stoker, G. (Ed.) *The New Politics of British Local Governance*, London: Macmillan.

Appendix E

Bibliography from Stage 3

Part 1. Papers and reports of studies (43 items, representing 26 studies)

Anastacio, J., Gidley, B., Hart, L., Keith, M., Mayo, M. and Kowarzik, U. (2000) *Reflecting Realities: Participants' perspectives on integrated communities and sustainable development*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Ashworth, C. (2000) 'Changing Cultures and Shared Ownership', *Local Economy*, 15, (3), 256-261.

Bauld, L. and Judge, K. (2002) *Learning from Health Action Zones*, Chichester: Aeneas Press.

Brennan, A., Rhodes, J. and Tyler, P. (1998) *Evaluation of the SRB Challenge Fund – a partnership for regeneration: An interim evaluation*, London: DETR.

Brown, A. (2002) *Findings from Working for Communities*, Scottish Executive Development Department Research Programme Research Findings No. 137, Edinburgh.

Carley, M., Chapman, M., Kirk, K., Hastings, A. and Young, R. (2000) *Urban Regeneration through Partnership: A study in nine urban regions in England, Scotland and Wales*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Chapman, M., Kirk, K. and Carley, M. (2001) *Community Participation in Social Exclusion Partnerships*, Scottish Executive Development Department Research Programme Research Findings No. 117, Edinburgh.

Dibben, P. and Bartlett, D. (2001) 'Local Government and Service Users: Empowerment through user-led innovation?', *Local Government Studies*, 27, (3), 43-58.

Dobbs, L. and Moore, A. (2002) 'Engaging Communities in Area-based Regeneration: The role of participatory evaluation', *Policy Studies*, 23, (3/4), 157-171.

Docherty, I., Goodlad, R., and Paddison, R. (2001) 'Civic culture, community and citizen participation in contrasting neighbourhoods', *Urban Studies*, 38, (12), 2225-2250.

Dolan, P., Cookson, R. and Ferguson, B. (1999) 'Effect of Discussion and Deliberations on the Public's Views of Priority Setting in Health Care: Focus group study', *British Medical Journal*, 318, 916-919.

Duncan, P. and Thomas, S. (2000) *Neighbourhood Regeneration: Resourcing community involvement*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Edwards, B., Goodwin, M. and Woods, M. (2003) 'Citizenship, Community and Participation in Small Towns: A case study of regeneration partnerships', Ch. 9 in Imrie, R. and Raco, M. (Eds.) *Urban Renaissance? New Labour, community and urban policy*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Edwards, C. (2001) 'Inclusion in Regeneration: A Place for Disabled People', *Urban Studies*, 38, (2), 267-286.

Edwards, C. (2002) 'Barriers to Involvement: The disconnected worlds of disability and regeneration', *Local Economy*, 17, (2), 123-135.

- Farnell, R., Furbey, R., Shams al Haqq Hills, S., Macey, M. and Smith, G., (2003) *'Faith' in Urban Regeneration? Engaging faith communities in urban regeneration*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Fitzpatrick, S. and Kintrea, K. (1998) *Young Batley: Young people and urban regeneration*, unpublished report, Department of Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.
- Fitzpatrick, S., Hastings, A. and Kintrea, K. (1998) *Including Young People in Regeneration: A lot to learn?*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Foley, P. and Martin, S. (2000a) 'Perceptions of Community Led Regeneration: Community and central government viewpoints', *Regional Studies*, 34, (8), 783-787.
- France, A. and Crow, I. (2001) *CTC - the story so far: An interim evaluation of Communities that Care*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation Findings No. 671, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Goodlad, R. (2002) 'Neighbourhood regeneration policy: rebuilding community?' in: *Reclaiming Community*, Nash, V. (Ed.), Institute for Public Policy Research, London, 65-84.
- Goodlad, R., Docherty, I., Paddison, R. (2003) 'Responsible participation and housing: restoring democratic theory to the scene', *Housing Studies Association Autumn Conference: Community, Neighbourhood, Responsibility* 9/10 September, Bristol, at: <http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/chp/hsa/papers/autumn03/Goodlad.pdf>
Accessed 5 October 2003.
- Hastings, A. and Fitzpatrick, S. (1996) *Dingle 2000 SRB: Young people and urban regeneration case study report*, unpublished report, Department of Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.
- Hastings, A. and Fitzpatrick, S. (1998) *The Moss Side Initiative: Young people and urban regeneration*, unpublished report, Department of Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.
- Hastings, A., Fitzpatrick, S. and Kintrea, K. (1997) *The Greater Shankill Partnership: Young people and urban regeneration case study report*, unpublished report, Department of Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.
- Hastings, A., McArthur, A. and McGregor, A. (1994) *Community Participation and Partnership in Estate Regeneration Project Case Study Report No. 6: Cruddas Park Community Trust*, TERU, University of Glasgow.
- Hastings, A., McArthur, A. and McGregor, A. (1996) *Less than Equal? Community organisations and estate regeneration partnerships*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Holden, S. and Craig, G. (2002) 'Engaging communities in the Hull/East Riding Health Action Zone: the role of community development in addressing health inequalities', Ch. 1 in Bauld, L. and Judge, K. (Eds) *Learning from Health Action Zones*, Chichester: Aeneas Press.
- Hughes, J. and Carmichael, P. (1998) 'Building Partnerships in Urban Regeneration: A case study from Belfast', *Community Development Journal*, 33, (3), 205-225.
- Judge, K. and Bauld, L. (Eds) (2001) 'Strong theory, flexible methods: evaluating complex community-based initiatives' *Critical Public Health*, 11:1, 19-38.
- Kintrea, K. (1996) 'Whose Partnership? Community interests in the regeneration of a Scottish housing scheme', *Housing Studies*, 11, (2), 287-306.

Kintrea, K. and Fitzpatrick, S. (1998) *Sandwell SRB3 'Young People in Focus': Young people and urban regeneration*, unpublished report, Department of Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.

McArthur, A. (1995) 'The Active Involvement of Local Residents in Strategic Community Partnerships', *Policy and Politics*, 23, (1), 61.

McGregor, A., Clapham, D., Donnison, D., Gemmell, B., Goodlad, R., Kintrea, K. and McArthur, A. (1992) *Community Participation in Areas of Urban Regeneration: A report to Scottish Homes*, Edinburgh: Scottish Homes.

Newburn, T. and Jones, T. (2002) *Consultation by Crime and Disorder Partnerships*, Briefing note/Police Research Series Paper No. 148, London: Home Office.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2002b) *Neighbourhood Regeneration: Lessons and evaluation evidence from 10 SRB case studies*, Urban Research Summary No. 1, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2002c) *Turning Areas Around – The Impact of SRB on Final Outcomes*, Urban Research Summary No. 4, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Osborne, S., Beattie, R. and Williamson, A. (2002) *Community Involvement in Rural Regeneration Partnerships in the UK: Evidence from England, Northern Ireland and Scotland*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Ouf, A. (2002) 'Community Development Projects in Older City Districts: User participation mechanisms in Egypt', *International Development Planning Review*, 24, (3), 299-314.

Parkes, M. (2000) 'Maintaining Momentum through Community Activism in Kings Cross', *Local Economy*, 15, (3), 261-263.

Ram, M. (1995) 'The Politics of Research: Local consultation in a City Challenge context', *Sociology*, 29, (2), 275-292.

Rhodes, J., Tyler, P., Brennan, A., Stevens, S., Warnock, C. and Otero-Garcia, M. (2002) *Lessons and Evaluation Evidence from Ten Single Regeneration Budget Case Studies: Mid term report*, London: Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions.

Shaw, K. and Davidson, G. (2002) 'Community Elections for Regeneration Partnerships: A new deal for local democracy?', *Local Government Studies*, 28, (2), 1-15.

Part 2. Review papers, reports and books (8 items)

Botes, L. and Van Rensburg, D. (2000) 'Community Participation in Development: Nine plagues and twelve commandments', *Community Development Journal*, 35, (1), 41-58.

Brownill, S. and Darke, J. (1998) *Rich Mix: Inclusive strategies for urban regeneration*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Burns, D. and Taylor, M. (2000) *Auditing Community Participation: An assessment handbook*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Burton, P. (2003) *Community Involvement in Neighbourhood Regeneration: Stairway to heaven or road to nowhere?*, Centre for Neighbourhood Research Paper 13. Available online

at <http://www.neighbourhoodcentre.org.uk/research/cnrpaperspdf/cnr13pap.pdf>. Accessed 27 July 2003.

Cooke, B. and Kothari, U. (Eds) (2001) *Participation: The new tyranny?*, London: Zed Books.

Foley, P. and Martin, S. (2000b) 'A New Deal for the Community? Public participation in regeneration and local service delivery', *Policy and Politics*, 28, (4), 479-491.

Khamis, C. (2000) 'Establishing Community Forums that Make a Difference', *Local Economy*, 15, (3), 264-267.

ODPM (2002a) *Community Involvement: the roots of renaissance*, Urban Research Summary No. 5, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Appendix F

Additional cited references

Bradford, M. and Robson, B. (1995) 'An Evaluation of Urban Policy', in Hambleton, R. and Thomas, H. (Eds) *Urban Policy Evaluation: Challenges and change*, London: Paul Chapman.

Buck, N. (forthcoming) 'Social Cohesion', in *Cities: economic competitiveness and social cohesion*, Harding, A., Gordon, I., Buck, N. and Turok, I. (Eds), Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (2001) *Strong Local Leadership – Quality public services*, Cmd 5237, London: The Stationery Office.

Goodlad, R. (2002) 'Neighbourhood regeneration policy: rebuilding community?' in: *Reclaiming Community*, Nash, V. (Ed.), Institute for Public Policy Research, London, 65-84.

Held, D. (1995) *Democracy and the Global Order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan governance*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Imrie, R., and Raco, M. (2003) 'Community and the changing nature of urban policy', ch. 1 in: Imrie, R. and Raco, M. (Ed.) *Urban Renaissance? New Labour, community and urban policy*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Kleinman, M., Burton, P., Croft, J. and Travers, T. (2002) *Links Between the Finance and Non-finance Elements of Local Government: A literature review*, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Lowndes, V., Stoker, G., Pratchett, L., Leach, S., and Wingfield, M. (1998) *Enhancing Public Participation in Local Government*, London: Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions.

Parry, G., Moyser, G., and Day, N. (1992) *Political Participation and Democracy in Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pawson, R. and Tilley, N. (1997) *Realistic Evaluation*, London: Sage.

Prescott, J. (2000) 'Foreword' to *Our Towns and Cities: The future – Delivering urban renaissance*, Cmd 4911, London: The Stationery Office.

Sayer, A. (2000) *Realism and Social Science*, London: Sage.

Smith, G. (1999) *Area-based Initiatives: The rationale and options for area targeting*, CASE Paper no 25, London: London School of Economics.

Social Exclusion Unit (2000) *A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal: A framework for consultation*, London: Cabinet Office.

Social Exclusion Unit (2001) *A New Commitment to Neighbourhood renewal: National Strategy Action Plan*, London: Cabinet Office.

Wallace, A., Croucher, K., Quilgars, D. and Baldwin, S. (2003) *Meeting the Challenge: Developing systematic reviewing in social policy*, paper presented to the Social Policy Association Conference, University of York, 16 July.

Produced by the Research Development and Statistics Directorate, Home Office

This document is available only in Adobe Portable Document Format (**PDF**)
through the RDS website

Home Office
Research, Development and Statistics Directorate
Communication Development Unit
Room 264
50 Queen Anne's Gate
London SW1H 9AT

Tel: 020 7273 2084 (answerphone outside of office hours)

Fax: 020 7222 0211

Email: publications.rds@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

ISBN 1 84473 440 4

© Crown copyright 2004