Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY

Community capacity building as the route to inclusion in neighbourhood regeneration?

Arp Fallov, Mia

Published in:
International Journal of Urban and Regional Research

DOI (link to publication from Publisher):
10.1111/j.1468-2427.2010.00905.x

Publication date:
2010

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript, peer reviewed version

Link to publication from Aalborg University

Citation for published version (APA):
Arp Fallov, M. (2010). Community capacity building as the route to inclusion in neighbourhood regeneration? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *34*(4), 789–804. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2010.00905.x

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from vbn.aau.dk on: December 04, 2025

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Community Capacity Building as the Route to Inclusion in Neighbourhood Regeneration?

Mia Arp Fallov*, ***Department of Sociology and Social Work, Aalborg University***

This paper is published online in

International Journal of Urban and Regional Research

This version is post-print

To access publishers version go to: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2010.00905.x

*Direct correspondence to Mia Arp Fallov, Frederikskaj 10b, 1. Sal, 2450 Copenhagen SV, Denmark, +45 99408110, e-mail: fallov@socsci.aau.dk

Community Capacity Building as the Route to Inclusion in Neighbourhood Regeneration?

MIA ARP FALLOV

International Journal of Urban and Regional Research (2010)

Abstract

How are we to understand the spread of the notion of capacity building in neighbourhood regeneration and policies to fight social exclusion? In this article, capacity building is understood as central to the mode of contemporary governance and the strategies of 'the third way' in England and Denmark. The article explores the concept of community capacity building and its relations to social capital. It argues that the Foucaultian concept of 'management of possibilities' is a useful 'grid of intelligibility' for a mode of government that works by constructing particular subjectivities of inclusion. It argues further that Bourdieu's notion of 'habitus' enables analysis of how processes of capacity building are embodied and how the capacity building approach is legitimized. Using local experiences of neighbourhood regeneration, it discusses how community capacity building depends on particular forms of social capital and involves the naturalization of particular capacities. The advantage of this perspective lies in disclosing how inclusion becomes dependent on acquiring a particular curriculum of capacities relating to the area and its inhabitants.

Introduction

Individual and communal capacities have increasingly become the target of policies to fight social exclusion at the neighbourhood level. Such policies target capacities for employment, civic engagement and collective mobilization — what we might also call 'community building' (Duncan and Thomas, 2000; Craig, 2007) — rather than exclusion from rights or resources. Based on comparative research in England and Denmark, this article develops a critical analysis of the mobilization of the concept of community capacity within neighbourhood regeneration and exclusion policies.[1] I discuss how this mobilization is an expression of the strategies of a particular mode of government underpinning the third way. I argue that this recent mobilization of the concept of capacity has to be understood as something more than new wine in old community development bottles. And what makes it worth analysing as more than simply jargon are, among other things, the connections it establishes between ways of promoting particular

1 The research project was based on discourse analysis of policy documents, speeches and strategy documents combined with semi-structured interviews with agents at all levels involved in the articulation and implementation of neighbourhood regeneration policies in two case sites; the New Deal for Communities programme in Oldham and the Kvarterløft programme in Odense. The study was organized around four themes: neighbourhood capacities, capacities for inclusion, community capacities and governance capacities. These four themes were analysed in a context of the history of urban regeneration and the characteristics of the third way in Denmark and England.

individual, communal and spatial capacities. I compare the specific national paths of New Labour's Third Way and its Danish equivalent in order to explore how regeneration based on capacity building is given varying expressions as a result of differences in welfare regimes, in national–local government relations and in international influences on inclusion discourses (Fallov, 2006). In the first section, I compare the English and Danish versions of the third way in relation to their mobilization of capacity building as the route to inclusion, their legitimization of an area-based approach and the image of local communities tied to this approach. The second section explores the notion of community capacity building in terms of its origins and its close connections to the concepts of empowerment and social capital. In the third section, I connect the concept of capacity building, as mobilized in relation to neighbourhood regeneration, to Foucault's conceptualization of governmental power, thus focusing on the connections between how localized social exclusion is construed and the way it is governed. In the fourth section, I argue for the usefulness of drawing on Bourdieu's notion of habitus in understanding processes of capacity building. In the fifth section, I use examples from local implementations of capacity building to discuss the implications of the construed curriculum of capacities for local communities, and especially the legitimization of particular forms of social capital in relation to active citizenship as a route to inclusion.

Two versions of the third way, and neighbourhood regeneration as capacity building

In this section I want to show how social inclusion becomes intimately connected with neighbourhood regeneration policies in the rationalities of the third way paths of Denmark and England, and how both are based on capacity building. The 'third way' is an alternative to 'state-centred' Keynesian universalism and to 'market-centred' neoliberal strategies. Common to both versions is the development of strict workfare regimes and the pragmatic combination of economic efficiency and social justice that results in a narrow understanding of exclusion.[2]

The intention to build welfare around work has prompted Levitas to categorize New Labour's Third Way[3] as dominated by a 'social integrationist discourse' (Levitas, 1998), which emphasizes an individualized understanding of social exclusion and the development of the capacities of employability. Social exclusion can be inherited, creating cycles of dependency and resulting in deficiencies of character. Here, one can detect the intertwining of a social integrationist discourse with a 'moral underclass discourse'. Fighting social exclusion, then, implies changing the personality of individuals, their horizons, expectations and their 'self-esteem' (Tony Blair cited in Fairclough, 2000: 52). The influence of the moral underclass discourse leads to a focus on individual and communal cultures of 'worklessness' as causes of exclusion and detachment from society. The Danish third way is closer to the French version of the social integrationist discourse, and social exclusion policies are framed by the supportive tone of the universal welfare regime and its relatively higher levels of social support for the socially excluded. Work inclusion is intertwined with the concept of the 'inclusive labour market', although in the Danish third way there is also increased emphasis on opportunity and incentivization. Despite these differences, the strategy of the social exclusion policies of both third ways is a combination of risk prevention via capacity development and targeted intervention and support for 'risk groups' and excluded areas.

2 Neither the English nor the Danish version of the third way can be characterized as a uniform and coherent policy strategy. Rather, the third way paths are attempts to reconcile and make compromises between different discourses and strategies based on a pragmatic approach to policy, and framed by the welfare regimes they have inherited.

3 I reserve the capitalized version for New Labour's Third Way.

I have gone into more detail regarding the question of the variations of workfare regimes and the development of employability elsewhere (Fallov, 2006; 2008). In this article, I will focus on the other, although interrelated, route to inclusion in both third ways: the question of active citizenship, here understood as generated through active participation in neighbourhood regeneration, and the role of community capacity building and local communities in this process.

Social exclusion in both versions of the third way is seen as locally constituted and becomes synonymous with the exclusion of particular neighbourhoods and areas. This suggests that policy discourses have appropriated the theoretical notion of *area effects* (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2002; Lupton, 2003; Skifter Andersen, 2003). This is, broadly speaking, the idea that social exclusion is caused by the interaction of social, economic and physical changes and that excluded or deprived neighbourhoods constitute an element in this interaction and, therefore, that neighbourhoods themselves contribute to exclusion (Skifter Andersen, 2003). The area-effect literature can crudely be divided into two analytically distinct, although empirically entwined, strands. The first focuses on agency-related causes connected to moralized discourses, while the second seeks causes among structural factors such as a lack of services, job opportunities and educational standards. My argument is that the agency-focused explanations for spatial exclusion in the area-effect literature have been appropriated and inserted in the third way policy narrative of social exclusion resulting in an individualized and spatialized perspective on exclusion.[4] This means that area effects are used to legitimize the area-based approach to tackling social exclusion. Consequently, targeting the most deprived areas through a triple strategy of developing the capacities of the area, those of its people and the governance capacities of both countries is seen as an effective and just means to tackle social exclusion.

It is the interrelations between these different forms of capacity development that make contemporary neighbourhood regeneration distinct from past urban initiatives, and more than simply a revival of the jargon of empowerment (Craig, 2007). Neither the area-based character of contemporary neighbourhood regeneration nor its focus on local communities make it distinct, as these were features of the market-led experiments of the 1980s and the SRB programme of the 1990s in England, as well as of the SUM programme of the 1980s in Denmark.[5] It is the combination of the individualization and spatialization of social justice with strategies to modernize government leading to an emphasis on the interrelations between the capacities of the inhabitants and their neighbourhood and the capacities of governing bodies at all levels that makes the third way approach to regeneration distinct. Each of the three dimensions of capacity contributes to the criteria for success, and eligibility of the participating areas is partly decided by their potential to develop these capacities.

The two different versions of the third way vary in their appropriation of the notion of area-effects and in the different political space they create for capacity building, which reflects differences in the politics of scale and the national articulations of the 'new localism' (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Amin, 2005). In the English case, the particular Third Way strategy results in the implementation of centrally defined policies and criteria for regeneration localized in the place-bound social economy of neighbourhood communities and third-sector organizations, backed by public funding. This implies a turn to the neighbourhood and the local community as those on whom the onus of responsibility and action rests, controlled by central government (Jones and Ward, 2002). Hence, localism is overshadowed by central regulation. The overall strategies of the English National Strategy of Neighbourhood Renewal (hereafter NSNR) can be

4 I have argued elsewhere, using Bernstein (1996), that this incorporation of academic debates is a recontextualization rather than a simple appropriation. In the sense that the academic concepts are inserted into the existing policy framework emphasizing the particular meanings of the concepts that resonate with the policy narratives (Fallov, 2006).

5 See (Fallov, 2006) for a more thorough comparative discussion of the history of urban policy.

characterized as aiming at improving local, regional and central governance capacity, activating residents and communities to enhance their capacity for self-governance, and improving the capacity of selected neighbourhoods (Social Exclusion Unit, 2001a; 2001b). The flagship of the NSNR is the New Deal for Communities programme, which runs in 39 neighbourhoods.

In the Danish case, intervention at the neighbourhood scale represents, on the one hand, the internationalization of policy regimes and, on the other, a particular national path where the local scale is inserted into a wider universalistic regime based on equity, and where the new local policies are negotiated to fit with already relatively autonomous local politics and strong local governments. The Kvarterløft programme, the primary initiative in a recent move to area-based intervention, aims to rebuild the capacities of deprived areas and the capacity for inclusion among their residents and, importantly, enhance the institutional capacities of governing bodies in the process (Kvarterløftssekretariatet, 2000). It has been running in 12 neighbourhoods overall, and is now in its anchoring phase. In the urban initiatives initiated after the Kvarterløft programme by the present Liberal-Conservative government, represented primarily by anti-ghetto strategies and the 'cities for all' programme, the link to the more moralized and agency-focused versions of area-effects is made even clearer.

Third way images of community

Before going into more detail on how a connection is construed between community capacity and the government of social exclusion in the third way paths of England and Denmark, I will focus on the centrality given to local communities and the imaginaries of community constructed at policy level. The variation in the community discourses, and especially the communitarian influences on these, contribute to the differences in responsibility placed on local communities in the capacity building process. The consultation document preceding New Labour's New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal explicitly defines the circumstances in which communities 'function best'. The following are articulated in relation to community:

> [T]hey contain a broad social mix; residents have an agreed set of rules which are consistently applied; there are places and facilities where people can interact; residents are consulted and involved in how the neighbourhood is run; and there is an on-the-spot presence to tackle problems swiftly and deter crime (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000: 53).

This definition is part of the discourse of 'rebuilding communities' that is central to the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal, since the rebuilding of community and the participation of local communities are heralded as prerequisite for the success of the regeneration process. In this discourse, there is a slippage between community and neighbourhood. Community becomes aligned with the territory of the neighbourhood and the elements of community in this definition are therefore intimately related to the capacities of neighbourhood. A community is based on a mix of residents, but of resourceful residents active in their own governance. A community is based on rules and is punitive of deviances (visible in the introduction of anti-social behaviour orders and community policing). It is based on the existence of community facilities where people can meet. Thus, this image of community is doubly spatially fixed through the boundaries of the neighbourhood and through the interaction at designated spatial focal points, such as community centres and libraries. In a more recent document from the Prime Minister's Strategy Unit a shift can be detected from the idea of 'reviving' and 'rebuilding' communities to 'stabilizing' communities (Prime Minister's Strategy Unit, 2005). This shift implies an increased emphasis on community as creating social order, social control and social cohesion. It diagnoses 'destabilized' communities as a contributing *cause* of deprivation and social exclusion and strengthens the connection to the moral underclass discourse by denouncing the behaviour of deprived local

communities as pathological; communities are perceived as having a 'greater need for assurance and deterrents, particular to crime, disorder and antisocial behaviour' (*ibid*.: 51).

Community is promoted in a less aggressive way in the Danish material than in the English. However, the image of community that is present contains many of the same elements and is similarly spatially fixed. This is a community tied to the locality, to a 'particular neighbourhood', it is 'mixed', contains 'possibilities for a broad section of the population' and the 'integration of functions' of life and work, so the neighbourhood 'meet[s] the needs of the citizen all through life' (By og Boligministeriet, 1999). In both countries, there is an emphasis on the importance of 'neighbourhood identity' for sustaining local communities, engaged and involved residents and the existence of facilities where these can meet. The Danish policy image of community differs from the English in that community is seen as more dependent on the commonality of interest than on a moral code. This idea of 'commonality of interest' likewise implies a set of common values, but is not as strongly tied to discourses on the moral breakdown of families and local communities. The Danish image of community is likewise influenced by a communitarian emphasis on the role of the local community for social integration and the aligning of societal values (Pløger, 1999), but it differs from the conditional, morally prescriptive, conservative and individual communitarianism associated with New Labour (Driver and Martell, 1997). Community is less privatized in the Danish version. Here community is about place identity and responsibility for local environment. It is about the community in the near public space. Both third ways endow local communities with a central role in the processes of inclusion, but in New Labour's Third Way the image of community is given a more moralized twist and the responsibility for capacity building is relatively more delegated to local communities.

Below, I have summarized the differences between New Labour's Third Way and the Danish version in Table 1, in order to show how the variations in third way paths lead to different strategies of community capacity building. Such simplifications always run the risk of exaggerating differences. Above, I have argued that both approaches to the third

Table 1 Summarizing the differences in the two versions of the third way and their consequences for community capacity

	English Third Way	Danish Third Way
Language of exclusion	Social integrationist discourses coupled with moral underclass discourse	Social integrationist discourse coupled with redistributive discourse and a few elements of moral underclass discourse
Different weight on factors of exclusion	Individual and communal cultures of worklessness coupled with social risks	Individual and social risks coupled with structural causes of exclusion
Image of community	'Moral community'	'Commonality of interest'
Understanding of community	• Private • Moralized • Slippage between local and national community	• Public • Local networks
Goals of community capacity development	Developing local responsibility and building social capital to achieve social cohesion, social order and social control	Developing local responsibility and building social capital to achieve positive local development
Political space for capacity development	Emphasis on local social economy in the shadow of central control	Autonomy of local governing agents under central guidance

way rely on a triple strategy of developing individual, communal and spatial capacities and, in addition, that building community capacities is intrinsically linked with a particular view of inclusion that emphasizes active involvement as a route to employability and social mobility, as well as a view of governance that instrumentalizes communities as both central agents in, and objects of, governance.

What is community capacity building?

Despite the popularity and spread of the concept of 'capacity' within policy discussion, there is little consideration of its origins and of why it became so salient in urban regeneration literature and policy debates in Europe during the latter half of the 1990s. Tracing the concept, it seems to have emerged from the transferral and cross-fertilization of its use in governmental reports and academic literature within international development studies and American experiences of community initiatives.[6] According to Harrow, who refers to a World Bank report of 1984, capacity building was initially associated with macro-economic growth emphasizing institutional building and technological development and transfer in the developing world (Harrow, 2001). Later in the 1990s, it applied to both social and economic contexts within developmental studies. Three factors have been transferred from development discourses to contemporary regeneration concerns: the emphasis on creating capacity for action, visible in the idea of the enabling environment signalling a move away from passive help; the assumption of capacity building as vital for the efficiency and sustainability of initiatives; and the importance of training and development for *both* local communities and governmental structures, which support these communities (Banks and Shenton, 2001; Harrow, 2001). The popularity of the notion of capacity building in Europe was boosted by the European Union adopting the concept in the early- to mid-1990s for urban initiatives focusing on local capacity development as essential to economic development.[7] In the late 1990s, capacity building figured strongly in the UK among the Single Regeneration Budget initiatives and as central to the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (Duncan and Thomas, 2000; Social Exclusion Unit, 2001a), taking on board both the American emphasis on human capital and community development as well as the more economically focused European conceptualizations of capacity. Conversely, in Denmark the concept is rarely explicitly used, but the discourses and strategies are present in the policy material in the emphasis on learning and institutional development and in the development of community organizations and civic engagement as part of the process of 'lifting' the area (Kvarterløftssekretariatet, 2000).

There are few attempts within the community capacity literature to define what is actually meant by capacity.

> [T]here is little clarity about the meaning of community capacity and capacity building in practice. Indeed, to date, there have been relatively few — and all fairly recent — explicit attempts to define community capacity in the literature (Chaskin, 2001: 292).

It can be argued that it is precisely this apparently ambivalent and open-ended character of capacity building that makes it a good tool in the governance of inclusion, because it

6 The American experience of capacity building originates in a plethora of comprehensive community initiatives and community development corporations originating in the healthy cities movement of the late 1980s, the Community Investment Act of 1994, the cutback of federal funding from many social programmes and the transfer of responsibility for programmes to states and local communities (Poole, 1997; Armstrong, cited in Banks and Shenton, 2001: 287; Chaskin, 2001).

7 An example of this is the EU-funded Community Economic Development in Britain in the 1990s, which targeted pockets of exceptional deprivation. Here, an 'essential aspect of the priority concerns capacity building measures, which attempt to strengthen individuals and local organisations to implement local development actions' (European Commission, 1997).

serves to unite capacities for inclusion from different arenas, while at the same time filling it with the set content of the employable and active citizen, the good community and the self-governing agency construed in the two different third way paths.

Citizenship in this mode of government comes to depend on conduct, rather than a fixed relation between citizens and governing bodies. It comes to depend on the responsible *practising* of rights, and is thus conditional on the ability to govern oneself responsibly (Raco and Imrie, 2000; Rose, 2000b). Legitimate conduct, that is, legitimate forms of self-governance, is secured through inducing a particular curriculum of capacities. Decoupling the close correlation between rights, nation and citizen in active citizenship signifies that citizenship is not an *a priori* right of birth, but something that has to be learned and acquired (Mayo, 2000). In this way, the strong relation between capacity development and citizenship is disclosed in that citizenship demands certain capacities — for self-governance, participation, responsibility and control. At the same time, the acquisition of such capacities rests on the mobilization of local communities for active participation in neighbourhood regeneration. Therefore, building community capacity has multiple interrelated purposes: it induces capacities necessary for active citizenship, it opens routes to inclusion, and it is an instrument for achieving efficient and responsive government.

There is an extensive literature analysing and criticizing community capacity building initiatives. Common points in this literature are critique of the use of the deficit model, which assumes communities to be empty buckets that need to be filled with human and social capital and capacities for collective action, and the misrecognition of existing capacities and potentials within local communities (Skinner, 1997; Taylor, 2003). Skinner and Taylor are among the few that attempt to define what is actually meant by community capacity building.

> Development work that strengthens the ability of community organizations and groups to build their structures, systems, people and skills so that they are better able to define and achieve their objectives and engage in consultation and planning, manage community projects and take part in partnerships and community enterprises.
>
> It includes aspects of training, organizational and personal development and resource building, organized in a planned and self-conscious manner, reflecting the principles of empowerment and equality (Skinner 1997: 1–2).

In Skinner's definition, capacity development is tied to empowerment. The results from my research suggest that community empowerment within neighbourhood regeneration is of limited scope. It is empowerment in the form of collective action, of participation and responsibility in the regeneration process (Mayo, 2004), but importantly, only participation and action in the form *recognized* by policy strategies.[8]

In Marilyn Taylor's definition, community capacity building becomes synonymous with the development of what she terms individual 'human' and 'social' capital and communal 'organizational capital' (Taylor, 2003: 141). These can be related to Bourdieu's cultural, social and political capital (Bourdieu, 1985; 1990). Social capital is explicitly related to capacity building in the two neighbourhood regeneration policies, while the other two forms of capital are emphasized either as derivatives of social capital or implicitly underpinning the enhancement of social capital.

8 Although local communities in both cases ideally influence the agenda of the regeneration process by contributing to the articulation of projects, there is little evidence of this in practice. Another difference between empowerment and capacity building is that the latter's focus on the development of skills and abilities for action does not necessarily lead to empowerment, understood as communities setting the agenda for what capacities need to be developed to secure inclusion or enable them to think the unthinkable. The limitations of community empowerment are likewise apparent in the exclusion of local communities from the evaluation process, contradicting the policy emphasis on ownership, and making it difficult for local communities to influence the future of their neighbourhoods (Wilks-Heeg, 2003).

The emphasis on social capital in the English policy debate can be traced back to the Commission for Social Justice of 1994, which drew on an understanding of social capital associated with Putnam in the sense of making a close connection between social cohesion and economic effectiveness (Levitas, 1998; Putnam, 2000). Just as the notion of community in the language of New Labour is stretched to encompass both the local neighbourhood and the community of the nation, social capital is a resource connected with both local communities and nationwide social cohesion and economic prosperity.[9] At the same time, social capital is articulated as a crucial individual resource in terms of enhancing connections to the labour market, inducing 'cultures of work' and multiplying 'working role models' (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000: 24). Social capital is therefore closely related to the development of other forms of capacity necessary for inclusion in New Labour's Third Way.

In the NSNR, the concept of social capital figures frequently. Social capital is understood here as the 'contact, trust and solidarity that enables residents to help rather than fear each other' (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000: 8) and as tied to 'community spirit' and 'social stability' (*ibid*.: 24). The elements of trust and networks generate reciprocity and the possibility of collective action. Therefore, social capital is mobilized as the means of generating the desired community. Lack of social capital is identified as the cause of social ills such as antisocial behaviour, crime, vandalism, racism, family breakdown, educational failure, and the undermining of local communities (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998: 74). Thus, the role of social capital is connected to the communitarian-inspired ideal of the ethical community, and the emphasis on social cohesion and behavioural explanations following from this (Taylor, 2004). In New Labour's language of regeneration, social capital is used to epitomize the ideal of the active self-governing community. It is seen as a resource in community capacity building and is connected, therefore, to the ideals of voluntarism and 'civicness' that permeate the language of New Labour's Third Way. Social capital is understood as the 'foundation that social stability and a community's ability to help itself is usually built on' (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000: 24). It becomes manifest in the multiple presence of 'community activities' around the existence of 'community facilities' (*ibid*.: 59–60), and has, therefore, close ties to the policy image of the spatially fixed community in local neighbourhoods.

In the Danish policy arenas the concept of social capital is more recent and its increasing popularity can be seen as a result of the influence and incorporation of international policy discourses from the EU, OECD and the World Bank, as well as international academic debates. The concept does not figure as explicitly as in the English policy material, but one can trace the influence of the ideas of Putnam in the emphasis on 'ownership' and 'networks'. Social capital is related to the neighbourhood scale and the existence of a rich level of networks and associations that can lift the neighbourhood (Skifter Andersen and Kielgast, 2003). Thus, social capital, as in the English case, is mainly conceptualized as a positive resource but, in contrast to the English debate, primarily in collective terms since there is less focus on individual social capital. The rationale of the Kvarterløft programme is that the state can help create social capital by supporting the formation of associations, and that this again will increase the levels of trust necessary for the bottom-up approach that is the ambition of the programme. In this way, the state becomes an important actor in the creation of social capital, not only in relation to funding, but also in the regulation of networks and associations through the approval of agendas and regulations (*ibid*., 2003: 32–4).

9 In the English policy debate social capital is stretched to encompass resources and qualities at individual, local and national levels threatening to make it an all- encompassing and thus meaningless term (Portes, 1998). Furthermore, the discourse oscillates between the individual and collective uses of the term and, in the same way as notions of exclusion and inclusion, obscures any distinction between social capital as cause and effect (Kearns, 2003).

Social capital provides policymakers with an instrument that enables connections between the emphasis on community and policies of regeneration. It provides policies with elements that can be measured (such as the number of associations and organizations in local neighbourhoods associated with cultures of self-governance, activity and responsibility) and with modes of explanation for policy failure, conceptualized as lack of social capital. The consequence is the politicization of neighbour relations and friendships in socially excluded neighbourhoods (Perri 6, 2002; Crow, 2004).[10] This strategy takes divergent forms in the two countries. The Danish policy discourse is less individualized and more closely connected to state-funded social mobilization, in contrast to the English discourse where the mobilization of social capital contributes to the privatization of risk and responsibility.

Capacity building as an instrument in the 'management of possibilities'

It is useful to draw on the framework of Foucaultian studies in governmentality as a grid of intelligibility for this new mode of governance of exclusion and the role of capacity building in it. The governmentality literature takes as its point of departure Foucault's notion of governmental power as the 'conduct of conduct' and the 'management of possibilities', understood as the structuring of the possible field of action and thinking/knowing of others (Foucault, 2000b: 341; Elden, 2001: 106). This is a perspective that focuses on the forms of instrumentalization of knowledge involved in the techniques of government (Foucault, 2000a). How are we to understand this 'conduct of conduct' in relation to neighbourhood regeneration? It is the 'actions upon actions of others'. It works through the imposition of forms of subjectivity. It does this by imposing particular capacities as the path to inclusion, that is, the capacities of employability and active citizenship. Moreover, this perspective focuses not only on how action is conducted through the construction of particular subjectivities, but also on how the terms of these subjectivities are delimited: 'To be governed is not only to have a form imposed upon one's existence, but to be given the terms within which existence will and will not be possible' (Butler, 2002: 220). The 'management of possibilities' connotes, therefore, the construction of particular horizons for inclusion, the imposition of particular modes of employability and active citizenship. It is a perspective that focuses on all the 'practices that try to shape, sculpt, mobilize and work through the choices, desires, aspirations, needs, wants and lifestyles of individuals and groups' (Dean, 1999: 12), in other words, on governance of the practices of self-governance.

Community, in this governmental rationality, becomes the central territory between state, market and individual. The instrumentalization of this form of community as both object and target of government is vital to the rationality of the third way paths (Rose, 2000a). There is a slippage in this mode of governance between the individual and community. This means, firstly, that the imposition of subjectivities is paralleled by a limitation of the ways in which communities can be constructed and imagined through their instrumentalization into governable objects. Community capacity building is a central part of the process of empowering and disciplining communities so that they become capable of self-governance. Secondly, this implies that communities become the ontological field in relation to which the subjectivities are understood. This means that the communities become the central container of capacities of inclusion and the medium for inculcating these capacities in self-governable individuals, who are themselves central actors in neighbourhood regeneration (*ibid*.: 1409). The strategy of the

10 This emphasis on social capital in both policy frameworks continues a long tradition in public services for governing social networks, for example within health and criminal services — albeit now in a more explicit way.

contemporary mode of government is to reinvent the role of government and the political apparatus as the facilitator, stimulator, and instigator of self-governing activities through decentralizing, privatizing and devolving power to intermediate bodies and citizens, as well as controlling and shaping the development of their capacities. As Dean argues, government rests upon the definition of the sources, effects and utility of individual and communal capacities (Dean, 1999: 15).

Community discourses and community images are mobilized as techniques in the management of possibilities; prescriptions of legitimate relations and values in these discourses become the horizon of action for both the governed and the governors (Foucault, 2000b). In the English case, the emphasized capacity is social capital, understood as the community providing essential networks, which again provide the individual members with positive role models and pathways to inclusion in the labour market. Community is seen as a capacity in relation to its positive effect on social cohesion, through relations of belonging, social order, social control and stability. These capacities are connected to the physical capacities of the neighbourhood. In the Danish case, the capacities emphasized are identity and flexibility tied to the ability to accommodate different demands and functions, and, as in the English case, these capacities are closely connected to social capital and the physical capacities of the neighbourhood.

The policy visions are imaginaries, and in that respect they differ from the way in which a community is judged through the practical monitoring of the regeneration effort, this being based on the number of residents actively involved, and the number of networks and associations within the spatial unit of the neighbourhood. The above policy imaginaries are crucial, in the sense that they influence which networks and associations are to be included in the accounts. They influence the ways in which a community becomes thinkable (and unthinkable) and, therefore, the processes of translation between developments at the local level and the monitoring procedures adopted by central and regional government. Furthermore, they inform project development strategies through their diagnosis of what are deemed capacities and incapacities.

Active communities and the orchestrating of legitimate capacities

Capacity building can be understood as the collective orchestrating of habitus,[11] as attempts to mould habitus in a specific direction by inculcating a curriculum to which the excluded might aspire. Habitus functions here both as an orientation towards future action and possibilities (Moi, 1991), and thus as the enabling device for the acquirement of new capacities, and as a means of censorship in that some pathways and routes of developments become unthinkable (Bourdieu, 1990).[12] It is here that a parallel to the Foucaultian concept of 'management of possibilities' can be seen, in that they both stress

11 '[S]ystems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them. Objectively 'regulated' and 'regular' without being in any way the product of obedience to rules, they can be *collectively orchestrated* without being the product of the organizing action of a conductor' (Bourdieu 1990: 53, emphasis added).

12 I want to argue for a reading of Bourdieu that emphasize habitus as a 'generative structure' (McNay, 1999). Habitus is not formed once and for all, but develops through experiences in different fields. Habitus not only shapes the experiences, but is equally itself transformed in the process: the case of upward or downward social mobility could be an example. This reading of Bourdieu is one that allows scope for reflexivity and deliberate action to resist and change the social situation. However,

the exclusion of certain sets of actions through the moulding of subjectivities. The advantage of Bourdieu's notion of habitus is that it makes it possible to explain the embodiment of such relations of power.[13] 'Equal opportunities' are, therefore, not equally possible for any group or habitus. The relation to what is possible is a relation of power, inasmuch as, for some groups, the social world is structured in categories of the possible and impossible, besides what has already been appropriated as possible by other groups. This appears both in forms of self-censorship and insofar as some groups do not have sufficient capital to enter the arenas where capacity development takes place. Capacity development becomes a process that legitimizes the curriculum itself, and the processes of acquirement result in the legitimization of the privileged access obtained by some groups and the improbability of acquirement of other groups. At the same time, negative sanctions are imposed on those unable to acquire the necessary capacities.

Similarly, community capacity becomes dependent on the orchestration of habitus, insofar as the mutual adjustments implied by the formation of community as a collective agent depends on the mastery of a common code (Bourdieu, 1990). It is for this reason that the process of individual capacity development and community capacity development are intrinsically linked, as inculcation of the curriculum of capacities function as the common code that enables collective action. Conversely, actions of resistance to this curriculum can equally form the basis of collective action. A further advantage of relating capacity building to the notion of habitus is that government practices and institutions are made viable, not only through their materialization in things, but equally in bodies — in the dispositions of habitus (Bourdieu, 1990). Therefore, capacity building becomes a question of moulding the habitus towards new possibilities and of realizing and legitimizing particular governmental practices and institutions. In this instance, the realization, legitimization and success of the area-based approach to neighbourhood regeneration depend on the moulding of the collective habitus of the governors to be able to engage in the process of capacity building, concomitantly with the moulding of the habitus of residents.

Local experience with active citizenship

What is pointed out by Bourdieu is that the *usage* of the acquired capacities of citizenship depends on particular compositions of cultural and social capital (Bourdieu, 1990). Following Mayo, it is possible to talk of capacities *for* active citizenship and capacities acquired *from* active citizenship (Mayo, 2000). Local communities in socially excluded neighbourhoods often need to acquire particular capacities in order to participate in the regeneration process. At the same time, the capacities acquired through such processes of active involvement are seen by both governments as useful means for inclusion and social mobility. I will illustrate this below with examples from my research.

In both case areas building networks and bridges between organizations was seen by staff as essential to the regeneration process. This was more explicitly expressed in the English case, where it was seen as contributing to 'community spirit' (community officer) and the existence of 'positive role models' and 'behavioural control' (project

this does not mean that habitus is easily changed, since it produces inertia and excludes possibilities from the horizon, but that repeated action and the embodiment of new dispositions can provide possibilities for change (Sayer, 2005).

13 The advantage of Bourdieu's theory, from my perspective, is that it allows for the analysis of practices of capacity building as they are played out in contemporary neighbourhood regeneration. Conversely, the governmentality perspective focuses on how such practices came to be and how they could be otherwise. While the governmentality literature highlights the instrumentalization of communities in this rationality of self-governance, there is a tendency in the governmentality literature to neglect the role of class (Kerr, 1999) and differential resources available for accessing, acquiring and making use of the capacities for self-governance.

manager), very much in line with the national policy rationale. In both cases, the aim was to build formal networks, which take a *recognizable* form, from the perspective of governing bodies, in order to open the doors to resident influence and government funds. In this way, community capacity building in the shape of creating legitimate types of network demands specific capacities, as expressed by the community officer for the NDC:

> For instance, we have a lady who came in, she's a warden at the sheltered housing scheme… and she wants to set up social groups. So we had a chat about how… all she thought she had to do was just say right come along and we'll have a social group. But if you want to get money, you've got to set up a group properly. You have to have a constitution, a bank account, and all those kind of things, and she had no idea about that.

Building the type of social capital aimed for at policy level requires both the transmission of official criteria and continuing support from regeneration staff.

From the Danish case a further consequence of the criteria of formality emerged in relation to the engagement of ethnic minorities. The local authority have an unwritten policy of not recognizing ethnic organizations, since part of the local integration strategy is for these groups to be part of Danish organizations so that, as a local councillor put it 'you [the ethnic groups] get spread out so you become part of society and not just of this enclosed unit'. The consequences of this strategy are described by one of the project officers at the local Kvarterløft secretariat in relation to a network of ethnic women:

> This means, when these women try to make an association then they keep banging their heads against a wall, because their application was not good enough, their agenda not good enough, they could not be approved. When you cannot be approved as an association then you can't get funds for a room. You cannot even get a room in one of the schools to have your meetings in. We have tried to get them a room but have not been able to. But they were keen and said 'well we are going to have a party' and they borrowed a room in one of the schools and 500 women showed up to attend this party. This was really a success, but what is a fiasco is that we cannot get them a room to use day to day. That is the big problem, because in housing associations the demand is that they have to be open for everyone. These very orthodox women's groups, they cannot be open to everyone — if they are open to everyone, then they are not open to them.

This quote shows that ethnic organizations have social capital of the bonding and even bridging type, but that this cannot be transformed into the linking type (Kearns, 2003). To phrase it differently, they do not have the legitimate kind of social capital that is transmutable into symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1985). This means that these ethnic organizations will not become accredited as they are not recognizable from the perspective of the dominant system. This lack of recognition means that they are excluded from both influence and material resources, and that the continuation of the network is disrupted as they cannot get any spaces in which to meet. This exclusion is explained in part by the Danish national negation of multiculturalism; there is little experience with ethnic organizations and no institutionalized tradition of recognizing different ways of organizing and alternative ways of behaving 'civically'.

Another related form of explanation, which emerges from the interview material, centres on the disadvantaged position of ethnic minorities in relation to acquiring the curriculum of regeneration: the legitimate language and ways of acting in respect to regeneration. Several of the Danish interviewees expressed the view that ethnic minorities especially needed to acquire the part of the curriculum connected to common knowledge of the democratic system, and the dominant Danish culture of participation. For example, a local councillor stated that:

> It is this whole way of thinking that the rest of us have imbibed through our upbringing. How many Danes are not a member, or have not been a member, of a lot of associations over

> generations, and... with good and bad agendas right? What we have gained... they have not at all... they do not at all have these democratic tools.

This culture of participation is perceived, therefore, as something that is transmitted through family, interpersonal networks, and participation in political and civil society organizations. The assumption is that Danes, through a high rate of membership of associations of various forms, have gained the capacities for participation.[14] Ethnic minorities are disadvantaged in relation to acquiring these capacities, as they are often on the margins of such networks, and therefore have not gained the capacities for what is perceived as legitimate democratic participation. Generally, there tends in this case area to be little recognition of the gatekeepers to this form of cultural capital, the role of discrimination, as well as the existence of other traditions for societal and political participation. These local experiences highlight that particular forms of knowledge and capital are necessary for the practice and usage of community capacities. In this instance, particular forms of social and cultural capital are intimately coupled with knowledge of the legitimate forms of democratic behaviour. Moreover, both the English and Danish cases expose how official imaginaries of community delimit the horizon of possibility for constructing communities in the form that can be *recognized* as active participants in the regeneration process.

What we can learn through using capacity as a 'grid of intelligibility'

The strategies of the two national third ways can be understood as attempting to govern inclusion through building the capacities of the governed and the governors. Looking at the situation from this point of view discloses the close connections made between capacities for employability, capacities for active citizenship and the constructed subjectivities of inclusion. In this article, I have explored the varying ways in which community capacity building becomes intrinsically tied to this rationality of governance. Firstly, the spatialization of exclusion in relation to local neighbourhoods in both versions of the third way mobilizes local community incapacities as contributing causes of exclusion. Conversely, the preferred solution in both countries is the building of local community capacities by enhancing neighbourhood-wide social capital and empowering local communities to take responsibility for local regeneration. Secondly, the practice of community capacities is constructed as a medium for the enhancement of individual capacities. Through the active participation of local communities in the regeneration process, individuals gain capacities that contribute to their employability and their status as self-governable and responsible individuals.

Thirdly, local communities become the ontological field in relation to which individual capacities are understood. The policy visions of the locally fixed community built on networks of trust and reciprocity become the horizon from which individual capacities, and thus the subjectivities of inclusion, are thought to emerge. Moreover, these constructions of community capacities become the horizon in relation to which individual and communal actions are legitimized and *recognized*, judged, measured and controlled. A weakness of this mode of governing inclusion is that the delimitation of the horizon of community capacities, in practice, excludes already marginalized groups from participation and thus from this route to inclusion. At the same time, my research has shown that the acquirement of participatory capacities by community groups *in* and *through* the participation process has, in time, the potential to challenge both the imaginaries of community that function as the horizon of possibility for local regeneration and the curriculum of capacities necessary for active participation.

14 The experience of some of my interviewees was, though, that they had to learn as they went along.

Throughout the article, I have highlighted the different national variations to this governmental rationality. I have argued that the communitarian influences on the English Third Way result in a more privatized and moralized image of the local community, which in turn leads to the delegation of greater responsibility to local communities for the processes of capacity building relative to Denmark. Moreover, the greater reliance on local actors is coupled with strong national discourses on the role of social capital as the means to achieve social stability, social cohesion and economic growth. I have argued that the differences in the politics of scale in the two third way paths lead to variation in the ways individual, communal, spatial and institutional capacities are linked. Therefore, the different politics of scale result in varying modes of orchestrating habitus. In England, it is dependent on moral codes for good behaviour and legitimate social networks. The adjustment to these moral codes is institutionalized in a combination of responsible local communities and paternalistic central control. In the Danish third way, the orchestrating of habitus towards the development of community capacities is more formalized and state-sponsored. The instrumentalization of social capital here has to fit with the stronger and more autonomous role of structures of local social housing organizations and local government.

References

Amin, A. (2005) Local community on trial. *Economy and Society* 34.4, 612–33.

Atkinson, R. and K. Kintrea (2002) Area effects: what do they mean for British housing and regeneration policy? *European Journal of Housing Policy* 2.2, 147–66.

Banks, S. and F. Shenton (2001) Regenerating neighbourhoods: a critical look at the role of community capacity building. *Local Economy* 16.4, 286–98.

Bernstein, B. (1996) *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity*. Taylor and Francis, London.

Bourdieu, P. (1985) The forms of capital. In J.G. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*, Greenwood, Westport.

Bourdieu, P. (1990) *Logic of practice*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Brenner, N. and N. Theodore (2002) Preface: from the 'New Localism' to the spaces of neoliberalism. *Antipode* 34, 342–7.

Butler, J. (2002) What is critique? In D. Ingram (ed.), *The political*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

By og Boligministeriet (1999) *Fremtidens by* [City of the future]. By og Boligministeriet, Copenhagen.

Chaskin, R.J. (2001) Building community capacity — a definitional framework and case studies from a comprehensive community initiative. *Urban Affairs Review* 36.3, 291–323.

Craig, G. (2007) Community capacity-building: something old, something new.. .? *Critical Social Policy* 27.3, 335–59.

Crow, G. (2004) Social networks and social exclusion: an overview of the debate. In C. Philipson, G. Allan and D. Morgan (eds.), *Social networks and social exclusion — sociological and policy perspectives*, Ashgate, Aldershot.

Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality — power and rule in modern society*. Sage, London.

Driver, S. and L. Martell (1997) New Labour's communitarianism. *Critical Social Policy* 17, 27–46.

Duncan, P. and S. Thomas (2000) *Neighbourhood regeneration — resourcing community involvement*. Policy Press, Bristol.

Elden, S. (2001) *Mapping the present — Heidegger, Foucault and the project of spatial history*. Continuum, London.

European Commission (1997) *Towards an urban agenda in the European Union, communication, 06.05.97*. European Commission, Brussels.

Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, new language*. Routledge, London.

Fallov, M.A. (2006) Speaking the language of capacity: neighbourhood regeneration and social exclusion in Denmark and England. PhD thesis, Department of Sociology, Lancaster University.

Fallov, M.A. (2008) Governing inclusion through the capacity of employability. Paper presented at the NordWell-Conference, Workfare policies and welfare state legitimacy, Bergen 11–12 September. (Forthcoming in H. Blomberg, N. Kildal and P. Kettunen (eds.) (2010) *Workfare policies and welfare state legitimacy*.)

Foucault, M. (2000a) Governmentality. In J.D. Faubion (ed.), *Power — essential works of Foucault 1954–1981*, Penguin Press, London.

Foucault, M. (2000b) The Subject and power. In J.D. Faubion (ed.), *Power — essential works of Foucault 1954–1984*, vol. 3, Penguin, London.

Harrow, J. (2001) 'Capacity building' as a public management goal — myth, magic or the main chance? *Public Management Review* 3.2, 209–30.

Jones, M. and K. Ward (2002) Excavating the logic of British urban policy: neoliberalism as the 'crisis of crisis-management'. *Antipode* 34, 473–94.

Kearns, A. (2003) Social capital, regeneration and urban policy. In R. Imrie and M. Raco (eds.), *Urban renaissance*, Policy Press, Bristol.

Kerr, D. (1999) Beheading the King and enthroning the market: a critique of Foucauldian governmentality. *Science and Society* 63.2, 173–202.

Kvarterløftssekretariatet (2000) *Kravspecifikation for kvarterløft* [Demand specification for neighbourhood regeneration]. Statens sekretariat for kvarterløft, København.

Levitas, R. (1998) *The inclusive society? Social exclusion and New Labour*. Macmillan Press Ltd., London.

Lupton, R. (2003) 'Neighbourhood effects': Can we measure them and does it matter? *CASEpaper* 73, London School of Economics [WWW document]. URL http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/cp/CASEpaper73.pdf (accessed 2 February 2010).

Mayo, M. (2000) Learning for active citizenship: training for and learning from participation in area regeneration. *Studies in the Education of Adults* 32.1, 22–35.

Mayo, M. (2004) Exclusion, inclusion and empowerment: community empowerment? Reflecting on the lessons of strategies to promote empowerment. In J. Andersen and B. Siim (eds.), *The politics of inclusion and empowerment — gender, class and citizenship*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke.

McNay, L. (1999) Gender, habitus and the field: Pierre Bourdieu and the limits of reflexivity. *Theory, Culture and Society* 16.1, 95–111.

Moi, T. (1991) Appropriating Bourdieu: feminist theory and Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of culture. *New Literary History* 22, 1017–49.

Perri 6 (2002) Governing friends and acquaintances: public policy and social networks. In V. Nash (ed.), *Reclaiming community*, IPPR, London.

Pløger, J. (1999) 'Det lokale' som grundlag for bypolitikken — en illusion? ['The local' as the foundation for urban policy — an illusion?]. *Samfundsøkonomen* 7, 32–8.

Poole, D.L. (1997) Building community capacity to promote social and public health. *Health & Social Work* 22.3, 163–70.

Portes, A. (1998) Social capital: its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24, 1–24.

Prime Minister's Strategy Unit (2005) *Improving the prospects of people living in areas of multiple deprivation in England*. Cabinet Office and ODPM, London.

Putnam, R.D. (2000) *Bowling alone — the collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster, London.

Raco, M. and R. Imrie (2000) Governmentality and rights and responsibilities in urban policy. *Environment and Planning A* 32.12, 2187–204.

Rose, N. (2000a) Community, citizenship and the Third Way. *American Behavioural Scientist* 43.9, 1395–411.

Rose, N. (2000b) Governing cities, governing citizens. In E.F. Isin (ed.), *Democracy, citizenship and the global city*, Routledge, London.

Sayer, A. (2005) *The moral significance of class*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Skifter Andersen, H. (2003) *Urban sores — on the interaction between segregation urban decay and deprived neighbourhoods*. Ashgate, Aldershot.

Skifter Andersen, H. and L. Kielgast (2003) *De syv første kvarterløft* [The first seven integrated urban regeneration projects]. By og Byg, Hørsholm.

Skinner, S. (1997) *Building community strengths — a resource book on capacity building*. Community Development Foundation, London.

Social Exclusion Unit (1998) *Bringing Britain together: a national strategy for neighbourhood renewal*. HMSO, London.

Social Exclusion Unit (2000) *National strategy for neighbourhood renewal: a framework for consultation*. Cabinet Office, London.

Social Exclusion Unit (2001a) *A new commitment to neighbourhood renewal — national strategy action plan*. Cabinet Office, London.

Social Exclusion Unit (2001b) *Preventing social exclusion*. Cabinet Office, London.

Taylor, M. (2004) Community issues and social networks. In C. Philipson, G. Allan and D. Morgan (eds.), *Social networks and social exclusion — sociological and policy perspectives*, Ashgate, Aldershot.

Taylor, M. (2003) *Public policy in the community*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Wilks-Heeg, S. (2003) Economy, equity or empowerment? New Labour, communities and urban policy evaluation. In R. Imrie and M. Raco (eds.), *Urban renaissance*, Policy Press, Bristol.