NCRCRD
North Central Regional Center for Rural Development

Addressing Issues of Power in Community Development

Annabel Ipsen
Assistant Professor of Sociology
Colorado State University

This research was supported by the North Central Regional Center for Rural Development.

2019

Working Paper

NCRCRD

North Central Regional Center for Rural Development

Michigan State University
Justin S. Morrill Hall of Agriculture
446 W. Circle Drive, Room 66
East Lansing, MI 48824-1039

Phone: 517.355.3373
Web: ncrcrd.org

The North Central Regional Center for Rural Development (NCRCRD) is one of four regional centers in the United States that work to improve the quality of life in rural communities. With funding from the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture and the land-grant universities in our 12-state region, the NCRCRD helps Extension professionals, researchers and other partners address issues that affect rural areas across the region. The center provides leadership in rural development by linking research with education and community outreach to facilitate, integrate, link and coordinate research and action for rural America.

This material is based on work supported by annual base funding through the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, U.S. Department of griculture. Any opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the view of the U.S. Department of Agriculture or other funders.

Mission of the North Central Regional Center for Rural Development: Strengthening the ability of the land-grant university system to execute its rural development mission. Michigan State University is an affirmative-action, equal opportunity employer.

Addressing Issues of Power in Community Development

Annabel Ipsen[1]

This report puts academic debates on community development into dialog with applied approaches to address the ways that power asymmetries shape community development strategies. While community development is lauded as a pathway for economic growth, scholars and practitioners often fail to consider the broader context in which communities are situated, in addition to the needs and priorities of the communities themselves. I argue that this backdrop is key to the development process. To understand these struggles, we must include an analysis of power – one that makes power a central element in the development process. In this article, I show how communities with different levels of assets and place-based economic development have more (or less) power to negotiate the shape that development takes in their communities, particularly when powerful (outside) actors are present. To do this, I combine asset mapping with a power-sensitive version of commodity chain analysis. I draw on examples that illustrate four types of local power and discuss what kinds of strategies are most effective for building participatory development and leveling the unequal playing field. My framework is novel in that it helps communities analyze not only themselves, but also the powerful actors they confront. Much of the community development scholarship focuses almost exclusively on the assets or the needs of communities, while leaving out key actors who play instrumental roles in development.

Community development scholarship has long recognized the challenges that communities face mobilizing local actors to promote both sustainable economic opportunities and quality of life (Kirk & Shutte 2004). Practitioners have taken two main approaches to promote development. The

[1] Dr. Ipsen is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Colorado State University. Correspondence regarding the article can be sent to: a.ipsen@colostate.edu. This research was supported by the North Central Regional Center for Rural Development.

first tactic seeks to address a problem or need in order to mediate a perceived weaknesses in the community (Henry 2013; Hipwell 2009). This is often called a **needs-based** approach. The second method is a participatory model that builds on the strengths in communities (Kretzmann, 2010; Mathie & Cunningham 2003; Flora, Flora & Fey 2004). This is often called **asset-based** community development. My framework bridges these two approaches, taking community assets and needs into consideration, while also analyzing power relations and the importance of place.

These two approaches to community development tend to recognize that communities are heterogeneous, and thus embedded in diverse realities in terms of structure and power at a theoretical level, however most community development studies, applied and scholarly, fail to address those key differences in practice when proposing or enacting development strategies. I propose a framework that takes power asymmetries in community development seriously. This approach enables us to move beyond static models that assume that all communities are equal in their ability to enact change. It also broadens the scope of study to include not only communities, but other relevant actors, such as firms, as well as the relationship between industry and communities. In order to develop effective strategies for different types of communities, scholars and practitioners must analyze not only the deficits and the strengths within communities, but also the relationships of power and structural dynamics that contribute to or thwart communities' efforts of local development.

After an overview of the literature, I discuss my proposed framework and its application, laying out four types of local power. I define the four types of local power and draw on existing studies to give examples of each one. Then I apply the four types of local power to community development strategies, moving from the diagnostic stage – of determining what type of power a community has – to the enacting stage, whereby communities select and enact appropriate development strategies. Finally, building on examples in the literature, I demonstrate what types of strategies are relevant for local communities within each of the four types of local power.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Role of Assets and Capital in Participatory Community Development

To understand the relationship between community development and power, we must also discuss corporate interest and the links that firms have to local development. Three literatures gives us tools for moving in this direction: community development, commodity chains, and power. I draw on these areas of scholarship to discuss how assets, power, and place guide practice, as they mold a community's ability to effect change, particularly when powerful actors are present.

Some community development practitioners have focused on a top-down strategy to overcome a specific problem in the community, ranging from deficient leadership capacity to a lack of economic growth (Henry 2013; Hipwell 2009; Peters 2013). Their solutions may include activities like asset building, leadership training, and diverse capacity building actions (Osterman 2003; Warren 2001). As an extension of that strategy, local governments often mediate community deficits by offering subsidies and tax breaks to catalyze growth and encourage business retention. They claim that they are an essential part of attracting new businesses and supporting those already in place. Scholars have criticized this approach for creating a vicious cycle of dependent development in which communities may internalize the negative portrayals of themselves, be reluctant to participate in leadership activities, and not develop productive relationships within their communities (Kretzmann 2010; Kretzmann & McKnight 1993).

Other scholars have moved away from a needs-based model to a more participatory approach. These scholars propose strategies that build on the existing, but at times hidden, assets within communities to achieve a more sustainable development model (Kretzmann, 2010; Mathie

& Cunningham, 2003; Flora, et al 2004). Asset-based community development (ABCD) is one of these participatory approaches.[2] ABCD is a bottom-up development strategy that emphasizes community strengths over deficits. It is based on four pillars. First, it sees community assets as resources upon which communities can draw to address their needs. Different types of capital are seen as central to sustainable development (Green & Haines 2002). Some models, such as the sustainable livelihoods framework, include five types of capital: human, natural, financial, social, and built, whereas the community capitals framework adds political and cultural capital (Flora et al 2004). O'Leary (2005) asserts that cultural and political capital help us appreciate the often invisible resources beyond technical assistance that people need to improve their lives. Power determines who has access to cultural and political capital and how effective it is mobilized.

Second, ABCD mobilizes community and individual strengths, assets, and skills as a way of enacting change. An approach called appreciative inquiry is used to analyze a community's past successes. This approach helps communities design and deliver a plan that leverages their assets for community development (Emery et al 2006).[3] Third, ABCD is community-driven. Finally, it takes a participatory and collaborative approach to development, putting relationships at the center. Overall, ABCD focuses on how to make governance accountable and effective, while engaging citizens in the development process (Mathie & Cunningham 2003).

One method for understanding development within the ABDC tradition is the Community Capitals Framework (CCF) (Flora et al 2004). While studying entrepreneurism in communities, the authors found that the communities that were most successful in supporting development paid attention to all seven types of capital: natural, cultural, human, social, political, financial, and built (Flora et al 2004). **Natural capital** refers to location-based assets, such as natural resources,

[2] See O'Leary 2005 for a literature review on ABCD and references to relevant toolkits and handbooks.
[3] See Emery, Fey & Flora (2006) for worksheets on how to use appreciative inquiry with the CCF.

weather, and natural beauty. **Cultural capital** reflects traditions and the way that people interact in the world. It is tied closely to power in that cultural capital influences what voices are heard and which voices have influence in specific contexts. **Human capital** includes the abilities of people to develop and access resources and knowledge. In terms of community development, a participatory and inclusive leadership style would represent high human capital. Social capital is the connection between people and organizations or the "social glue to make things happen" (Emery & Flora 2006). **Political capital** is access to power, organizations, and power brokers. It includes the ability to leverage voice to make things happen. **Financial capital** is the economic resources that pay for development activities such as capacity-building activities and business development. Finally, **built capital** is the infrastructure that supports development, such as roads and water systems.

The CCF is also a useful tool for mapping different types of assets that communities have or do not have and how these effect a community's ability to negotiate development decisions with powerful actors. Assets can be physical things like buildings, a unique type of soil or climate; they can also be intangible like the work that advocacy groups do to pass regulatory changes. These assets become capital when they are invested to create new resources (Flora et al 2004).

While all of these types of capital are important to community development, the relationship between them is not straightforward. Emery and Flora (2006) use the CCF to examine community change in a Nebraskan community in decline. They find that social capital is "the critical resource" in reversing the downward trajectory of a community in decline to one of "spiraling-up" (Emery & Flora 2006: 19). Spiraling-up, according to Gutiérrez-Montes (2005), represents a process through which assets increase the likelihood that other assets will also be obtained. However, not all capital behaves in the same way. Emery and Flora (2006) find that while increasing financial or built capital may not produce a spiraling-up effect, social capital often does. Pigg, Gasteyer, Martin, Keating, and Apaliyah (2013) argue that the relationship between capital and spiraling-up is more nuanced. They find that the different types of capital are not always linked in the same way with the same intensity. Because projects are grounded in specific communities, the types of capital that are most important depend on the local context. In other words, successful development strategies are context-specific, process-oriented, and most effective when one addresses the behind-the-scenes dynamics, which often determine who has access to the requisite resources to get things done.

Asset maps or capacity inventories are a common way to document a community's assets (Emery et al 2006). The analysis of these maps can tell us a number of things about communities: what resources they have, how reliant a community is on one industry, and if there is potential to diversify by bringing in other businesses or entrepreneurial activities. However, asset maps do not tell us about power. Therefore, I propose combining a commodity chain approach with asset mapping to analyze how power works in development. By combining these approaches, we can better understand the complex relationships between industry and community development, as well as how assets can be mobilized positively and for whom.

Commodity Chains, Community Development, and Power

The term commodity chain first appeared in the literature in 1977, when Wallerstein and Hopkins (1977) developed the concept to differentiate their understanding of capitalism's territorial scope from the traditional way of thinking about globalization. They suggested starting with a consumable item and tracing back the set of inputs that ultimately produced this item, including raw materials, transportation, and labor, among others. They called this linked set of processes a commodity chain. Broadly speaking, commodity chains are a tracking strategy that link the global and the local, highlighting the role that social actors and institutions play in the production and distribution of goods. While much of the work on commodity chains has been focused at the firm or industry level (Gereffi & Frederick 2010; Sturgeon, Gereffi & Humphrey 2005), the world-systems approach to commodity chains has a more inclusive scope. Such studies focus not only on firms and suppliers, but they also document the workings of other inputs such as labor, institutions, and governance (Quark 2011; Collins 2005). Commodity chain analyses make visible key linkages between producers, suppliers, and consumers, but they also enable organizations to advocate for more fair production processes along the whole chain (Oxfam 2013).

For example, Cambodian garment workers launched a wage campaign targeting the major apparel brands sourcing from Cambodia in September 2014. They achieved a minimum wage increase by analyzing power and the commodity chains of key firms. They used this information to build a strategy that would break the impasse in negotiations between the government and unions by directly pressuring multinational brands that would in turn pressure their suppliers to pay higher wages. Organizers identified points in which they had leverage: they had density within the suppliers of a number of key brands and could affect their production if they went on strike; they also had a number of allies – workers within the global value chains of the multinational brands – who could exert pressure on the day of the campaign launch (Kong & Dalton 2017).

Communities, Firms, and Power from Below

Commodity chains help communities answer key questions such as: what assets does the firm need or value; why is the firm in a particular community; what role does the community play in the commodity chain; where are the nodes of power in the chain; and who would be strategic allies for communities within the commodity chain? This information is essential for successful organizing efforts and strategic development praxis, particularly in cases when a firm and the community do not share the same vision of development. This analytical mapping exercise can show communities what leverage they have or what type of strategy would be most effective when negotiating with firms to gain more voice in the development process. Asset mapping goes hand-in-hand with power analysis. In the example above, the garment workers union analyzed power within the commodity chain to pick their targets and to strategically form their campaign.

Gaventa's (1980) three-dimensional concept of power allows us to see the multiple ways that power imbalances can affect the development process. It also shows who participates in the process and what the outcomes are. In the first dimension, power is understood by looking at who participates, who wins or loses, and who prevails in bargaining over key issues (Polsby 1963). In other words, who has the most bargaining resources has more power. In the second dimension, power is exercised not only within the decision-making process, but also by excluding certain topics or participants. Bachrach and Baratz (1970) argue that to study power we must also consider the barriers to action. Parenti (1970: 501) supports this view, stating that "one of the most important aspects of power is not to prevail in a struggle, but to predetermine the agenda of struggle." By doing this, the dominant party determines whether certain issues ever reach the decision-making arena or not. The third dimension of power involves locating the processes of power behind the social construction of meaning. This includes shaping how non-elites understand inequality through controlling information, social myths, and symbols, and how these are manipulated in processes of power (Gaventa 1980:15).

Gaventa's study of power was centered in Appalachian coal communities in which local actors appeared submissive based on the stark power inequalities that shaped their inaction. His work demonstrated how unequal power relations structure the ways in which people act, discouraging or preventing marginalized people from showing their discontent. Other scholars have investigated how simple acts that might not seem openly resistant are in fact everyday forms of resistance (Scott 1989). Piven (2008) argues that power is relational and interdependent. She conceptualizes "interdependent power" to show the importance of power as a disruptive force in the analysis of social movements and their struggles over the distribution of benefits. Once our conceptualization of power includes power from below, we cannot simply assume the marginalized have no power. Rather, according to Piven (2008:5), "workers also have potential power over capitalists because they staff the assembly lines on which production depends."

For Piven, globalization has not radically changed the sources of power that produced reform in the past. In fact, the increased integration of global supply networks required by globalization offers greater potential for power from below (Piven 2008). She draws on examples that underscore the importance of place and the nature of the productive process. For example, Ogoni and Ijaw militants in the Niger Delta protested international oil companies by leveraging their knowledge of how oil is produced to interrupt the flow of production (Watts 2004). Ultimately by interrupting the flow of oil, the militants decreased supply and prices increased, forcing the hand of companies to find ways to negotiate. Protestors in Bolivia have used similar tactics to control the flow of natural gas (Kaup 2008). Peruvian and Chilean copper miners have also drawn on interdependent power successfully by interrupting the chain of production.

Piven acknowledges that the actualization of interdependent power is not easy; it requires people to break the rules and to strategically leverage the power that they have. She finds that globalization offers opportunities for the manifestation of popular power, but new strategies for mobilizing that power have to be crafted. I argue that these strategies must be based on the assets that communities have or can develop. In sum, I propose bringing asset-based development strategies into dialog with power and commodity chain analyses to better understand the conditions under which communities can gain more voice in the development process.

A NEW FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING LOCAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

While development scholars and practitioners acknowledge the need to take assets, power, and place into account, these variables are often absent at the moment of designing community development strategies. In the framework below, I show how differing levels of assets and place-based economic activity create different types of local power within communities. Assets are resources – tangible and intangible – that we want to keep, develop, and sustain for future generations. I use the seven assets that Flora et al (2004) identified in the Community Capitals Framework: natural, cultural, human, social, political, financial, and built. While the authors refer to these assets as capital because they have been invested to create new resources, I prefer to use the terminology assets because I see them as inputs in the larger community development process, rather than as outcomes per se. I define place-based economic activity (PBEA) as a type of economic activity that is relatively place-bound. As such, it excludes easily mobile industries, industries with low sunk costs, or industries that do not derive a significant benefit from being located in a particular area or community. Extractive industries are good examples of place-bound economic activities since natural assets (i.e. copper) are not easily mobile. Companies need to be in that specific location to extract the economic benefits from it. Businesses that are not place-bound might include businesses like McDonalds, Walmart, etc. These businesses, while they might prefer certain places over others, are not bound to a specific place to derive their profits.

I analyze power within communities that is generally conceived of as power from below. This type of power is different from power from above or the power of outside interests. The different types of local power within communities point to the need for different development strategies. The Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) has another way of conceptualizing this distinction between power from above and below. It believes that "organized people and organized money are the only two sources of power" (Osterman 2003:175). I identify four types of local power and offer a brief description of each one. While I put these types of power in a table format below for ease of viewing, these categories are not meant to be static, as both communities and businesses are ever-changing. Assets can be developed; businesses can move or close; and the process of development is messy. It is contingent on local leadership and larger structures. I visualize these quadrants more as a guide of what power looks like on a continuum within distinct communities with differing assets and place-based economic activity. In my discussion of these four types of power, I will offer examples that make clear this nuance.

Table 1: Assessing local power for community development

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Place-based economic activity (PBEA)</td><td colspan="2">Local Assets</td></tr>
<tr><td>Low Assets, low PBEA (LL)</td><td>High assets, low PBEA (HL)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Low assets, high PBEA (LH)</td><td>High assets, high PBEA (HH)</td></tr>
</table>

Low Assets, Low Place-based Economic Activity

Communities that have low assets and low place-based economic activity (LL) are often communities with higher levels of poverty, higher unemployment levels, and a smaller economic base. Examples of the low asset, low PBEA typology can be seen across the U.S. Recent decades of deindustrialization and automation have hit hard in the rural Midwest, Northern Plains, and rural Southern towns, resulting in plant closures and the decline of small farms. Additionally, numerous Indian reservations, like Pine Ridge or Rosebud in South Dakota, are good examples of this typology (Summers 2006). Historically reservations were placed on isolated, undesired lands with few, if any, assets to develop. In these areas, poverty is severe and persistent. As older generations die and younger generations move to other locales to pursue educational and economic opportunities, the populations that remain in or return to these areas are often those with fewer options. Today, Pine Ridge is in one of the poorest counties in the country. Here poverty and unemployment rates are astronomical. The U.S. Census Bureau's 2017 study found that more than 40 percent of residents in the largest of Pine Ridge's counties lived below the poverty line (U.S. Census. 2017). Unemployment was 89 percent in 2005 according to a Department of the Interior report and life expectancy is the shortest in the country, on par with Haiti. Chronic health issues plague the reservation with extreme rates of alcoholism, diabetes, and infant mortality.

There are massive barriers to local development on reservations. As Summers (2006: 87) documents in his study of welfare reform in reservations in South Dakota, “labor markets, physical infrastructure, and educational and training opportunities are completely inadequate” to support a transition to a more mainstream view of how the local economy works. Development is thwarted by structural factors, including poor coordination between tribal, state, and federal government. For example, in Pine Ridge the Tribal Native Employment Work program (NEW) was closely linked to Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), but in 2001 there was a dispute over how the tribal government applied TANF work requirements. Before they could sort it out, the state ceased working with NEW. This change made managing the strictures of TANF difficult for residents, making it nearly impossible to transition from welfare to work (Summers 2006). In terms of asset-based development, native peoples on reservations are legally unable to own the property they live on, making it extremely difficult to acquire equity. This severely limits their ability to access credit which impedes wealth generation. These are critical strictures for development, so it is unsurprising that traditional top-down approaches that ignore these particularities have failed.

Within this typology, there is nuance. Communities in the rural Midwest and South that have been undergoing demographic shifts are one example. In these communities, immigrants have moved in providing a new lifeblood to communities that are emptying out. This demographic shift molds communities internally and shapes the types of employers that they retain or attract. These communities attract businesses in search of low costs and available, cheap labor. As such, they do not tend to be place-bound. So while these communities may have some industry, they would still be considered low PBEA. Slaughter houses or meat packing plants are excellent examples. In the 1970s, these businesses moved from urban areas to the rural Midwest and South because of the low costs, low wages, available workers, proximity to inputs, and friendly regulatory spaces. By 2000, over 60% of meat packing and processing jobs were located in nonmetropolitan areas (Kandel & Parrado 2005). It is not a coincidence that over time those jobs have undergone dramatic shifts, from good paying union jobs held primarily by white men, to non-union, precarious jobs filled primarily by Latino immigrants and Black workers (Miraftab 2016).

High Assets, Low Place-based Economic Activity

These are communities that have more assets, such as built assets or social assets, but lack businesses that have strong ties to place. Built assets refer to the infrastructure that a community uses such as water, roads, sewers, and telecommunications. Social assets refer to the connections between people and organizations. Having place-bound economic activity tends to make these businesses less likely to leave because they garner socioeconomic advantages from being located in these particular spaces. Specifically, these communities tend to be located in areas where previous waves of economic development entailed significant investments in the built environment. Communities mobilize those assets to seek new investments to fill gaps left from deindustrialization or economic downturns, often engaging in bidding wars against other towns. They tend to court businesses that are not necessarily place-bound, such as Walmart, Lands' End, Amazon, and Foxconn. Some states encourage bidding wars between their communities, whereas others make this type of development more difficult (Merriman, Skidmore & Kashian 2010). Unfortunately, this development strategy often requires communities to make additional investments and/or build or maintain infrastructure; to forego potential income by offering substantial tax breaks; and to subsidize costs of businesses by offering low-cost, long-term leases, subsidized labor, training, and utilities. In this process, outside interests often gain power over local communities, resulting in a race to the bottom. This approach to development generates conditions for firms to prosper while passing the risks and costs to a community that becomes complicit in a model of development that accentuates and perpetuates inequality.

For example, in 2017, Amazon announced that it was planning on building a second headquarters in North America dubbed HQ2. Since September 2017, 238 cities engaged in a cut-throat bidding war to be the home to HQ2 and the promised $5 billion investment and $50,000 jobs that would be awarded to the winning city. In January 2018, 20 finalist cities were chosen. These cities have scrambled to offer unique proposals to woo Amazon, the third largest company in the U.S. Proposals included building Amazon its own city called Amazon, offering free utilities, and substantial tax breaks (Roberts 2017). New Jersey Governor Christie and legislative leaders said they would offer Amazon tax breaks worth $7 billion over the next decade if the firm were to build there. Attracting jobs and investment of this scale is often costly and has unexpected consequences for community development. Seattle, Amazon's first headquarters, is now home to the nation's fastest growing housing prices, grid-lock traffic that is the fourth worst in the U.S., and a bifurcated community of wealthy techies and anxious wage earners (Roberts 2017). Others caution that Seattle's prosperity under Amazon will be difficult to replicate since Seattle has its own "homegrown upsides" which help to retain highly-skilled workers even during periods of decline (Roberts 2017). In November 2018, Amazon announced that New York City and Northern

Virginia will be the company's second and third headquarter sites, splitting the 50,000 jobs and $5 billion investment equally. In addition, the company will add Nashville as an East Coast operations hub, promising 5,000 jobs.

Low Assets, High Place-based Economic Activity

Communities that have low assets and high place-based economic activity (LH) are often communities with natural assets that are particular to a specific type of economic activity, giving them a place-based advantage. However these communities may lack other essential assets that enable them to leverage these resources, such as political, human, or social assets. In addition, local economies in these communities may be highly dependent on one industry (Tauxe 1993). Communities with an extractive industry such as coal or natural gas would be a good example of this type of power, since these industries are highly place-dependent. Another type of industry that might be found in LH communities, would be an agricultural industry that requires a very specific type of environment for its production, such as products that are sold as protected designation of origin (PDO) (i.e. tequila or mezcal) (Bowen 2015) or genetically modified seeds produced for research (Ipsen 2017). In these cases, the place-bound nature of firms can give communities some power. Firms are more willing to negotiate because they need to be in a specific type of place to maximize the financial benefits derived from their work. However, the amount of leverage this can give communities varies widely, depending on other local assets that a community may have and the alternatives available for the industry in question (Bowen 2015; Ipsen 2017).

A classic example of LH communities is found in Appalachian coal country. Gaventa's (1980) approach to power, developed while studying coal industry interactions with Appalachian communities, provides a useful entry point to understand power dynamics between firms and communities. Importantly, Gaventa cautions that the absence of visible conflict should not be interpreted as consent. This is an extreme example of unequal power dynamics, as communities were often company towns, giving the company a great deal of control over everyday life; economic opportunities were extremely limited and highly dependent on the coal company. Another example is that of communities near genetically modified research facilities for corn seed in Southeast Puerto Rico. While seed R&D facilities have limited options in terms of where they can attain the climatic, environmental, and regulatory assets they need, Puerto Rico is in a vulnerable position due to the acutely high unemployment levels, lack of other industry in the area, and dire financial situation as a commonwealth in post-disaster recovery. These vulnerabilities make it difficult for communities to negotiate for better conditions (Ipsen 2017).

High Assets, High Place-based Economic Activity

Communities that have high assets and high place-based economic activity (HH) are often communities with natural assets that are specific to a particular economic activity. They also have human, social, and political assets. These communities have lower unemployment rates and local economies likely do not revolve around one industry, as having a more diversified economy is something communities often draw leverage from when negotiating with powerful actors.

The rural communities in the French countryside that produce comté cheese are an example that is in the high asset, high PBEA arena. Comté cheese has protected designation of origin status, meaning that to sell it as "comté cheese" producers must seek a certification that is granted to certain French geographical indications for products like wines and cheeses under the auspices of a specific government bureau. Producers must meet specific criteria that tie the product not only to place, but also to specific ways of producing the cheese, which give it a very unique taste. Bowen (2011) finds that the social, cultural, and political assets these communities hold, together with the place-bound nature of producing comté cheese, give producers a strong advantage.

DISCUSSION: ENGAGING POWER AND PLACE IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

A place-based, power sensitive approach to community development requires a two-pronged approach: diagnostic exercises and enacting strategies.

Diagnostic Exercises

In order to make use of the outlined framework, communities with all types of local power need to diagnose what type of power they currently have. Asset mapping is a common tool for communities to determine the quantity, type, and degree of assets that they have, and what assets the community does not have, but would like to develop. Commodity chain analysis has not been applied as frequently as asset mapping to local development. This is mainly because applied and scholarly approaches to community development tend to focus on community assets and needs, overlooking the role that outside institutions and actors play in the development process. By employing a commodity chain analysis, communities gain insight into the role that placed-based economic activity and power play in local development. This is particularly important for communities whose development trajectory is significantly shaped by a powerful actor, such as a transnational company. A commodity chain analysis is a practical tool that helps communities identify important stakeholders along the chain of production, as well as key nodes of power, and potential collaborators that might share the same goals (i.e. improve labor conditions).

As research shows, it is critical to identify allies along the chain that will help communities leverage their power in negotiating with the firm to improve work conditions, to limit environmental hazards, or to mold the shape of a local development project (Shaw 2017; Kong & Dalton 2017). Conducting this analysis also gives insight into why this company is located in a particular community, which helps communities identify how much place-based power they might have. For example, sometimes firms are located in a particular location because of cheap labor and lower taxes, but often there are other reasons that are less obvious, making companies more willing to negotiate with communities rather than move. This often depends on the unique characteristics or assets the community holds (i.e. particular environmental assets, bilingual labor pool, etc.) and the amount of resources that a company has invested in a specific place. These sunk costs may be monetary, but they may also be non-monetary, such as fruitful relationships with local government or key actors that enable the firm to meet its regulatory or productive needs.

These diagnostic activities can help guide communities to better leverage their strengths, while addressing deficiencies. It is important to recognize that the categories of power mentioned above are more fluid and flexible than they might appear. The conceptual frame is meant to be a guide, not a strict structure. Once a community has determined its position in the power structure, it can select what types of strategies are more effective. Communities might lie in the middle of one of the types of local power and should therefore use thoughtful discussion to determine what strategy best fits their needs. These exercises should guide a conversation of where a community is currently and where local actors want it to be in the future.

Enacting Strategies

When enacting a development strategy, communities should focus on actions both inside and outside of the community. Inside the community, activities should be constructed in ways that make the most of a community's assets, while minimizing its weaknesses. Outside the community, plans should be attentive to issues of power and participation, structuring activities in ways that leverage local power and incorporate a range of active networks to help communities meet their goals. Each community is different and strategies should be context- and place-specific. Nonetheless, I draw on existing literature to show what kinds of activities would be effective considering the type of local power that a community has.

Low assets, low place-based economic activity (LL).

These communities are weak in terms of assets and place-based economic activity. They would benefit from building broad advocacy networks; developing capacity that was identified as lacking, but essential in the diagnostic stage; and laying the groundwork to support place-based economic activity that draws on the strengths of the community. Within the low asset, low PBEA typology, two examples of local development come to mind. The first is Polyface farms. This farm was built on “the most worn out, eroded, abused farm in the area of Staunton” in Virginia’s rural Shenandoah Valley (Polyface farms n.d). While this now successful venture began in an area without many assets or place-specific economic attributes, today the farm supports ten employees and has over a million dollars in sales. Polyface farms is a localized venture that has been built to maximize its minimal assets. It uses nature as a model to produce a symbiotic system in which every animal contributes an ecological service to the other. For example, cows are grazed in paddocks and moved frequently. Once moved, the owner waits three days to bring the chickens to the grazed paddock. The chickens then eat the larva from the cow paddies. In this process, they get their protein intake, spread the manure, and fertilize the paddock, cocreating the rich natural environment the farm needs to prosper. The farm’s owner has become a celebrity figure in the alternative farming world. His fame has enabled him to build a niche market for his products, while also developing a network of support that he can draw on for interest-free loans (Polyface farms nd). In this way, Polyface farms leverages its place-based production model to build its assets.

The Lakota Federal Credit Union offers an example of a community-centered approach to local development. In 2009, community leaders began a strategic plan to address one of the community’s needs and to promote local asset development. Prior to 2012, there were no mainstream financial institutions on the Pine Ridge reservation. Residents who wanted to cash a check or get a loan had to travel over 60 miles each way or use institutions that charge high fees to access basic financial services (Woessner 2013). The community achieved its goal of establishing a credit union by building strong network and allies with groups such as Lakota Funds, a local non-profit that sponsored the credit union. The community, together with Lakota Funds, formed a Steering Committee to draft a charter for the credit union. They brought in advisors from three credit unions in the area, and over a three-year period, they cultivated relationships with key actors and developed social, financial, and cultural capital to achieve their goal. The group was awarded three grants from the U.S. Department of Treasury's Native American Community Development Financial Institution Assistance Program. This $450,000 covered the start-up funds and the salary of the full-time manager. Today, the credit union is an integral part of the community, enabling residents to cash checks and access credit, but it is also a means to financial stability and overall well-being for the community (Woessner 2013).

High assets, low place-based economic activity (HL).

These communities are asset-rich, but place-poor. They would benefit from strategically strengthening and broadening their advocacy networks. HL communities can use their acquired social capital to leverage their assets to reach a broader public. In addition, communities in this category are in a position to take cooperative (as opposed to conflictive) tactics with important stakeholders. These tactics include participating in a company's community relations or corporate social responsibility initiatives. If the firm doesn't have these activities, communities are in a position to help develop them. Voluntary standards are another type of activity that communities might engage in with corporations. Voluntary standards are guidelines that establish best practices. These are typically driven by the private sector, but their development can include representatives from the state, non-governmental organizations, and communities. While these initiatives are not legally binding, they can be a first step in building cooperative relationships with firms in the community and having some voice in what activities or partnerships are developed and how they are monitored. These types of standards have been more successful in reducing workplace fatalities and in improving health and safety measures than in getting companies to go beyond the law in terms of improving labor conditions.

One way that communities in the high assets, low PBEA typology have leveraged their strengths to contribute to development is through hands-on training to address a specific need. The Food Finance Institute (FFI) in Madison, Wisconsin is a good example. Madison is rich in social, cultural, and political assets. It is a state capital and university town; it has a highly educated population and is known for its advocacy work. In its quest to support entrepreneurism in food ventures, the Small Business Development Centers (SBDC) partnered with the university to develop training to support the financial literacy of entrepreneurs in food businesses. FFI works with the State through consultants at the SBDCs to provide entrepreneurs with free training on how to strengthen their skills, connections, and knowledge through business model optimization and financial technical assistance (Food Finance Institute n.d.). This cooperative partnership between the community, the state, and the university generated resources that contributed to the success of several businesses that take a place-based approach to food.

Low assets, high place-based economic development (LH).

These communities are asset-poor, but place-rich. They would benefit from strengthening and broadening their advocacy networks in ways that build on the power that place gives them, while forming strategic relationships with others that possess assets they need such as a specific skill-sets or financial support. These communities are in a position to make local policy changes that draw on their networks and place-based assets as leverage. These actions enable citizens to participate in local governance, as well as in broader lobbying efforts at the state level. Policy changes are highly context-specific, as different states and localities have different ways of regulating the local government's degree of involvement. Policy changes may include home rule or zoning laws that set restrictions or prohibit particular types of activities like fracking or concentrated agricultural feeding operations (CAFOs) (Buday 2017; Smith & Ferguson 2013). However, policies and statues can also be industry-specific, creating a challenge for governance. For example, in Pennsylvania, communities successfully used zoning ordinances as a tool to prohibit drilling in their municipalities. Yet after Act 13 or the Pennsylvania Gas Well Impact Fee Act was passed, municipalities were mandated to "allow for the reasonable development of oil and gas resources" (Smith & Ferguson 2013: 377). Eventually, this statute was repealed and local fracking bans were slowly legitimated in several Pennsylvania municipalities. In the area of fracking or CAFOs, advocacy organizations provide vital support for communities on what types of strategies have worked in specific areas and why. In New York, communities enacted more than 160 municipal zoning ordinances to ban fracking before a state-wide ban was passed in 2014 (Dokshin 2016). Activist networks were integral in getting the ban passed.

Public opposition and activism surrounding bottled water extraction provides another poignant example of how communities in the low assets, high PBEA typology leveraged their local power to confront a powerful outside investor. Nestlé sought to establish what would have been the nation's largest water bottling plant in McCloud, California. McCloud is a former company town where the timber industry has been in decline since the 1990s. In 2002, the mill closed completely, pushing unemployment rates to over 20 percent. In 2003, Nestlé approached officials of the McCloud Community Services District (MCSD) with a contract that would have generated $350,000 annually for MCSD (Jaffee & Newman 2013). The MCSD voted to approve a secretly negotiated contract that would give Nestlé 520 million gallons of local spring water annually for 99 years (Jaffee & Newman 2013). In response, the community mobilized, forming the McCloud Watershed Council. They began to work in coalition to leverage their place-based power with groups such as Trout Unlimited, California Trout, Concerned McCloud Citizens, Food and Water Watch, and Corporate Accountability International. These pooled resources enabled residents to build the social, cultural, political, and financial assets they needed to pursue legal challenges and to bring attention to their dispute. Nestlé was required to conduct an environmental impact study, which it initially failed to do. Ultimately, the contract was ruled null and void (Lohan 2009). Nestlé continued to invest millions in public relations and lobbying efforts, but after confronting six years of sustained grassroots organizing, lawsuits, and unfavorable media coverage, the company capitulated, saying it no longer had a need for the site (Lohan 2009; Jaffee & Newman 2013).

High assets, high place-based economic development (HH).

These communities are asset- and place-rich. They need to maintain and continue to build a strong, diverse network of support, like the communities discussed above. HH communities are positioned to draw on the power that place-based economic activity gives them. What exact activities they do depends on the specific context within which they find themselves. These communities can organize protests, ballot initiatives, moratoriums, policy changes, and take legal actions. In addition, they can engage in advocacy at the local level, as well as at higher levels.

Crandon is an example of a community in the high asset, high PBEA arena. It is a rural town in Forest County, Wisconsin. The economy is diversified, based on timber, tourism, light industry, and tribal businesses. Despite having lower per capita income and higher poverty rates than the state average, the communities drew together to successfully fight a proposed mining project that would affect their environment. Tribal organizations are the largest employer in the county and maintain numerous tribal-run programs and a foundation. These programs – elder programs, cultural and recreation centers, a daycare, tribal housing, and economic ventures – contribute to community well-being, and develop the social, cultural, natural, and human assets needed in Crandon and surrounding communities.

Crandon drew international attention when Exxon Coal and Nicolet Minerals Company sought to develop copper sulfide mining operations at the headwaters of the Wolf River in proximity to Crandon, the Mole Lake Chippewa Reservation, and the Menominee Reservation. The Tribes feared contamination of deer, fish, and wild rice from acid mine drainage. The environmental debate was ongoing for over two decades, from 1976-2003, as the mine changed hands and project plans were adjusted. The Crandon mine project was marked by a series of delays, public opposition, lawsuits, and regulatory changes, including the passage of a mining moratorium law in 1998, and lawsuits that resulted in the Mole Lake Chippewa having the right to raise water quality standards on their reservation so they are higher than the state standard. An unprecedented alliance between five different tribal governments, sport fishing organizations, local governments, and environmental organizations was instrumental in the broad-reaching advocacy campaign. Eventually the companies offered to withdrawal the project and to sell the land. In October 2003, the Mole Lake Chippewa and Forest County Potawatomi agreed to pay $16.5 million to acquire more than 5,000 acres associated with the proposed mine. In 2006, the Mole Lake Chippewa made the final $8 million payment. Interestingly, BHP Billiton (a companies involved in the proposed mine), responded by creating a charitable trust for the Tribe with the $8 million (Imrie 2006).

CONCLUSION

This paper brings together asset- and needs-based approaches to community development as a way of promoting a more effective type of community development, one that is community-driven, power-sensitive, and context appropriate. I argue that in order to build local development that enables communities to begin to level the unequal playing field with powerful outside actors, we must look both inside and outside of communities. Outside institutions should not be ignored in processes of development, particularly when public-private partnerships are seen as potential solutions to a declining state and these partnerships tend to be based on unequal power relations. While much of the community development literature focuses on the needs and assets of the communities, it misses a critical component of local development – power and power brokers. Accordingly, I have built a framework of local power, delineating four types of local power in communities. I argue that communities with different types of local power are differentially situated to make change in their communities and, thus, require different development strategies.

In order to know which type of local power communities have, I propose combining asset mapping with a power-sensitive version of commodity chain analysis. This is a way of mapping power relations between communities and outside actors and institutions, particularly industry, which tends to be an important power broker. These activities also enable communities to actively identify allies and broader networks that help them leverage their place-based assets. These assets are instrumental in gaining voice in the development process. In sum, effective development strategies must recognize the importance of local assets, power, and place in order to determine what strategies are most effective for maintaining local voice in local development.

This article draws on existing literature to illustrate examples of communities within the four typologies of local power, as well as development strategies in these communities. This typology is a guide, one that is only useful when it recognizes the flexible and fluid nature of the framework. While this work is grounded in the community development literature, it is largely theoretical, which has some limitations. Some of the tactics mentioned are best suited for negotiating with particular types of industries, especially firms whose success is tightly linked to place. My work serves as a base for future scholars who seeks to apply this framework in local communities. This research would yield a great deal of best practices for practitioners, as well as important theoretical learnings for community development scholarship.

REFERENCES

Bachrach, P. & Baratz M.S. (1970). *Power and poverty: Theory and practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bowen, S. (2011). The importance of place: Re-Territorializing embeddedness. Sociologia Ruralis: 51(4), 325-348.

Bowen, S. (2015). *Divided Spirits: Tequila, Mezcal, and the Politics of Production*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Buday, A. (2017). The home rule advantage: Motives and outcomes of local anti-fracking mobilization. *Social Currents* 4(6): 575-593.

Collins, J. (2005). New directions in commodity chain analysis of global development processes. *Research in Rural Sociology and Development* 11, 3-17.

Dokshin, F. (2016). Whose backyard and what's at issue? Spatial and ideological dynamics of local opposition to fracking in New York state, 2010 to 2013. *American Sociological Review* 81(5), 921–948.

Emery, M., Fey, S. & Flora, C. (2006). Using community capitals to develop assets for positive community change. *CD Practice* 13, 1-19.

Emery, M. & Flora, C. (2006). Spiraling up: Mapping community transformation with Community Capitals Framework. *Community Development: Journal of the Community Development Society* 37, 19-35.

Flora, C., Flora, J. & Fey, S. (2004). *Rural Communities: Legacy and Change*. 2nd ed. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Food Finance Institute website. (n.d.). Retrieved November 10, 2018, from http://foodfinanceinstitute.org/grow-your-food-business/.

Gaventa, J. (1980). *Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Gereffi, G. & Frederick, S. (2010). The global apparel value chain, trade and the crisis: Challenges and opportunities for developing. *Policy Research Working Paper*; World Bank.

Gereffi, G., Humphrey, J. & Sturgeon, T. (2005). The governance of global value chains. *Review of International Political Economy* 12, 78-104.

Green, G. & Haines, A. (2002). *Asset building and community development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gutiérrez-Montes, I. (2005). Healthy communities equals healthy ecosystems? Evolution (and breakdown) of a participatory ecological research project towards a community natural resource management process, San Miguel Chimalapa (Mexico). PhD Dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames, IA.

Henry, H. (2013). Exploring an asset-based approach to nursing. *Nursing Times* 109, 15-17.

Hipwell, W. (2009). An asset-based approach to indigenous development in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 50 (3), 289-306.

Imrie, R. (2006). Indian tribe gets $8 million gift mining company sets up trust for Mole Lake Chippewa with the band's final payment for proposed mine site. *Madison.com*. Retrieved September 15, 2018, from https://madison.com/news/indian-tribe-gets-million-gift-mining-company-sets-up-trust/article_8adafe40-b82c-5cf5-91d0-3a0d15115eb3.html

Ipsen, A. (2017). Dimensions of Power in Regulatory Regime Selection: Shopping, Shaping, and Staying. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers 107 (4), 849-866*.

Jaffee, D. & Newman, S. (2013). A more perfect commodity: Bottled water, global accumulation, and local contestation. *Rural Sociology* 78 (1), 1-28.

Kandel, W. & Parrado, E. (2005). Restructuring of the U.S. meat processing industry and new Hispanic migrant destinations. *Population and Development Rev.* 31 (3), 447–471.

Kaup, B. (2008). Negotiating through nature: The resistant materiality and materiality of resistance in Bolivia's natural gas sector. *Geoforum* 39, 1734-1742.

Kretzmann, J. (2010). Asset-based strategies for building resilient communities. In John Reich, Alex Zautra & J.S. Hall (Eds.), *Handbook of adult resilience*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Kretzmann, J. & McKnight, J. (1993). *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*. Evanston, Il: Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research.

Kirk, P. & Shutte, A.M. (2004). Community leadership development. *Community Development Journal* 39, 324-351.

Kong, A. & Dalton, L. (2017). Living Wage Campaign and Seeds of Radical Transformation. In Fahmi Panimbang (Ed.), *Resistance on the Continent of Labor: Strategies and Initiatives of Labor Organizing in Asia*. Asia Monitor Resource Center.

Lohan, T. (2009). After 6-year battle, McCloud, CA defeats water bottling giant Nestle: How a tiny town sent a multinational packing. *Alternet*, September 15. Retrieved November 11, 2018, from https://www.alternet.org/story/142645/after_6-year_battle,_mccloud,_ca_defeats_water_bottling_giant_nestle.

Mathie, A. & Cunningham, G. (2003). From clients to citizens: Asset-based community development as a strategy for community-driven development. *Development in Practice* 13 (5), 474-486.

Merriman, D., Skidmore, M. & Kashian, R. (2010). Do tax increment finance districts stimulate growth in real estate values? *Real Estate Economics* 39 (2) Article 3.

Miraftab, F. (2016). *Global Heartland: Displaced Labor, Transnational Lives and Local Placemaking*. Bloomington and Indianapolis, IL: Indiana University Press.

O'Leary, T. (2005). Asset based approaches to rural community development: Literature review and resources. Retrieved November 1, 2018, from https://resources.depaul.edu/abcd-institute/publications/publications-by-topic/Documents/ABCD-IACDGlobal.pdf.

Osterman, P. (2003). *Gathering power*: *The Future of Progressive Politics in America*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Oxfam. (2013). Behind the brands: Food justice and the big 10 food and beverage companies. Oxfam Briefing Paper 166, Feb 26. Retrieved June 26, 2018, from https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/bp166-behind-the-brands-260213-en.pdf.

Parenti, M. (1970). Power and pluralism: A view from the bottom. *Journal of Politics* 32, 501-30.

Peters, B. (Ed) (2013). *Applying an asset-based community–driven development approach in Eithiopia, 2003-2011: Final international evaluation report.* Antigonish, Canada: Coady International Institute.

Pigg, K., Gasteyer, S., Martin, K., Keating, K. & Apaliyah, G. (2013). The community capitals framework: An empirical examination of internal relationships. *Community Development* 44 (4), 492-502.

Piven, F. (2008). Can power from below change the world? *American Sociological Review* 73, 1-14.

Polsby. N. (1963). Community Power and Political Theory. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Polyface farms. (n.d.). Retrieved June 25, 2018, from http://www.polyfacefarms.com/our-story/

Quark, A. (2011). Transnational governance as contested institution-building: China, merchants, and contract rules in the cotton trade. Politics & Society 39(1), 3-39.

Roberts, P. (2017). This is what really happens when Amazon comes to your town. *Politico Magazine*. 19 October 2017. Accessed on July 15, 2018, from https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/10/19/amazon-headquarters-seattle-215725.

Scott, J. (1989). Everyday forms of resistance. *Copenhagen Journal of Asian Studies* 4, 33-62.

Shaw, M. (2017). Community development: reviving critical agency in times of crises. In Sue Kenny, Brian McGrath, and Rhonda Phillips (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Community Development: Perspectives from Around the Globe* (pp. 26-39). Routledge.

Smith, M. & Ferguson, D. (2013). Fracking democracy: Issue management and locus of policy decision-making in the Marcellus shale gas drilling debate. *Public Relations Review* 39, 377-386.

Summers, G. (2006). Welfare reform on the reservation, South Dakota. In Kathleen Pickering, Mark H. Harvey, Gene F. Summers & David Mushinski (Eds.), *Welfare Reform in Persistent Rural Poverty: Dreams, Disenchantments, and Diversity* (pp. 87-122). University Park, PA: Penn State University Press.

Tauxe, C. (1993). *Farms, Mines, and Main Streets: Uneven Development in a Dakota County*. Temple University Press.

U.S. Census. (2017). Quick facts. Retrieved June 26, 2018, from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/oglalalakotacountysouthdakota/PST045217#PST045217.

Wallerstein, I. & Hopkins, T. (1977). Patterns of development of the modern world-system. *Review: A Journal of the Fernand Braudel Center for the Study of Economies, Historical Systems and Civilizations* 1 (2), 111-145.

Warren, M. (2001). *Dry Bones Rattling: Community Building to Revitalize American Democracy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Watts, M. (2004). Resource curse? Governmentality, oil, and power in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. Geopolitics 9(1), 50-80.

Woessner, P. (2013). New credit union promotes financial access on Pine Ridge reservation. *Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis website*, January 1. Retrieved November 12, 2018, from https://www.minneapolisfed.org/publications/community-dividend/new-credit-union-promotes-financial-access-on-pine-ridge-reservation.