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I was adopted and raised by white people, but my family, and communities that I have lived in, played in, worked in, prayed in, and belonged to from young adulthood to now (as one elder called it, my foolish years) have been mixed native and white. My daughter and her father are enrolled members of an Ojibwe band. My own birthfather's people are a mix of white and tribal roots from the southeastern part of the country – Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee. Some went early into Illinois, others south to Arkansas, and then west as part of the Trail of Tears. While a few written accounts do exist, what I know about this has been passed down to me in traditional forms, which mean the most to me. My main motivation for doing the project is that I, my family, and my friends, have been betrayed and devastated over and over by people who spoke of the idea that people should be cared for and not be mistreated, but who acted otherwise, based on different motivations, cultural values, expectations, and systematic histories. I still have to watch people I love suffer, and people continue to die, because of this.

Oppressive and hurtful behavior is not just because some people are ignorant, but also because some people willfully and purposefully choose to act based on their preferences for short-term economic and social dominance. These conflict with different preferences and systems, such as those that value collective subsistence, long-term thinking and behavior. So it is necessary to be strategic about how and when people with these differing preferences interact, whether that is systematically mandated, or voluntarily desired. It is useful to look for and talk about the similarities that can be referred to, that mutually beneficial action can be based on; and to be aware of the differences, to better negotiate from and for a position of indigenous empowerment and self-determination. As the thesis project unfolded, I repeatedly asked myself, and was by
asked by others: by whom, with whom, for whom, how, for what purpose and use was the project being done, and to what end? These were the same questions written down by Linda Tuhiwai Smith, an indigenous leader whose work was relied on heavily in this project.

While I can’t and don’t speak for others, I can speak for myself. I could not and would not have done this project, without all of my family, friends, elders, community mentors, and supportive cohort members and staff, who shared their thoughts and their words and their prayers and their time and their food and their coffee and their laughter and their tears, who kept their arms around me, loving me, guiding me, and holding me up when it seemed impossible to keep going. I know that I have grown immensely. I also hope that more people will think deeply and more broadly about their relationships, their leadership, their motivations, and their actions. I wish for all people to use the information they get for the benefit of all, rather than just some people. I wanted this paper to be helpful for building respectful relationships and diverse, sustainable communities. This paper is the result of my work, and also the work of all those who contributed to it. It is up to them to judge for themselves, whether or not it has been or will be of any use or help to them.
Abstract

Local Leaders’ Perceptions of Social Capital and Community Development is a study of social capital as described by five local leaders, based on their experiences with community development. In contrast to previous local applications of universal and collective social capital measures, the current project was a qualitative study of individual social capital. It looked to critical reviews of social capital theory, and decolonizing methodologies, for the creation of questions used in face-to-face interviews with individuals that lasted one to two hours long. From these interviews, qualitative descriptions of social relationships were gathered and analyzed. This revealed different types of ties between individuals and small groups, and the ties, motivations of, and benefits to, local leaders. It also presented an idiosyncratic picture of local community development. Of particular note were the experiences of leaders as advocates and agents, involved in building relationships cross-sector, cross-cultural, and cross-construct, in multi-dimensional and bounded contexts. This study may serve as a reference for those interested in better understanding the impact of social ties, in diverse leadership and for local, multidimensional sustainable community building efforts.
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Chapter One – Introduction

This project was a study of the impact of social relationships on five individual local leaders involved in community development efforts, based on their perceptions and experiences, and a relatively narrow theoretical definition of social capital: “the benefits accruing to individuals by virtue of participation in groups and on the deliberate construction of sociability for the purpose of creating this resource” (Portes, 1998, p. 6). It also looked to critical reviews of social capital theory, and decolonizing methodologies, to reveal the different kinds of ties between individuals and small groups, and the ties, motivations of and benefits to local leaders.

Many community development leaders across the country, and around the world, have seen social capital as a potentially valuable concept for improving the quality of lives for individuals, groups, and communities (Portes, 2000). Numbers of studies have grown, based on social capital as a collective benefit to cities and nations (Putnam, 2000). This trend was also noted locally, and included participation by portions of the community in a national social capital benchmark survey (Digby, Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation, 2007), and an attachment to community surveys (Knight, 2010). Easterling (2008) gave a glowing report of efforts by a local foundation aimed at developing social capital.

Not everyone has been happy with social capital theory. Critical analyses of studies indicated a lack of definitional consistency that stemmed from confusion about what it was, and what it did (Portes, 1998). Cause and effect generalizations and measures were also questioned, such as those between collective and individual social
capital, and between concepts such as civic engagement and social capital (Portes, 1998, 2000). As Portes noted, ‘Social capital as a property of cities or nations was qualitatively distinct from its individual version’ (2000, p. 3). Also noted were gaps in knowledge related to the multi-dimensional nature of the sources of social capital; as well as access to and exclusion from benefits to individuals and groups, based on different cultural norms and values; —social ties can be a liability as well as an asset’ (Woolcock, 2001, p. 4). These issues and questions were also relevant locally. As noted by Digby (Digby, Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation, 2007), regarding local participation in the national benchmark study, significant populations such as cell phone users, college students, and Native Americans, were underrepresented or not represented at all.

According to Woolcock (2001), ‘it is important to stress that, while gathering ‘hard data’ is indispensable, the qualitative aspects of social capital should not be neglected. In many respects, it is something of a contradiction in terms to argue that universal measures can be used to capture local idiosyncratic realities. At a minimum, this means that the construction of survey instruments to measure social capital should follow intensive periods in the field, ascertaining the most appropriate way to ask the necessary questions’ (p. 20-21).

However, adjustments to this type of research are also required, to address both criticisms of social capital theory (Portes, 1998, 2000) and decolonizing perspectives (Grande, 2000; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Issues include systematic, underlying assumptions, biases, and omissions, such as a failure to acknowledge mainstream ideologies, and contrary constructs as equal bases of fact. As indigenous sources have shown, many
methods and theories have not been beneficial to those being researched (Cleary Miller and Peacock, 1997; Day and Tellet, 2008; Grande, 2000; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Examining social capital on a smaller, qualitative, and respectful way may present a more meaningful picture than large-scale national measures and overall aggregate statistics (Portes, 2000; Weisinger and Salipante, 2005), and give a more detailed and useful reference point for sustainable leadership and community development (Rydin and Holman, 2004).

**Purpose**

The purpose of this project was to better understand the impact of social relationships and roles of leaders in local community development efforts. The research sought to answer the question: how do local leaders define, perceive, and experience social capital in community development efforts? A literature review was conducted to better understand social capital theory, to narrow the scope of the current project, to create open-ended questions to be used as a guide in interviews, and as a basis for analysis of the information gathered. This study may be useful for those interested in the concept of social capital, decolonizing methodologies, local leadership, and community development. The hope is that it will provide food for thought, and respectful, meaningful action for understanding social ties within sustainable community building efforts.

**Background**

Previous local measures of social capital were from participation in national, large-scale quantitative studies. Local data contained significant gaps of information, including detailed descriptions of qualitative aspects of local social capital. In gathering
the sources of information to lay the groundwork for this study, three overarching, interrelated themes became apparent: social capital, community development, and leadership.

**Setting**

This project was located within a Midwestern, mid-sized, metropolitan setting (~100,000 people) in an economically moderate to poor, widely spread geographic area (Northland Connection, 2010), home to a largely homogeneous European-American population (Center for Rural Policy Development, 2010). However, the regional population also included a substantial number of Native Americans, and a lower number of other ethnic minorities. These groups made up a higher percentage of those considered at-risk, underserved, and under-represented, potentially affecting inclusion in areas of leadership (Ford, 2008; Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, 2009; United Way of Greater Duluth, 2009). The project at hand may be useful to those interested in the concept of social capital as it intersects with ideas of diverse leadership and sustainable community development, in areas that are similar regarding demographic and geographic considerations. However, care must be taken in making generalizations or comparisons to development in areas that are dissimilar, such as larger urban areas with greater diversity or differing ethnic populations and economic status.

**Assumptions and Limitations**

This project looked at the definitions, perceptions, and experiences of social capital shared by five individual local leaders, related to their social ties and community development. It did not attempt to measure the quantity of social capital present and it
was not within the scope of the study to explicate any differences or similarities in demographic characteristics of previous studies. Also, while leader narratives may have included information about their experiences with various organizations, programs, and development initiatives, the goal of this study was to determine the leaders’ personal understandings of social capital, rather than organizational structures or operational policies or practices. This was a qualitative study of social capital and it was assumed the participants would be able to understand and answer the questions asked in the interviews. A few theoretical definitions and dimensions will follow.

Definitions and Concepts

Social Capital. Origins of social capital theory were attributed to two researchers, Bourdieu (1986), and Coleman (1988). While future studies diverged, often based on the further works of one scholar or the other, both Bourdieu and Coleman emphasize the intangible character of social capital relative to other forms. Whereas economic capital is in people’s bank accounts and human capital is inside their heads, social capital inheres in the structure of their relationships” (Portes, 1998, p. 7). Collective social capital was the collective value of all social networks (who people know) and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other (norms of reciprocity”) (Harvard Kennedy School of Government, Putnam, 2010). Individual social capital was defined as the benefits accruing to individuals by virtue of participation in groups and on the deliberate construction of sociability for the purpose of creating this resource” (Portes, 1998, p. 6); Positive or Negative Social Capital was described as a mechanism for individuals and groups to gain access to resources and also reinforce exclusion from
access to resources based on unequal power relations” (Schneider, 2007, p.577-578).

Multi-dimensional ties are horizontally or vertically linked in and outside of community (Woolcock, 2001). Categories of ties include:

- **Bonding.** Homogenous, strong ties, between people in similar situations, such as immediate family, close friends and neighbors; gang members or school cliques (Coleman, 1986; Putnam, 1995; Portes, 1998).

- **Bridging.** Heterogeneous ties, or more distant or weak ties, loose friendships and workmates (Putnam, 1995; Steinfield, Ellison, and Lampe 2008).

- **Linking.** Ties with unlike people in dissimilar situations outside of the community, for leveraging of a wider range of resources. This includes the scale of ties, i.e. horizontal and vertical, related to power dynamics (Woolcock, 2001).

- **Bracing.** Links between a limited set of actors in partnership, collaborative, or governance settings, across and between scales and sectors, for social scaffolding to strategically strengthen ties in a bounded community (Rydin and Holman, 2004).

**Community development.** The creation and support of economic and social programs, partnerships, and collaborations, to structurally and organizationally enhance and sustain the quality of life for citizens, by foundations, community service agencies, and area initiatives (Local Initiatives Support Corporation, 2010; United Way of Greater Duluth, 2009, 2010; Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation, 2010).
**Capacity Building.** Development of an organization's core skills and capabilities, such as leadership, management, finance and fundraising, programs, and evaluation, in order to build the organization's effectiveness and sustainability. It is the process of assisting an organization to identify and address issues and gain the insights, knowledge, and experience needed to solve problems and implement change” (Lake Superior Initiative, 2010).

**Leadership.** Defined and described as: positions of authority or influence (Merriam-Webster, 2010; Senge, 2006); reputation (Zacharakis, Flora, 2005); functional roles (Senge 2006; Senge, P., Smith, B., Kruschwitz, N., Laur, J., and Schley, S., 2008); situational, including cultural traditions and histories (Grande, 2000; Peacock and Wisuri, 2001; Treuer, 2011; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999).

**Decolonizing Methodologies.** Tuhiwai Smith (1999): A process which engages with imperialism and colonialism at multiple levels; having a critical understanding of the underlying assumptions, motivations and values which inform research practices” (p. 20); concerned with the broader politics and strategic goals of indigenous research; researchers have to clarify and justify their intentions; methods become the means and procedures through which the central problems of the research are addressed; often a mix of existing methodological approaches and indigenous practices” (p. 143).

**Summary**

While local community development efforts included measures of social capital, it has been from a large-scale, collective, and quantitative perspective. Qualitative information about local social capital, especially related to leadership ties, is noticeably
absent. This study offered a starting point for these types of discussions, through interviews with local leaders based on their definitions, perceptions, and experiences of social capital and community development efforts. Three areas of literature were seen to be informative, and will be examined in the next chapter.
Chapter Two – Literature Review

Introduction

Three bodies of literature are relevant to this study of local leaders’ perceptions and experiences of social capital in community development efforts: Social Capital, Community Development, and Leadership. Throughout this literature review, unless otherwise noted, all italicized emphases were added, to indicate key ideas and components of the current study.

Social Capital

Several sub-themes of social capital were noted: theoretical developments, criticisms of theory, trends, and local studies.

Theoretical Developments of Social Capital

Beginning uses of the term and concept in modern capitalist society are largely attributed to two researchers, philosopher and anthropologist Pierre Bourdieu (1986), and sociologist James S. Coleman (1988). Regarding social capital, in relation to other forms of capital, “both Bourdieu and Coleman emphasize the intangible character of social capital… Whereas economic capital is in people’s bank accounts and human capital is inside their heads, social capital inheres in the structure of their relationships” (Portes, 1998, p. 7). The works of Bourdieu and Coleman centered on individuals or small groups as the units of analysis … and the benefits accruing to individuals or families by virtue of their ties with others. Bourdieu’s treatment of the concept, in particular, was instrumental, going as far as noting that people intentionally built their relations for the benefits they would bring…” (Portes, 2000, p. 2).
Bourdieu (1986) defined social capital as “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition” (p. 248). Bourdieu said that while social capital is “never completely independent of it” (p. 249), “economic capital is at the root of all the other types of capital and … these transformed, disguised forms of economic capital … produce their most specific effects only to the extent that they conceal … the fact that economic capital is at their root” (p. 252). He also found that the greater the investment in disguise, the greater the value of conversion (p. 254-255), and that understanding the “efficacy” or intended effect of social capital requires an objective ability to step outside of two opposing perspectives: one that sees all exchanges as a matter of only economics; and one that advocates for other intended effects and ignores the first view (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 252).

Coleman (1988) found that “social capital is defined by its function. It is not a single entity but a variety of different entities… they all consist of some aspect of social structures and they facilitate certain actions of actors” (p. S97). He identified social capital closed network, bonding ties, and more loosely associated bridging ties, in which “credit slips” were created when people did things for each other or organized in ways that allowed resources of one relationship to be appropriated for use in others. He also noted that both kinds of these relationship structures consisted of obligations, expectations, and trustworthiness; information channels; and norms or sanctions (Coleman, 1988, p. S97).

A departure from Bourdieu and Coleman followed when political scientist Robert
Putnam (1995, 2000) focused on the collective aspect of social capital as an indicator of community and nation-wide civic health (1995, 2000). Putnam (1995) placed social capital in a civic context, describing it as “features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (p. 67). Putnam (1995) further noted that “symbolic” membership, or membership in name or by virtue of payment of membership dues, was not sufficient; civic engagement and social connectedness was also necessary (p. 71) His definition: “the collective value of all ‘social networks‘ (who people know) and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other (‘norms of reciprocity‘)” (Harvard Kennedy School of Government, Putnam, 2010). The popular appeal of Putnam’s views led to the quick rise and widespread use of social capital theory; however, within the plethora of studies that followed there was confusion and debate about the difference between what social capital was, and what it did (Edwards & Foley, 1997; Portes, 1998, 2000; Woolcock, 1998).

Current trends included a couple of significant critiques by sociologist Alejandro Portes (1998, 2000), who analyzed differences in the works of Bourdieu and Coleman, and the shift of focus from individual social capital to collective social capital by Putnam. He also elaborated on critical differences in definitions, applications, measurement, determinations of cause and effect, and the development of attributes of ties as having positive and negative effects (Portes, 1998, 2000). International social scientist Michael Woolcock (1998, 2001) also synthesized many of the theoretical characteristics of social capital, to create a multi-dimensional understanding of social capital based on the concept

This multidimensional perspective, along with globalization and other international interests, spurred further works that addressed issues of access, marginalization and exclusion, based on unequal power relations (Bottrell, 2008; Brough, Bond, Hunt, Jenkins, Shannon and Schubert, 2006; Rydin and Holman, 2004; Schneider, 2007, 2009). The work of Rydan and Holman (2004) built on the multidimensional ideas of Woolcock (1995, 2001) but also included the strategic development of bracing social capital ties, across sectors, scales; bounded horizontal and vertical contexts, for scaffolding in bounded community development.

**Criticisms of Social Capital Theory**

Portes (1998) found the use of an all-encompassing definition both vague and contradictory; the inclusion of processes, mechanisms, consequences, and contexts, for both sources and effects of social capital, opened the door to theoretical confusion and proliferation (p. 5). Defining social capital as functions of entities that were both structures, and mechanisms for producing, accessing, or facilitating social capital led to equating what it was with what it did (Edwards and Foley, 1997; Portes, 1998, 2000; Woolcock, 1998, 2001). At least three sets of theoretical criticisms related to this development were noted:

1. **Problems of cause and effect.** The blurring of components, especially in studies of collective social capital, created overlapping problems related to establishing cause and effect. For Portes this was indicated by tautological or circular reasoning:

   --Saying, for example, that student A has social capital because he obtained access
to a large tuition loan from his kin and that student B does not because she failed to do so neglects the possibility that B’s kin network is equally or more motivated to come to her aid but simply lacks the means to do. Defining social capital as equivalent with the resources thus obtained is tantamount to saying that the successful succeed. This circularity is more evident in applications of social capital that define it as a property of collectivities” (Portes, 1998, p. 5).

2. **Problems of omission.** The example above also illustrates omission. According to Portes (1998, 2000) and others (Burt, 2000; Woolcock, 1998, 2001), other problems of omission are indicated by a failure to consider:

a) *other types of capital* (e.g. human, economic, political)

b) *detrimental effects*; these included “at least four negative consequences of social capital: exclusion of outsiders, excess claims on group members, restrictions on individual freedoms, and downward leveling norms” (Portes, 1998, p. 15).

c) *other equally probable causes* in the creation of social capital.

These problems were also seen in civic engagement, and nonprofit work (Schneider, 2007, 2009; Weisinger and Salipante, 2005); as cultural reproduction in leadership (Zacharakis and Flora, 2005); and in development of the creative class (Hoyman and Faricy, 2009).

3. **Problems of bias.** These included cases where social capital was seen as:

a) *hierarchical*; with stances that were *top-down, or bottom-up, elitist or defensive* (Edwards & Foley, 1997; Loury, 1977; Portes, 1998, 2000; Putnam, 1995; Skocpol, 1996; Schneider, 2007; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). These were indicated by:
* misperceptions of social capital as the *ability to acquire it*

* broad assumptions of the dominant society

* equating social capital with its *virtuous effects and merit-based thinking*

* measurement of *unreliable or inaccurate indicators* in collective contexts

* failure to address *other factors* (other capital resources, time ranges, and motivations)

b) *political preference; indicated by:*

* A belief that a decline in the social health of the nation was due to failure on the part of the masses of people, without any responsibility being attributed to the top-down policies changes and practices of corporate, professional, or governmental elites.

* A failure to recognize an unlevel historical, political and economic playing field (Edwards & Foley, 1997). This also included the circular reasoning previously noted, similar to “the successful succeed” (Portes, 1998, p. 5). As Skocpol noted:

  “How ironic it would be if, after pulling out of locally rooted associations, the very business and professional elites who blazed the path toward local civic disengagement were now to turn around and successfully argue that the less privileged Americans they left behind are the ones who must repair the nation’s social connectedness, by pulling themselves together from below, without much help from government or their privileged fellow citizens. This, I fear, is what is happening as the discussion … rages across elite America” (1996, p. 25).
c) an either/or, two-ended paradigm or construct, that did not recognize any operation outside of the dominant system, or acknowledge pre-established systems and methods (Grande, 2000; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). These types of bias were indicated by:

* A failure to address hegemonic assumptions and attitudes of the mainstream, dominant society. This was evident in the coining of the term itself by Bourdieu (1986).

* The paternalistic use and development of theoretical concepts, with research outcomes related to ethnic or marginalized populations and contexts seen only as a reaction to a negative state of affairs, rather than an acknowledgement of empowerment.

* Analyses that lack an acknowledgement of benefits received as a result of such research, including and especially benefits to the researchers.

* Analyses from privileged positions that saw actions only in terms of presumptions of assimilation (cultural reproduction) or exclusion.

Theoretical Trends

Portes’ solution to the dilemmas posed was to advocate a return to the study of individual social capital, which would allow the effects to be more clearly seen, and accounted for (1998). Therefore, he gave a relatively narrow definition of social capital: “the benefits accruing to individuals by virtue of participation in groups and the deliberate construction of sociability for the purpose of creating this resource” (Portes, 1998, p. 3). Portes (1998) further
suggested analyses that separated: —(a) the possessors of social capital (those making claims); (b) the sources of social capital (those agreeing to these demands); and (c) the resources themselves” (p. 5). In addition to these separations, Portes found another factor to be at the crux of social capital:

–Equally important is the distinction between the motivations of recipients and of donors in exchanges mediated by social capital. Recipients’ desire to gain access to valuable assets is readily understandable. More complex are the motivations of the donors, who are requested to make these assets available without any immediate return. Such motivations are plural and deserve analysis because they are the core processes that the concept of social capital seeks to capture” (1998, p. 5).

Woolcock (1998, 2001) was a proponent of collective social capital studies who agreed with the need to find consistency and clarity in defining social capital, by keeping separate the descriptions of its structures and its effects. He also found that “a single term is inadequate to explain the range of empirical situations demanded of it, that it confuses sources with consequences, justifies contradictory social policies, and understates corresponding negative aspects” (Woolcock, 1998, p. 159). Woolcock (1998, 2001) synthesized the multi-dimensional aspects of social capital from a directional context, beginning with those previously seen as horizontal in nature – the strong and weak ties, also known as dense or bonded and loose or bridging ties – between people and their networks (Coleman, 1988; Granovetter, 1973; Putnam, 1995). Woolcock (2001) then noted a vertical dimension of social ties that connected relationships of unequal status
within a hierarchical setting. He found the key function of these linking ties was the capacity to leverage resources, ideas, and information from formal institutions beyond the community” (Woolcock, 2001, p. 11).

Additionally, he noted some functional entities, such as trust, did not always appear or apply, especially in collective studies (Woolcock, 2001). He proposed that short of dismissing the term [social capital] altogether, one possible resolution of these concerns may be that there are different types, levels, or dimensions of social capital, different performance outcomes associated with different combinations of these dimensions, and different sets of conditions that support or weaken favorable combinations” (Woolcock, 1998, p. 159). Furthermore, he concluded that it was different combinations of bonding, bridging, and linking” ties responsible for variation of outcomes seen in the literature, and he saw social capital as a dynamic component in which optimal combinations change over time” (Woolcock, 2001, p. 11).

Rydin and Holman (2004), who further explored multidimensional relationship ties, noted that in some contexts, such as within a bounded area and with strong place-based identification with that area” the interpretation of linking social capital as being beyond the community was insufficient (p. 121). Also, studies of bridging and linking social capital focused more on transfer of information and network development, rather than on characteristics such as norms, values, and trust (Rydin and Holman, 2004). Consequently, Rydin and Holman (2004) introduced the concept of bracing social ties, which incorporated all the concepts of social capital within a bounded area, based on common goals, across different sectors, scales, and directional contexts (p. 121). They
defined bracing ties as those concerned with strengthening links across and between scales and sectors but [which] only operates within a limited set of actors, to provide a kind of social scaffolding” (Rydin and Holman, 2004, p. 122-123). Adding the category of a bracing type of social ties was based on a perceived gap of understanding related to cross-sector, cross-scale, and cross directional (horizontal and vertical) linkages involved in community-based partnership or collaborative situations (Rydin and Holman, 2004).

Rydin and Homan (2004) noted this often involved the difficult task of integrating community leaders, and through which the development of common norms, or goals, was desired. The use of bracing ties encouraged a focus on these characteristics in a strategic way, rather than an all-embracing approach, as suggested with bonding ties (Rydin and Holman, 2004, pp. 123-124).

Partnership and collaborative development such as that associated with sustainable community development, according to Rydin and Holman (2004), includes a variety of stakeholders working together to create and implement policy. In addition, development of the capacity to act on goals within the community was seen as an activity that should be inclusive of people from different sectors (Rydin and Holman, 2004, p. 124). However, the development of bonding and/or bridging social ties alone was also not always sufficient or appropriate (Rydin & Holman, 2004; Portes, 1998, 2000; Schneider, 2007; Weisinger and Salipante, 2005; Woolcock, 1998, 2001). While similarities were seen in network development and structural holes theories (Lengnick-Hall, and Lengnick-Hall, 2003; Rydin and Holman, 2004), the focus in those studies was
on benefits related to diversity of information and opportunities for brokerage, rather than cohesion (Rydin and Holman, 2004, p. 124).

Rydin and Holman (2004) found the development of bracing social ties played a significant role in a situation where there was a goal of creating successful policies for sustainable community development, and in particular, where there was conflict and strain between actors and small groups of actors [“actors” refers to both individual people, and organizations or other incorporated groups]. These issues were about the interpretation of sustainable development; issues of direction and control, where differences existed regarding hierarchical practices; communication – including the type of language that was used to describe the concept; and both information and resource sharing (p. 126).

Rydin and Holman argued that only those efforts that included the building of bracing ties – targeted links across sectors and between levels, such as people from local government, voluntary groups, businesses, communities, and service providers – would be successful for community development in a holistic, integrated, cooperative and collaborative way (p. 127). Rydin and Holman (2004) also concluded that social capital, in all its forms, should not be viewed as a single tool but rather as a variety of strategies to be tailored to specific problems and specific local contexts as needed (p. 131).

Three final studies of social capital are relevant to the topic of diversity of social ties, leadership and sustainable community development, as a trend in theoretical development of social capital. First, Schneider’s (1999, 2007) studies of social capital, civic engagement, and nonprofit services to diverse populations indicated that while
social capital and civic engagement may operate together, one did not always lead to the other; and volunteers do not [necessarily] expand their social networks to develop long-term resource-sharing relationships with the recipients of their aid” (Schneider, 2007, p. 575). Furthermore, Schneider (2007, p. 579) found that “presuming that participation in voluntary associations necessarily represents social capital… overlook[s] the fact that people can belong to the same organization and not develop trusting relationships.”

Second, Weisinger and Salipante (2005) formulated a theory of ethnically bridging social capital in a study of organizational efforts to increase ethnic diversity in nonprofit leadership. It was noted that, “even when sufficient opportunity and mission-based motivation exists, social capital of the bridging type will likely be insufficient to sustain interactions among diverse members” (Weisinger and Salipante, 2005, p. 29). They theorized that organizations were more likely to be successful in diversifying, and in retaining ethnic leadership, when diversity training work, and empowerment work, was done within established, collectively bonded groups; and in collaborations between diverse and non-diverse groups (collective bridging ties). This type of diversity-building work is in contrast to only relying on efforts to create individual diverse ties between diverse and non-diverse leaders, in non-bonded contexts. A couple of quotes by Weisinger and Salipante (2005) highlight the key issues:

“Organizational leaders who conceive of diversity only in representational terms are unlikely to perceive the lack of pluralistic diversity at the disaggregated levels of direct human interaction. Their attention needs to be directed to that disaggregated level… There they can attend to problems of
consummatory *motivation and ability*. They can intentionally and carefully structure interactions around mission-based routines within recategorized [sic] groups in order to create bridging social capital” (p. 51).

“The common diversity practice of directly addressing differences in identity, whether through sensitivity training or the celebrating of cultural differences, may be counterproductive in settings where diverse members lack the comfort and skill needed to interact with differing others. However, by creating the types of conditions and processes outlined here for pluralistic interaction … organizations might create and sustain forms of social capital that can ameliorate identity-based conflicts in society” (p. 53).

A final social capital source was relevant to diversity in community development and leadership. Zacharakis and Flora (2009) studied attempts to increase access and leadership by people typically marginalized or excluded, and found successful efforts were indicative of cultural reproduction (assimilation) rather than increased social capital, or increased cross-sector ties. Zacharakis and Flora (2009) explain:

“As community developers, our premise is that community development projects inherently result in leadership development and enhance human and social capital. Research indicates that formal leadership education, decontextualized from the workplace or the community, often does not improve individual performance or capacity to fulfill leadership duties. Moreover, our work with rural communities suggests that most people who participate in leadership programs already see themselves as leaders. A self-selection process
typically occurs in most community development projects when established leaders are usually the first to step forward and initiate a project. Unless there are incentives or encouragement to reach out to others, the project reproduces the cultural capital of existing leaders, and therefore of the community. We are not suggesting that they are consciously trying to exclude people outside their leadership clique, rather that the process of cultural reproduction is unconsciously incorporated into the development process.” (pp. 303-304).

―We believe that distinguishing between bonding and bridging social capital and incorporating the notions of cultural capital and cultural reproduction … [will] contribute to greater agency for communities and neighborhoods. Along with the building of diverse linkages – both within and outside – these measures should improve the quality of people’s lives and the sustainability of their communities‖ (p. 306).

Local Studies of Social Capital

A search for social capital literature pertaining to the specific geographic area of the current study provided a series of possible sources, several of which were connected. For ease of categorization, these were divided into three sets.

The first resource set was based a national social capital benchmark survey, that included data gathered from the local community area (Harvard Kennedy School of Government, Putnam, 2006). Related to this were other works: an analysis of the local information from the benchmark study, for a local foundation (Digby, Duluth Superior
Area Community Foundation 2007); a journal article that highlighted the efforts by the same local foundation, for its “important contributions… in building social capital” (Easterling, 2008, p. 39); and a press release related to Easterling’s article (Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation, 2009).

The second resource set was found on a referral from a source in the same local foundation of the first resource set. It included a summary of local information from another national longitudinal survey conducted by another foundation in the community, on the more general topic of quality of life, based on measures of attachment to community (Knight, 2009). Some measures of social capital were mentioned but the information given was similar to that reported in the first resource set (Digby, Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation, 2007; Knight, 2009). Subsequent works were repeated measures of the survey, the following year, with no significant changes (Knight, 2010).

Regarding the relevance of the first two research sets to the current study, the synopsis of the benchmark study showed there were gaps related to the sample of people surveyed; significant populations in the local area, such as cell phone users, college students, and Native Americans, were underrepresented or not represented at all (Digby, Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation, 2007). This was also an issue in the second resource set, which indicated its survey samples were based on current census figures (Knight, 2009). A comparison of these to more locally accurate demographic indicators (Center for Rural Policy Development, 2007) indicated similar underrepresentation.
This effect could be mitigated in future studies with the use of demographic indicators more specific to the local area, and consideration of other known research issues, such as those involved in the census-taking process. Some of these issues have been described by researchers as “barriers to gaining census information” and included the “attitude and motivators of single unattached mobiles [college students, homeless, etc.], economically disadvantaged, and ethnic enclaves” (Bates et al. 2009, p. 3). However, the description of these factors as barriers has also been seen as a matter of perspective. Tuhiwai Smith (1999) finds that the problem lies within flawed research designs; cultural protocols, values, and beliefs are not barriers, but rather integral factors that need to be explicitly and appropriately built into the research process (p. 15).

Furthermore, in both the national benchmark survey (Harvard Kennedy School of Government, Putnam, 2006), and the attachment to community surveys (Knight, 2009, 2010), detailed qualitative information specific to local social capital and leadership ties was absent. While it was noted that some of the questions asked were in the right direction regarding approval of leadership efforts and openness to diversity, due to the collective context, the quantitative methods and measures, and the failure to include significant populations, the results were skewed and left the research wanting for details (Digby, Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation, 2007; Knight, 2009, 2010; Putnam, 2006; Harvard Kennedy School of Government, 2010). Also, social capital and civic involvement ranked as the two lowest indicators correlated to attachment to community (Knight, 2010, p 9). However, the attachment to community surveys did note
that critical areas of underperformance included perceptions of leadership, public education, and openness to diversity (Knight, 2009, 2010).

The third resource set included works that addressed gaps and disparities related to poverty. One made only a minimal mention of building social capital in the local area, without any discussion of definition or measurement (Community Action Duluth, 2010). A second work referred to a specific subset of the population, the social capital of women in rural communities (Scheffert, 2008). Within that article, Scheffert (2008) referred to the development of a specific model for the research and building of social capital; subsequently, other related works that expanded and applied this model were noted (Scheffert, 2009, 2010). Their greatest value lay in the context of rural community development efforts. However, the model primarily referred to the collective types of social capital promoted by Coleman and Putnam, rather than individual social capital, donor motivations and benefits in deliberately constructed relationships, as discussed by Portes (1998, 2000). Consequently, it included some of the problems discussed in the theoretical criticisms of social capital section (Portes, 1998, 2000; Woolcock, 1998, 2001).

Because of the limited literature specific to individual social capital in the local area, another search was done for studies of the local area that indirectly related to the topic. Subsequently, two reports created by the local affiliate of a national social organization (United Way of Greater Duluth, 2009, 2010) were found. As with the criticism of Putnam’s work (Portes 1998, 2000; Schneider, 2007), an argument could be made about generalizations of cause and effect, and underlying motivations (Bourdieu,
1986); however, the reports also provided valuable direction about community development efforts at the local level, in the specific geographic area of the current study. They included information about both the successes of and challenges faced by specific initiatives, and included educational implications (United Way of Greater Duluth, 2009, 2010).

Further investigation of the initiatives identified in the reports produced the topics of capacity building, leadership, partnership, and collaboration across various community sectors (United Way of Greater Duluth, 2009, 2010). This created a starting point for discussion of these topics, through interviews with local leaders, based on their experience with community development efforts and individual definitions, perceptions, and experiences of social capital.

**Community Development**

The local geographic area of the current study had no shortage of organizations responsible for local community development efforts, which included work by foundations (Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation, 2010; Knight, 2009, 2010; NC, 2010), community development and service agencies (Arrowhead Regional Development Council, 2009; Center for Rural Policy Development, 2010; Local Initiatives Support Corporation, 2010; United Way of Greater Duluth, 2009), and area initiatives (Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, 2009; Lake Superior Initiative, 2010; Clayton, Jackson, McGhie Memorial, 2009; Duluth Human Rights Commission, 2010). Highlighted for the purposes of this study was information related to the assessment of social development of strengths or assets, and challenges or needs; efforts
to meet those gaps; and areas where a greater understanding of social structures and ties might be useful (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). Two sources in particular noted these aspects of development from a social perspective (Lake Superior Initiative, 2010; United Way of Greater Duluth, 2009, 2010).

The first source (United Way of Greater Duluth, 2009, 2010) produced a series of reports that qualitatively focused on community efforts toward social and educational development of children and youth. The stated purpose was to inform and guide management and development of programs, policies, priorities, and initiatives; further goals included encouragement of greater provision of early learning experiences, educational resources, other opportunities and the relationships needed to prepare younger citizens for a high quality of life, prosperous work, civic engagement, and lifelong learning (United Way of Greater Duluth, 2009, 2010).

Featured were personal stories of impact, successful program efforts, key issues, current research findings, trends, public policy, disparities and gaps in service, and recommendations (United Way of Greater Duluth, 2009, 2010). These were based on a variety of sources that included interviews with experts and key reports, from educational, judicial, governmental, and research-based entities, at local, county and statewide levels (United Way of Greater Duluth, 2009, 2010). While progress was seen in a number of areas, also noted were ongoing problems and concerns; solutions to the challenges posed, relative to the discussion of social capital, frequently included greater capacity building, more partnerships, and increased collaboration between organizations (United Way of Greater Duluth, 2009, 2010).
The second source (Lake Superior Initiative, 2010, brochure) specifically addressed efforts to increase organizational capacity building, through development of core skills and capabilities, such as leadership, management, finance and fundraising, programs, and evaluation [for] effectiveness and sustainability… [and] to identify and address issues and gain the insights, knowledge, and experience needed to solve problems and implement change.”

However, studies of organizational development and social capital have noted that understanding social relations within organizations was no longer sufficient for increased effectiveness (Lengnick-Hall & Lengnick-Hall, 2003). In today's knowledge economy, social capital and relationships … extend well beyond conventional organizational boundaries … [to carry] information and ideas to those who need it, when they need it” (Lengnick-Hall & Lengnick-Hall, 2003, p. 53). Even closer to the point then, is the subject of leadership and a better understanding of leadership development; particularly as it involves relationships of leaders within and outside of community development organizations. This brings us to the final body of literature relevant to this study.

**Leadership**

Leadership has been defined as those positions which are based on: authority or influence (Merriam-Webster, 2010; Senge, 2006); reputation (Zacharakis and Flora, 2005); functional roles (Senge, 2006; Senge, P., Smith, B., Kruschwitz, N., Laur, J., and Schley, S., 2008); and situational factors, such as cultural traditions and histories (Grande, 2000; Peacock and Wisuri, 2002; Markusen and Rendon, 2009; Tellet and Day, 2008; Treuer, 2011; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). This section is divided into three subthemes:
Leadership Positions, Roles, and Views: Ideas and Issues of leadership in Social Capital Sources; and Cultural Constructs and Sensitivity.

**Leadership Positions, Roles, and Views**

Peter Senge (2006) noted that developmental theories of leadership have been found in age-old traditional sources all around the world (p. 318). Throughout these teachings, Senge (2006) saw that one of the oldest ideas associated with leadership was wisdom (p. 318). Another idea was that of the development of personal, individual gifts (p. 339), and a third was a principle of effectiveness that came from an appreciation for the “power of holding a vision and concurrently looking deeply and honestly at current reality” (p. 340). In many cases, these ideas have been lost or replaced with the idea of “positional authority” which is an oversimplification of complex, important, and diverse roles and levels at which networks are developed, and change is sustained (Senge, 2006, p. 319). Senge (2006) further noted a deeper, more problematic message that “only people with power to bring about change are those at the top of the hierarchy, not those further down” which implies that “all others are not leaders” (p. 319).

Primarily interested in organizational leadership, Senge used the term “ecology of leadership” to describe the environments and relationships that contribute to effective or sustainable growth (1999, p. 10; 2006, p. 319). Within this, Senge noted both fundamental and functional roles that exert influence across all different organizational positions: designers, teachers, and stewards (2006, p. 320-321), and the role of advocacy (Senge, P., Smith, B., Kruschwitz, N., Laur, J., and Schley, S., 2008).
He also found that, regardless of organizational position, the term ‘leader’ was an assessment made by others. People who are truly leading seem rarely to think of themselves in that way. Their focus is invariably on what needs to be done, the larger system in which they are operating, and the people with whom they are creating—not on themselves as ‘leaders’. Indeed, if it were otherwise, there is probably a problem. For there is always the danger, especially for those in leadership positions, of becoming ‘heroes in their own minds’…” (p. 340).

**Ideas and Issues of Leadership in Social Capital Sources**

Zacharakis and Flora (2005) conducted a study that looked at the social background of reputational leadership, in a setting demographically similar to that of the current study, and found that leadership was not always represented by holding public office or owning key business, but through community ‘reputation’ (p. 298-299). These leaders ‘establish their credentials either by ‘getting things done’ or being able to stop projects they feel have no merit, through behind-the-scenes influence or by effectively representing the community’ (Zacharakis and Flora, 2005, p. 299). They also found that ‘certain social categories of people were largely excluded from leadership in the core group of organizations’ (Zacharakis and Flora, 2005, p. 298), and came to the conclusion that ‘community development projects frequently tend to reproduce existing leadership structures rather than create opportunities to expand community leadership beyond existing leadership pools or cliques’ (Zacharakis and Flora, 2005, p. 288). While this presented a future research question for the local area of the current study, for current purposes, the significance was the recognition of the need for a broader scope for the
identification, appreciation, and development of leadership, rather than politically correct or tokenistic inclusion with the expectation of assimilation.

In their study of bracing social capital ties, Rydin and Holman (2004) also addressed cross-sector inclusion in strategic community planning efforts such as sustainable development. While this study was discussed to a greater degree in the literature review section on theoretical trends in social capital, and in the section on community development, one key component of bracing ties is useful to note here: the concept of cohesiveness. This is an important issue in strategic and deliberate construction of relationships for the purposes of reaching common goals; however, discussions of cohesiveness in cross-cultural ties of leaders was largely absent in the social capital literature, and in local sources related to capacity building and leadership development.

Finally, in social capital studies that included discussions of civic engagement and leadership cross-culturally, Schneider (2007, 2009) and Weisinger and Salipante (2005) addressed in greater detail some of the challenges to a broader vision of leadership noted by Zacharakis and Flora (2005). All of these studies included specific efforts to strategically confront the issues of diversity and cultural reproduction in leadership, by looking at leaders from typically excluded groups, and social ties within and without these groups, through involvement with community-based non-profit organizations.

**Cultural Constructs and Sensitivity**

Scholars and other community leadership collaborations, such as Cleary Miller and Peacock (1997), Cullinan (1999), Clayton, Jackson, McGhie Memorial (2009), Day and Tellet (2008), Grande, (2000), Grover LeGarde, 2003, 2006,
2008, Grover LeGarde and Keenan, 2006, Howard (2006), Markusen and Rendon (2009), McIntosh (1988), Peacock and Wisuri (2002), Satz (1991), Senge (2006), Treuer (2011), Tuhiwai Smith (1999), Wlodkowski (1999), and Zerubavel, (1997) have discussed many aspects of and differences between indigenous and mainstream dominant ideological or cultural constructs, or the ways that systems of values and beliefs are built and enacted, and these have included:

* Verbal, nonverbal, and other physical and metaphysical elements, involving space, time, individualism, collectivism, gender, consciousness, spirituality, health, language, resources, and management of resources, organization, and leadership.

* Assumptions and attitudes of privilege, worthiness, innocence and culpability, with regard to white people, people of color, and people who have been marginalized or excluded, targeted, and discriminated against.

* The influence of mainstream dominant society, and the widespread, systematic, devastating and genocidal biases, omissions, and offensive practices.

* Indigenous peoples’ previously well established and increasingly revitalized sovereign forms of social, economic, historic, and political systems, values, and beliefs that continue to exist alongside and within the currently dominant societies and systems.

Of particular relevance with regard to diversity of leadership and constructs are functional roles (Senge, 2006; Senge, P., Smith, B., Kruschwitz, N., Laur, J., and Schley, S., 2008), and situational factors, such as those of cultural traditions and histories
(Grande, 2000; Peacock and Wisuri, 2001; Treuer, 2011; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). A locally produced PBS television documentary series, and companion book (Fortier, Norgaard, and WDSE-TV, 2002; Peacock and Wisuri, 2002), provided an overview of Ojibwe leadership from pre-contact to contemporary times. Treuer’s (2011) study of a well-known Ojibwe leader, Hole In The Day, gave a detailed picture of the leadership role of advocacy and agency through deliberate constructions of diverse ties, in changing social, economic, and political environments. It also showed that actions of agents with diverse ties, even those that appeared to be bonded (such as those in mixed marriages), are not always consistent with decolonizing empowerment when they do not share common motivations, goals, ideologies, and constructs (Treuer, 2011, p, 174).

Similarly, in Decolonizing Methodologies, Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) wrote at length about how many research projects failed to examine who is behind the work, or discuss the imperialist and colonialist agendas that influence underlying foundations, contexts, motivations, methods, and type of language used. However, Tuhiwai Smith (1999) also found that many indigenous peoples are asserting their rights to self-determination and are using research for purposes of empowerment (Bergstom, Cleary Miller, and Peacock, 1998; Cleary Miller and Peacock, 1997; Grande, 2000; Grover LeGarde and Keenan; Peacock and Wisuri, 2002; Tellet and Day, 2008; Treuer, 2011).

Tuhiwai Smith (1999) described the decolonizing methodologies being used as—"a process which engages with imperialism and colonialism at multiple levels; having a critical understanding of the underlying assumptions, motivations and values which inform research practices” (p. 20); —concerned with the broader politics and strategic
goals of indigenous research; researchers have to clarify and justify their intentions (p. 143); methods become the means and procedures through which the central problems of the research are addressed (p. 143); often a mix of existing methodological approaches and indigenous practices” (p. 143).

Decolonizing methodologies seek to holistically increase indigenous empowerment and self-determination, through frameworks, strategies, and models, using indigenous methods or indigenous and non-indigenous methodologies. While Grande (2000) found that even critical pedagogy and critical theorizing have been oppressive, as a part of the "Whitestream" (p. 469) academic world, because they have failed to consider separate and sovereign constructs of indigenous knowledge, critical theory can be used by indigenous scholars as a way to initiate dialogue on the dominant modes of critical theory” and acknowledgement of “American Indian sovereignty and self-determination” (Grande, 2000, p. 470). Decolonizing methodologies attend to this issue, by requiring consideration of two key sets of questions: First, who is doing the research, how are they doing it, and why; second, how will the research and theoretical approach be useful, to whom, for whom, in what way, and why (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999).

These questions are required to be applied to the research design, the researchers, those included in the research, information gathered, and the methods used to gather, examine, discuss, share and subsequently use the information. Also considered are strategies that appear, toward shifts in cultural sensitivity: avoidance, personal development, consultation, and making space” (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 176-177). As Tuhiwai Smith also noted, “these strategies have various consequences, positive and
negative... they all involve different ways of making changes, although the first strategy of avoidance may not be helpful to anyone” (1999, p. 177).

She also indicated four models —~posed by Graham Smith (1992), related to culturally appropriate research, that could be undertaken by non-indigenous researchers: mentoring, adoption, power sharing, and empowering outcomes” (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 177). Tuhiwai Smith (1999) found there were “two distinct pathways through which an indigenous agenda is being advanced” (p. 125) and for further inspiration, offered brief explanations of twenty-five potential or currently active project frameworks (p. 142 - 162). Finally, Tuhiwai Smith (1999) talked about indigenous researchers and the simultaneous “inside/out and outside/in” nature of their work (1999, p. 5).

These ideas and the overlapping areas of influence were seen in several other sources related to local leadership as well. Bergstrom, Cleary Miller, and Peacock (2003); Clayton, Jackson, McGhie Memorial (2009); Cleary Miller and Peacock (1998); Grover LeGarde (2008), and Grover LeGarde and Keenan (2006); and Cleary Miller and Peacock (1997) discussed leadership with regard to issues of socialization through education. Day and Tellet (2008) looked at leadership through collaborative education, language revitalization, and child welfare research efforts. Leadership through artistic expression was also noted; through the production of a PBS television series (Fortier, Norgaard, WDSE, 2002) and its companion book (Peacock, Wisuri, 2002), that also included a specific segment on Ojibwe leadership. A study of traditional and contemporary native artists, and the roles of leaders as advocates and gatekeepers, was equally significant (Markusen and Rendon, 2009).
Summary

This review showed a need for caution in looking at cause and effect when examining social structures and personal ties, within both research projects and in-action projects related to diverse, multidimensional, sustainable community development. While many of the sources of this literature review considered leaders and leadership from a collective perspective, they also provided vital background and contextual information, for better understanding the perceptions and experiences of individual local leaders involved in community development.

In line with the key questions and considerations of decolonizing perspectives were the critical analyses of social capital theory by Portes (1998, 2000), which advocated examination of the deliberate construction of relationships, and the individual motivations of and benefits to donors of resources in those relationships. Given the nature of the local setting, the current study also relied on the considerations of social capital ties and diversity, civic engagement, nonprofit work, and leadership by Schneider (2007), Weisinger and Salipante (2005), Woolcock (1998, 2001), and Zacharakis and Flora (2005). A final social capital work of interest had to do with the development of cohesive relationship ties for diverse, sustainable community building; within bounded, cross-sector, cross-scale, directional, situational, and purposeful contexts that shift and change at times, and over time, by Rydin and Holman (2004).

Finally, the most meaningful and helpful framework and information for creating and proceeding with the research project at hand, through the combination of decolonizing methodologies, indigenous perspectives, and mainstream methodologies
and theories, came from Tuhiwai Smith (1999) and others (Bergstrom, Cleary Miller, and Peacock, 1998; Cleary Miller and Peacock, 1997; Clayton, Jackson, McGhie Memorial, 2009; Cullinan, 1999; Fortier, Norgaard, WDSE, 2002; Grande, 2000; Grover LeGarde, 2003, 2006, 2008; Grover LeGarde and Keenan, 2006; McIntosh, 1988; Markusen and Rendon, 2009; Peacock and Wisuri, 2002; Satz, 1991; Smith, 1992; Tellet and Day, 2008; Treuer, 2011; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; and all the elders and community members who guided this project). They showed such efforts have been useful for increased indigenous self-determination and empowerment, and culturally sensitive and appropriate collaborative projects, in diverse communities.
Chapter 3 – Methodology

Introduction

This chapter describes the research design, setting, participants, information gathering, and analysis methods of the current study, based on the question: How do local leaders define, perceive, and experience the phenomenon of social capital in community development efforts?

The purpose was to better understand the impact and roles of social relationships of leaders in local community development efforts. A combination of decolonizing methodologies, phenomenology, and concepts of social capital theory were used (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007; Creswell, 2009; Moustakas, 1999; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999).

Research Design

While previous local studies of social capital were based on surveys developed for a large scale, nation-wide quantitative studies of social capital (Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation, 2007; Easterling, 2008; Knight Foundation, 2009), as Woolcock (2001) found, the qualitative aspects of social capital should not be neglected” and “it is something of a contradiction in terms to argue that universal measures can be used to capture local idiosyncratic realities” (p. 20-21). However, qualitative research has also not been without its problems. Regardless of good intentions, in practice research has been disempowering when alternative constructs were not considered as equal bases of fact (Grande, 2000, Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Underlying assumptions, biases, and omissions were also noted criticisms of social capital theory (Portes, 1998, 2000). As
indigenous sources have shown, many methods and theories have not been beneficial to those being researched (Cleary Miller and Peacock, 1997; Day and Tellet, 2008; Grande, 2000; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999).

However, when combined with decolonizing methodologies and perspectives, some theories and methods have been used to respectfully increase self-determination, empowerment, and cultural sensitivity, by and for indigenous peoples (Day and Tellet, 2008; Grande, 2000; Grover LeGarde and Keenan, 2006; Howard, 2006; Markusen and Rendon, 2009; Cleary Miller and Peacock, 1997; Peacock, Wisuri, and WDSE-TV, 2002; Satz, 1991; Smith, 1992; Treuer, 2011; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Decolonizing methodologies seek to holistically increase indigenous empowerment and self-determination, through frameworks, strategies, and models, using indigenous methods or indigenous and non-indigenous methodologies. All require consideration of two key sets of questions: First, who is doing the research, how are they doing it, and why? Second, how will the research / theoretical approach be useful, to whom, for whom, in what way, and why? (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999)

These questions are applied to the research design, the researchers, those included in the research, information gathered, and the methods used to gather, examine, discuss, share and subsequently use the information. Also considered are strategies that appear, toward shifts in cultural sensitivity: avoidance, personal development, consultation, and making space” (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 176-177). As Tuhiwai Smith also noted, these strategies have various consequences, positive and negative… they all involve different ways of making changes, although the first strategy of avoidance may not be helpful to
anyone” (1999, p. 177). She also indicated four models —posed by Graham Smith (1992), related to culturally appropriate research, that could be undertaken by non-indigenous researchers: mentoring, adoption, power sharing, and empowering outcomes” (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 177). The noted questions and considerations were applied throughout the current research project. The outcomes can be seen in the forward, and in the design and contents of the study.

Phenomenology is a qualitative methodology that regards participants as co-researchers, and asks the central question: what is the essence and meaning of the phenomenon? (Moustakas, 1999; Patton, 2002) According to Moustakas (1999), the first step of phenomenology is to set aside the researcher's pre-dilections, prejudices, [and] predispositions” in order to look at the information being presented as if seeing them again for the first time (p. 85); and the researcher is challenged to come to know things with a receptiveness and a presence that lets us be and lets situations and things be, so that we can come to know them just as they appear to us” (p. 86).

With a decolonizing perspective, the initial question was asked pluralistically: what are the essences and meanings of social capital theory, relevant literature, and the interviews? Also advocated is an active response to the embedded factors identified by Moustakas (1994); the first step is to make plain the basis for pursuing the information, and its use (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999).

Edwards and Foley (1997) asked whether or not the theory of social capital gives any new tools for analyzing and understanding contemporary society. They believe it does, by showing how cultural factors are embedded within community-based social
structures. These are the relational contexts in which understandings of how the world works, orientations toward it, and how to engage it are embedded, produced, and reproduced in a continuous process of construction, negotiation, and appropriation” (Edwards and Foley, 1997, p. 678).

Aspects of social capital theory were found to be useful when combined with decolonizing methodologies. While Coleman (1988) found social capital to be about benefits as a result of individual attributes, such as trust, dominant community norms, and values; and Putnam (1995) found social capital to be a national issue; Portes (1998, 2000) discussed critical issues related to who benefited, who and what was excluded, and why. Of particular importance, he found it necessary to separate what social capital was, from what it did, and to look at individual motivations of, and benefits to, donors of resources, within the deliberate creation of relationships, for the purposes of obtaining those benefits” (Portes, 1998, 2000). He also defined social capital as those particular benefits (Portes, 1998, 2000). Woolcock (1998, 2001) produced an overview of the types of ties based on various attributes, and discussed vertical dimensions of ties in hierarchical contexts. Schneider (2007, 2009); Weisinger and Salipante (2005); and Zacharakis and Flora (2005) noted factors related to diversity. Finally, Rydin and Holman (2004) looked at the deliberate creation of cohesive relationships, for the purposes of bracing (strategic scaffolding), to reaching collective goals in multidimensional, sustainable community development efforts. Theoretical definitions and descriptions of social capital identified in these sources were used as a front-end guide (Creswell, 2009, p. 62), and referred to
the creation and use of open-ended questions, relative to the research question, as typical with qualitative design (Creswell, 2009).

**Setting and Participants**

Qualitative strategies of inquiry do not always require random or large numbers of samples; the goal is to select those participants who will “best help” explore the research question at hand (Creswell, 2009, p. 178), and for “fitness of purpose” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, p. 354). After IRB approval (Appendix), a list of potential participants and contact information was created based on previous experiences of the researcher. It included individuals considered leaders based on: positional authority (Merriam-Webster, 2010; Senge 2006); reputation (Zacharakis & Flora, 2005); functional roles (Senge, 2006; Senge, P., Smith, B., Kruschwitz, N., Laur, J., & Schley, S., 2008); and situational factors, such as cultural traditions and histories (Grande, 2000; Peacock & Wisuri, 2001; Treuer, 2011; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Individuals were contacted through phone calls, email, and in-person. A consent information sheet was given to each interested individual; interview questions were supplied as requested, and all correspondence included the researcher’s name and contact information (Appendix). Five local leaders were purposefully selected based on the criteria listed above, consistent with sampling for “maximum variation” to “investigate and document the variations, range, and patterns of a particular phenomenon in different or unique conditions” (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007, p. 176). While maintaining confidentiality, elders and mentors were consulted for guidance regarding appropriate goals, methods, and ways of sharing, before and during information gathering, analysis, and sharing of the results. Participants also reviewed and
approved the portions of their transcripts selected for use in the study.

**Data Gathering and Analysis**

The researcher individually and privately met with the participants for a digitally recorded interview that was one to two hours long. Participants had the option to withdraw from the study at any time. Questions could be rejected, and as the interviews progressed, the order and forms were changed due to time constraints, or combined, when multiple answers were given in one response. The interviews were transcribed, assigned a codename, and all actual, identifiable names and contexts were disguised or deleted for anonymity. Information was accessible only to the researcher, and security measures were taken to protect the contents.

The information gathered was first observed and considered with regard to the key questions and other considerations of decolonizing methodologies previously discussed, then organized for analysis. Topically related portions of the interview transcripts were selected, based on the themes of the literature review (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). Descriptive components as units of meaning, and underlying structures and conditions, were noted and clustered, for comparison with the literature (Moustakas, 1994). Finally, common components and themes were seen in the heart of the project: the interviews with local leaders. Due to anonymity concerns, transcript selections were randomly placed within each topic rather than by interviewee. Discussions of these results were organized into three sections: Leadership Views and Roles, Cultural Sensitivity, and Social Capital Concepts.
Summary

The current study was an effort to qualitatively examine the definitions, perceptions and experiences of social capital of local leaders, to present a meaningful picture of social capital within community development. This included a combined methodological approach that incorporated both decolonizing and phenomenological methods throughout the design, information gathering, analysis, and discussion process. Discussion of the results will follow in the next chapter.
Chapter 4 – Results and Discussion

Introduction

The purpose of this project was to learn about how social relationships impacted the work of individual community leaders. Analysis of the information gathered from the interviews included decolonizing aspects such as key questions (by whom, for whom, how, and why), and strategies and models related to cultural sensitivity and appropriateness (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999); phenomenology (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007; Moustakas, 1999; Patton, 2002); and theoretical developments of social capital from the literature review. Unless otherwise noted, all italicized emphases were added to indicate key ideas and components of the current study. The results were divided into three themes for discussion: leadership views and roles; cultural sensitivity; and social capital concepts.

Leadership Views and Roles

Results. The following selections illustrate the leadership views and roles:

* I’ve actually never … very seldom have I sought, overtly sought, a leadership role. I think that’s about a style of a person; with some people I say they have a very understated style of leadership…and then in certain settings ... the culture of the overall organization is extremely muted, it’s very subtle, it’s just really a covert operation.

* I don’t think of it like that. I’m a servant, and I take that very seriously. It’s an honor; I never thought of it as a leadership thing, but for the purposes of this
interview I can see that it is, but I don’t walk around thinking that way, you know? It’s a lot of work and you really have to have some good people skills, you’ve got to be really good to people at all times, to be respectful and trying to help the best way you can. And try to help people learn or be very, very patient and kind to somebody who might not know something. And no matter how tired you are, you’ve always got to set that aside and be really respectful. I try to model myself after the women elders who have taught me to watch things, to sit back and be more quiet, and observe. And after the chief at our Big Drum, he’s passed away now but… he was the most loving man. And even though I’m just there to serve, I’m washing kettles in the kitchen, he always came in there to give me a sideways hug. He would take the time to thank the woman in the kitchen; get an umbrella for somebody if the sun was in their eyes, or the rain, to go and get an umbrella for them if they’re an elder and just little things to try and be really good to the people.

* To the kids … I’m just a _bad_ grandpa; big brother’ … so that’s my role anyway.

* I think some people see me more as a leader than I see myself. I think maybe as a teacher, I guess I am a leader in some respects. … I guess I’m more of a quiet leader and I’d just rather _do_’ … I just do it quietly and do it with quiet support from others.
* My style of leadership is not so much to be the head but to lead through organizing, to lead through collective effort. I believe in the value of that and the worth of that; but also I don't like a pyramidal structure, particularly. And I certainly don't want to be at the top of the pyramid; I don't feel secure or safe in that spot. And ideologically I don't believe in it either, but I think emotionally… I don't think it fits me.

* Sometimes I feel like I am a contrary leader, which means … I feel it. That contrariness is that they don't like me, and god knows I don't like what they represent, but I will go to the mat because I feel like there's too many of them and there's not enough people who can articulate what needs to be said. I know I have the gift of words, and I totally can call on the empathetic passion, so if someone calls and needs testimony related to some issue of advocacy and they need it right now; they know I will do it… absolutely, absolutely… I know how difficult, how divisive issues are and how difficult people can be. I just know, and I know how to say it; I know what to say. When I have spoken about something, some people who really hate me have, begrudgingly almost, gone, 'ok, you know, ok' [tone of reserved acceptance] and I'm like well, you know, it's true. There's certain things you just go, well, I wish you did see it; for some reason you haven't and that's none of my business. But my business is, I will come here and I will say it. And that just continues and continues… and it's just the way it is, I guess.

* We sort of want to have these _pie in the sky_ ideas like, we're going to change
this community through the power of art and change everybody’s lives! But I think really it comes down to connecting with one person and then branching out from that in a way. So I like to start with the little people, I mean the kids – just for me, you’re not going to have a good community unless you develop relationships with the kids. The kids tell their parents, the parents gain the trust then and they’re like, “who’s this person who’s trying to change our community?‘ They’ll believe their kids and I think it kind of builds up from that. I see it as just a person-to-person building… gotta start small.

* If you have good social capital, that means you’re comfortable with different groups and you can reach our hardest hit groups, such as the multiple sex partners population (people who have sex with more than 40 people; most people, 40 and under is more normal for them); and then IV drug users. That’s a tough population if you’re not born into it, so what I love is that I can find those people and be comfortable there.

* They label us as youth workers. The whole purpose was to work to establish relationships with families to kind of curb crime. Which actually works; I’ve been doing this for 15 years, and since then, the crime rates went down. Kids and families have come and stayed, stayed in this area now, [neighborhood with a high number of poor people, people of color], because they like how the city is a lot more peaceful and calm than some of the other cities. Graduation rates are a way, way higher percentage than they were when we started. When we were first
starting, 17-18 years ago, one to five kids of the kids graduated, depending on how many kids were in high school. I think our record – a few years ago – we had 28 graduate. We have so many kids in college; in fact some are taking prep college classes right now or are in college. So we’ve got to try to hire them to role model them back to our kids. Sometimes I think a good leader is who you surround yourself with, as far as positive, strong, caring, open people that you are able to work with. Also it’s about connection and relationships. If you don’t have any relationships, you’re not going to be a good leader. And that kind of goes to the connecting because sometimes we’re all different and it has to do with… I’m getting into race and culture, all kind of stuff. But I walk into a room, that I don’t know this group of people, that’s going to make connecting instantaneously harder.

* I worked for a little while, very intensely with this little group of women, and it was really difficult and there was a lot of in-fighting. That sort of ‘crabs in a bucket‘ thing was going on, that was just sort of hell on wheels. What I noticed was, to sometimes just be part of the wall, just pretend I wasn’t there; and sometimes to duck out entirely and come back later, and then people are all happy to see you, because it’s like, oh, you’re not our problem today, you’re a whole new flavor. Like sort of trying not to get hit in dodge ball, and it seems crazy because it doesn’t seem like it’s very quick and effective. I’m getting this job done, but you have to work with what is; and if what is, is very hostile and… hostile, that’s just the best way to describe it, at war with itself and anything that
comes in, then you have to survive in order to get anything done and you have to just survive as best you can. A lot of people aren’t comfortable in this culture because it’s so hostile to them, and I’ve learned a ton from them.

* It’s amazing, there are even these gaps in relationships when you look at teachers. Very few teachers, I fully believe, bond with our students [of color, excluded, marginalized] … maybe like just in one particular school. Some of them plan and do strategic kind of stuff with kids but it’s all system-based off the school; it’s not about the relationship and the caring. It’s all about what they’re ‘supposed to do’ in their role. As a youth worker, youth advocate, I deal with a lot of the teachers, a lot of the school system. I’m trying to be *in-between* that, so I can have a better role for the kids and the parents.

* I was an advocate doing social change work. People who do social change work are agitators. Within any system you build those kind of bracing relationships to speak on behalf of the people so that you can be a spokesperson for the people who are still trying to find their voice. I had a really interesting experience with a prosecutor; the woman had years of abuse from her husband and there was a day that she thought that he was going to kill her. Now she had never fought back, she never did anything but that day because she thought she was going to die, she defended herself. Now, all these years, we’ve seen women hospitalized, brutalized. It looked a lot sometimes like attempted murder, but never once was anybody charged with attempted murder. She was immediately charged with it.
And we thought, why are all these men almost killing women – you never hear those words, but the minute a woman defends herself. So this was a relationship I need to build with a prosecutor, to talk on her behalf because she's a native woman. One of the elders said, you need to give him tobacco, and I said what? A prosecutor? What is he going to do with this tobacco? 'I don't matter as long as it gets in his hand.' So I wrapped it in cloth and I gave it to him. ... I said I'd like to give you this tobacco on behalf of so and so, because I’d like you to listen to me so I can talk to you about her. He took the tobacco; he held it in his hand, and he treated it like gold. And I said, now, look at how huge the file is on all the abuse she suffered, over several years; that day, she thought she was going to die. First time she ever lifted a finger towards this man... I just talked to the prosecutor about her life and he listened. Somebody else tried to say something, he wouldn’t even look at them; he kept his eye contact with me. When we were done he asked me what he should do with the tobacco and I told him to put it out on the east side of a tree. So he thought about all that. When we went back into court we got a stay of adjudication. She didn’t go to prison for years; she’s a quiet native woman and I spoke on her behalf.

Discussion. Leadership has been described as positions of authority or influence (Merriam-Webster, 2010; Senge, 2006); reputation (Zacharakis, Flora, 2005); functional roles (Senge 2006; Senge, P., Smith, B., Kruschwitz, N., Laur, J., and Schley, S., 2008); and situational factors, including cultural traditions and histories (Grande, 2000; Peacock and Wisuri, 2001; Treuer, 2011; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). While those interviewed
recognized that they did lead, it was perceived as being situational and cultural, on an as-needed basis, not as one of their primary self-described identities, or as a career by itself. Also noted was the functional role of advocacy, or agency; the leaders often acted as go-betweens, as seen in their construction of relationships, interactions with others, work done in various positions, and recognition by others in various contexts. Some had that role because of their positions, and some chose their positions because of their relationships and those roles. All had worked as staff within, and had been independently contracted with, nonprofit organizations. All had direct personal, social, and work experience with individuals who were oppressed, excluded, marginalized and stigmatized.

**Cultural Sensitivity**

**Results.** All the leaders had deliberately constructed, multicultural ties, based on personal and social interactions, through their community work, or both. Common concerns and commitments they have made, with regard to community work, had to do with reducing systematic oppression.

* There was this recent hiring of minority advocates for the school district. What the district was asking was enormous. 12 people were supposed to handle a school district of 89,000 people; help them learn how to integrate, deal with everything on the gamut, to desegregate the schools and upgrade the climate* [cynical tone], the pockets of ignorance, all of that. They’re charged with everything… well, that’s discouraging, because that’s too much. How do you do that, really, if you have to? How would you really leverage your power?
I had a really weird experience with a man who was in leadership where he actually told me that he wanted me to learn how to lie and manipulate on the job. Actually, we were meeting with some other people who worked in the same field who were really cool; I could feel they liked me. I worked directly with people, and I was telling them from the people’s point of view about what, from all those years of working with them, exactly what I thought. And so when he asked me to not come to those meetings for awhile, until I learned to lie and manipulate a little more, I thought… these are people who see examples of lying and manipulation on a regular basis! Don’t you think they’re gonna know when we’re lying and manipulating? So anyway, that’s just horrible to have this young man talk to me like that. So I called him into a meeting and had three, four other people there, and told him, don’t ever talk to me like that again. You may be a leader in words, but you are no leader; you don’t talk to people like that. And then he said, of course the classic words that white guys say, ‘I don’t recall that.’ But I expected him to say that, so… there’s an example of very poor leadership, because he lies and manipulates. I was being honest, because why would I mess around like that? They are used to liars and manipulators, so they don’t need that.

* I look at myself as a game-changer, especially for our kids. Some community members were trouble-shooting ideas how to get support for their kids, because sometimes schools are so… they won’t flex on anything. What it is, there are issues if you’re native and appreciate your culture, and then it’s either biology or
some class, the kids have to do something that goes against their beliefs. They refuse to do it. But the school’s not budging, they’re saying, ‘you’re going to fail.’ But schools can’t discriminate against the cultural religion. They can’t [emphatic tone] So we try to get information, round up support for these kids. Because if there’s another way to do it, let’s find another way to do it. Why punish a kid, why is it punitive? The kids don’t want to fail. So for me, I just have to think it’s the way that I can build relationships.

* I really care about this racial, cultural divide stuff; that’s probably my biggest thing right now, locally as well as internationally. What’s been the biggest challenge for me is developing deep, trusting, respectful relationships across culture and across race. Not just because it’s hard for me, it’s hard for our society. And so that’s been probably a real effort on my part to do that. The thing that has gotten me there the best, in spite of all my intentions and desires, was getting involved in the anti-racism circle building process. I’m involved in a statewide task force on racism, and I don’t think we can deal with racism until we build trusting relationships, because we have to work across races and cultures. If we can’t trust each other, if we don’t have that social capital, we can’t do it. We can’t be a coalition. The work has very cross-race, cross-culture dialogues, and that’s hard! It’s hard even to recruit people because there’s so much history of distrust and exploitation and hurtfulness. But there are those who are brave enough to do it … and now there’s over 100 involved in our community. It’s not like nirvana kind of relationships; it’s not always ‘kumbaya.’ I have found that in our
continuing work on various projects in our community, those who have been in the process stick a little bit longer and a little bit better. When I go to a meeting, that’s some sort of anti-racism initiative meeting, and I look around the room I go, oh, there’s a ton of us here! There are looks of trust. You might not agree with everything that person says, but you know they’ve been down that road and there are some basic tenets. There’s been a commitment, and there’s just a little more trust that the person will stick there. I think that’s had an impact.

* Right now we’re kind of doing community development with the people. We’re seeing that the future generations really want to know things like ‘why should we have an Indian name? Why should we use tobacco?’ So a huge group of us are doing this, meeting and strategizing on how to hold on to our way of life. People who are in leadership should listen to the people; leadership is really to see what is on people‘s minds and in their hearts; what do they want that’s going to help their life. Not all the people do, but a big portion are hungry for that, are craving that spiritual way of life.

**Discussion.** Most of the leaders expressed awareness of strategies in shifts toward cultural sensitivity: avoidance, personal development, consultation, making space; and experiences with culturally appropriate models of action: mentoring, adoption, power sharing, and empowering outcomes (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Some examples of these were seen in the leadership views and roles section, such as avoidance (disconnection between role of teacher and role of community member) and empowering outcomes (speaking on
be
half of community member who was victimized). While examples of cultural
sensitivity and appropriate models of action can also be noted in the remaining discussion
sections, these, and many more from the interviews could not be shared or considered
here, due to the scope and length of the current study.

The selections included in this section address another aspect of cultural
sensitivity and diverse relationship building: conflicting constructs. While people may
espouse similar values, they may also carry hegemonic assumptions, beliefs and habits of
dominance; as a result, even some efforts related to emancipation or transformation can
be problematic, when they are based on different ideological constructs – the ways in
which beliefs are built and acted upon.

The leader who was asked to lie and manipulate on the job gave an example of
both a value and a construct conflict. The leader was asked to act in opposition to a value
that is common to many different constructs – honesty. They were also asked to go
against a cultural leadership construct taking their cue from a younger male. The example
also illustrated the difference between economic and power constructs based on
hierarchical dominance, and alternate, resource and power sharing constructs. The leader
was individually, personally, and professionally being set up; and the on-the job context
was also a set up that could lead to two institutional groups or systems being pitted
against each other.

This is classism at work; and when it intersects with issues of ethnicity, it is
racism. This piece was also illustrated in a video produced by a local anti-racism group.
In it, the example was given of a young Native American man, who was interested in
going to college, being told by a white school counselor that he should go to a vocational school; that he would never succeed at a university. The man did not believe this, and went on to attain a doctorate (Clayton, Jackson, McGhie Memorial, 2009). This example showed that there were not only inaccurate and undervaluing expectations and assumptions of intelligence and ability based on culture and skin color, but also the implication that there was a difference between people who attend universities and vocational-technical schools. The counselor was perpetuating classism, directed at everyone in mainstream society, and racism, when that was directed at a person of color.

In the U.S., this habitus (Bourdieu, 1990) of pitting of people, groups of people, and institutions, in a hierarchical, dominant, power-based manner can be seen in most of the dominant systems built on white, Anglo-Saxon and Protestant (WASP), or other Christian, ideologies (Allport, 1979; Caroll, 2001). These systems have histories of Greco-Roman-Judeo-Christian struggles, where patterns of scapegoating and division have become systematically entrenched since ancient times (my ethnicity, my religion, my government, my job is better than yours, and when this is threatened, it is those peoples‘ fault); key words that pop up in discussions where oppression around construct differences are at issue include hierarchical comparisons: more than, less than, better than, lacking (Burke, 1935).

A final, related example from the interviews was the construct conflict between a Native American student and the dominant school system‘s requirements; between indigenous cultural religion and mainstream science education. Both constructs would agree that they cared about the student, but had different ideas regarding how that was put
into action. The works of Bourdieu (1986), Portes (1998, 2000), Weisinger and Salipante (2005), Rydin and Holman (2004), and Tuhiwai Smith (1999) are important to note here. What were the consummatory motivations of, and benefits to, the school administrators or teachers, as donors of resources to the student? What were those motivations of, and benefits to, the student, as a donor of resources to their community? What were the motivations of, and benefits to the individual youth worker, as a donor of resources to both communities? Of what use was the action, to whom, for whom, and to what end? Why? How were the motivations and goals being put into action?

Bourdieu (1986, p. 241-258) discussed different forms of capital, hidden or disguised as construction of social capital (however purposeful or unintentional); he gave the example of an educational system within a capitalist structure (the greatest economic return with the least amount of investment) and the economic motivations behind the development of cultural (human) capital, disguised as a discussion of, or production of, social capital (p. 254). There may have been alternative ways the student could have achieved both their economic and social goals.

Often, the motivations of and benefits to go-betweens are similar to the economic or social motivations of the dominant system. As shown by Grover LeGarde (2006, 2008), and Peacock and Wisuri (1997), portrayals through documentaries, film and television (Clayton, Jackson, McGhie Memorial, 2009; Fortier, Norrgard, WDSE-TV, 2002; and Lightning, 2008), and many others sources too numerous to cite here, these motivations can have devastating and genocidal effects. However, as the go-betweens in the current examples showed, leaders also have the capacity to positively act on the basis
of identification with, or within, an alternate construct, as caregivers, communication channels, and as servants to others, and on the bonds within those communities.

While trust is ideal for bonding, sometimes more important is similarity of positive motivations and goals, and the need for cohesion rather than bonding (Rydin and Holman, 2004). The go-between acts as the cross-construct —“glue”, that holds efforts together. Again, depending on the motivations of the go-between, this can have positive or negative outcomes.

This is where the systematic work of creating anti-racism circles within bonded groups of mainstream culture can more effectively change individuals and systems. These groups can reinforce, validate, and educate people about the impact of motivation, and of leadership in the role of go-betweens. Numbers and groups of individuals can more effectively put into action the systematic work of power sharing, and making space for non-mainstream cultures, and support self-determination and empowerment efforts, where various peoples speak for themselves.

Several, if not all, of the other types of construct differences noted in the literature review (Leadership, and Cultural Constructs and Sensitivity sections) applied to the examples here. However, they will not be individually addressed due to the length constraints of the paper.

Working on cross-cultural efforts and being in cross-cultural relationships, does not necessarily equal —“freedom from the exercise of intellectual arrogance, or evangelical and paternalistic practices” (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 177, citing Bishop, 1994). Empowerment requires an understanding of what is wanted, by all involved; it is not
necessarily about just doing what an organization or the dominant system wants or expects (Grande, 2000; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; Cleary Miller, Peacock, 1997). Therefore, it is useful to look for and talk about, common values, and constructs, for mutually beneficial action; it is also necessary to be aware of and discuss the differences, in order for people in marginalized positions, or people working on their behalf, to better negotiate from a position of empowerment and self-determination (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). These are best seen in the real live interactions of people.

Other decolonizing considerations related to the key questions – by whom, for whom, how, and why (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999), will be addressed with examples of strategic relationship building, and the motivations and benefits involved, in the discussion of social capital concepts.

As this discussion of leadership has shown, there is a need to look further at the efforts or actions of, motivations of, and benefits to individual leaders as donor go-betweens. The following section has examples of these, in the descriptions given by the leaders interviewed.

**Social Capital Concepts**

**Results.** The following are descriptions of deliberately constructed relationships with combinations of dimensional attributes; motivations of and benefits to the leaders, as donors of resources within those relationships; cross-culture, cross-sector, and cross-construct diversity of the ties, and sustainable, multidimensional community development. The italicized emphases were added, to indicate key ideas present such as types of ties, types of motivations, types of benefits being received, and types of
ideological constructs being presented. Selections have been separated based on types of
ties and associated motivations and benefits (1-3); cultural and ideological values, beliefs,
constructs and associated motivations (4-5); and cross-construct community development
(6-8).

1. Bonded relationship ties were present, based on similarity of identity, cultural
norms and values; motivations associated with these ties stayed even when
circumstances changed.

* People just find it weird when I am walking with one of the kids and I kind of
got my arm around them, in a side hug, it’s like I’m walking them through things.
And like they’re like _how do you put your hands on a kid of color?_ and I’m –
this is not a kid of color, this is just a human and we have this bond because they
know I truly care for them! And I know, for me, that’s the number one with kids
and parents. Some parents it’s not quite as bonding because sometimes they’re
reserved and they’re more … they know me, they know what I stand for, they
know what I do, and that’s about it. Some co-workers you bond more with, and
some you’re just there for the mission and you do looser connecting just for where
you’re at.

* If you are working all the time on your personal circle, you just have more to
give when you go outside of your personal circle, into other people’s circle.
Bonding ties help you grow, help you see things. I don’t know why I thought
you’d have it all together at my age when I was younger but there’s even more
stuff to learn. So that bonding is everything. I could just work on my really solid
bonded relationships and it doesn’t have to be a lot, just a few that I work on keeping those going… I don’t want to isolate myself. Then there’s the bonding with the Creator and keeping that fed. So bonding is… once you have those solid bonds, the rest all fall into place.

* I’ve seen kids in the camps grow up now. It really is all about relationships. It is kind of hard… the income, it’s low. I’ve lived it, and I am low income but mentally I don’t feel like I am though. You know, it’s a whole other way of living that breaks my heart.

2. Bridging and linking ties, with motivations that changed, by situation and context.

* I know in some situations here in the city, a lot of our local housing has moved out of this particular neighborhood, to a different part of the city, because a bunch of people are coming in with money and trying to turn it into condos, which then changes the community because now some of the people who fit into the low-income category are some our kids of color. So now they’re moving out. So instead of building a positive community thing, I think it hurts, because now all the relationships that were here and the connections that made it what it is now... it kind of loses some of that. I think that happens whenever money can be made, or even when it’s about the image of the city or the neighborhoods closer to downtown – they’re trying to keep a positive spin on things or even a false sense of positive. Like “this is the clean area; a certain type of people fit into this area” – usually they’re white and have money. So in order to change the image, you shift
the ability to have low-income housing in this area to go to other places in the town. That way you have more of a dynamic of, maybe rich retirees that want to retire in a condo, and it’s about money. I guess it depends on what kind of hat you’re wearing. We’re trying to help families and kids succeed to be their highest potential. Community building is when you have a goal to build certain things in the community; for us it’s the positive stuff. But if you’re about increasing the tax base, or other money-based things for the city, it’s about fixing, rebuilding old buildings for higher income people to come in and tax, and for what they think people are going to come and do.

*People come from all different walks of life, from other countries and cultures. You don’t discriminate on ‘you have to be from our community.’ We’re able to have a beautiful exchange. The link is spiritual.

3. Bracing ties, strategic, loosely bonded, in a bounded and collective context, for a bounded and collective purpose.

* As a [community service] manager I really came to grips with the issues around trying to build a multi-cultural, multi-racial staff, and how difficult that was. It was something I really wanted but it was extremely difficult – recruiting, hiring, whatever. So I got involved within the agency; I became part of a diversity statewide team, got some training. The more you peel that away, the more you realize how difficult it is; it’s not just a quick-fix kind of thing; it’s not something that you can just be a good person and fix. I got more in touch with the systemic issues, the deeper issues around cultural divides… I wanted to figure that out. I
realized it wasn’t just about the corporations; it was really an important issue around the community itself in many, many different ways. So I started becoming involved; initially it was building up a coalition to really explore what racism was about and to become leaders in undoing racism. One church was really interested in that so we really kind of pursued that pretty deeply. I also supervised student teachers in highly diverse schools and that was fascinating for me to see how really good teachers can make a difference in kids’ lives. But then I became more involved with different organizations in the community; social service organizations, educational groups, community service groups and we all were collectively starting to form a coalition of people who really cared about dealing with racism. It’s such a collective problem, and a collective solution; that’s where organizing comes in. You can’t just fix one piece and you can’t just transform one person. You start with the person but then you build the organization, and then you have to build the links between the organizations in order for there to be a persevering shift.

* I needed to build this kind of bracing relationship so that I can learn from each one of those systems, find out exactly why something is going the way it is going. Or challenge it even, but not challenge it to a point where I ruin that relationship but yet say the things I need to say.
4. Ideological values and constructs, among and between cultures, classes, and people otherwise excluded or marginalized, and associated motivations and benefits.

* Social capital is about people trying to capitalize on becoming prestigious. They determine which circles of people to get around to capitalize on how they’re seen or perceived in the community so that if they are seen with them, they will be seen that way too. All the different kinds of relationships are about basic love for humanity. Gotta have it, otherwise, what is it all about? Hopefully it’s not about social capital.

* I don’t give up. I pull out all the stops. I mean, I’ll find some way of having some connection, something in common. You just look for that. And the other thing, too, is that there are some relationships that are just not gonna work because a particular person is just so unwilling to see it at your level. But you don’t give up on others like them, or in the same situation.

* We got involved in solidarity with our son; he does human rights work. For him, it feels good that his parents care about human rights issues and make efforts on that behalf, and we communicate that a lot with each other.

* I was helping my daughter … her identity is American Indian mixed blood; however, I said always identify as American Indian because, believe me sister, that’s how the world sees you. And if you go out with your right foot forward, then you can deal with all that muckety, you know, and you can say I’m Scandinavian and a little French all you want and you can be all excited about it,
because you should if you want. But how the world sees you impacts you greatly. So *always go with a strong offense*, be very proud of that, and understand it better than they do; so be very rooted, otherwise, you’re gonna… the paybacks are not fun. So I decided you know, I could tell her that in one sentence, however, I had to raise her that way, and so it was on me as a parent to make sure that was occurring on a cellular level as it were every year. It was seamless, she really had no idea in many ways that it was so deep, and now she does.

* For me what I get out of some relationships is if I can help people open their eyes, see things out of their little lens or box because a lot of our folks don’t get it. They don’t understand. And the thing is, when they don’t understand, they shut down. They don’t ask questions – they don’t ask the tough questions, they don’t! What I want a lot of my fellow white people to do is find the uncomfortable situation and stay in it. Don’t back away from it; don’t get out of it; stay in it. And then challenge it. Challenge yourself in that situation. If you’re hitting your head against the wall in a situation with a person of color and you don’t know what’s going on, sit there for awhile. Then you start to develop strategies and tools – how to work with everybody, all different types of people. For me, if I can help people see that and touch some of that or get a taste of it, that’s very important because then they can start to be more effective.

* I had a mentor who was one of the first people of color here in the city; he worked in an old, hard-labor industrial business. He took me under his wing; he
always called me his ‘light-skinned son.’ We did many things together, for local organization events, and kids. We had the same vision with kids and what we wanted to have accomplished. He’d come in and say, ‘Hey, quit sagging the pants, pull your pants up, be a man’ you know. It was about personal responsibility and none of this taking from the system; no, step up, pull yourself up. He had a real, genuine way about him and he taught me so many things. He was very honest with me and I’m always willing to help, and that’s how we started that process. There’s another man who works in the community. I’ve known him and his family for years. We are almost on the same wavelength. I mean, I can answer his sentence before he finishes and vice versa, he can do it with me. When it comes to kids, there are a lot of folks who don’t know how to work with kids. We can de-escalate a situation in a matter of seconds, or however. We have similar styles and he’s teaching me a lot of things too. So that is kind of big for me. There are some other folks I get together with too, who are older than me; lots of camaraderie and sometimes the arguments; but the history too, I mean, they have an amazing history from being through the war, coming and being some of the only people from the culture in the city. The stories they got are just amazing, about how they had to fight, how proud they are. There are a lot of members of the community here helping me.

* What this whole thing boils down to, for me, is power imbalance, and I don’t know who all should be holding the power all the time, but I know it can be abused and it can be imbalanced. Usually those two states are very bad for
everything… So I feel like I got to know all different kinds of people, and it gave me tons.

* I am busting my tail out there. Being a youth worker is not an eight-hour job, it’s just not. Kids are calling me on weekends; kids are calling me at seven in the morning because they need a ride to school. I might be working to help them succeed until late at night, and it’s like that every time, so you’re looking at 12-13 hour days. I could have quit years ago, but I can’t. I mean, I gotta… there’s something about raising kids… I have kids that I have taken in. I’m not a foster parent but they’ve lived with me and I’ve helped raise them. I raised a young African American man, took him in around 13 and 14 and now he’s an adult. He has a nickname for me, because I’m like a father to him, but I’m not his birth father. We do family events; he’s like a son to me. And my other son calls him big brother, that kind of thing. I also took in a young native man; he lived with us almost two years. So there’s an investment in the community… a true investment, not some phony, fake ‘I’m only going to be here for a year or two so I’m going to close my eyes and not care’. The other part for me to be successful is just to be able to have these great relationships with kids, and the parents. If I somehow couldn’t have a relationship with the parents and the kids, this wouldn’t work.

5. Specific expressions of ideological constructs.

* In the U.S. we have such a message of individualism. Sometimes people think they’re more self-sufficient and independent than they really are. They don’t realize how much social capital saves their butt. They think they’ve done it all
themselves, you know? I guess that’s the ultimate of white privilege, thinking you’ve done it all yourself… off the backs of many people and you totally don’t get who they are. So I think social capital is essential to our survival, but healthy social capital, that is fair, just and non-exploitive social capital; that would be my goal. Social capital in the higher sense, not just the “getting what you can from other people”.

* I went to this meeting to address human trafficking and prostitution. The meeting was to define it, what do you think this is? You know, people bring what they have to it. There were people from all different walks of life there. The tribes sent many people. The metro area sent people, also tribal people. The university sent people; nonprofit leaders were there. Really, what I took away from it was that it’s about personal power, if you can articulate that without wanting to burn the house down, which is, you know, sometimes a feat. We’ve lived with it long enough, and we’ve cared enough to learn who this is really affecting and how’s it affecting them. Trafficking and prostitution has affected my whole life and I’ve given working on it a great deal of effort. The academics were there thinking about it in terms of research, and intellectual property. I think academia is rife with a desire to own ideas and knowledge and it’s pretty abhorrent to me. I feel like that about social capital because it implies property. This is not going to solve anything, in my view of life. And the politically correct are very covetous of correctness, and I say it’s a direct link to Pilgrim, there’s a rigid tone of ‘you must
behave properly”. And I think that’s so dangerous for human beings because that doesn’t allow us a full spectrum of humanity.

We have all different responses because we have all different life experience and needs. So the politically correct, nonprofit leaders are jumping in and saving the world, and the academics are going ‘let us instruct you.’ Really, if they tell us one more time that this starts when… that people are groomed when they are 14… They studied that somewhere; they don’t know anybody, and they should be very careful with their tone, because it’s too restrictive and authoritative and that curtails the conversation. It curtails the learning, and that doesn’t allow other people to build on their understanding of what’s going on. How come they don’t really know them? How come they don’t really understand them and value them? I mean; it’s not all concepts.

I think that thing of personal power, of genuineness, that’s the thing I valued most, because I think it is harmonious for me with knowing that the most important thing in life is to be human. What anybody from any walk of life is looking for, is someone who’s authentic and genuine and has empathy. Because then they have some planks to walk on with you, they feel like you’re gonna approach them but you’re not gonna run them over, you’re going to listen. For example, the lady who’s the coordinator of the task force, she said, well, now, why is it that these people are not shunned when they are in the women’s shelter, these prostitutes who you say are pretending to be battered women so they can get shelter? Somebody spoke up and said that’s because there’s a code of _we will all
help each other’ because you know, generally speaking, unless you do something extremely weird, you’re not gonna be shunned because there’s a code of let’s help each other survive. And this woman from a tribal women’s shelter said, ’that’s exactly my experience; these women protect each other like street women protect each other. They’re a tribe unto themselves.’

And the facilitator was humble enough and present enough and strong enough to just say, ’I don’t understand, can you explain this?’ You know? And the first person said, yeah, that’s a great question, because they had just said that prostituted women were shunned in certain settings. And so the facilitator’s thinking, ’well, how come they’re not shunned there?’ Good, logical question. But if you haven’t lived there, worked there… The academics didn’t have the answer, you know, university people might study it to death, but really… it’s not like they didn’t bring things to the table; they did, but their social capital is limited and it’s because of their walk in life. If they’d broaden their walk… same with the politically correct; their walk is very limited. That homogenous thing is keeping them from where we are. So there’s stuff they will never know, because we know the women involved in trafficking and prostitution in a very personal way, because they’re really in our lives. But we don’t go around telling each other, telling the world, ’well, here’s the deal…’
6. Ideological constructs directionally and dimensionally changed over time, due to the influence of these diverse bonded and bracing ties.

* I feel more comfortable with people who have been marginalized than I do with people in the power structure, although naturally I fit with the people in the power structure in terms of my upbringing and my own advantages, my own privileges. But that’s become less and less attractive to me. Recently my family had a gathering and I really was so chewed up about how can I go and retain who I am, but not be the butt of their treatment? I’ve been the butt of their treatment for a long time. These are my WASP connections, but I feel less akin to that now than I do to people who are across where I came from. I feel more solidarity and more kinship with difference; when it’s homogenous I feel sort of uncomfortable; it feels like these aren’t my people. I remember thinking when I was with my family, these aren’t my people; I need my people.

* At first I volunteered, and I just fell in love with the kids. But what I began to learn was that, with the difference, there was definitely a shift when I realized white privilege, for me, and then realizing that there’s so many things in place for when I grew up, especially in the little nearby town where I grew up which is all white basically, that a lot of people of color don’t even get anywhere near close to these options. And then also, along with that, was the fact of the welfare system and how I think it’s broken. I wanted to break the cycle of kids going back on that. And wanting the kids seeing and feeling the value of hard work and maintaining a job and being a good, decent human. Being caring, you know. I’d
do certain activities where I’d take kids out and do jobs and activities where they made money. Sometimes the parents would call me and I’d get an earful, because they’d say ‘what are you doing with my kid and why are you working my kid?’ and I’m like well, if you look in their pocket they’ve either got a new pair of shoes or $50. That’s what I do, we do jobs and I’d give the kids a choice – I can buy you shoes or I can give you the cash. And then the parents are, wow, you’re getting my kids working, what’s going on with that? It’s just that kind of thing, to instill those values in kids. I’m not gonna dance around the issue; I’m firm but fair. Some kids take it well, some don’t. Some kids like it, some kids I have to tweak it a little bit, you know? But if they have somebody other than their parents in their life they know really care for them, it’s just a positive; it’s about turning out really good, really good young kids. These kids are all fantastic, lovely. It’s working, we’ve got so many beautiful kids that are all going out into the communities and being positive people. Some parents don’t want anything to do with me; one said ‘are you a social worker? Get the hell out of my house!’ I’m like, whoa… I’m not a social worker; I’m not. So at first you’re trying to get a strategic plan in place so I can get to know you. Then the relationship hopefully moves into closer, bonding.
7. Strategic development of multi-dimensional relationships, based on common goals and cohesive, bracing, cross-culture, cross-sector ties, in cross-bounded communities.

* You’re seeing the big picture but that’s because you’re out, and you have to come in, with an understanding of a cultural concept of what happens, why we make these quick decisions, and some of them are very good and some are very bad. You have to understand that really acutely, and then you have to build to a tipping point. You have to help a whole culture go from A to B. You can’t do it yourself; you have to set things in motion that will help it tip. Don’t wear your ass out. Fly like geese, fly in formation, help each other out; don’t overburden yourselves; stay extremely united. Even though obviously you want to kill each other sometimes, but you know... the beauty of it.

* There are muckety-mucks… I don’t even know if that’s even a racial term or not; my dad always used to say it. It’s the folks you kinda got to kiss up to a little bit or build a relationship with. They think they’re higher than you are, they think they’re better than you; they think they know more than you do. But even though you know that they don’t, you just try to kinda be… not phony, but polite. In some big meetings, I know I irritate some people, because I ask the questions about race and culture and what’s happened. But I’m making sure I’m super polite with them when I see them everywhere else. I really try to push it, oh nice to see you again, how was your day, I haven’t talked to you in awhile. Because
some of these people are heavy-hitters. They’re powerful people; they’re high up. I’m kind of the one who *ruffles the feathers*, and I know that. So yeah, definitely, you have to do that. I gotta be nice to you, otherwise I aint gonna be able to do *what I need to do*.

* You’re supposed to *just be as human as you can be to one other and then all those authorities and powers don’t get in the way*, you’re simply trying to *share some humanity* and get from A to B as peacefully as possible, as carefully and kindly as possible. That thing of „kindness is the greatest wisdom“ that’s my spiritual belief. That’s really true, because on certain days I want to kill people. That’s not kind! [laughs] Just the opposite! I can sure tell you I know the opposite! But then I am so touched when people can be so kind. It means they have to gentle their inner nature to pull that off, and I’m like damn… I’m impressed! [laughs]

* In the school district, *everybody is pretty much white*. There isn’t one African American teacher in the whole district. There are three administrators that are African American, and there are paraprofessionals. There are a couple of Native teachers, usually Ojibwe, who are teaching the language, but there are some bi-racial teachers too and there are some paraprofessionals that are native. This is the first time the school district has ever *hired this many people of color all at once*, *which is a huge step* for the district.
* I can just work with different pockets of people and they just know me the way they know me; they don’t ever give me this—well, what are you doing that for?*

It’s promoting understanding of people living with HIV and giving out information on prevention of HIV. And that’s been really good, except really constrictive, because it’s CDC funding and they’re very medical, and deeply, deeply bureaucratic. I thought, this isn’t nearly adequate enough, because of knowing that tribal communities are very migratory, that only come to the city for a period of time, and I didn’t see that community getting its needs met highly enough with HIV prevention. We also realized there was a lot of the street youth community coming from these little tiny towns, so we started honoring any requests from little tiny towns. So we broadened the area of service. Which made a lot of work, but more satisfying, because it felt like it wasn’t falling on deaf ears and we weren’t constantly struggling with people who just don’t want to know.

* I’ve been very fortunate to be exposed to the most humble leadership by women, elders who were in positions as head women in our ceremonial life, and currently we have a head woman in our ceremonial life; one of the most beautiful leaders. I wish everybody could have a glimpse of what a true leader is. Because to me, they’re true leaders. You could never walk into a room and pick out which one is the head woman here; you couldn’t. Because they’re very humble, very observant, watching everything, work right in the kitchen with us. And I’ve never, ever seen them abuse their position, they really feel honored to be in it, and they know they’re teachers, and gosh, I just can’t do them justice, explain to you what
I know in my heart, what I see and felt. The men would look to them, ‘is it ok to start now?’ A lot of respect from the men towards the women leaders, the head women. All those headwomen, all those leaders observe people a lot and know a lot about you, by watching you. And if they saw you doing something wrong, they would tell you, directly, and teach you to do it right and say, now you know. And it was very direct and yet you knew that – somebody else could be doing something wrong over there and they didn’t say a word! They’ve chosen you to teach. They were honest like that, not sneaky. I don’t know how the dominant world will ever understand what leadership could look like. A lot of them get in leadership and they forget what they said about what they were going to do. I want to honor the traditional elders as the true leaders. They stand under the people; they don’t stand above the people. In a patriarchal system it’s to stand above the people; you make the rules and you tell the middle ones to enforce the rules, and the ones below, it’s like _hey, I don’t make the rules, I just see the rules, and…_’ The leaders I know stand under the people and see, what is needed; how can I support this, what do I need to teach here? What do people need to know? And so they observe a lot. It’s a living experience so it’s hard to honor them in the best way I can with words.

Discussion. The relationships showed combinations of dimensional attributes, imbedded cultural and economic factors, such as other types of capital, and factors related to historical, political, cultural and ideological beliefs and constructs. These were noted in the literature review, previously cited cases in other sections of the thesis, and
also in other, unshared portions of the interviews, which included multiple espoused definitions of social capital.

Consequently, understanding the social relationships of those interviewed required separating the sources (types of ties) from their actions; it also included looking at the motivations of and benefits to donors of resources (Portes, 1998, 2000), and dimensional contexts (Woolcock, 1998, 2001; Rydin and Holman, 2004). These were also in line with the key questions and considerations of decolonizing methodologies (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999).

Bonded relationship ties were present, based on similarity of identity, cultural norms and values; motivations associated with these types of ties stayed in place even when circumstances changed (Coleman, 1986; Granovetter, 1973; Treuer, 2011). Descriptions included bridging and linking ties, with motivations that changed, by situation and context (Burt, 2000; Edwards and Foley, 1997; Granovetter, 1973; Portes, 1998, 2000; Skocpol, 1996; Woolcock, 1998, 2001). Noted too were bracing ties, strategic, loosely bonded, in a bounded and collective context, for a bounded and collective purpose (Rydin and Holman, 2004).

The motivations of, and benefits to individuals as donors, related to different types of deliberately constructed, diverse, personal, social and work relationships. They included personal identification as, and with, people who were marginalized, the values of people who were from other cultures, and ideological constructs different from mainstream, dominant, US society, based on concepts of space, time, gender, resources
and management of resources, as cited in the literature review section on cultural constructs and sensitivity.

The espoused ideologies were based only on the perceptions and experiences of those interviewed (explicit reciprocal identification by the people being referred to, who shared the ideologies, was not included). However, in a limited way, these shared ideologies indicated diverse bonded and bracing (cohesive, scaffolding) ties; individually and deliberately constructed; donor motivated; cross-culture, cross-construct, and cross-bounded communities.

The social capital sources on bonded ties were largely concerned with assimilation (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1995) similar to the ties noted as cultural reproduction (Zacharakis and Flora, 2005). Other sources regarding diverse ties were in vertical and collective contexts (Schneider, 2007; Weisinger and Salipante, 2005; Woolcock, 1998, 2001). Studies that involved multi-directional, cross-sector ties, did not address cross-cultural or cross-construct considerations, and were interested in benefits to a collective within a single bounded system (Rydin and Holman, 2004). There is an absence of social capital literature regarding ties individually and deliberately constructed; diversely cross-culture, cross-construct (not hierarchical), cross-bounded communities (such as between tribal reservation communities or urban tribal groups within or in close proximity to towns and cities), and motivations of and benefits to donors within the relationships. Further discussion of these types of ties could be potentially significant for more effective leadership development, and multidimensional, sustainable community development.
Culturally bonded, bridging, and linking ties that were vertical in hierarchical power contexts, by themselves have been seen as insufficient to change systematic oppression or increase self-determination and empowerment, based only on civic engagement (Schnieder, 2007); typical diversity strategies (Weisinger and Salipante, 2005); or increased access by marginalized people, when cultural reproduction (assimilation) was expected (Zacharakis and Flora, 2005). Also, both the leadership role of agency, and deliberate construction of diverse ties (including those within families), are not always consistent with decolonizing empowerment when they do not share common understandings, motivations, goals, ideologies, and constructs (Day and Tellet, 2008; Grande, 2000; Treuer, 2011).

However, for some leaders, motivations based on different ideological constructs, and differing constructs, did change over time (directionally and dimensionally), due to the influence of these diverse bonded and bracing ties. Consequently, a combination of the alternative, empowerment-based constructive strategies noted in the literature, and strategic development of diverse bracing and diverse bonded ties such as those seen in the interviews, could be considered effective or necessary for changing systematic oppression; in other words, changing constructs that are based on an ideology of dominance.

According to Rydin and Holman (2004), the creation of sustainable, multi-dimensional communities requires the strategic development of cross-sector, and multi-directional relationships, based on common goals, and cohesive, bracing relationship ties.
As the interviews have shown, the added consideration of individual, cross-cultural and cross-construct relationships might be useful for any such effort.

**Summary**

Analysis of the information shared, and that which was not included due to length, indicated that diversity mattered in the social relationships of the leaders who were interviewed; while the value – in terms of capital – was disputed, depending on the ideological, social, cultural, and capitalist, or non-capitalist constructs of different individuals. Comparison of the information gathered from the interviews, to the information found in the literature from both decolonizing sources and social capital works, showed some of the impacts of motivation and benefits on the deliberate construction of diverse relationships. All of the leaders saw leadership as situational and cultural, and their roles were functional, as go-betweens, within positions as advocates and agents. Some had those roles because of their positions, and some chose their positions because of their relationships and those roles. All the leaders had deliberately constructed, multicultural ties, based on personal and social interactions, through their community work, or both. Common concerns had to do with reducing systematic oppression. Further discussion of these relationships and concerns was based on the application of aspects of decolonizing methodologies; and on the basis of social capital concepts – social capital as deliberately constructed relationships, and as motivations of and benefits to donors of resources; and diversity of relationships, particularly diversely bonded and bracing ties, with regard to strategic, sustainable, multidimensional community development.
The information presented – the personal perceptions and experiences of the leaders, and the suggestions, strategies, and models given by the literature review sources – may be of use to groups and organizations working to diversifying leadership and increase the capacity to serve. It may be of use to individuals and groups building diverse personal and social ties, self-determination and empowerment outcomes. Finally, it may be of use to educators and leaders in all forms and roles, who are in a position to share, and model, multidimensional, collaborative, and sustainable relationship community building. Further conclusions of the results, related to these possibilities will be included in Chapter Five, Summary and Conclusions.
Chapter Five – Summary and Conclusions

Observations

The common theme of the interviews, related to understanding the impact of social relationships and community development, was the desire to address underlying issues, factors, and conditions that prevent equality, humanity, and dignity for all; by putting attention and resources toward preventing systematic oppression, such as racism, and classism. One leader, who has spent a lifetime of studying and working towards personal, social, and organizational diversity, stated this clearly: “The thing that has gotten me there the best, in spite of all my intentions and desires, was getting involved in an anti-racism circle building process.” Also necessary is follow-through; this was best summed up by an elder and educator, in an anti-racism organization’s resource video: “Trainings are great, but they need to be the springboard for the real work, which is getting out there and meeting people” (Clayton, Jackson, McGhie Memorial, 2009).

Throughout the interviews, the leaders showed that doing the work is at least two-fold; first through personal and strategic social relationship building that teaches people, in positions of privilege, authority, and power in the dominant systems, how they as individuals perpetuate and reinforce those systems in unhealthy and disrespectful ways; and second, by seeking out diverse people and strategic projects that include models of learning, collaboration, sharing, and empowering ways of building multidimensional, sustainable communities.
**Educational Implications**

People working with youth and adult learners in various capacities, including within the local public school system, indicated that while they are grateful for the efforts that have been made to empower parents and students, they also see the need for the racism of those in positions of authority to be addressed. The hiring of a limited number of advocates short term and training them to work with parents is good, and increased hiring of teachers that have been historically excluded is great, but neither is enough – also needed is the training of teachers, staff, and administrators in positions of authority, to increase their awareness of how systematic white privilege leads to personal biases, preferences, motivations, behaviors, policies and practices that are keeping people from being fully human and effective. This also applies to higher education, and calls on people in those areas to provide greater spaces, access, support, power sharing, and collaborative efforts to educate community members about these issues. The work is being done, and there’s room for more.

Nieto (1999) and Howard (2006) pointed out that “we can’t teach what we don’t know” [book title]. However, the people interviewed for this project have shown that the issue is more than ignorance; it is also a matter of *not just teaching what some prefer or what benefits some individuals the most*. In this complex global age it’s not enough – and sometimes impossible, or inappropriate – to become deeply familiar with, or separate, the multitude of cultures that show up in the classroom or the workplace. But what can be understood to a greater degree is the concept of appreciation for, rather than fear of, difference; of how to embed both self-reflection and action-based collaborative and
support projects into learning, places of learning, and policies; and how personal motivations and social behaviors contribute to, and perpetuate, issues of de-humanization and systematic domination and control.

It is also not just a lack of money, even with a ‘difficult’ economy. As some people noted, especially during the toughest of times, it’s not just about money. As advocates, nonprofit service providers, mentors, and allies, the leaders interviewed were all familiar with the issues of fundraising and grant writing, and all spoke of the problems related to classism. One construct was to see money as the problem, to feel that nothing can be accomplished without it, and to think that people are severely limited without it. In another construct, understanding and appreciating differences inspired creativity, innovation, hope, and created alternate means of expanding relationships and services, as a higher priority. Such a construct offered increased respect, communication, and stories of that shared wisdom and experience related to networking and other vehicles for action that do not necessarily require money; that shared insight about other systems for trading goods and services. It was not disputed that money helps; but thoughts, and constructions of thought, that are dependent on money were and are problematic.

Needed is a greater acknowledgement of how the differences between these constructs have wrought centuries-long inequalities, related to access to opportunities, accumulation or hoarding, and depletion or destruction of resources. This includes the ways in which some people are able to have and give greater support that encourages innovation and creativity but fail to have consistent expectations of and for all, while other people have been, and continue to be, denied the same rights and opportunities;
largely due to the intersection of both systematic structures and personal biases. This can be seen in any given area, including housing, neighborhood development, employment, the arts, and other areas. There are sufficient resources for all, but there are different ideas about the sharing and management of them. All of this has to do with systematic oppression related to different cultural and economic constructs.

The people most often negatively impacted, whose voices are not frequently heard in dominant society – youth, teens, and adults who are stigmatized, excluded or marginalized – and those who work on their behalf, must be listened to. They have all identified solutions needed to address issues of racism, classism, and other forms of discrimination that create and reinforce systematic oppression, as a critical issue of leadership and community building.

All people are both learners and teachers, and all can be more effective in those roles by understanding the motivational differences of go-betweens. There are those who act with integrity and honesty, who serve to empower those with less access and resources. Others intentionally and unintentionally reinforce the ongoing perpetuation of issues of inequality, dominance, control, and self-serving greed or profit for a few, rather than human rights and respectful quality of life for all. Effective education includes understanding the ways in which people are systematically pitted against each other, to create confusion and disempowerment.

As the voices of this project stated, there is a great need on the part of the community to consider the long-term effects of denying the co-existence of other systems and constructs; and a persistent failure to consider alternative, outside-the-box ideas,
inputs, and models of leadership different than that of the dominant mainstream. However, also described within this project were examples from the wider-reaching models, where there are greater understandings, experiences, and possibilities, related to perceiving and approaching diverse relationships based on something other than the accumulation of capital and where difference is welcomed and appreciated. There is no rational need for educators to be isolated, or disconnected from each other, their students, parents, administrators, business and organizational leaders, as members of a diverse, sustainable, multidimensional local community.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The role of go-betweens, and issues related to the motivations of and benefits to donors of resources in deliberately constructed relationships, was only briefly addressed in the current project. There could be a more thorough understanding of the simultaneously deeply bonded and diverse bracing ties between leaders who identify as or with people who are marginalized or excluded and those people who are marginalized or excluded, as identified by and in the words of people within the groups that are marginalized and excluded. An alternative focus could be on diverse ties that appear to be mutually beneficial but which are not. Such efforts may or may not be in line with an indigenous agenda or useful project framework. Tuhiiwai Smith (1999) found there are at least “two distinct pathways through which an indigenous agenda is being advanced” (p. 125) and at least “twenty-five project frameworks” (p. 142 -162) considered appropriate. With these in mind, a recommendation might be for a compilation to be done of actual projects being proposed or carried out locally that are either indigenous-based, or
collaborative cross-construct, with information from those involved as to the support needed to achieve the goals.

Another similar and significant but more specific recommendation would be for a study to be done of the awareness and inclusion of local indigenous agendas, and decolonizing methodologies, within academic programs in the local area, including K-12, college, and continuing education levels, and within educational and strategic planning efforts of community-based organizations, initiatives, and city-wide coalitions.

A third recommendation for research would be more in-depth case-studies of leaders’ local anti-racism efforts, and organizational efforts to diversify leadership in ways related to consultation, making space, power sharing, and empowering outcomes, rather than reinforcing hierarchical expectations and cultural reproduction. Such studies might be able to communicate what has been done historically, is being done currently, what still needs to be done, and what support is needed; especially with regard to systematic issues such as education, housing, employment, and healthcare discrimination, self-determination, and collective empowerment.

The fourth and final recommendation would be to better understand how go-betweens, as advocates or “inside/outside” researchers and workers, identify with and form ties with each other; and the motivations and benefits of doing so. These benefits might include reducing “burn out” – overextending themselves, triggers of PTSD and other effects of second hand trauma; or other ways in which such identification and ties are strategically beneficial for keeping a united vision and cohesive achievement of goals around eliminating oppression. When this is done, it can be a form of teaching through
role modeling, and also very inspiring on a personal level.

**Summary**

The information technology age has spurred greater mobility and a greater diversity of communities and ideas, both virtual and physical. While many individuals and groups that have been marginalized and excluded still have significant systematic barriers to deal with, the combination of old and new civil rights movements and increased communication has led to wider organizing, and a wider variety of relationships. Many groups of people are working to both retain and reshape their unique cultural identities and values, and at the same time, individually and collaboratively grow their communities based on a humane view of leadership and inter-connected relationships, in positive, graceful, and inspiring ways.

All of us on this planet are facing great demands on resources, and the need for greater attention to be paid to the management of resources. However, by broadening our understanding of the social fabric that makes up the quilt of the communities in which we reside, we can see the situation as one of great excitement and beauty, rather than fear. This can be validated and reinforced by seeking out and listening to a wider variety of leadership, through actively growing peoples’ awareness of our strengths and issues, by broadening our ideas of what, and who, community is. The hope is that this project has offered more than just notions of social ‘capital’; it has offered real life examples of diverse cooperation, collaboration, and bonding, for the purposes of building healthy, sustainable, multidimensional communities.
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Appendix 1: Consent, Interview Questions, IRB Approval

CONSENT INFORMATION SHEET for RESEARCH STUDY:
Local Leaders’ Perceptions of Social Capital and Community Development

You were selected and are being invited to be a participant in this research study because of your good reputation as a local leader. Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to participate. This research is being done by: Lynda Ferguson, Master's of Education candidate at the University of Minnesota-Duluth.

Procedures:
If you agree to participate, I will ask you to meet with me privately for an interview that will last from one to two hours. I will ask questions related to your perceptions and experiences of social capital in community development. You will be provided with copies of the transcript narratives, and a final draft of the research study. Short follow-up sessions may be held during the research process to answer any questions you may have or statements you may wish to make regarding the accuracy of your comments.

Confidentiality:
The interview will be digitally recorded for audio, and coded for anonymity and confidentiality. All information will be securely stored in a password-protected file and a locked physical file in a private location, and destroyed within one year of the end of the project. The researcher is the only person who will have access to any of the information.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:
Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University of Minnesota. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

Contacts and Questions:
If you have any questions, feel free to ask them now. At any time during the process if you have questions, please contact me and let me know. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher, you are encouraged to contact either my advisor, or the Research Subjects’ Advocate Line.

Researcher:  Lynda Ferguson, phone # 218-733-9952, email: ferg0152@d.umn.edu
Advisor:  Kim Riordan, phone #218-726-7251, email: kriordan@d.umn.edu
Department of Education, University of Minnesota Duluth
Education Endazhi-gikinoo'amaading 150, 412 Library Drive
Duluth, MN 55812-3029
Advocate:  Research Subjects’ Advocate Line, D528 Mayo, 420 Delaware St. Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455; 612-625-1650.
Appendix 2: Interview Questions

Section 1: Demographics

Gender

Date of birth

Ethnicities

Cultural memberships (eg. personal, social, political, economic, etc.)

Residential history (place of birth, residences of significance, current residences)

Relationship to Duluth/Duluth area (include length of time)

Family history (including origins, childhood, teen, adult)

Education history

Work history

Current work life

Leadership roles

Leadership training

Communities you consider yourself a part of

Community development roles

Section 2: Community Development

What does the phrase “community development” mean to you?

What kinds of efforts have you been a part of related to this?

What kinds of roles have you had in these efforts?

What does the phrase “capacity building” mean to you?
What kinds of efforts have you been a part of related to this?

What kinds of roles have you had in these efforts?

Section 3: Leadership

What are the characteristics of a good leader or of good leadership, in general?

What is the most significant issue facing local community development leaders currently?

How do you think that issue could be addressed?

What have you seen leaders do that had an impact on you?

One of the reasons I wanted to interview you is because of the good reputation you have as a leader in community development. In what ways do you consider yourself to be a leader?

What are your strengths and assets as a leader?

What are some of your challenges as a leader?

What is one thing you never want to hear said to you again as a leader, and why?

What is the primary kind of support you need to be most effective as a leader (towards most effectively and efficiently accomplishing your goals or visions)?

Section 4: Social Capital

Category 1. Definitions – In this category, there are no right or wrong answers.

There are many definitions of social capital, and I just want to get a sense of which ones local leaders have heard of and have experienced.

To what extent are you familiar with “social capital” as a term or concept?

In what contexts have you heard of it?
How would you define it?

If you have not heard of it or are not familiar with it, on its face, how would you define it?

A couple of different definitions I found in reading about social capital have to do with the scope of social capital. Most of the local measures of social capital have involved collective groups and collective benefits, but the kind of social capital I want to focus on involves individual benefits. I am interested in learning about the benefits that you as an individual leader get from your relationships, including any efforts you have made or might currently be making to deliberately create relationships, in a particular context: your work as a leader in community development.

Section 4: Social Capital, continued…

Category 2. Sources - This is about your relationships and your community development goals and efforts, and how they fit together for you. I want to focus on you as the individual, and your participation in any kind of group, which can be as small as you and one other person, or you and any other number of people. Participation can be any kind of involvement. It can be personal or impersonal relationships, and have a direct or indirect impact. It is not limited to co-workers, committee members, or people from any other kind of community organization. These are the sources of potential benefits, related to you as an individual and as a leader, and your role in or goals for community development work.

What kinds of relationships impact your work as a community development leader?
How have they or do they currently impact your work or your goals?

Are there any kinds of relationships that you have never had but wanted, or had once but no longer have and would like to have again, that would positively impact your work?

Are you currently working towards having any relationships like that?

If so, what efforts are you making to create them?

Section 4: Social Capital, continued…

Category 3. Multi-Dimensional Sources

Given the following information, what are your perceptions and experiences of social capital, related to your roles, goals, or work related to local community development?

Social capital can have multi-dimensional sources and degrees of positivity, strength, time, closeness, likeness, and other characteristics:

- **Bonding social capital.** Homogenous ties, between people in similar situations (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman 1988; Putnam, 1995; Portes, 1998).

- **Bridging social capital.** Heterogeneous ties, or more distant associations (Putnam, 1995; Weisinger & Salipante, 2005; Steinfield, Ellison & Lampe 2008).

- **Linking social capital.** Associations or contacts with unlike people in dissimilar situations outside of the community (Woolcock, 2001).

- **Bracing social capital.** Links between a limited set of actors in partnership that provides social scaffolding and operates as a way to strengthen ties in a more strategic rather than bonding manner (Rydin & Holman, 2004).
**Category 4. Benefits and gaps in benefits.**

*Given all that has been discussed so far, what are your thoughts in general about benefits you have gotten, are getting, or are not getting but would like to get, related to your roles, goals, or work related to local community development?*

**Section 5: Any other thoughts on or questions about the subject of social capital?**

Lynda M. Ferguson, phone # 218-733-9952, email: ferg0152@d.umn.edu
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**From:** irb@umn.edu

**To:** ferg0152@umn.edu

**Subject:** 1004E81212 - PI Ferguson - IRB - Exempt Study Notification

TO: kriordan@umn.edu, ferg0152@umn.edu,

The IRB: Human Subjects Committee determined that the referenced study is exempt from review under federal guidelines 45 CFR Part 46.101(b) category #2 SURVEYS/INTERVIEWS; STANDARDIZED EDUCATIONAL TESTS; OBSERVATION OF PUBLIC BEHAVIOR.

Study Number: 1004E81212

Principal Investigator: Lynda Ferguson
Title(s): Local Leaders' Perceptions of Social Capital and Community Development

This e-mail confirmation is your official University of Minnesota RSPP notification of exemption from full committee review. You will not receive a hard copy or letter.

This secure electronic notification between password-protected authentications has been deemed by the University of Minnesota to constitute a legal signature.
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Research that involves observation can be approved under this category without obtaining consent.
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Upon receipt of this email, you may begin your research. If you have questions, please call the IRB office at (612) 626-5654.