# Neighborhood Planning
# for Community
# Revitalization

## Community Gardens in
## Phillips Neighborhood

# Community Gardens in Phillips Neighborhood

Conducted on behalf of
Phillips Neighborhood Network, and Phillips ETC
(Environment-Transportation-Community)

Prepared by
Maki Kawase, Graduate Research Assistant
University of Minnesota

January 2002

January 2002

Community Gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood

In a report by the City of Madison Advisory Committee on Community Gardens (CMACCG) (1999), community gardens were defined as "the sites of a unique combination of activities such as food production, recreation, social and cultural exchange and the development of open space, community spirit, skills and competence" (p. 7). Based on her case studies of six community gardens in Minneapolis, Minnesota, Kurtz (1996) similarly described community gardens as "the places created by urban residents making a concerted effort to create and sustain beauty, supplement food production, and create a safe haven for neighbors and children" (p. 1). These places were vacant inner city lots transformed by "gardeners, …residents who use garden paths for walks, and others who relax in the verdant surroundings of the gardens" (CMACCG, p. 12, 1999). A manifesto issued to the Minneapolis City Council by a group of people in the Phillips Neighborhood illustrated these efforts:

> Neighbors venture out of their homes and meet each other on the street. The fear that kept them in their homes is transformed into a combination of decisiveness, anger, exasperation and hope. They claim a vacant city lot. Maybe the lot is strewn with rubble, condoms and broken glass. Maybe it has become a space where crime, illness, fear prevail. Bolstered by their mutual support, they muster their courage to face and claim this space, and with a combination of imagination, cooperation and hard work, they transform that space into something else (Phillips Environment, Transportation, and Community [PETC], p. 1, n.d.).

In addition to these human resources, other resources, including donations of seeds, plants, soil, wood chips, compost, free water, and grants for building fences have been invested in the establishment of community gardens (Phillips Neighborhood Network [PNN], 2000b). Although it is widely accepted in the Phillips Neighborhood that these human and donated resources have been significant contributions to the success of the neighborhood's community gardens, their effects have never been empirically studied.

The Phillips Environment and Transportation Committee (PETC), together with Phillips

Neighborhood Network (PNN) and the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs of University of Minnesota (CURA) have entered into a collaboration to describe and interpret the character of community gardens in Phillips. A study of these gardens was begun in January 2000. The regional area for this study was the Phillips Neighborhood, located on Minneapolis' south side. Based on the 1990 US Census of Population and Housing, the total population in the Phillips Neighborhood was 17,067 in 1990, representing 4.6% of the total population of the City of Minneapolis. The total population remained nearly unchanged from 17,115 in 1980 (PNN, 2000a). There are 160 vacant lots, and of these, 20 community gardens in the neighborhood in 2000 (PNN, 2000a).

<div align="center">Literature Review</div>

While PETC, PNN, and CURA organized this study to describe community gardens in Phillips, it was the chief aim of the study to give consideration to community gardens as entities within the context of a contemporary inner-city environment. Thus, I focused on reviewing literature that discussed the actual situation of community gardens in pragmatic ways. In her study, Kurtz (1996) classified literature on community gardens in two areas: literature including "an historical context for community gardening in American cities" and literature covering "the community gardens of the last twenty years" (p. 9). Following Kurtz's classification and the requirements of this study, the researcher reviewed the literature of Kurtz's second classification.

Severson (1987) studied a community garden located in Chicago, IL and described the experiences of people working in a community garden as well as the history of the garden itself. She concluded that people who became involved in the process of building the community garden gained power to influence local public policy. Gardeners eventually sought to purchase community garden spaces from their local government.

Lowrie (1993) studied how different activities were used to preserve community gardens, using as an example of an outreach program, "Education in the Gardens (EIG)" in New York City (NYC). The purpose of this program was to support outdoor education programs implemented in New York public schools and community centers. Assisted by the Board of Education, Operation Green Thumb (OGT), sponsored by the New York Department of General Services, gave

non-profit organizations a lease on city-owned vacant properties for the purposes of creating community vegetable and flower gardens.

Lowrie (1993) presented examples of EIG projects sponsored by groups such as daycare centers and PTA groups. Based on EIG's achievements in 1993, Operation Green Thumb leased more than 1,000 lots to 600 community groups. He concluded, "gardening offers endless opportunities for 'hands-on' learning" (p. 18). Although he quoted a teacher as saying, "The garden…has a profound impact on the life, focus and enthusiasm of the students who use it" (p. 16), he did not specifically describe how these "hands-on" (p. 16) learning experiences influenced participants in community garden activities.

Dawson (1987) wrote that gardens in urban open spaces might contribute to making and linking habits in such forms as "a small isolated habitat island, a stepping stone to other habitats, a corridor connecting habitats, or a large viable habitat" (pp. 138-139). Riddell (1993) explored how, through greening as a community activity, it is possible to develop human resources and to create new community leaders. She did not, however, give definitions of greening, greening sites, and greening organizations. Much like other researchers, she used various communities as case studies, and in addition, she developed an analysis of those projects. According to her analysis, it is possible to develop human resources and to create new community leaders through greening as a community activity. For example, greening teaches people in a community to work with their neighbors in order to improve the community. Later, these people become valuable resources, and some of them emerge as community leaders.

Riddell (1993) also made the point that greening sites or gardens were resources for "community functions" (p. 5). Among these functions, she listed outdoor classrooms, centers for cultural activities with art students, centers for job training opportunities in farming projects, or sources for economic opportunity for neighbors through the production of value-added commercial products for a local market. She also suggested that greening organizations became agents of social change. These greening organizations gave, for example, job training to inmates at a jail through the production of food for soup kitchens. Other greening organizations provided

youth with a program of employment or with a higher education scholarship under a partnership with philanthropic foundations.  She concluded that greening could be a way to start community development.  Still, she stressed it was necessary for greening organizers or organizations to focus on developing leaders and resources in a community.

From the literature review, and in particular from literature on the influences of community gardens, I identified some of the functions of community gardens.  These were:

1. Greening activities in community gardens develop human resources and create new community leaders.

2. Greening sites or community gardens serve as sites for outdoor classrooms, cultural activities, job training programs, and the development of economic opportunity.

Based on these community garden functions, this study might identify the same or different functions by examining community gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood.

<div align="center">Problem</div>

Prior to this study, the human and material investments in community gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood have not been examined.  What the gardens are like and what they contribute to the community have not been described.  Community gardens might take on functions that we have not identified.  For instance, they might play important roles in the neighborhood despite the opinions of neighbors.  To identify new or existing functions in community gardens, our collaboration, the Phillips Environment, Transportation, and Community (ETC), the Phillips Neighborhood Network (PNN), and the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA) arrived at the question central to this study: "What are community gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood?"

Objectives

Responding to the problem statement, "What are community gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood?" PETC, PNN, and CURA developed two objectives for this study:

1. To describe community gardens in Phillips by:

   a) Recording the history of community gardens;

   b) Describing the physical property and resources located in the community

gardens, such as fences, water bins, compost bins, and the like; and

    c) Describing what resources have been invested in the community gardens.

2. To describe how people perceive community gardens, including the definitions and functions of community gardens.

By achieving these objectives, I would be able to illustrate community gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood. In this report, the definitions and functions of community gardens in the neighborhood through people's perceptions are discussed. Descriptions of each community garden with respect to history, property, and resources are not included here, but they are available at PETC (Address: c/o The Green Institute, Suite 110 – PEEC Building, 2801-21$^{st}$ Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55407. Phone: 612-278-7119.) and at www.pnn.org/petc/gardens/index.htm.

<div align="center">

Method
</div>

## Collection of Data

Qualitative research methods were chosen. I utilized five methods for data collection: (a) searches on the Internet, (b) traditional literature searches, (c) searches of written information, (d) observations, and (e) interviews. Patton (1990) emphasized the value of using multiple methods of research. He wrote that "triangulation", the combination of methodologies, in the study of the same phenomena or programs could strengthen the design of research. By using the multiple methods, different types of data could give cross-data validity checks (Patton, 1990).

From searches on the Internet and traditional literature searches, I learned about community gardens in different cities in the U.S. By searching the Internet and written information, I ascertained the legal status of community gardens such as land ownership or garden status. I used observations, interviews, and written information provided by people who have been involved in community gardens activities in order to describe the gardens and people's perceptions of them.

I prepared question items for observations and interviews. Appendix A includes a worksheet for observations and interviews, and Appendices B, C, and D include worksheets for interviews. From observations, I collected information on physical properties of each community garden such as fences, cultivating plants, facilities, and so on. Through interviews, I gathered information on

the history of the gardens, the resources that have been invested in each one, and people's perceptions of each.

<u>Selection of Community Gardens and Interviewees</u>

The Phillips Environment, Transportation, and Community (PETC) and the Phillips Neighborhood Network (PNN) selected 12 community gardens out of 32 in the Phillips Neighborhood as subjects to be studied. The criteria for selection were (a) the location of the community gardens in Phillips, (b) active status of the gardens as measured by the involvement of people, and (c) the length of time the community garden existed. Furthermore, these community gardens were divided into two tiers. Eight community gardens were selected in the first tier to be studied this time due to the limited duration of the study (See Appendix E).

I decided to interview a total of 8 interviewees who were either a gardener or the coordinator of a community garden. These interviewees were the persons most knowledgeable about community gardens. As people who have been constantly involved in community gardens activities, they were key informants. In addition to these interviewees, 12 other persons were included in the study. They were classified into three categories; (a) a resident who lived near by community garden and was involved in community gardens activities (N=6), (b) a non resident who did not live in the Phillips Neighborhood and was involved in community gardens activities (N=1), or (c) a resident who lived near a community garden and was not involved in community gardens activities (N=5). With these additional interviewees, I was able to gain more views toward community gardens so as to better describe various aspects of community gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood.

I obtained the names of interviewees who were either gardeners or coordinators of community gardens from PETC and PNN (See Appendix E). In addition, I used referrals from those gardeners and coordinators and the door knocking to recruit other interviewees. Appendix F includes a list of the interviewees' descriptions. I gave pseudonyms to the interviewees so as that they were not identified by real name in this study.

Internship Program

During the first half of this study, from January to May 2000, the researcher acquired 12 students as interns to observe community gardens and complete interviews for this study.  They took an internship through classes that they registered at college and received credits.  I developed an intern program for these students (See Appendix G).  Each student or group of students was assigned a community garden that each person or the group wanted to study.

Two groups of students volunteered for this project.  The first group consisted of 4 undergraduate students from the University of Minnesota.  Lonnie Nichols, a former director of PETC conducted a search for classes that offered student interns their choice of assignments through the University Neighborhood Network (UNN).  UNN is a project of Neighborhood Planning for Community Revitalization (NPCR) and is supported by the Minneapolis Foundation (University-Neighborhood Network, 2000).  UNN assists in matching neighborhood projects and areas of academic research by using UNN web database in which both faculty and neighborhoods post their courses and their projects, respectively.  These students were in the geography class of "Changing Form of the City" and decided to write a report based on their experiences of internship in the Phillips Neighborhood.

The second group consisted of 6 undergraduate students who were enrolled in a public affairs class at the University of Minnesota.  The research assistant for this class worked with Nichols. This person introduced the community gardens study plan to students in his class.  These students decided to study community gardens as part of their assignments for the class.  Besides these two groups, one volunteer intern was a student in the Master of Technical Communication program at Metropolitan State University.  He was informed of the volunteer position at PETC in one of his classes.  Nichols informed the instructor of the class of the need for a volunteer technical writer. The other student volunteer was an undergraduate student in Ecological Studies at Hamline University.  She had to take an internship at any organization offering community development services with attentions to ecology for one of her classes.  She selected PETC for her internship.

For the second half of this study, from June to August 2000, I worked with one intern who

was an undergraduate student in Landscape at University of Minnesota. All of the interns from January through August 2000 assisted me as interviewers in conducting interviews.

Interview Process

After I identified and recruited interviewees, each intern interviewer directly contacted an interviewee and made an appointment for an interview. The interviewers met each interviewee in person anywhere according to the interviewee's preference such as at the interviewee's residence, coffee shop, or conference room of PETC. The questions in Appendix B were the common questions and were asked to all interviewees. Appendix C includes interview questions for residents who lived near a community garden and were involved in community gardens activities or a gardener/coordinator of community gardens. Residents who lived near a community garden and were not involved in community gardens activities were asked the questions listed in Appendix D. The interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed by interviewers. Interviewees and I confirmed transcriptions. The interviewers also took notes on the content of interviews.

## Findings

In this section, I discuss an interpretation of the data from interviews regarding peoples' perceptions of community gardens in Phillips Neighborhood. The findings include the definitions and functions of community gardens. Interviewees' responses with pseudonyms were used to provide readers with insight into the range of responses. The interview transcripts are available at PETC (Address: c/o The Green Institute, Suite 110 – PEEC Building, 2801-21$^{st}$ Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55407. Phone: 612-278-7119.).

Definitions of Community Gardens

People in the Phillips Neighborhood were able to define community gardens orally, yet these definitions were unrecorded. I identified definitions of community gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood from interviews for this study. People expressed community gardens' definitions in different ways.

Jill Hills defined community gardens as "public natural spaces" differentiating them from residences' yards, "Well, I just personal, [I] think community gardens are such valuable places.

They are public natural spaces, and your yard is your private natural space" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 6, 2000). Compared with private natural spaces, public natural spaces possessed "a different meaning culturally and in society and something really profound and moving" (p. 6). Similar to this response in considering community gardens' cultural meaning, Carol Luis described a community garden as a "safe place" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 26, 2000). For her "safe" in this context meant more than freedom from physical risk, danger, harm, or injury. Such a "safe place" should create the following environment:

> It [A community garden] would be a place where everyone felt welcome, that all cultural symbols were present, so no matter what culture you came from, you knew the park was for you. You can find something of your own there that you could identify with (p. 26).

Alex Cole described a community garden as a center for a block, "It's the center of the, ah the social life of the block" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 36, 2000).

In community gardens, Cathleen Hamilton thought people could "garden, watch, watch things grow that, that we need" and "get to watch them [community gardens] from where we live, the concrete all the time" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 9, 2000). Hamilton described a community garden as a "creative outlet" (p. 9). She also explained that participants in the community gardens belonged to a community appeared from a community gardens at "multiple levels" (p. 7) and were connected as a "web" (p. 7). She said:

> There are [the community] of people directly involved with it, and there are [the community] of people who organized and worked to make gardens like this possible…[a] wider network of people, so I really see, not [in] isolation but a web of positive[,] very site-specific activity… (p. 7).

Jill Hills pointed out such a phenomenon of network of people or web as "organic creations as in the sense of, …made by the accumulation of different people, personalities, and interests" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 6, 2000).

Functions of Community Gardens

From the responses of the interviewees, functions of community gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood came to light.  Based on the interviewees' statements, I identified and named two domains of community garden function: (a) Physical and (b) Behavioral.  The Physical Function included the statements describing how community gardens functioned as physical space in the Phillips Neighborhood.  The Behavioral Function contained the statements illustrating how community gardens functioned to influence people or the environment in the Phillips Neighborhood.

Physical function.  The interviewees gave different examples of using community gardens in Phillips Neighborhood as physical space.  The first cluster of examples suggested that community gardens were used as gathering space.  Jack Scott said, a community garden was "a place for people to meet and to know each other" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 29, 2000).  Some other interviewees also mentioned the usage of community gardens as gathering space.  Jill Hills said, "[A community garden] serves as a gathering place…" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 7, 2000).  According to Sam Fitzgerald, a community garden "[i]s a place for people [to] come together, meet each other, even [if] we are [from a] different culture background" (M. Kawase, p. 12, 2000).  Hilary Nelson used the word, "common area" to describe community gardens as gathering space, "[A community garden] is a nice little, common area, where everyone in the neighborhood is welcomed" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 4, 2000).

The second cluster of examples included how people, who did not participate in community gardens' activities, used community gardens as physical space.  Jack Scott explained how casual people used community gardens, "Especially in June, people like to walk through the garden and eat their lunch" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 29, 2000).  Cathleen Hamilton did not use a community garden as a space for farming or meeting people.  The community garden was "mental refuge" for her:

> And I think some, I think it's really nice, a nice little mental refuge.  I don't use the
> garden physically, but I do feel [a breath of] air when I drive by (M. Kawase, interview

transcript, pp. 8-9, 2000).

Behavior function. The interviewees expressed how community gardens influence people or environment in the Phillips Neighborhood. The first cluster of responses found on how community gardens helped to create landscape in the Phillips Neighborhood. Cathleen Hamilton focused on the beauties of community garden, "[A community garden] looks nice" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 8, 2000). Similarly Joe Henderson said, "[A community garden] makes the place look better and all that" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 43, 2000). Bruce Young acknowledged the influence of community gardens on the block, "The garden affects the block very much, because [of] the flowers and grass help to create a nice environment around the block" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 32, 2000).

The second cluster of responses included how community gardens influenced people's feelings. Some interviewees pointed out participating in community gardens activities developed a sense of ownership. Dean Penn stated, "…[a community garden] gives a chance for a family or an individual to plant their own fruits" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 30, 2000). Anne Peterson concluded that, "The people who garden the land like it [a community garden], because they could feel like they owned their own piece of land" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 17, 2000). Robert May explained the sense of ownership developed by neighborhood kids:

> Um, 'cause now all the kids have little patches in the garden. Little three-foot by three foot [patches] for each kid on the block. Or each kid that wants to. Which is almost all of them. And they love it. You know, well you know they can see that they plant something, it grows, [and] they take care of it. The kids have a big investment in the garden. They don't let other kids go in there and trash things and mess it up. So, they're quite interested in protecting the garden (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 36, 2000).

The other interviewee raised the point that participating in community gardens activities could give people a sense of accomplishment. Frank Turner said, "Garden[ing] makes you feel you can actually get something done" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 20, 2000).

Some interviewees thought community gardens made people feel calm or peaceful. Cathleen Hamilton said, "[A community garden is] very, aha, I don't know, I think it's just real calming for people there, living in urban environment" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 8, 2000). Jack Scott felt, "Since the garden was created, it has been a plus for my wife and me. It feels quiet and peaceful. When we wake up in the morning, we can smell flowers, which is wonderful" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 29, 2000). Hilary Nelson reflected: "Peace and tranquility. You go down and sit at that bench and you feel peace and tranquility, a piece of country in the city. Urban...I am so tickled we were able to keep it" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 4, 2000).

The third cluster of responses included how community gardens influenced people to do things differently. Dean Penn believed that a community garden could make people work together. He said, "[A community garden] created a social opportunity for the neighborhood and [we] learn to work with each other as well" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 30, 2000). Cathleen Hamilton also suggested participating in a community garden was an inexpensive way for community participation:

> Ah, I think it creates very immediate, very accessible way for many, many people to be involved in that part of, you know, ah, that part of Phillips, I guess. You don't have to be in a well-paid garden [laugh]. You just have to have a bit of soil, and you have time to do it (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 9, 2000).

Carol Luis said that through community gardens she learned a tremendous amount about working with other people, making and maintaining the garden. For her, "...it was just a great feeling to see people coming together" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 26, 2000). She also noted how people get along with each other:

> Youth explored culture and race through the park since they came from all races. Because of the D Park [Community Garden], they became friends with other kids of all races. Families of the youth are very proud of what their children are doing. People are used to get off at the bus stop and walk through the park. Some would rollerblade, sit, and basically have a safe place (p. 26).

Some interviewees said community gardens produced opportunities to communicate with other people.  Dean Penn said, "The garden created an environment for the neighborhood to communicate" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 30, 2000).  Eva Wright thought, "It gets people to talk to each other…so many that in the summer I can't get a lot of work done, because people are always stopping by" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 24, 2000).  Bruce Young noted, "The garden also helps the neighborhood to communicate with each other" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, pp. 32-33, 2000).

According to some of the interviewees, working with and communicating with others can build a community.  Robert May said, "What it means to me is that it's [a community garden is] a tool for building community" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 36, 2000).  Eva Wright thought that the D Park (Community Garden) was one of the driving forces that helped the neighborhood recreate.  She observed, "When [the] garden's existence was being threatened, the group work was much more organized" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 23, 2000).  Cathleen Hamilton mentioned, "…[people in community gardens] talk about their life and, you know, get to know each other better…" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 9, 2000).  She thought this could be "grass-root connections" or a "one-to-one connection", and these connections "will start that community" (p.9).  Hilary Nelson also referred to people's activities as a group:

> …it [a community garden] makes the community more cohesive, a reason to get
> together, gives you a reason whether it is to go down there with a group of people to
> pick up litter or just take the seniors down to enjoy the flowers (M. Kawase, interview
> transcript, p. 4, 2000).

The fourth cluster of statements included how community gardens influenced people to see things differently.  Some interviewees shared how people saw values of community gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood.  Jack Scott said:

> It is a substantial investment of time and energy in my case. But the value of the garden
> represents the neighborhood's capacity, cooperation and mutual trust. I believe these
> are the effects of the garden, since I believe in these values (M. Kawase, interview

transcript, p. 26, 2000).

For Dean Penn, the community garden was a symbol, "…I feel the garden as an important symbol for the community… The reason I say that, because I see how the neighborhood work[s] as a team in the garden" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 30, 2000). Sam Fitzgerald viewed the values of community garden as "a place of respect" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 12, 2000). He said, "I think [a community garden] is a place of respect in the neighborhood. The first two years we have vandalism, now the garden [is respected so] that nobody come[s] to bother it anymore" (p. 12).

Some interviewees believed that community gardens contributed to safety in the neighborhood. Cathleen Hamilton said, "Ah, I mean, I think arguably they probably keep crime rates low" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 8, 2000). Eva Wright and Carol Luis, both agreed with the necessity of community garden to make a place safer. Wright said, "[A community garden] means that ABC Street can be a safe place" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 24, 2000). Luis thought, "ABC Street would be a place that needed to have the garden since it was more isolated and a higher crime rate at the time" (M. Kawase, interview transcript, p. 25, 2000).

<div align="center">Conclusions</div>

In the literature review, some of the functions of community gardens were identified and clustered. These clusters were community gardens as activities in a community to develop human resources for community development and as spaces presenting resources for community functions. With these clusters in mind, I attempted to identify the functions of community gardens in Phillips Neighborhood.

First, I presented definitions of community gardens based on the interviewees' responses. The community gardens were defined as public spaces for different people to garden, watch things grow, feel welcome, or find something that people could identify with. It seemed that a network of people made the community gardens happen.

Second, I identified and named two major functions of community gardens: Physical Function and Behavioral Function. The Physical Function covered the interviewees' responses

regarding how community gardens functioned as physical space in the Phillips Neighborhood.  The community gardens were used as physical space for both people who got involved in community gardens' activities and casual people who walked by or stopped by community gardens.  In particular, a number of the interviewees said that people used community gardens as physical spaces to gather, meet, and come to know each other.

The Behavioral Function included the statements expressing how community gardens influence people or environment in the Phillips Neighborhood.  There were four themes of the responses of interviewees.  The first cluster was responses related to the influence on environment.  The interviewees recognized the beauty of community gardens and their ability to create a nicer neighborhood environment.

Second, third, and fourth clusters were the responses of the influence on people.  The second cluster addressed how community gardens influenced people: There were statements that people gained a sense of ownership, a sense of accomplishment, or a sense of peace through community gardens.  The third cluster covered how community gardens influenced people to do things differently.  People stated that community gardens helped them to work together or to communicate with other people.  Some noted that these activities build community.  The fourth cluster included how community gardens influenced people to see things differently.  Community gardens were symbols and places of respect in the neighborhood.  Community gardens were viewed as contributors to safety in a neighborhood.

As the literature review indicated, the community gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood were also activities for people.  The community gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood provided people with activities of working together or communicating with other people.  In this study, I did not identify the function to develop human resources in a neighborhood.  The community gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood were also spaces for people.  Although the literature review showed different functions of community gardens as spaces such as outdoor classrooms, centers for cultural activities, job training opportunities, or economic opportunities for neighbors, the community gardens in this study presented their functions as physical spaces for gathering.

By recording and describing people's perceptions of community gardens in the Phillips Neighborhood, it became obvious that the community gardens functioned as gathering spaces.  The community gardens were embedded in people's everyday lives in a way that helped them to work together and communicate with others.  Passerby also enjoyed the community gardens as physical spaces in which to eat lunch or refresh themselves.  The functions of the community gardens are not extraordinary, but rather they are ordinary.  Still, ordinary is fundamental to people's everyday life.

# References

City of Madison Advisory Committee on Community Gardens. (1999). Growing a stronger community with community gardens: An action plan for Madison [Draft action plan]. Madison, WI: Author.

Dawson, K. J. (1987). Nature in the urban garden. In M. Francis & R. Hester (Eds.), Meaning of garden: Proceedings of a working conference to explore the social, psychological and cultural dimensions of gardens (pp. 138-142). Davis, IL: Center for Design Research.

Kurtz, H. E. (1996). Constructions of "community" and "garden": An approach to community gardens in Minneapolis. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Lowrie, S. (1993). Successful youth gardening. Community Greening Review, 3. 16-18.

Malakoff, D. (1994). Chicago, Illinois: City in a garden. Community Greening Review, 4. 18-23.

Nelson, K. S. (1998). Bridging two worlds: Neighborhood planning for community revitalization. CURA Reporter, 28 (2), 1-5.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

Phillips Environment, Transportation, and Community. (n.d.). The flower power manifesto to the Minneapolis city council from the villages of Phillips and surrounding neighborhoods [Manifesto]. Minneapolis, MN: Author.

Phillips Neighborhood Network. (2000a). Phillips neighborhood network [On-line]. Available: http://www.pnn.org/ [June 2000].

Phillips Neighborhood Network. (2000b). This is the year of community gardens in Phillips [On-line]. Available: http://www.pnn.org/crime/gardens.htm [June 2000].

Riddell, J. (1993). Beyond gardening: Building strong communities through urban greening. Community Greening Review, 3. 4-9.

Severson, R. (1987). United we sprout: A Chicago community garden story. In M. Francis &

R. Hester (Eds.), <u>Meaning of garden:  Proceedings of a working conference to explore the social,</u> <u>psychological and cultural dimensions of gardens</u> (pp. 80-85). Davis, IL: Center for Design Research.

University-Neighborhood Network. (2000). <u>University-neighborhood network</u> [On-line]. Available: http://tcfreenet.org/org/npcr/projects/unn/ [June 2000].

## Appendix A

Description Worksheet

**Description Worksheet**

**Name** _____ **Community Garden No.** _____

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | |
| Other Name(s) | |
| Address | |
| Additional Location Info | |
| Size in Acres | |
| Land Ownership | |
| Garden Status | |
| Buildable / Unbuildable | |
| Contact | |
|    Phone # | |
| Gardener | |
|    Phone # | |
| Neighbor (involved) | |
|    Phone # | |
| Neighbor (not involved) | |
|    Phone # | |

## Description Worksheet - Continued

| | |
|---|---|
| Location in the block | |
| Fenced / Fenced off | |
| What is grown? | |
| (flowers, veggies, perennials, fruit trees, ect.) | |
| Facilities located | |
| (lich gate, benches, etc.) | |
| Adjacent properties | |
| Residential / Commercial | |
| Well / Poorly maintained | |
| Visiting date | |
| Weather of visiting date | |
| How many people? | |
| Genders of people | |
| Ages of people | |
| What were they doing? | |

# Appendix B

Interview Worksheet (For All Interviewees)

**Demographic Information**

**Intern** _____          **Community Garden No.** _____

                                     **Interviewee** _____

| Gender | Female | Male | | | | | |
|--------|--------|------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 20 or less | 21-25 | 26-30 | 31-35 | 36-40 | 41-45 | 46 or older |
| Resident in Phillips | Yes | No | | | | | |
| Length living in Phillips | | | | | | | |

# Appendix C

## Interview Worksheet (For Gardener/Resident Involved)

**Interview Worksheet  (For Gardener/Resident involved)**

**Intern** _____          **Community Garden No.** _____

**Interviewee** _____

| | | Question | e.g. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1) | When did you become involved with the garden? | | |
| | 2) | Why did you want to become involved with the garden? | | |
| | 3) | What do you do in the garden?  How often do you do things in the garden (hours/week)? | gardening, meeting people, interacting with kids | |
| | 4) | What kind of group participation are going on in the garden? | national night out, bonfire, seasonal cerebration | |
| | 5) | When did the garden start? | the name of people involved | |
| | 6) | What resources has the garden received? | CCP/SAFE Grants, Other funding, Plant donations, Soil, Water | |
| | 7) | How does participating in the garden affect you? | | |
| | 8) | What does the garden mean for you? | | |
| | 9) | How does the garden affect people? | gardeners, residents, people who walk through | |
| | 10) | How do you perceive the role of the garden in the neighborhood? | | |
| | 11) | What is community in relation to the garden for you? | | |
| | 12) | Do you think the garden will be here in five years? | | |
| | 13) | Do you want the garden to be here in five years? | | |

# Appendix D

## Interview Worksheet (For Resident Not Involved / Non Resident and Not Involved)

**Interview Worksheet  (For Resident not involved)**

Intern _____                                    Community Garden No. _____

Interviewee _____

|     | Question | e.g. |     |
|-----|----------|------|-----|
| 1-a) | Do you know any garden in your neighborhood/block? | Note: If the interviewee does not know the garden, explain the interviewee about the garden and skip to question 2). |     |
| 1-b) | If you know the garden, do you visit the garden? |     |     |
| 1-c) | If you visit the garden, how often do you visit the garden and what do you do in the garden? | gardening, meeting people, interacting with kids |     |
| 2) | What does the garden mean for you? |     |     |
| 3) | How does the garden affect people? | gardeners, residents, people who walk through |     |
| 4) | How do you perceive the role of the garden in the neighborhood? |     |     |
| 5) | What is community in relation to the garden? |     |     |
| 6) | Do you think the garden will be in your neighborhood/block in five years? |     |     |
| 7) | Do you want the garden to be in your neighborhood/block in five years? |     |     |

Appendix E

## Community Gardens List in Phillips

**Community Gardens List in Phillips**

| Community Garden No. | Location | Address | Contact | Phone # |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | W | 2749 Portland Avenue South | | |
| 2 | N | 2309-15th Avenue South | | |
| 3 | N | 2122-16th Avenue South | | |
| 4 | S | 2444-11th Avenue South | | |
| 5 | S | 12th Avenue South and Lake Street | | |
| 6 | S | 2727-12th Avenue South | | |
| 7 | E | 2432-17th Avenue South | | |
| 8 | E | Little Earth, 24th and Cedar Ave. S | | |
| 9 | W | 2305-5th Avenue South | | |
| 10 | N | 1501 and 1504 East Franklin | | |
| 11 | S | 14th Avenue South and 27th Street | | |
| 12 | E | 2821-16th Avenue South | | |

Appendix F

Description of Interviewees for the Community Garden Project

| | Interviewee | Gender | Age | Resident in Phillips | Length of Residency |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Gardener | F | 31 - 35 | No | None |
| 2 | Resident Involved | F | 46 + | Yes | 25 years |
| 3 | Resident Not Involved | F | 41 – 45 | Yes | 24 years |
| 4 | Gardener | M | 46 + | No | None |
| 5 | Resident Involved | F | 31 – 35 | Yes | 6 years |
| 6 | Gardener | F | N.A. | No | None |
| 7 | Resident Involved | F | 46 + | Yes | 2 years |
| 8 | Gardener | M | N.A. | Yes | N.A. |
| 9 | Resident Involved | M | N.A. | Yes | N.A. |
| 10 | Resident Not Involved | F | N.A. | Yes | N.A. |
| 11 | Coordinator | F | N.A. | No | None |
| 12 | Resident Involved | F | N.A. | Yes | N.A. |
| 13 | Coordinator | M | 46 + | Yes | 25 years |
| 14 | Non Resident Involved | M | N.A. | No | None |
| 15 | Resident Not Involved | M | 46 + | Yes | 20 years |
| 16 | Gardener | F | 46 + | Yes | 20 years |
| 17 | Resident Involved | M | 46 + | Yes | 20 years |
| 18 | Resident Not Involved | F | 41 – 45 | Yes | 22 years |
| 19 | Gardener | M | N.A. | Yes | N.A. |
| 20 | Resident Not Involved | M | N.A. | Yes | N.A. |

Appendix G

Intern Program  - Invitation Letter

**Intern for**
**Measuring the Presence of Community Gardens in Phillips**

**Maki Kawase**
Research Assistant (University of Minnesota)
Phillips ETC (Environment-Transportation-Community)
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Office: 612-278-7118 / Home: 612-331-7236
e-mail: kawa0034@tc.umn.edu

Welcome to Phillips Neighborhood!  We hope we have fun together through the project, Measuring the Presence of Community Gardens in Phillips.  You will select a garden from the Phillips ETC's list of gardens.  Let's see and listen to "changing form of the city" through the garden in Phillips Neighborhood.

The goal of the entire project is to seek the meaning of gardens for people in Phillips Neighborhood.  The intern program plays an important role to gather information on each garden.  The information will serve as primary and secondary data for the project.  Finally, the information will be on the Web at pnn.org (the Phillips Neighborhood Network).

The following outlines the intern program.

**Intern Program**

**Goal**

The goal of the intern program is to write a profile of a garden.

**Procedures**

To write a profile of a garden, you need information on the garden.  First step of writing a profile, you complete an Object Description.  In the Object Description you clearly describe the various components of the garden you want to write about.  The Object Description Worksheet will be provided.

Second step is to interview with the participants you identify in the Object Description and to analyze the interview.  We prepare the set of questions for the interviews.  Besides them, add your questions to the interviews.  This will give richness to your interviews.  The Interview Planning Worksheet will be provided.

The last step is to write a profile of the garden. The profile consists of two sections, Garden Description and Garden Story. You combine the information from first and second steps together and write them in narrative form.
The procedures are as follows.

**<First Step: Object Description>**

1. General Information
   - ☐ Name
   - ☐ Address
   - ☐ Area

2. Participants
   - ☐ To identify a gardener/gardeners working at the garden.
   - ☐ To identify residents being involved in the garden.

3. Setting
   - ☐ To describe the setting in which the garden locates.
   - ☐ What physical, social, psychological factors in the setting might influence the garden?

**<Second Step: Interview and Analysis>**

1. Interview with gardener/resident

   [Involvement]
   - ☐ How is a gardener/resident selected?
   - ☐ Why does a gardener/resident participate?
   - ☐ What should a gardener/resident be gaining from his/her involvement in the garden?
   - ☐ Does the garden affect people being involved in the garden? If so, who? How are they affected?

   [Activities]
   - ☐ What specific things are carried out in the garden?
   - ☐ What does a gardener actually do to accomplish the specific things?
   - ☐ Future schedule, planning, and available support.

   [History]
   - ☐ When does the garden start? If available, get the exact date and people being involved.
   - ☐ What specific activities were carried out?

   [Meaning]
   - ☐ What does the garden mean for you?

☐ How do you perceive the role of the garden in the neighborhood?
☐ What is community in the context of community garden?

2. Analysis of interviews

Based on the interviews, you will analyze...
☐ How does a garden affect people?
☐ Changes/non changes in a garden.
☐ How does a garden contribute to making a sense of community?
☐ Differences/similarities between people being involved in a garden and people being not involved in a garden.

**<Third Step: Profile>**

1. Garden Description
☐ Information from Object Description

2. Garden Story
☐ Information from Interviews and analysis

**Working Plan**

We will discuss the working schedule.
☐ Weekly meeting/Monthly meeting.
☐ Weekly progress note/Monthly progress note.
☐ Fixed working plan/Flexible working plan.

Intern Program - Working Plan A

**Working Plan**

| Community Garden No. | Time Line | | Item | Who will I ask? | How will the tasks be done? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Week 5 | (2/14-2/20) | Description | Lonnie | - Access to the Web (pnn.org) |
| | | | | Paul | - Visit the community garden |
| | | | Interview | Maki | - Call interviewees and make interview appointments |
| | Week 6 | (2/21-2/27) | Interview | Maki | - Interview |
| | Week 7 | (2/28-3/5) | | Interviewees | |
| | Week 8 | (3/6-3/12) | Interview 1 | | |
| | | | Interview 2 | | |
| | | | Interview 3 | | |
| | Week 9 | (3/13-3/19) | Work week | | - Write a profile |
| | Week 10 | (3/20-3/26) | Description | Lonnie | - Access to the Web (pnn.org) |
| | | | | Paul | - Visit the community garden |
| | | | Interview | Maki | - Call interviewees and make interview appointments |
| | Week 11 | (4/3-4/9) | Interview | Maki | - Interview |
| | Week 12 | (4/10-4/16) | | Interviewees | |
| | Week 13 | (4/17-4/23) | Interview 1 | | |
| | | | Interview 2 | | |
| | | | Interview 3 | | |
| | Week 14 | (4/24-4/30) | Work week | | - Write a profile |
| | Week 15 | (5/1-5/7) | Wrap up | | - Complete the work |

## Intern Program - Working Plan B

**Working Plan**

| Community Garden No. | Time Line | | Item | Who will I ask? | How will the tasks be done? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Week 5 | (2/14-2/20) | Description | Lonnie | - Access to the Web (pnn.org) |
| | | | | Paul | - Visit the community garden |
| | | | Interview | Maki | - Call interviewees and make interview appointments |
| | Week 6 | (2/21-2/27) | Interview | Maki | - Interview |
| | Week 7 | (2/28-3/5) | | Interviewees | |
| | Week 8 | (3/6-3/12) | Interview 1 | | |
| | | | Interview 2 | | |
| | | | Interview 3 | | |
| | Week 9 | (3/13-3/19) | Work week | | - Write a profile |
| | Week 5 | (2/14-2/20) | | Lonnie | - Present your plan |
| | Week 10 | (3/20-3/26) | | Lonnie | |
| | Week 11 | (4/3-4/9) | | | |
| | Week 12 | (4/10-4/16) | | | |
| | Week 13 | (4/17-4/23) | | | |
| | Week 14 | (4/24-4/30) | Work week | | |
| | Week 15 | (5/1-5/7) | Wrap up | | - Complete the work |

# Intern Program - Meeting Schedule

## Meeting Schedule

**Name** _____

| | Week | Schdld. | Date | Time | Item |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Week 2 | January 25 (T) | | | | Presentation by Lonnie Nichols |
| Week 3 | 1/31 (M) - 2/6 (S) | | | | Meeting with Maki |
| Week 4 | 2/7 (M) - 2/13 (S) | | | | Meeting at Green Institute |
| Week 5 | 2/14 (M) - 2/20 (S) | | | | |
| Week 6 | 2/21 (M) - 2/27 (S) | □¡ | | | |
| Week 7 | 2/28 (M) - 3/5 (S) | | | | |
| Week 8 | 3/6 (M) - 3/12 (S) | □¡ | | | |
| Week 9 | 3/13 (M) - 3/19 (S) | | | | |
| Week 10 | 3/20 (M) - 3/26 (S) | □¡ | | | |
| Spring Break | 3/27 (M) - 4/2 (S) | | | | |
| Week 11 | 4/3 (M) - 4/9 (S) | □¡ | | | |
| Week 12 | 4/10 (M) - 4/16 (S) | | | | |
| Week 13 | 4/17 (M) - 4/23 (S) | □¡ | | | |
| Week 14 | 4/24 (M)   4/30 (S) | | | | |
| Week 15 | 5/1 (M) - 5/7 (S) | □¡ | | | |