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PREFACE

There have been profound social changes in contemporary Australia that reflect the ascendancy of enterprise culture. It represents a fundamental challenge to social policy and in particular, the practice of community development. This thesis has emerged from reflections about my own experiences of endeavouring to make sense of the nature and pace of the changes going around me. My own initial sense of bewilderment and powerlessness about what was occurring developed into an abiding concern about the impact of such change on ordinary workers.

Community development emerged as an interesting litmus test of the legitimacy of this concern. It is a term that conjures up a plethora of images—often seemingly contradictory. The paramount image, however, that comes to my mind is one of challenging dominant thought, ideas, discourse and attitudes and generating creative alternatives that reflect the needs of people and engage them in the process. One would think on the surface, then, that if any workers could resist the impact of enterprise culture, it would have to be community development practitioners.

However, my own observations suggested that practitioners were similarly bewildered and feeling powerless. Yet, community development has a history of resistance and challenge? What was happening? This, then was the challenge that I have set for myself as I believe that it is essential to document such significant social change. Enterprise culture, with its emphasis on individualism, competition and the market is being actively promoted by the state and appears to threaten the very core of community development values and practice.

Whilst, there was a great deal of writing about particular aspects of what I have termed enterprise culture such as tendering and new managerialism there seemed to be a paucity of research into the concept that such ‘devices’ might be actually nested within a broader political and cultural project that sought to transform discourse, policy and practice across society, its institutions and citizenry. Further, my own experiences in the workplace suggested that perhaps such devices were simply the vanguard of much larger changes that ultimately had the potential to change the nature of work and social relations.

For example, in a broader context, the notion of an enterprise culture (which incidentally was first coined by conservatives in 1970s Britain who applied it to policy as members of the
Thatcher Government) appeared at one level to reflect a revival, albeit dressed in new clothes, of an individualistic, neo-liberalist ideology that decreed collectivism and state sponsored activity. Yet, the British experience suggested that it was the state itself that was engaged in the active promotion of an enterprise culture?

A related theme that influenced this research was an interest in the processes by which such ideologically driven change occurs. How does it come to be so influential in Australia; how is it transported into each and every workplace? This led to a focus on the importance of discursive practice as one indicator of the nature and extent of the transformations of working life and in particular, the impact on a form of practice, namely community development. Very quickly it emerged that there were many different experiences and responses to enterprise culture. The challenge has been to reflect the diversity whilst seeking to develop a framework that might enable important trends to be discerned and analysed.
ABSTRACT

Community Development as a form of practice promotes empowerment and social justice. Its origins lie in people's collective struggle to be heard, recognised and accorded full citizenship in society. It has developed strategies to achieve social change that challenge dominant ways of thinking, policy and resource allocation in society. Enterprise culture has its origins in the individualism and competitiveness of capitalism. These essentially neoliberalist concepts have been remoulded into a radical political program of change sponsored by the state under the guise of new managerialism, competitive tendering and privatisation. This research seeks to examine the interface between community development and enterprise culture as a potential site of tension and contestation through an analysis of discourse.

The initial task, therefore, was to elaborate the concept of enterprise culture and examine the ways enterprise culture has been manifested in community development. The focus has been on practitioners committed to community development through a qualitative, empirical approach with a view to discerning their views on the relevance and impact of enterprise culture on their work. Community development provides a useful domain for interrogating the infiltration of the concept of the enterprise culture because of its history of opposition and mobilisation. The research seeks to understand the ways in which the forms of enterprise culture as an essentially cultural project are manifested in practice contexts and to analyse the nature of the response to its various manifestations. As a result, it constitutes more than just a critique of any one of these forms, eg, privatisation, tendering out, managerialism, and instead seeks to investigate the degree to which a cultural shift may be occurring towards notions of greater individualism and away from collective notions of responsibility, obligation and citizenship.

The research critically analyses the impact of enterprise culture on Australian social policy through the case study of community development practice. The manifestations of enterprise culture are investigated at various levels, with an emphasis on the responses of practitioners.

A related aim is to reveal the range of possible responses to the infiltration of the enterprise culture in terms of values, language and practice into community development. Are new
forms of practice emerging or is the field being steadily co-opted by government social and educational policy?

Finally, the research should enable some future directions to be identified for the field of community development. The findings represent an initial attempt in an Australian context to establish the degree of influence that enterprise culture has had and/or will have on social policy.

Chapter 1 examines the concept of enterprise culture and a background to its impact on community development as a domain of practice. The meaning of enterprise culture and its origins will be examined in Chapter 2. Its influence on Australian social policy is then discussed with particular reference to recent changes in Victoria regarding family services.

In Chapter 3, the main features of critical discourse analysis are outlined as a framework for subsequent analysis of the links between discourse and hegemony. The work of Fairclough (1992, 1995) is utilised to highlight the relevance of discourse analysis to an examination of the infiltration of ideas associated with enterprise culture into the domain of community development. Chapter 4 provides an overview of the origins and defining characteristics of community development practice. The diverse beginnings and philosophical underpinnings are discussed and the main features of community development outlined in order to establish meanings attached to key concepts such as empowerment and participation.

In Chapter 5, the findings of initial interviews with sixteen community development practitioners are discussed in terms of their perceptions of the impact of enterprise culture on their practice and the organisational culture within which they operate. These initial interviews were conducted in November-December 1996. A primary focus of the interviews was to establish the key words in their lexicon of practice and to provide an opportunity for reflection on the relative influence of discourse and practices associated with enterprise culture. A framework for analysing and making sense of the forms of response to enterprise culture is applied to the responses. Four forms of possible response are proposed and discussed in the context of the data.

Follow up interviews were conducted in November-December 1997 and the findings of these interviews are discussed in Chapter 6. A particular emphasis in these interviews was on any changes in the lexicon of practice and indications of a change in the impact of
discourse and practices associated with enterprise culture. The forms of response suggested in the framework outlined in Chapter 5 are discussed in the light of any movement in the responses of participants in the study. The implications of the findings are discussed in the context of the framework of responses or forms of embrace of enterprise culture analysed in earlier chapters.

Finally, in Chapter 7, the potential for community development as a form of practice to transcend or at least accommodate the impact of enterprise culture through strategic forms of embrace is discussed and possible strategies based on the research that may assist in the development of this response are proposed.
SUMMARY
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The thesis explores the dynamics of enterprise culture and its impact on community development as a significant form of practice committed to social justice. The research examines what is meant by enterprise culture and its various manifestations and explores the dynamic of the interface between enterprise culture and community development from the perspective of 16 community development practitioners. Their experiences are identified through an interpretative framework that focuses on discourse including the currency of word usage and meanings and their relationship to practice. The shifts in usage, meaning and practice can be subtle and the changes over time and space are of particular importance to the task of discerning trends in the nature of community development practice. Such shifts in language use can be part of broader social and cultural change. Four forms of response are postulated: strategic, hegemonic- compelled and complicit; and overt rejection. The emergence of hybridised forms incorporating elements of all or some of these responses is evident and reflective of broader paradigmatic shifts that are transforming the basis of community development practice.
CHAPTER 1 - BACKGROUND: IDENTIFYING THE RESEARCH PARAMETERS

The concept of enterprise culture

Enterprise culture is a concept that initially gained currency in the early 1980s as part of the discourse associated with the Thatcher Government in the United Kingdom. The development of enterprise culture reflects processes that have reshaped contemporary capitalism. These processes include economic globalisation, the end of the post-war tripartite consensus between industry, government and unions based on Keynesian economics and the resurgence of 'new right' thinking on the role of the State and the individual. The increasing influence of neo-liberalist critiques has contributed to a sustained attack on the public or collective ownership and provision of resources and services.

Concurrently, ideas associated with the Left of political and sociological thought have been seen to be on the retreat following the demise of the former USSR and Eastern Europe. There has been much debate about the future of socialism and its supposed demise in the face of the final victory of the market and individualism over the state and collectivism. Enterprise culture has emerged out of this debate as a key cultural and political vehicle enabling the ideas of the right to be translated into policy and practice by the state. A basic premise of this research is that the discourse, policies and practices associated with enterprise culture have the potential to serve an important function in contemporary capitalist society of reasserting and extending hegemonic relations of the market into domains that previously operated from perspectives critical of the market and its discourse.

Enterprise culture has also been portrayed by its proponents as a set of values, behaviours and attitudes that emphasise innovation, self-reliance, initiative, flexibility and autonomy in individuals and is seen to be equally applicable to all levels of institutions across both public and private domains. It is closely linked to calls for renewal of societies and their economics by neo-liberal thinkers. The qualities thus described are seen as promoting essentially private enterprise or capitalistic modes of being and operation (Karpin, 1995). One of the most fascinating aspects of the rise of enterprise culture has been its championing and active promotion by the state, the very institution that has been condemned by neo-liberals.

Enterprise culture, its proponents argue, is to be promoted through a radical overhaul of public policy across a range of areas including education, health and community services with the aim of achieving a policy shift away from a culture that was 'anti-enterprise' and promoted
and perpetuated a culture of dependency amongst both workers and recipients of such services to self reliance and enterprise culture (Karpin,1995; Crowther and Caldwell, 1991:8).

The analysis of discourse offers important insights into the processes of change accompanying the active promotion of enterprise culture through public policy. In particular, it can assist in illustrating emergent trends and the dilemmas practitioners experience in terms of their response to its infiltration into domains such as community development. Enterprise itself is a term open to contestation regarding its meaning and its application. Fairclough (1989:113) has argued that there are three meanings of the term enterprise. It can be used to refer to qualities associated with being enterprising, as an activity and as a private business. An examination of its usage in texts that promote its efficacy reveals a narrowly circumscribed meaning that privileges a neo-liberal capitalistic interpretation. In other words, a profit making self seeking competitive individual or organisation is denoted as the pinnacle of achievement. This process marginalises and de legitimises other discourses and experiences of groups outside this hegemonic reality. For example, Waring (1996) has written extensively on the lack of recognition of women's initiative and enterprise in all sorts of endeavours because they are outside the market. The claiming of words by enterprise discourse as its own denies the diverse origins and definitions of terms such as enterprise and empowerment.

Crowther and Caldwell (1991:13) highlight this process when they argue:

*cultures which support entrepreneurship can be created and ... people can be liberated, inspired and empowered to face an uncertain future with optimism, to seize the opportunities it offers, and to develop creative solutions to its problems.*

Gee and Lankshear (1995) note that the outcome is meant to be an "enchanted" workplace with knowledge workers that are "smart" and:

*hierarchy is dead and partners engage in meaningful work amidst a collaborative environment of mutual commitment and trust (1995:5).*
The workers within such enchanted workplaces are expected to be multiskilled and the discourse associated with many aspects of their work (often including their job title and description) has been revamped to reflect the new realities of enterprise culture. This hegemonic view that real enterprise only occurs in profit making and competitive situations also emphasises the individualist over the collectivist interpretation of human endeavour.

This research seeks to identify some of the impacts of enterprise culture (and its associated discourse, policy and practice) on the domain of community development and the responses of practitioners to its implementation. In particular, the focus is on the impact of competitive tendering as the dominant form of funding from the state for organisations employing community development practitioners. The degree to which such a dramatic change to the funding context then might lead to an unravelling of the whole context and organisational framework that sustains community development is pivotal. For example, will an emphasis on competition and efficiency prompt changes towards business forms of organisational culture such as 'new managerialism'. What are the impacts on workers and their ability to practice community development? Critical discourse analysis, based on Fairclough's work (1992,1995) provides a useful starting point for indicating emergent trends regarding those issues and possible forms of response to enterprise culture.

Community development as a form of practice

Community development, in this study, is defined as practice that involves working with individuals, groups and communities utilising empowering strategies to affect change at all levels of society through challenging dominant values, thinking, behaviours and practices. It is an essentially contested term that has been used to describe practices such as the 'pacification' of villagers during the Vietnam war by American troops through to the radical social activism associated with the social movements that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s.

In the 1980s and 1990s community development has developed as a form of practice across many social issues. The widespread usage of the term and associated practices reflect its recent origins in those social movements. As a result, by the 1990s, hundreds of unfunded community based groups had emerged concerned with a myriad of issues including the environment, disability, women, ethnicity and race, employment, education, health, law, and the arts. Many have gained recognition from the state of their claims and proceeded to employ community development workers predominantly through the funding by submission.
model. Community development, for many of the groups, has represented an appropriate form of practice as evidenced in its popular appeal to many practitioners.

The attack that has been mounted by the new right on the role of the state has had profound implications for community development discourse and practice. The dilemma for community development is that part of its discourse has been captured by enterprise culture. Similarly proponents of both community development and enterprise culture have argued (though from different philosophical origins) that the state can be inefficient in distributing resources and guilty of displaying a patronising attitude towards those who make use of community services (Mayo, 1997:6). The concern within community development has revolved around the power of the state to control the lives of its citizens through the machinations of the welfare state, whilst failing to redress fundamental causes of inequality. Free market advocates insist that their strategies, which include some of the discourse commonly associated with community development, can assist in the rolling back of the state and serve to:

...promote cultures of self help and self sustaining development, rather than cultures of dependency ...In the fiercely competitive climate of an increasingly globalized economy, partnerships, participation and community development are perceived as ways of mobilizing additional resources to meet increasing social needs while containing the pressures on public expenditure. (Mayo, 1997:5)

This research seeks to reveal the impact of contestations over the meanings ascribed to terms such as empowerment and participation as enterprise discourse seeks to claim them and apply such meanings across sites where community development is practiced and where its meanings of such terms has prevailed. There is the potential for this process to either coopt community development discourse and practice or provide the opportunity for its strategic realignment to enable it to retain its core commitments and values with a legitimacy and credibility that provides time and space for autonomy in practice. These forms are articulated below.

The forms of response to enterprise discourse one might expect to find within the domain of community development will be shaped by the experiences and values of those who practice within it. For example, many community development practitioners have long been
ambivalent about the role of the state. They have been critical of the welfare state as a means of providing services and support and in its role as funder of many community based agencies (and their workers). Critical left perspectives dating back to the 70s have pushed the line that the state is paternalistic, and an agent of social control. This suspicion of the state as an agent of social control and patriarchal capitalism has underlined much of the critical responses to the state. It has been seen as unresponsive, an instrument of repression hamstrung by its role of protecting the interests of the economic and political elite.

Advocates of more anarchistic forms of community development practice have advocated decentralisation of the state and greater autonomy for both individuals and groups as a means of promoting social change. These libertarian ideas have emerged particularly from feminist analysis, and ecological and green perspectives. Critical sociological theory on the role of the state has also informed much of this thinking (Kenny, 1994). This oppositional discourse has therefore been critical of previous discourse and practices associated with both public and private sectors. Other practitioners have worked within the laborist consensus associated with the welfare state, and have seen their work in incrementalist and pluralist terms. That is, their practice of community development has focused on what Gorz has described as 'reformist reforms' (Gorz, 1964) A further interpretation of community development involves forms of practice variously called local enterprise development (both in Australia and overseas) which has utilised some of the discourse associated with business, enterprise and the market. The tensions inherent in these different interpretations of community development practice could be expected to be evident in the range of responses to enterprise culture and its discourse and practices. In order to continue to receive funding, organisations have been increasingly compelled to adopt the imposed discourse as part of the terms and conditions of participating in competitive tendering processes.

Examining Discourse

Analysis of the emergent different responses of community development practitioners to such changes is pivotal to this research. Fairclough's work (1995) on critical discourse analysis, has provided a useful background in developing the methodology for this research as it offers great insight into the forms of embrace of enterprise culture by practitioners through its focus on word meanings and their relationship to practice. The shifts in meanings and practice can be subtle and the changes over time and space are of particular importance to the task of discerning trends in the nature of community development practice. The search for evidence
of such shifts in meanings and practice involved interviewing sixteen practitioners from
diverse backgrounds in the domain of community development in November and December
1996 and again in November - December 1997. The emphasis throughout the research was
on the daily complexities and dilemmas facing practitioners as they endeavoured to respond
to massive change that has the potential to marginalise and even silence their voice as
advocates of social justice and challengers of dominant discourse and practices.

Fairclough (1988,1992,1995) has played an important role in the development of critical
discourse analysis. For the purposes of this research, his definition of discourse will be utilised,
viz:

Spoken or written language use...semiotic practice...such as...non verbal
communication. But in referring to language use as discourse, I am signalling a
wish to investigate it in a socially informed way; as a form of social practice
(Fairclough,1995:131).

The implication of viewing language use as social practice is that it is a mode of action that is
always in a dialectical relationship with its social context. This suggests that whilst language is
largely determined by the social, it also socially 'constitutive'. Critical discourse analysis can be
utilised to explore the ways in which language use socially shapes social identities, social
relations and system of knowledge. It therefore enables research to focus on the links between
social practice and language because each discursive event is simultaneously seen as a piece
of spoken or written text, discourse practice involving the production and interpretation of a
text and a piece of social practice (Fairclough, 1995:97) Language use within this context can
therefore be an expression of convention and thus contribute to social reproduction or it can
be creative and socially transformative (Fairclough, 1995:131).

This research will examine the language use of community development practitioners in order
to gain insight into the degree to which enterprise discourse is shaping the context and
practice of community development. Enterprise discourse, in this instance is seeking to
transform a domain traditionally sceptical and even hostile to its claims. However, given the
diversity of forms of community development practice outlined above (in terms of
relationship to the state, meanings ascribed to and uses made of key strategies such as
participation, social action, consciousness raising, and advocacy, and the ends promoted eg,
empowerment, social change), responses to enterprise discourse and practice may be expected to vary widely. Fairclough (1995) notes that whilst language can be viewed as socially shaped, the processes by which this occurs cannot be seen as monolithic or mechanistic. The reality is that a range of discursive practices (often competing, contrasting, and coexisting) are sustained in societies and institutions. There is a complex relationship between discursive events and the conventions or orders of discourse that underlie them. An order of discourse of a social domain (such as community development) is defined as the:

\begin{quote}
totality of its discursive practices, and the relationships (of complementarity, inclusion/exclusion, opposition) between them.... And the order of discourse of a society is the set of these more 'local' orders of discourse, and relationships between them... The boundaries and insulations between them and within may be points of conflict and contestation, open to being weakened or strengthened as a part of wider social conflicts and struggles (Fairclough, 1995:132).
\end{quote}

Critical discourse analysis also sets out to make explicit the connections between texts and broader social relations. For Fairclough, each discursive event works ideologically and as such contributes to the reproduction of relations of power. Further to this, social and cultural changes largely reflect discursive change. The impact of discursive change on these broader changes in society is particularly important to Fairclough as he believes the connections have been too often ignored, as discursive change can be a decisive influence and indicator of the outcome of hegemonic struggle over meaning and the structuring of orders of discourse (Fairclough, 1995: 18, 96-97).

The new hegemony associated with enterprise culture seeks to mimic the private sector by emphasising a reorganisation of the public sector and community based sector along commercial lines with a refocusing on customers, competition and efficiency. The process of "technologisation of discourse" is of critical import to this research. This term has been coined by Fairclough to identify the:
process of intervention in the sphere of discourse practices with the objective of constructing a new hegemony in the order of discourse of the institution or organisation concerned, as part of a more general struggle to impose restructured hegemonies in institutional practices and culture (Fairclough, 1995:102).

Training packages developed by discourse technologists (often consultants) aim to re-orient the workforce to be more flexible and business like. (Fairclough, 1995:100-101) In Australia, the work of the Karpin Report (1995) and Crowther and Caldwell (1991) stand as testimony to the role of discourse technologists and the practice of intertextuality. Intertextuality involves the dissemination of ideas and meanings in an uncritical fashion from a common source and their application to a range of settings and formats. For example, much of the literature associated with enterprise discourse has been inspired by an OECD Report in 1989, which in turn draws on work by Peters (1982, 1987) and Drucker (1967, 1985). Both the Karpin Report and "The Entrepreneurial School" written by Crowther and Caldwell rely heavily on these texts.

Community development can provide a case study of how enterprise culture can spread into domains aided by discourse technologists as the disseminators of the new order. Gee and Lankshear (1995:5) have noted that what they term 'fast capitalist texts' have been critical in this process of discourse technologization in the fields of adult education and training (which encapsulates community development education and training). The development of an enterprise culture is promoted by such texts that talk of an enchanted workplace without hierarchy; flexible, smart workers able to show initiative and respond creatively to situations. The authors make the important point that at times such texts take on the language of critical theory, much of which has informed the theoretical and value base of community development as a form of practice.
The Research Task

In seeking to establish the impact of enterprise culture on community development, the language use of practitioners can be analysed in order to ascertain if any trends are emerging at the interface. For the purposes of this research, an interpretative framework was developed as a means of drawing out the extent to which enterprise discourse is transforming the domain of community development. Practitioners were asked to reflect on the currency of usage of 26 terms in relation to their daily practice. It was postulated that three possible scenarios might be evident when reviewing this data:

- Firstly, a contestation of meaning regarding the shared usage of terms (within different terms of reference) such as empowerment, participation, autonomy, collaboration and liberation championed by proponents of both enterprise culture and community development. A critical aspect within this scenario is to ascertain whether either of the meanings prevails in the discourse of practitioners or whether a merged discourse was appearing.

- Secondly, the absence or decline in usage of terms previously part of the lexicon of community development might suggest changes in practice. For example terms such as social action, social justice, social change and consciousness raising may come to be seen as outmoded or "too risky" in the current climate.

- Thirdly, the emergence of terms promoted by enterprise discourse such as business, enterprise, product, market, opportunity, and efficiency may indicate the extent of its infiltration into the domain of community development.

These three scenarios provide the basis for a research frame for contextualising some of the emergent responses to enterprise discourse from within the domain. It is suggested that the following forms of response may be evident in the responses from practitioners, in disparate, diffuse and sometimes coexisting configurations. The responses are:

- strategic embrace

- hegemonic embrace (can appear as a complicit or compelled embrace)
The first two forms of embrace involve a sense of compromise and accommodation whilst the third clearly suggests a rejection of enterprise discourse. Fairclough has suggested a similar formulation when he observes:

*People in their actual discoursal practice may react in various ways to pressures for change emanating from the technologisation of discourse: they may comply, they may tactically appear to comply, they may refuse to be budged, or they may arrive at all sorts of accommodations and compromises between existing practices and new techniques. The latter is perhaps the most common and certainly the most interesting case. Study of such accommodations in the discoursal practice of workplaces strikes me as a likely source of insight into the actual impact of technologies of government on practice and into ongoing processes of change in social relations and social identities (Fairclough, 1995:77-78).*

In the context of the research at hand, the development of accommodations and compromises between existing practices (community development) and new techniques (enterprise culture) will be the focus. Thus the concept of a strategic embrace suggests a degree of conceptualising by practitioners about appropriate forms of practice that will allow the autonomy required to promote the core values of community development. The potential for cooption with such an approach is of course high, as is the need for critical reflection to ensure that the means (which increasingly reflect enterprise discourse and practice) do not overwhelm the ends (social justice, re-distribution of power, resources and knowledge). If these trends appear dominant in a domain such as community development with a history of oppositional discourse, then the hegemonic juggernaut that Fairclough proclaims is enterprise culture could be seen to be well on the way to achieving its key political task of realigning the discourse and practice of the so called 'post capitalist' age.

It is postulated that such a hegemonic embrace may emerge from a sense of compulsion on the part of practitioners and organisations, that in order to survive they have no choice but to adopt the imposed discourse- a compelled embrace. On the other hand, it is suggested that there may be evidence that others have embraced elements of enterprise discourse voluntarily
and spontaneously, seeing the associated policies promoted by government such as competitive tendering opportunities to be seized upon offering growth and income even if it means discarding original goals and strategies of social justice - a complicit embrace.

The final response (overt rejection) would signify a complete rejection in both critique and practice of enterprise discourse and a continuation of existing community development practice. In endeavouring to make sense of this range of possible responses from practitioners as revealed through their discursive practice, it is suggested that the following three factors may be influential:

* the degree of autonomy workers possess in defining their discourse and practice in the context of their organisational framework and its policy,

* the relationship of the organisation to the state, its relative autonomy and preparedness to "test" the boundaries or interface of this relationship,

* the ideology that informs their practice and in particular, the degree to which an oppositional politics and resistance are pivotal.

This research, therefore, sets out to establish how community development practitioners have gone about the task of responding to enterprise discourse, and whether new forms of what might be termed 'merged discourse and practice' are evident. If such is the case, the next step is an assessment of the degree to which such discourse and practices represent a way forward or a retreat from the core values of community development.

The key areas for analysis in this research are therefore:

* the extent to which enterprise culture has infiltrated the domain of community development as reflected in the discursive practice of practitioners,

* the processes by which it has infiltrated the domain of community development,

* the complex and multi-layered dynamics occurring at the interface between community development discourse and enterprise discourse,
the diverse and complex responses arising from this interface, the impact on workers at this interface, and the critical factors influencing the form and nature of such responses including worker autonomy, organisational context in relation to the state and the ideologies underpinning practice.
CHAPTER 2- ENTERPRISE CULTURE AND THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE STATE:

Challenges to the role of the state and the rise of enterprise culture

The period from the onset of the depression in 1929 to the end of World War 2 helped reshape industrial capitalism. Neo classical economics reigned supreme in Europe and North America, but its inability to account for the human cost of the depression contributed to its relative decline. The increased role of the state during the war and the need to rebuild devastated societies and lives led to a rethinking of economic policy. The context of this rethink also included the prominence of the USSR during the war and an increased interest in the policies it pursued. Resistance groups, led by socialists and anarchists had also been very active during the war in Europe.

A reformulation of capitalism which did not affect the principle of private property, nor the economic and political power of the elite, found expression in the economic theory of John Maynard Keynes (1936). Keynes argued that governments had a key role to play in economic management and indeed had an obligation to intervene in the economy to ensure adequate levels of aggregate demand to guarantee economic growth and employment. He argued that the depression was made worse by the refusal of governments to intervene and stimulate demand through job creation schemes and capital works. He emphasised fiscal policy as a central tool of management, in conjunction with monetary, labour and trade policies.

One of the outcomes of the pre-eminence of Keynesian economic theory in the immediate post war period was an increasingly interventionist role of the state in the management of society. For example, the welfare state took shape as a result of social policy. The escalation of the cold war also saw governments devoting increasing resources to defence. According to the World Development Report released by the World Bank in 1997, government expenditure as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) rose in 'rich' countries from less than 10% in 1913, to 20% in 1960 and over 40% by the 1980s (World Bank, 1997).

Post war capitalism also witnessed the promotion of a consensus between labour and capital mediated by the state and in particular, social democratic and Labor Governments. This consensus led to union and business appointments to government bodies and the pursuit of policies that were seen as mainstream and acceptable in the context of economic and social realities. For example, centralised wage fixing and arbitration and moderate levels of public
ownership of services and resources were maintained in Australia from the late 1940s by the Menzies and successive Liberal governments into the 1970s. Concentration of capital continued unabated during this period and there was little improvement in the distribution of wealth and income. Unemployment was comparatively low and Keynesian economics became established as the new orthodoxy.

The oil crisis of 1974 and the resultant stagflation challenged the orthodoxy of Keynesian economics. Inflation became increasingly difficult to control and unemployment rose as economic activity remained depressed. Over time, the theories of monetarists such as Friedman (1962) re-emerged, just as Keynes had risen to prominence following the depression and World War 2. In the past 20 years, the critique of Keynesian economics developed by Friedman including the ideas that governments distort the effective operation of capitalism and markets are the greatest expression of freedom for individuals, have been built on to reflect changes in the structure of an increasingly globalised economy. Indeed, the perceived failure and subsequent discrediting of Keynesian economics was seen as reflective of both the inefficiency of the state and the fundamental flaws of collectivist forms of policy that endeavoured to promote 'equality of opportunity'.

The state was seen as a bloated bureaucracy, out to protect itself and rife with unproductive practices and paternalism that promoted a culture of dependency (Mayo, 1997:6). The rise of enterprise culture and associated concepts has reflected changes in the relationship between the state and its citizens. The term was popularised in the 1970s by the then Conservative opposition led by Margaret Thatcher as a catch all phrase to describe the qualities that were seen to be desirable to restore and renew Britain. The perceived decline of the once great nation, it was argued required a vision of economic, cultural and moral reconstruction. Many of the arguments promoted at this time found expression in Australia a decade later and were, as shall be shown, taken up by government.

As an ideological and political tool of the neo-liberal right, enterprise culture is seen to embody the natural traits of people to be self reliant, autonomous individuals, but these traits, it is argued have been suppressed by the "heavy hand" of the state including the welfare state and the public education system. The full potential of an enterprise culture for society will, therefore, only be realised when two major changes occur in society. The role of the state in achieving both changes is pivotal. The state is to be re-fashioned as the chief advocate and promoter of enterprise culture (Keat and Abercrombie, 1991). It is to steer the ship, not row.
its cargo or product is enterprise discourse and practice, and the destination is no less than the hearts and minds of the masses.

Firstly, socio-cultural change to release the natural enterprising qualities of individuals and groups requires people to relearn (and acquire in the case of the young), the meaning and practice of enterprise. It needs to be valued as a core attribute, and the practice of enterprise through entrepreneurship should be encouraged from a young age with appropriate rewards and social status attached to it. The state again needs to take the lead and ensure that it emphasises the values associated with enterprise culture in the broader community by overhauling two key systems—education and social security. Keat and Abercrombie (1990:4) argue that the education system in Britain was identified as a major source of unenterprising cultural attitudes and values including a disdain for commercial activity and the welfare state was also targeted for change because income security measures promotes a culture of dependency in which the individual relies on the state.

Secondly, major institutional change involving the transformation of the state is required to ensure it reflects as far as possible the discursive practice of the 'post capitalist' private enterprise championed by Peters (1982) and Drucker (1985). The extension of the domain of the private market, its discourse and practice, into the public sector is essential. Examples of policies that have been pursued include the privatisation of significant functions of the state including electricity, contracting out of services and functions and the restructuring of the public service based on the lines advocated management theorists such as Drucker (1985). As enterprise culture is also portrayed as vulnerable, it also requires the state to 'lead by example' by nurturing it through substantial ideological, economic and social investment in those institutions run by the state to ensure it not only establishes itself but also simultaneously replaces anti-enterprise discourse and practice.

The corporatist state that arose after World War 2 based on Keynesian orthodoxy lacked sensitivity to the signals from the market and the community. The market thus provides a vehicle for the transmission of unlimited and appropriate communication required in order to cope with the speed of modernisation and change associated with globalisation at an international level. The free space that is created enables the interplay of individuals and families (recast as sovereign consumers) with relevant institutions.
By re-classifying areas such as health, education, and community services as competitive industries and exposing them to the 'accountability', 'discipline' and 'rigour' of the market, they become more efficient, more focused on the needs of their customers because they have to compete for their dollar by producing a 'product' that is competitive and attractive.

These areas and others that have been publicly provided or funded, are seen by the proponents of enterprise culture to have been insulated from the market by the umbrella of the state and dominated by values antithetical to an enterprise culture. The resultant discursive practice of these institutions has discouraged enterprise amongst individuals, organisations and the wider community. Enterprising qualities have been sapped by such practices because the state is essentially cumbersome and centralised.

The strategies utilised by the cultural and political project of constructing an enterprise culture are twofold: a sustained attack and deconstruction of any inimical anti enterprise tendencies, discourse or practice and those that promote them (unions, activists etc) and the harnessing of the state and its power to impose enterprise discourse and practice as hegemony. Worcester (1991:45), reflecting on the impact on, and response of English trade unions to enterprise culture, argues that the policy agenda was designed to,

\textit{sogegrate those organised interests whose existence potentially threatened the core principles of the free market/strong state project. The enterprise culture represented in effect, an explicit critique of the civic philosophy of the post war settlement and the tripartite arrangements that philosophy sanctioned.}

Similarly, the past was re-formulated and rationalised by Thatcherites as a time of an \textit{anti-enterprise culture} which resulted from collectivist ideas promulgated by social democrats and led to national decline and degeneration (Burrows and Curran, 1991:10). Forms of intervention by the state including planning are seen to be inefficient and cumbersome.

Enterprise culture in this context is essentially a political project that has an ideological purpose of supplanting established norms and modes of practice with political values of individualism and competition and a notion of freedom from state control inspired by
Friedman (1962) and Hayck (1960). Cross and Payne, (1991:3) regard it as a slippery construct often lacking in clear definition by its proponents that is designed to rationalise radical changes. It is a central tenet of this research that enterprise culture represents an ideological (and therefore political and social) project. It is but the latest in a long line of policy and practice paradigms from neo liberalism, but its promotion comes at a time of vulnerability for many of its prime targets. For example, the role of the state (and in particular the welfare state and public provision of education) has been heavily scrutinised (as outlined above). It is a cleverly packaged set of "tools" designed to solve all manner of problems. However, such a simplistic description denies the reality of the ideology underpinning enterprise culture,

*the economic culture of enterprise is informed by the assumption that competition-generating winners and losers is vital...Enterprise reforms effect a shift in consciousness...to a "culture"..., in which every individual understands that the world does not owe him or her a living.* (Heelas & Morris, 1992:10)

Schwengel (1990:136-142) argues that enterprise culture is really one response to the structural problems facing capitalist societies involving private sector leadership in society without a theory of culture reflecting real changes in work patterns, family and community. It is an attempt to answer the questions posed by long term changes associated with globalisation, long term economic decline and loss of world markets, and that it is not just a phase but a process. A space between the market and individuals or money and culture is held to be critical in the development of new attitudes and practices,

*Money is the preferred institutional framework for a better interaction between culture and economy than a moralistic corporatist State* (Schwengel, 1990:141)

This interaction, based on the market, is seen to be unstable yet flexible and able to facilitate the processes of change that are required in the relations between the market and individuals. Intermediary powers are seen to be obstacles to change and hence must reform themselves to facilitate this free exchange or be removed from the sphere of influence. Hence, trade unions become an 'interference' in the 'free' operation of the labour market. The resultant safe job
forever mentality has resulted in inefficiency and created a middle class salariat (Heelas and Morris, 1992:5). This term is used to define those who are seen to have benefited from the growth of the welfare state and education: the middle class do better, the trade unionist and their union. By definition, these workers are seen as "unproductive". By introducing enterprise culture to these areas a new emphasis of not relying on an established income can be instilled. In turn, the users of various services and programs can gain power as consumers, and as active citizens using their freedom of choice to 'vote' when they spend their money. Friedman (1962), claims this is the ultimate and most important freedom that people can have and only the market can deliver it to them. Those who have been reliant on the state, either as paid workers or in receipt of support, therefore require a 'short, sharp shock' to enable them to become 'enterprising people'.

Personal responsibility is a key principle of the consumer democracy that will develop as enterprise culture takes hold and transforms organisations, the state and individuals. The use of indicators of customer satisfaction is seen as the key to improving the enterprising qualities of individuals and institutions such as education, welfare and health. Enterprise culture is more than a mere revival of economic liberalism as it has arisen in a post consensus context giving rise to novel configurations and applications. The ideological nature of this process of redefinition has been concealed by the catch cries and slogans that have accompanied enterprise discourse regarding individual choice and freedom. According to British critiques, this is the level at which the concept must be interrogated because the,

the counter revolutionary context of the enterprise culture is the vital component in understanding its nature and the terms of the debates in which its proponents have been engaged (Heelas & Morris, 1992:16)

Marquand (1992) casts the proponents of enterprise culture as the 'revolutionaries' seeking to establish that collectivism has corrupted society and that the remaking of individuals as enterprising and entrepreneurial beings is central to the total consolidation of the market order in all areas of human endeavour. Enterprise culture is both their means and the ends. (Marquand, 1992:68). To Marquand, enterprise culture in its various guises and manifestations represents a means of increasing control by capital over labour, legitimising a shift in power relations from the public to private domain, and in both these domains a shift from the bottom to the top of organisational hierarchical structures (Marquand, 1992:69).

The Karpin report reflects the broader agenda of enterprise culture as developed in Thatcher's England. Its two salient and defining features, the focus on individual characteristics of enterprise and institutional and managerialist change are evident. Beeson, (1995:24-25) in a commentary on the Karpin Report, argues that it places responsibility for Australia's economic problems on the predominance of social values that are inappropriate for a robust capitalist society. These values, the report argues, have been inculcated by a majority of Australians whether they be managers or workers on the factory floor. They have been reflected in a 'comfortable' approach to work and life in general. Industries have grown fat on the protection of government in the way of tariffs and regulation. The individual has lost her/his drive and initiative because of an overly benevolent government that offers cradle to grave security. Such values have then permeated through all layers of society and produced inefficiency and a lack of enterprise from management to the shop floor. The process of globalisation, it is argued, changes all that and demands that we, as a nation, change our ways and quickly.

This is shorthand for arguing that public intervention (in the Keynesian mould) in the social and economic life of a society breeds inefficiency, dependency and the cure is a *remodelling and reconfiguring* of the role of the state in late capitalist societies. This is a crucial point because it highlights the changing needs of capitalist enterprise in the global economy. Many commentators have argued that the rise and rise of neo liberal policies and practices represents an attack on state intervention. Whilst the forms of state intervention have been radically unravelled through policies such as privatisation, competitive tendering and outsourcing, state intervention to protect and enhance established economic power remains.

Thus, enterprise culture reflects, through its two pronged approach aimed at the individual and institution, a new role for the state. Seen in this light, enterprise culture is clearly a political project that seeks to fundamentally realign society and economic and political power.
The role of the state is now held explicitly to be the re-education of the Australian people to reflect appropriate attitudes of entrepreneurialism (see Chapter 3 for a discussion on discourse and hegemony and the potency of word meanings in asserting hegemonic relations of power). Thus, our education system needs remodelling to ensure it engenders an entrepreneurial mindset. Entrepreneurialism is to be raised to the pinnacle of status and achievement for all, especially the young to aspire to. The Karpin Report refers to the most important task of the state being to develop a positive enterprise culture through education and training in order to ensure Australians come to value the creation of wealth. Creating a positive enterprise culture is seen as a huge challenge as it involves,

...a change in the values inculcated in the education system, in the workforce and in the enterprise (in order to create)...community attitudes that support the creation of wealth (economic and social), and managers with a high level of entrepreneurial skills (Karpin, 1995:107).

The state also needs to reflect the hegemonic view that life is a competitive business requiring entrepreneurial skills in the way it goes about its affairs. All arms of the state are expected to adopt managerial styles of organisation and re-educate their workforces with the assistance of the discourse technologists. Many can expect a reduction in their workforce and to experience the process of corporatisation - the taking on of all of the trappings of a private company and positioning the organisation in the marketplace ready for privatisation and/or 'competition'. This has occurred to a large number of public instrumentalities in the 1990s.

The strategy in Australia is to be similar to that pursued in Britain; firstly to recast the government as an active promoter of enterprise culture through a revamping of its activities especially in the key area of education, and secondly to develop enterprising qualities in individuals and organisations. Enterprise culture, then, is held to be 'teachable' provided other anti-enterprise notions are removed from the education system. As noted above, the full benefits of an enterprising nation can only be realised when the population is trained in the techniques of enterprise. The harnessing of labour to such ends requires the acquisition of,

the requisite soft skills with which to harness labour's potential profitability... (and) the skills required by both management and the workforce
may be effectively transmitted through specific practices..... where the specific techniques of 'soft skill' leadership may be passed on, while for labour this will be achieved by harnessing the resources of both the state and the private sector to promote more appropriate, enterprising values (Bereson, 1995:26).

The state then has become the site for the transmission of enterprise culture—a conduit by which its attendant policies and practices can be transported into the sectors and domains targeted for change and 'renewal'- education, health, community services amongst others. The efficacy of this approach is evident. The state's control of funding and policy in such areas has enabled this transmission to be swift and wholesale. In less than a decade, the face of public policy has been reshaped to reflect the imperatives behind enterprise culture. The paradox in this process has been the use of state power created largely through Keynesian inspired economic and social policy, (along with social democratic influences) for an essentially political project that is inimical to the core values of such thinking. Hinkson (1993), has argued that such changes in the role of the state are part of a re-making and re-alignment of the role of the state and production in a post-modern setting. He believes that the notion of a post-modern market embodied in this process is a reflection of its extended reach because of rapid technological change in relation to communication, the production of a new range of commodities available globally and its ability to define people as consumers in terms of identity. He believes that similarly it is possible to talk of a post-modern state characterised by its own set of defining features to reflect the realities of the post modern age. (Hinkson, 1993:16) Cannan notes the process of constituting new identities and labels is also evident in the reconfiguring of what was the welfare state.

citizens have rights as consumers; they have rights of choice and complaint..... Service users become customers in the project of marketisation. This consumer democracy is supposed to challenge the sinecures which unenterprising professionals and administrators have apparently created for themselves in the welfare state (Cannan, 1994:7-8).

Considine has described this re-configuration as a market bureaucracy, which oversees a contract state that engages and promotes widespread private sector involvement in the provision of services, expenditure of public money and the excercising of state power. (1996:22). The recent changes to Victoria's youth and family services are a good example of
the discursive and practice changes that accompany the workings of this market bureaucracy in its promotion of enterprise culture. It is an illustrative example that highlights the changing context of community development as a number of community development workers interviewed for the research are employed in this field.

The impact of enterprise discourse on social policy

In November 1997, the Victorian Department of Human Services, released a report outlining the future framework of youth and family services. The Redevelopment of Victoria's Youth and Family Services- Strategic Directions. As a blueprint, it seeks to identify the issues requiring attention and the proposals for achieving improvements in program delivery. It nominates a lack of accountability and a fragmentation of services as two key issues to be addressed. It proposes a number of changes that have also been applied across the community services field in general in response to these and related issues.

The proposed service paradigm based on outputs reflects the hallmarks of enterprise culture in that an increase in state control is presented under the guise of greater flexibility and ensuring the best available services. The Department of Human Services is a business that is in the market place buying and selling. In outlining its new approach the Department notes it,

will see the Department specifying the outputs and services to achieve the outcomes it wants to purchase (1997:18).

The changes are presented as simply improving what agencies do by reorganising their specification and management arrangements (1997:10). The process in developing and operating programs becomes a technical matter for professionals and business managers. There is no place for community generated change and challenges to government. This service paradigm is top down, the grassroots generation of ideas, innovation and programs is replaced with the expert deciding what is best, specifying it in a tender and then using quasi market principles to determine which tender will deliver a service at the best price.
Such an application of market theory to community services is taken as a given— that the best available services can only come about in a competitive and self-seeking context. This leap of logic denies the reality of the values that have underpinned the sector, including commitments to collaboration, networking, and a sense of collective energy devoted to a common cause of social justice. That these are alternative conceptions of human society and the way it is organised is not acknowledged. There is an acknowledgement that accessible services close to the community still have a role to play— but that role is circumscribed within the requirements of the state tender. The language of community development rarely surfaces, but its application is firmly predetermined by the service paradigm of enterprise culture. An expansive, innovative service paradigm based on community development is, not surprisingly, absent.

Another feature of this service paradigm is a commitment to growth— to large scale organisations offering consolidated services in a competitive or ‘contestable’ environment— monitored, accountable and delivering ‘value for money’. Thus the report notes that there will be an,

*aggregation of services and programs, combining programs with similar objectives and client groups* (1997:11).

This emphasis on growth was reflected in responses from practitioners as part of this research. It represents an intriguing rewriting of neo liberal economic theory which emphasises a number of small competing businesses as the means of guaranteeing the most efficient allocation of resources. Thus, there is a signalling of this move to larger organisations as being the preferred tenderer,

*Many services will be delivered through larger structures* (1997:1).

Whilst this may reflect the reality of capitalist society, with large corporations dominating many sectors of the economy, it is intriguing that a reduction of services and programs is advocated. On the other hand, having to deal with fewer and larger organisations enhances the capacity of the state to control the field and ensure compliance with its demands.
Another assumed outcome of competitive tendering is the argument that 'contestable' processes (read competitive) will deliver better, quality outcomes for the community. There is an emphasis on monitoring, greater accountability and delivering 'value for money' (Human Services, 1997:1).

There appears to be no discussion of the apparent contradiction in specifying outcomes and services to be delivered through a tender process, reducing as part of the service paradigm the number of such services and agencies operating, yet suggesting it is going to be a competitive environment noted for its innovation. The report acknowledges Victoria's community based services as being robust and highly valued (1997:7), yet denies the historical reality that this assessment can only be made because such services have been often small, decentralised and close to their communities of need. In fact, much of the innovation that has emerged in the sector has been generated by these small community based groups and their workers, utilising community development strategies. Rather than specifying a service paradigm based on a continuum of services that builds on this rich heritage, the report exemplifies an ahistorical approach that imposes new forms of discourse, practice and organisation on the sector. The absence of community development ways of working and discourse in the report devalues the work of those communities and workers committed to a range of issues. The strategies they have employed have often been both enterprising and innovative- but in collaborative, non competitive ways. The failure to include such ways of working is part of the hegemony that is enterprise culture.

For example, the service continuum outlined in Section 5 of the report (Department of Human Services:1997) does not advocate a range of services from the individual level to community focus, but rather reflects a focus on fixing individual problems. There is no contextualising of the social issues that individuals experience and the focus on services that can be supposedly measured for outcomes and thus controlled and contained. Any language alluding to the need for broader social change or consciousness raising is conspicuous by its absence. The description of services to respond to domestic violence is a case in point. Existing funding arrangements for domestic violence outlined in Appendix 1 of the report as Family Violence services (both direct and regional networks) are to be replaced with government purchasing 'group treatment services' for victims of domestic violence(1997:27). The service paradigm underpinning enterprise culture is thus essentially a 'treatment' model that seeks to depoliticise and remove the social construct and meanings associated with people's experiences. Victims of domestic violence now require treatment for their problem.
The impact on smaller organisations and their fear for their own survival is another aspect to be investigated in this research along with the question about the extent to which this changed policy context has led organisations and practitioners to embrace the changes. It could be suggested that they are caught between a 'rock and a hard place'. Whilst it may be expected that practitioners and/or the organisations that employ them will 'play the game' in order to gain funding in order to survive, such action on its own is not necessarily seen as evidence of adopting a hegemonic embrace. Signs of systematically removing all evidence of community development in both discourse and practice is the important indicator; the other side of the coin and the element focused on in this research.

It is essentially the political and collective nature of community development that is most under threat with the move to embrace enterprise culture. This move represents a paradigm shift for community development because it seeks to suggest the broader political context is of no concern to practitioners and that what matters is being a smart, efficient, customer driven organisation focused on outcomes and ready to respond to the next tender.

The tendering process also leaves organisations even more tightly bound to the state than occurred under the previous funding by submission arrangements. This is an important issue because relative autonomy in practice has enabled innovative forms of practice to be nurtured and then flourish. The shift towards tendering is based on the view that such arrangements were inefficient, fragmented and ineffective because they were 'inputs driven', not outcomes focused. The existence of many small groups led to poor management and lack of accountability in the community services sector. This argument then enables the state to suggest that business principles are being introduced on purely efficiency grounds and that the process is not political. At last the community sector can be reined in and made accountable in a time of fiscal restraint.

This view is typical of the line espoused by those promoting an uncritical acceptance of enterprise culture. The attempt to depoliticise the changes as nothing more than changes to promote best practice and accountability belies the fact that only those forms of practice that do not challenge the status quo are given the status "best practice", and that the politicised, and challenging forms of collective practice are silenced and marginalised. The service paradigm ushered in by enterprise culture also signifies an increase in state control, but again sold under the guise of greater flexibility and ensuring the best available services. Thus,
this approach will see the Department specifying the outputs and services to achieve the outcomes it wants to purchase (1997:18).

The changes are presented as simply improving what agencies do by improving their specification and management arrangements (1997:10). The process in developing and operating programs becomes a technical matter for professionals and business managers. There is no place for community generated change and challenges to government. This service paradigm is top down, the grassroots generation of ideas, innovation and programs is replaced with the expert deciding what is best, specifying it in a tender and then using quasi market principles to determine which tender will deliver a service at the best price. A quasi market refers to the adoption of some of the practices of the market in a context of continuing state control of the tendering process.

There is an acknowledgement that accessible services close to the community still have a role to play, but that role is circumscribed within the requirements of the state tender. The language of community development rarely surfaces, but its application is firmly predetermined by the service paradigm of enterprise culture. An expansive, innovative service paradigm based on community development is, not surprisingly absent.

It is important however not to romanticise the practice of community development (which is examined in Chapter 4) in the context of the welfare state. A critical analysis highlights the problematic nature of much of that practice. Whilst the welfare state with its emphasis on a safety net for all and the rational application of uniform regulations provided scope through its funding of community based organisations for some autonomy in practice, it is important to note the arguments of feminists that difference on the basis of gender, class, ethnicity, sexual preference and geographic location was often ignored. The funding by submission approach that was utilised within the welfare state did, however, allow for activist campaigning around difference and an increasing recognition of its importance in program design and delivery. This process enabled at least some definition of needs, programs and services through discourse that reflected the experiences of those in need. The increased state control that flow from the implementation of enterprise culture inspired policy changes such as the one planned for youth and family services means simply that there is less room for innovation and progressive community development.
Thus, the application of enterprise culture to social policy has been undertaken and sustained by the state through an overhaul of institutional policies and practices that have explicitly sought to redefine the roles of the state, community based organisations and workers. In summarising the discussion to this point it is suggested that the promotion of enterprise culture has been informed by the following assumptions:

- the market theory of competition and efficiency driven by consumer sovereignty,

- a business organisational culture and structure stressing new managerialism and total quality management,

- the promotion of a sense of individuals as self seeking, self interested competitive beings and as the prime organising and motivating unit,

- it is government sanctioned and sponsored - the state as the 'hegemonic' messenger through its use of competitive tendering processes,

- a libertarian ethos emphasising the 'freeing up' of initiative and creativity in order to promote enterprise.

However, the promotion of enterprise culture as an instrument of social policy appears to deliver somewhat different realities:

- rather than promoting of many, small competing businesses (seen as the underpinning of market theory), processes such as tendering promote rapid consolidation, and concentration of services and projects in the field with the potential for oligopolies,

- social control rather than libertarianism and enterprise- initiative circumscribed by tender specifications and the desire to win the next tender,

- top down decrees and tighter control of funding,

- longer hours and worsening job security.
The possible consequences of this apparent gulf between the assumptions and realities of enterprise culture as an instrument of social policy are addressed below, especially in terms of their impacts on practitioners.

Thus, the impetus to adopt consumerist and competitive forms of organisational culture and discourse associated with enterprise culture, has been sponsored and driven by the state through substantial shifts in social policy since the 1980s. In particular, changes to the perceived role of the state away from being a funder of community services provided by community based agencies towards that of a purchaser of services from competing businesses have served to highlight the way in which the forms and discourse of enterprise culture have been transported into new domains. Funded services have long been aware of the conditional autonomy delivered by funding from the state. The changes associated with enterprise culture involve a renegotiation of their place in the scheme of things. The intent behind such changes, it is suggested is the transformation of agencies to embody the characteristics of competitive businesses. The proposition being examined is the extent to which community development can creatively respond to the 'realities' of enterprise culture in the context of state sponsorship of such hegemonic practices through its control of funding.
CHAPTER 3 - THE PRACTICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The emergence of community development

Community development as a form of practice has complex and diverse origins that reflect the many headed nature of the beast. As a term, it has origins in the early work of the United Nations with former colonies of European countries in the 1950s and 1960s. It was used in this context to signify attempts to develop structures and processes that could support independence of the former colonies. Thus, Rossouw (1996:2) drew out the following definition from United Nations documents,

*The term 'community development' has come into international usage to connote the process by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with those of governmental authorities to improve the economic, social and cultural conditions of communities, to integrate these communities into the life of the nation and to enable them to contribute fully to national progress.*

European colonial powers used similar terms to describe their actions to ensure that only sympathetic leaders emerged from the indigenous peoples of their former colonies. Such leaders were often trained in Europe and were frequently prepared to ensure that a tight pattern of dependency remained between the colonial powers and the former colonies in their neo colonial relationship. Community development processes of building community and promoting participation were designed to quell popular resistance movements that sought a more independent stance for their countries. The Americans similarly practiced what were euphemistically called 'pacification' programs at a village level again using community development practices.

Similarly, in the 1960s the British and United States Governments promoted programs based on community development practices as a part of policies aimed at tackling issues of urban decay, poverty, homelessness and discrimination. The Community Development Program in the United Kingdom and the War on Poverty program in the United States were the predecessors and inspiration behind the Whitlam Government's Australian Assistance Plan (AAP). However, like its overseas precursors, the AAP was based on a Keynesian policy approach that was beginning to come under attack with the onset of the oil crisis of 1973.
This policy approach took an essentially pluralist perspective on social issues. Issues such as poverty and inequality were defined in terms of people's equality of opportunity. Thus, greater access to resources and services such as housing, health and education would enhance equality of opportunity for the poor and enable them to have a greater chance of succeeding in an industrial capitalist society.

Community development strategies such as participation were called into service to encourage the poor to mobilise and gain much needed services and resources for their communities. Some of the issues related to such state sanctioned programs promoting participation are discussed below. There is no doubt however, despite the limitations of such programs that many established services such as community health centres emerged from these programs and certainly the development of Australian contemporary community development practice was assisted by the AAP. It enabled the claims of many groups for recognition by the state to be heard and at least partly responded to. For example, women's refuges were funded after sustained social action from women forced government's to acknowledge there was a need for such programs.

There is no doubt that such claims were both made and responded to with increasing frequency throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Both the Fraser and the Hawke governments from 1976 onwards funded many community based programs in community health, unemployment, youth services, housing, disability, community law, community education and information, and women's issues. Service delivery was undertaken primarily by those with social work and welfare work qualifications. As the predominant forms of 'professional' practice both were under fire throughout this period as agents of social control and there was a growing pressure on practitioners to adopt a more activist and critical perspective to their work. At this time, an unfortunate dichotomy began to emerge which has continued to this day. It consisted of the argument that the site for radical social change was to be found in community work, whilst any work with individuals was by definition social control and not contributing to broader social change or challenging societal structures.

The 1970s witnessed the emergence of a plethora of causes which struggled to achieve recognition from government. Fraser (1989), in her important work, Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory, analyses the processes involved in what she describes as the "politics of needs". She sees three important struggles for those seeking to establish claims on the state and they are very much about discursive practices and
the meanings attached to key terms. The first is the struggle to establish that the need is one that should be of political concern; the second is one over interpretation of the need and finally, there is a struggle over the form and extent of provision to satisfy the need. She defines these three struggles as active practice; as acts and interventions by groups with unequal resources to establish the legitimacy of their claims and to challenge those with hegemonic power (Fraser, 1989:164-166). Some of the most progressive and creative forms of community development have emerged from such struggles undertaken by many movements including environmental and feminist activists. The oppositional discourse from social movements can profoundly challenge and modify hegemonic interpretations and create new discourse.

Fraser notes that the social is the arena where conflict over needs occurs and that the struggle over recognition of claims to be acknowledged in the political arena must be won before public provision is provided (1989:170-171). With public provision of services, comes a number of dilemmas for community development practitioners. The need becomes a service, decontextualized and removed from oppositional meanings and those who were once activists in political movements become clients of the service. In the Australian context, there have been a number of examples of self help activist groups in the 1970s and 1980s who have faced a crisis of legitimacy once they have received funding. Once fellow activists now became the paid co-ordinators and workers - the experts able to define the need and called on for advice from government. Other activists became service users.

Community development was practiced often by 'untrained' workers, but was not as explicitly acknowledged as occurs today (no doubt partly due to the introduction of formal training courses in community development from 1988). Both funding and accountability arrangements were often inadequate and organisations that received funding were more bound to the state. However, there was some room for manoeuvre and there is no doubt that pockets of creative community development practice were able to flourish in the funded sector. There are many who argue that the real site for progressive community development practice has always been within social movements as the originators of most of these claims for recognition from the state of major contemporary social and environmental issues of concern. Feminists and many other activists adopted the phrase, the 'personal is political' and sought to practice consciousness raising and social action.

Innovation in practice and new forms of organising have emerged in the decades since the 1960s. Much of this innovation owes its origins to the grassroots and small scale nature of
many groups. Many emerged from a common concern or need expressed by *communities* (that is people experiencing similar issues in their lives) who have joined forces to share experiences and from that the process of collective solidarity and empowerment has created an environment in which creativity and passion have combined to produce significant social change for many communities.

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s community development began to be associated with new left thinking that suggested local struggles could form the basis of a new attack on capitalism and the beginnings of socialist resistance. However, there has been an ongoing debate about the extent to which fundamental structural change can result from community development practice. Marxist perspectives have argued that community development practice 'within the system', i.e. the welfare state, is caught in a fundamental dilemma, because it is unable to 'bite the hand' that feeds it lest it loses its funding. Others have taken a more strategic view arguing that it is possible to work 'in and against the state' by both accepting government funding, yet practising in radical ways to promote social change (Kenny, 1994: 85-91). The funding by submission approach developed by government from the 1970s had its problems but compared to the current approach of competitive tendering it enabled organisations to define their work from a progressive value base, to utilise and adapt community development strategies in innovative ways in relation to different situations, communities and struggles. There was often sufficient worker autonomy to enable practitioners to integrate community development strategies into all levels of practice- individual, group and broader community. The small scale nature of many organisations was a reflection of diversity- of ideas, practice and values. Many were also under resourced and lacked the organisational support required. Many effective networks of workers emerged at regional and state levels to both provide support for small, local groups and to push the broader policy and political agendas of the groups to ensure a more effective voice. Government even funded a number of these networks or coalitions. This process, in retrospect stands in stark contrast to the situation today where such coalitions have long since been defunded. Under the guise of spending less dollars more wisely on services, government has been able to remove networks of organised and well informed practitioners and groups working collaboratively at both a practice level and a political level.

This latest challenge to community development reflects broader processes that have underpinned the decline of the Keynesian inspired welfare state model dominant since the 1960s. Enterprise culture has been used both as the diagnostic tool and the medicine to 'cure'
the ills associated with the welfare state. As has been argued above, the decline in the impetus for collective provision of services delivered and/or funded by the state has resulted from both problems associated with the model itself and a sustained attack from neo conservatives who argued that such provision was a threat to individual liberty and that the market could satisfy individual needs more efficiently. Culpitt notes (1992:184) that such critiques dovetailed with left critiques that criticised welfare state policies and programs to justify a reduced role for government and bureaucracy. Advocates of more anarchistic forms of community development (including some within the green and feminist movements) have long advocated decentralisation of the state and greater autonomy for both individuals and groups as a means of promoting social change. Critical left perspectives within community development, largely derived from sociology (see Kenny, 1995), along with feminist and more recently green perspectives, have all expressed suspicion about the role of the state arguing variously that it is a form of social control, an expression of patriarchal capitalism and an unresponsive instrument of repression hamstrung by its role of protecting the interests of the economic and political elite. The anarchist origins of community development in social movements live on today in a myriad of causes including the environment, the rights of women, gays, lesbians, and the disabled. Advocates of more anarchistic forms of community development (including some within the green and feminist movements) have long advocated decentralisation of the state and greater autonomy for both individuals and groups as a means of promoting social change. However, the catch 22 involved in taking state funding has always served to mute the effectiveness of community development to critique and push for social change. None of the major social movements that emerged from the 1960s onwards has been immune from the double edged sword of accountability to the state and the provision of dollars to develop programs.

Theoretical underpinnings

The purpose of theory in the context of this research is seen to consist of three interconnected parts. Firstly, it offers an explanation of the world around us and our own reality and experiences. For example, each has its own reasons for poverty or environmental degradation and an underlying world view which serves to rationalise and contextualise such analysis. Secondly, each has some conception of an ideal world, an alternative that would see the end of social and other forms of inequality. Finally, each specifies appropriate strategies to enable the achievement of this ideal and sometimes even nominates the principal agents of such change.
As is evident from the brief discussion above, community development has been influenced in its contemporary development by diverse and at times, conflicting social theories. The term has been applied to a range of activities and practices employed by those with power and the powerless. It has been coopted by the state at various times, yet remains for many who practice it a powerful tool for challenging the power of the state and those who support it. It has had many claims and counter claims as to its efficacy placed at its door. As was established in the previous chapter on critical discourse analysis, it is as open as any term to use and abuse- its meaning always circumscribed by the values and ideology of those who claim to practice it. Community development perspectives are best understood as different ways of interpreting and applying its key strategies and the ends that are sought from their employment. Community development can be a form of practice that empowers or disempowers a group of people. It can contribute to a process of social change and it can also hinder that process. The key question is in whose hands is definition of the term and its application in practice? What do they stand for and what is influencing the way they define their work? Community development has evolved, as has been shown, from diverse origins that reflect a range of world views. The connection between theory and practice has been a source of a great deal of discussion and reflection in writings on community development (Kenny, 1994:54).

The predominant usage of the term community development amongst practitioners since the 1980s has been influenced by a range of perspectives- no one approach has been or is pre-eminent. This has meant that practitioners particularly in paid employment have been mindful of their relationship to the state in developing their practice. One notable characteristic of community development practitioners is their ability to utilise strategies that reflect their reading of the political situation. The recent onslaught of enterprise culture is just the latest, although definitely most pressing challenge faced by workers. A difference in practice emerges in terms of the degree to which individual workers are prepared to challenge dominant interests, policies and practices and the strategies they deem most appropriate. Thus, whilst most would no doubt ascribe to the ultimate aims of collective empowerment, social justice and greater equality, there would be a parting of the ways in terms of the important question of where to focus social change strategies.

Those in paid employment face immediate dilemmas because invariably the funding body will be emphasising perspectives that do not involve challenges of this sort. Thus government departments have reflected liberalist or pluralist perspectives that seek to employ some of the
strategies of community development in forms that do not challenge hegemony and in fact seek to often reinforce it. The skill in community development practice has always been in the ability to exploit one's autonomy in order to develop more radical and challenging responses to the issue at hand. The perspectives that have had most influence on the development of this primary skill of community development are the Marxist, feminist, and anarchist traditions. Each has contributed substantially to the theory informing practice. Enterprise culture represents an immense challenge to each perspective and its theoretical base. To remain relevant to community development, there is an urgent need for a recontextualising of each to reflect changed realities.

The struggle to variously apply Marxist, feminist and anarchist perspectives to community development has been in the context of its relationship with the Keynesian/pluralist welfare state and centralised funding of a non-government sector. Community development as a form of practice within the welfare state faces the same dilemmas as other human service disciplines such as social work. Whilst much of the theoretical basis of community development practice has been informed by Marxist, feminist and anarchist perspectives, practitioners have had to be prepared to work within a predominantly pluralist perspective that emphasises working with and within the state constructs to promote limited forms of participation, and an equality of opportunity view of social justice. No doubt numbers of practitioners have been prepared to work within this incrementalist perspective. The practice issues have been perceived as constrained by the system of funding and strategies are selected that are acceptable to funding bodies. One of the criticisms levelled at community development (Kenny, 1994:258) as a form of practice within the welfare state has been that broader social, political and economic structures are not challenged because of the predominance of the pluralist perspective that identifies the main cause of social inequality to be a lack of access to critical resources such as information and services such as education. For pluralists, the provision of such services and information with state funding is seen to ameliorate the inequality of opportunity. The issue with the state for pluralist practitioners has been more concerned with levels of funding and security of funding. This essentially welfare state consensus perspective has been jolted by the sudden change to the rules brought about by enterprise culture - the game is no longer played the same way. As has been argued earlier, enterprise culture, imbibed as it is with liberalist ideology explicitly critiques the welfare state and offers a very different world view to explain issues such as poverty and nominates strategies and policies that reflect its individualist, competitive and capitalist connections. As these strategies and policies take hold in social policy formulation and implementation,
enterprise culture and its manifestations will redefine the context and reshape the paradigm within which a great deal of community development practice occurs.

The discourse of community development: praxis for an 'ideal(ised)' world?

Practitioners' views of community development

Certain core values, strategies and approaches appear to be central to community development practice. Salamanca, Dixon and Kelly (1995:18) in their study, *Images of Community Development*, identified the following themes from the responses:

i) community participation and control/self determination,

ii) collectivity and group empowerment,

iii) individual empowerment,

iv) social justice and access and equity,

v) social and political change.

Three of these themes—social change, community and participation provide an illustration of some of the aspirations of the practitioners who were part of this research and the issues they confront in endeavouring to engage in praxis.

Working for social and political change:

An important component of community development that has been the subject of enduring debate concerns the most effective focus of practice that will promote social change—the individual or broader community. Such dualism reflects thinking from the seventies that declared that all work with individuals is a form of social control and that all community work (development) promotes social change. Whilst the contemporary debate has seen a moderation of such generalised and incorrect claims, vestiges still remain. A more integrated approach has emerged from this contemporary debate that has enabled practitioners to acknowledge that effective practice often begins with the needs of an individual and that a range of strategies are required at a number of levels—individual, organisational and structural as part of their work for social change. Important strategies that underpin practice include consciousness raising, social action, participation, self help and advocacy.
The practice of community development involves a blending of idealism and pragmatism. In defining the distinguishing characteristics of community development, it is important to recognize the ideals that motivate and inspire because it is often these ideals that can throw up dilemmas for practitioners in terms of their responses to enterprise culture. The practitioners interviewed for this study were quite clear about their own motivation and rationale for engaging in community development practice. Dan, for example, believes it is based on the promise of an 'ideal' world where,

\[
\text{everyone is treated with respect and dignity and is able to participate to develop their full potential, to live lives that have value and meaning. All the divisions like race and gender that disempower people are removed.}
\]

Community development is seen by Dan as contributing to the achievement of that ideal in a variety of ways,

\[
\text{(it) is the mechanism and the philosophy and the processes that get you from here to there...it's about changing values, ideas and attitudes through a certain way of practice to work towards that ideal...I see two models, one where society is functioning very poorly, benefits some people and I see another model where everyone is treated fairly.}
\]

Janis identifies two aspects to her ideal- no capitalism and full self determination which would include an ideal community that she defines as follows,

\[
\text{where we as a community completely determine what happens with our local services, that our local governments are fully representative and collaborating totally with local communities towards all the decision making that happens...a very participative collaborative thing where the community owns the resources.}
\]

The emphasis on replacing capitalism as part of her ideal world is explained by Janis as being necessary because,
to me capitalism represents all that inequity between groups and also the whole class issue of income and wealth distribution and I see community development giving us the tools and the practice and the strategies to enable us to get to that goal.

Tracy centres on the ideal outcomes she would like to think community development was capable of achieving,

*I think about the ability to actually affect change. You might see the dilemma, see how it is impacting on people, know how to go about changing it, but every system that is in place thwarts that. I think ... a dream would be identify a problem, seek a solution, put it in place and not have the problem again and that would be my dream...if you can keep things simple it is sometimes achievable.*

Trish has an extensive activist background and feels that a more appropriate term is community organising because community development is increasingly being used by government and business and has lost the politics it had and should have.

*I think as community development workers or community organisers our role is not to organise stuff on behalf of people but a lot of us do have skills in how do you run a campaign or strategic thinking- how to critique and pull apart an issue. Perhaps it is about bringing people together, encouraging people to critically reflect, you know the Freire stuff, consciousness raising and critical dialogue.*

Janis saw the ideal of community development in terms of prefigurative practice,

*community development as a way of empowering (people)...and learning skills and working towards self reliance.*

In terms of their ideological base, all the practitioners interviewed for this research emphasised social justice as a universal goal to reverse the impact of prevailing economic,
political and social structures such as capitalism on people's lives. In terms of strategy, activist notions of consciousness raising and advocacy are often stressed and some of the slogans that might accompany them are 'the personal is political' and 'action for a change'.

There is a sense of challenge, of confronting those with power, but also a strong commitment to working in partnership with those experiencing disempowerment, denial of rights and lack of access to needed resources to live fulfilling lives. Community development is thus portrayed as both a vision and a praxis - a way of linking and integrating such visions into relevant on the ground activism to achieve progressive social change.

Kenny (1996) has conceptualised this approach as an activist model. It incorporates concerns with social justice and political economy. The activist model emphasises self determination, rights discourse, decentralisation of power and responsibility and concepts of mutuality, democracy and empowerment. She notes a dynamic of exclusion that can arise in activist groups as individuals and cliques can assume control and exclude and/or marginalise other viewpoints. (Kenny, 1996:9) This latter issue has been a long-standing concern of many practitioners because it highlights the potentially problematic nature of their relationship with people they are engaged with. They are in a position of relative 'power over' in terms of resources, information, status and authority and the use of consciousness raising and similar strategies can serve to privilege particular perspectives and experiences. Such processes can serve to reinforce the worker's perspective as the "right" answer.

The notion of 'community'

Young (1990) has voiced another dilemma of relevance to both this study and the practice of those interviewed. Her concern is that a notion of 'community' as some idealised goal is problematic. She argues,

those motivated by it will tend to suppress differences among themselves or implicitly to exclude from their political groups persons with whom they do not identify. The vision of small, face-to-face, decentralized units that this ideal promotes, moreover, is an unrealistic vision for transformative politics in mass urban society (Young, 1990:300).
Thus, the desire for solidarity and unity can lead to exclusion and marginalisation that this process can be reflected in the dominant discourse within small communities. For her, large urban environments often can provide the time and space for difference to flourish (Young, 1990:300). These comments are particularly pertinent to the earlier discussion about the anarchist, decentralised decision making emphasis that has flavoured much community development. It adds to the ongoing debate about the relative role of the state and the balance between centralised and decentralised structures of decision making. The promotion of participation of those excluded from dominant structures and discourse has underpinned much community development and has been a crucial strategy in the promotion of empowerment.

Participation

Practitioners interviewed as part of this study reinforced the findings of Salamanca et al (1995). For example, Tracy and Jocelyn viewed participation as a core strategy symbolising a commitment to community development,

_ used a lot within this centre about how...people participate and to what depth and to what degree do they participate...how to make it more open to participation; it's part of the parcel of the core of this place (Tracy)._

For Jocelyn, participation and empowerment underpin the practice of her agency,

_participation....we use that all the time, next to empowerment and that is about all levels of the organisation, staff, volunteers, service users._

Dan and Joe both linked it to a broader social justice framework. Thus for Dan, it is a core strategy emerging from an,

_underlying philosophy of some sense of social justice, participation and democracy._
Joe referred to a meaning often applied to participation in community development settings when he cited examples of promoting greater involvement of service users in the life of the organisation,

we believe that in the wider picture our service users should be able to participate in decision making and we will encourage people and talk to them about it...on the back of our exit surveys there is a list of things of how they can participate in this organisation....anything we do though the office.....is driven by those four elements of social justice (participation, access, equity and rights)

Irene and Kate both view participation as part of the organisational culture that is an essential ingredient with their own agencies if community development is to flourish. Irene saw it as part of her process of working with others,

participation relates very strongly to communication because if you don't know what's going on or if you haven't informed people then it's very hard for them to participate.

Kate noted its impact of the organisational culture of her agency,

consumer participation in the management ....takes a lot of time but it has been part of the culture that has been operating...... for a long time...

Such commitments to participation need to be seen in the context of Young's post-modern critique (1990) and earlier work by Repo (1977) and others that structures, organisations and processes established with the aim of empowering those on the margins of society can replicate dominant structures of discourse and social practice. Repo (1977) identified how middle class interests can take over attempts to promote community participation and feminists point to the impact of patriarchy on the forms of participation that develop.

Armstein (1971) noted that there were up to eight uses of the term participation. Importantly, her key observation was that it was who was able to control the meaning of the term and its practice that determined the outcomes. Her concern was that state sanctioned forms of
participation amounted to little more than social control: a means of silencing critics and ensuring the agenda of the power holders is enacted. At the top of her ladder of citizen participation sits citizen control which connotes control over the agenda, the resources and decision making. This framework, if applied to the organisational dynamics and the work of community development practitioners suggests a need for clarity of meaning of the term when applied to practice. For example, forms of participation promoted by community development practitioners are often state sanctioned or circumscribed by agency requirements. Where on the ladder of citizen participation do such forms sit? Within social movements themselves the question of who is really participating in key decisions and who is excluded is crucially important. Often, there are informal or unspoken rules and processes for ensuring a dominant view is adopted and other dissenting views are silenced.

Trish's experiences echo such sentiments, but also hold out the prospect of change in both discourse and practice within activism,

_The broad left are actually recognising that gender is a big issue and there are big issues about how organisations operate that exclude people on the basis of their gender and sexual preference. I think that's going to be one of the exciting things that will be happening in the community unfunded left network. I think that there has been some good organising where groups are being challenged on the basis of gender, cross gender, where the traditional left male groups are struggling really hard to see what their relevance is in society...I think the language is being critiqued in a much more constructive way._

Given such dilemmas, is it possible or even desirable to contemplate the achievement of citizen control involving an absolute devolution of power to the lowest level that includes power over resources, information and decision making. Is it possible to achieve this ideal? A view to be tentatively explored within this study and open to further study is the potential of building on Young's analysis and promoting notions of difference within a framework such as proposed by Arnstein.

The other problematic issue for this approach is the weight of the forces of the economy and the state that work against real citizen control. The increasing concentration of economic
power in the hands of larger and larger global corporations reduces even further the room for manoeuvring and prefiguring alternative forms of social organisation. A counter argument however, is that information technologies are opening up more accessible forms of information that have the potential to engage more people in alternative ideas and promote participation.

Community development, as a domain of practice constitutes a way of working to challenge dominant structures, values and practices (hegemony) to effect change, with an emphasis on access, equity, rights and participation. It is open to diverse interpretations, evident in the wide range of practices that go by the name. It has been effective in mobilising and organising people to express their own experiences with their own voice across ecological and social justice concerns. The cutting edge of practice has often to be found in the activist unfunded work of loose coalitions of individuals and groups who have worked creatively to bring a whole range of issues into the mainstream as part of the push for social change and recognition of rights. Practitioners have generally been paid through the agency of the welfare state and had to work to balance their own values and perspectives with the funding imperative that has tied agencies to the state. The dilemmas around key terms such as empowerment, participation and community are as real for practitioners whether they are paid or not. The sanctioning and active promotion by the state of enterprise culture poses even more demands on practitioners' skills given that it involves often the removal of explicit reference to community development in even its more sanitised versions.

The organisational context of community development practice:

The translation of theory into practice- the development of an effective praxis that reflects the progressive ideals alluded to in the previous discussion is always contingent on its context. The culture of an organisation emerged as a critical frame of reference especially in terms of the degree to which it nurtures a community development perspective. Jocelyn identified that her workplace,

*aims to work primarily with disadvantaged women in our community ... to provide a direct service, work directly one to one but to do that form an empowering position, ...to identify through that work causes of disadvantage in our community and .... to work to change those.*
Joe, when first interviewed, was very clear about the emphasis of the organisation he was employed by:

"We're funded to do 30% of our work as community education and community development. We interpret that to our own ways and certainly community development to us is trying to bring about social and systemic change in the issues that seriously affect our service users. We also have a thread of what we see as community development going through our casework ... we try to get our service users to do as much as they can themselves."

The concurrent emphasis on both individual and broader concerns is relevant because it highlights the integration of a range of strategies to respond to the needs of people. The organisational culture is also heavily influenced by the stance of the committee of management. Tracy reflected on the class and ethnic characteristics of her committee:

"I think the organisational culture is very middle class, anglo-celtic trying to be beneficial to the community it serves."

Frances found gender was an important determinant of the organisational culture she was part of:

"Being all women and working with women.....there was often very much more of a lightness and attempting to make time for other things and people doing a lot of things together"

One interesting aspect of organisational culture that emerged with some practitioners was their likening of it to a family. Frank, for example commented:

"There is a very strong organisational culture here. It is not all positive... and it is changing...the culture was always of the small organisation ...and it was very much a family we all know each other...some with more power than others and 'undiscussables' there were things you couldn't talk about"
He continues with a picture of a rapidly expanding organisation- a four-fold increase to over 100 staff in just eight years. Accompanying that expansion was a review of structures and more formal structures to deal with human resource issues and the establishment of a staff management consultative committee and a union presence was developed. This, according to Frank generated angst amongst those used to informal ways of working and access to decision making power. He noted the pivotal role of the chief executive officer in driving such change:

there were people in the organisation who were sycophantic about the organisation and what it stands for, but it has all changed and partly it has changed because Jim has seen it and he deals with it, not always in the way I'd want him to but at some point he says this is important to do now. He is a very important person in the organisation. It will be a very different kind of organisation when he is not there.

Continuing with the theme of family in defining organisational culture, Jocelyn noted that the organisational culture she operated within evolved:

out of its history as a neighbourhood house, its sense of being with and part of the community....the organisation is very complex, it is not just an organisation with a $600,000 a year budget, it is also an organisation with seven different programs and a lot of staff- 30 people on the payroll. There comes a point at which you need some skills to manage that. So the culture- it is a family culture. A culture where people use words like- I was hurt. One of the newer staff said to me the other day "if I hear someone say I'm disappointed one more time I'll scream"- I'm a mother and I say that to my child. Is that what we do in this workplace- and they do. It's a phenomenal culture.

Trish reflects on this changing organisational dynamic as well:

In the neighbourhood house, I think there is an organisational culture and it is a culture based on its old history. I don't think it has moved into the 90s from the 70s and it is a culture where the neighbourhood house is seen to be a place to drop in and make some friends. It hasn't really adopted a broader culture of there is perhaps more things that are needed in the community than
just a place to meet friends and have a cup of tea and go out to community lunches.

A number of issues emerge from these reflections. Community development has evolved as an organised activity that utilises structures of administration and decision making. However, a distrust of formality and structure which dates back to the 1970s has tended to produce organisations that rely on informality and smallness of scale to operate. In addition, modes of practice often reflect this tradition and workers' accountability is seen to be taken on trust by committees of management. However, as the scale and demands of practice have increased, practitioners (often influenced by their formal training in community development and related fields) have challenged such organisational cultures as witnessed in the stories of Jocelyn, Frank and Trish. The extent to which such organisational issues leave community development vulnerable to claims by enterprise culture for the need to adopt business ways of working as a way to resolve them is analysed in subsequent chapters. It is sufficient to note at this point that practitioners are themselves readily acknowledging shortcomings in the culture of their workplace. The picture of community development that emerges then is of a vibrant domain of creative and critical practitioners committed to progressive social change.

However, its praxis has always been somewhat problematic; with dilemmas around every corner in terms of discourse and practice. Whether as a prefigurative politics challenging hegemony or a pluralist adjunct to the welfare state its strengths are also its weaknesses. Diversity to some represents fragmentation to others, solidarity for some is denial of difference to others. In later chapters such dilemmas are revisited and a consolidation and integration of themes proposed in relation to the meanings and practice associated with terms such as 'empowerment', but first it is essential to gain some insight as to how practitioners who have gained their experience immersed in such debates and dilemmas have responded to what some might argue is the singularly biggest challenge of all - enterprise culture.
CHAPTER 4 THE RESEARCH FRAME: DISCOURSE AND HEGEMONY AS CONSTRUCTED MEANINGS

Methodology and interpretative framework

The methodology and interpretative framework developed for this research has been influenced by Fairclough's work (1989, 1992, 1995) on critical discourse analysis. The approach that has been adopted provides a useful and effective means of making sense of, and assessing the changes wrought by enterprise culture within the domain of community development through the eyes of sixteen practitioners. It provides the researcher with the ability to highlight the dynamics and tensions experienced by practitioners seeking to respond to paradigmatic changes such as those induced by enterprise culture. The discourse of practitioners has been analysed at two levels; firstly, in terms of language use and word meanings, and secondly, in relation to the way they describe their approach to community development practice and any changes that they perceive are occurring as a result of the impact of enterprise culture. The key questions that prompted the research were:

* what is the enterprise culture and the nature of its challenge to the community development domain?

* to what extent are community development practitioners who are part of this study absorbing and accommodating the processes, practices and ideology underpinning enterprise culture and still maintaining their commitment to community development as reflected through their discourse?

* what are the prospects for challenging enterprise culture? How might that challenge occur? Can community development prove resilient and in fact influence and/or challenge the language, practices and processes of enterprise culture?

* are new forms or models of community development practice likely to emerge from the dialectic of change occurring at the interface of the domain and enterprise culture?

The expected outcomes of the research were:

* a substantial survey of the community development field and current forms of practice,
* a clear perspective on the form of infiltration of the values and practice of the enterprise culture into community development practice,
* an assessment of the nature of the response from community development to this infiltration utilising an appropriate interpretative framework,
* an analysis of emerging forms of community development practice within the context of the enterprise culture.

The study is formative and does not seek to present its results as constituting generalised findings applicable to all in the domain of community development. However, the richness and texture of the material provided by the practitioners graphically portrays the pervasive nature of the changes upon their domain and their daily practice. The interpretative framework that has been developed provides a useful tool for consolidating the emerging threads of practitioner responses, is flexible enough to explain the apparent contradictions and ambiguities evident in those responses and to reveal that merged or hybridised responses are the predominant outcome.

Practitioners from a variety of settings illustrative of the range of community development discourse and practice were selected through a purposive or targeted sampling process in order to enable an empirical study of data related to the impact of the enterprise culture on community development. In all, sixteen practitioners were selected on the basis of their community development experience and current employment. Details of their backgrounds are provided in the Appendix. Part of the purposive sampling process was also to ensure that the broad spectrum of fields or sites of community development practice was reflected in the practitioners chosen. Their specific fields of practice included community and adult education, community health, local enterprise development, community action and social protest, overseas aid, community law, disability advocacy, welfare rights, financial counselling, community/neighbourhood houses and centres and women's housing. Examination of the language use of practitioners in order to ascertain broader trends occurring within community development forms the core of the methodology. Practitioners were interviewed twice, 12 months apart in order to reveal the extent to which there were any evident changes over time in their discursive practice and the possible causes of such changes. The first interview (conducted in November/December 1996) consisted of background questions regarding the organisational context and definitions of community development and a lexicon of 26 terms that practitioners were asked to reflect on in relation
to their meaning and currency of usage to describe elements of their daily practice and/or the context of that practice (see Appendix for a full outline of the interview schedule).

The lexicon provided the most detailed and illuminating data. Terms were selected after the literature review and from acquired knowledge of the domain of community development and enterprise culture. In order to ascertain the extent to which concepts associated with both constituted part of each practitioner's lexicon, terms that have meanings and origins derived discretely from each were chosen along with a number of others that have contested meanings. Thus within what I describe as the community development discursive cluster terms such as consciousness raising, social justice, social action, class, gender and activist were included. Similarly, terms popularised within the enterprise culture discursive cluster such as efficiency, business, market, competition, product, businesslike and customer were incorporated. As the literature review revealed that a number of terms including empowerment were open to contestation because they were in usage within both the discourse of community development and enterprise culture (see Crowther and Caldwell, 1991; Gee and Lankshear, 1995; Kenny, 1994), they were included as representative of the interface between the two.

Practitioners were also asked to reflect on the sources of any changes they were aware of within their practice. In particular, the funding arrangements within which their organisations operated and the degree of reliance on funding from the state were discussed in relation to such changes. The follow up interviews twelve months later, (in November/December 1997) sought to identify any developments that had occurred in the nature of their responses to enterprise culture as revealed through changes in their discursive practice and cross checking with their initial lexicon. These questions were more open ended, building on the themes developed from the practitioner's own experiences.

It was postulated that three possible scenarios might be evident when reviewing this data;
• Firstly, a contestation of meaning regarding the shared usage of terms (within different terms of reference) such as empowerment, participation, autonomy, collaboration, liberation championed by proponents of both enterprise culture and community development. A critical aspect within this scenario is to ascertain whether either of the meanings prevails in the discourse of practitioners or whether a merged discourse was appearing.

• Secondly, the absence or decline in usage of terms previously part of the lexicon of community development might suggest changes in practice. For example terms such as social action, social justice, social change and consciousness raising may come to be seen as outmoded or “too risky” in the current climate.

• Thirdly, the emergence of terms promoted by enterprise discourse such as business, enterprise, product, market, opportunity, and efficiency may indicate the extent of its infiltration into the domain of community development.

The interpretative framework that was developed sought to establish whether any or all of the above scenarios were occurring and the degree to which hybridised or merged forms of discourse were emerging. The framework was an outcome of the analysis of the transcripts of interview, and in particular the lexicon of usage. The framework which is presented diagrammatically below in Figure 4.1., conceives a continuum of discursive practice, from enterprise discourse to community development discourse (represented on the vertical axis). Thus, at one end of the continuum is located the discursive cluster surrounding enterprise culture including the usage of terms such as business, competition, market and product; whilst at the other sits the discursive cluster of community development with its key concepts such as social justice. In between are expressions of diversity- forms of hybridised discursive practice. The link to practice is expressed in the horizontal axis which has pre-existing forms of practice at one end of a continuum and altered forms of practice at the other. These ends of the continuum are seen to represent those ways of working employed by practitioners prior to the introduction of enterprise culture into their setting in the former and a complete alteration of practice as a result of the impact of enterprise culture is absorbed in the latter case. Similar
to the discursive axis, the space in between reflects hybridised forms of practice. Indicators for each are based on the assessment of each practitioner regarding the degree to which their practice has altered, or is altering.

Figure 4.1.-

Interpretive Framework (1)-
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Altered forms of practice

Enterprise culture discursive cluster

This interpretative framework also allows for the contextualising of the emergent responses to enterprise discourse from within the domain. It is suggested that the following forms of response may be evident amongst practitioners, in disparate, diffuse and sometimes coexisting configurations. These responses which are explicated in Chapter 5 are:

- strategic embrace,

- hegemonic embrace (can appear as a complicit or compelled embrace),

- overt rejection.

They are incorporated into the interpretative framework (Figure 4.2. below) and findings based on it are included in Chapter 6.
Figure 4.2.

Interpretive Framework (2)
The Relationship between discourse and practice

Outline of Critical Discourse

In seeking to make sense of the myriad of changes that have accompanied the infiltration of enterprise culture into domains such as community development, this research builds on the work of Fairclough (1988, 1992, 1995). He has advocated the investigation of such trends through the employment of what he terms critical discourse analysis based on a social theory of discourse. According to Fairclough, discourse can be defined as

spoken or written language use, ... semiotic practice ... such as ... non verbal communication. But in referring to language use as discourse, I am signalling a wish to investigate it in a social-theoretically informed way, as a form of social practice (Fairclough, 1995:131).

The implications of viewing language use as social practice are that it is a mode of action that is always in a dialectical relationship with its social context - a dynamic process that is both
shaped by this context but also contributing to its form, meaning and content. Critical discourse analysis can be utilised to explore the tension between the two, to examine the ways in which language use socially shapes social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge. Fairclough notes that language use can mirror convention, but it can also contribute to social change in creative ways. He argues, however, that conceptualising language use as socially shaped does not infer that the processes by which this occurs are monolithic or mechanistic. The reality is that a range of discursive practices (often competing, contrasting and coexisting) are sustained in societies and institutions. There is a complex relationship between discursive events and the conventions or orders of discourse that underlie them (Fairclough, 1995:131). He further categorises types of discursive practice (elements of orders of discourse) as discourses (signifying areas of experience from a particular perspective such as feminist) and genres (language use associated with a socially ratified activity such as an interview) (Fairclough, 1995:132).

One of the other uses of critical discourse analysis relevant to this research is that it sets out to,

makes visible through analysis and to criticise, connections between properties of texts and social processes and relations (ideologies, power relations) which are generally not obvious to people who produce and interpret those texts, and whose effectiveness depends upon this opacity (Fairclough, 1995:97).

This linking of discourse to wider patterns of social reality reflected in institutions, relationships and work enables exploration of the changes wrought by enterprise culture at all levels of society as a piece of cultural engineering seeking to establish 'restructured' hegemonies. Hegemony can be taken to mean the adoption of discourse and practices promoted by dominant social forces. Discursive practice can therefore provide insights into the extent to which enterprise culture as hegemony is gaining ascendancy across domains and an indicator of the struggle over meanings and practice. This conceptualisation of changes in discursive practice within a domain such as community development as indicative of the transformation more generally of practices and social and power relations underpins the
interpretative framework that has been devised for this research. It is hoped that documenting the *processes of transformation* and the *forms of response* to enterprise culture will prompt examination of the broader impacts on social and power relations within society of adopting the enterprise culture (Fairclough, 1995:77). Fairclough argues that each discursive event works ideologically and as such contributes to the reproduction of relations of power (Fairclough, 1995:18). Hegemonic struggle takes place within discourse and stakes include, 

the structuring of the orders of discourse as well as other dimensions of hegemonies ... accounts of social change need to give more serious attention to discourse than they have in the past, and to the question of how discursive change relates (instantiates, constitutes or reflects) to social and cultural change... Social and cultural changes are largely changes in discursive practices (Fairclough, 1995:96).

Hegemony involves the integration of opposing views and practices, not just their marginalisation. This process of integration can take the form of contesting the discursive meaning of key terms within a domain such as empowerment and remoulding them to reflect the dominant meaning and to effect change, and gain 'consent' and complicity to the broader changes that follow. Enterprise culture provides a good example of one such 'hegemonic instrument'. Fairclough also highlights however the fact that hegemony is never complete, it is never stable and there are always points of resistance within society. (1995:92) Thus, one might expect to find hybridised forms of enterprise culture embraced to varying degrees across different sites. Purvis and Hunt (1993) in a valuable review of the relationship between discourse and ideology suggest that it is the connection with 'systems of domination' that make discourses ideological. In terms of the research at hand, these *systems of domination* are identified as the features of enterprise culture. A central question underpinning this research is whether the state through its funding and policy control is promoting a hegemonic embrace of enterprise culture by workers and their organisations within those fields where community development as a form of practice has existed. The use of the term hegemony in this context is intended to connote dominant discourse, practices, policies and structures with the former seen as the vanguard promoting and sustaining the latter. The link between enterprise discourse and the subsequent adoption of practices, policies and structures it advocates is explained by Hall in his examination of Thatcherism and the links between ideology and discourse,
the whole discourse of Thatcherism combines ideological elements into a discursive chain in such a way that the logic or unity of the disclosure depends on the subject addressed assuming a number of specific subject positions. (Hall, 1988:49)

Changed priorities in government funding, new criteria for funding, eg output based, tendering out and 'competition', benchmarking and customer service are some of the catch cries of these new and changing realities. The idea of a discursive chain referred to above is therefore relevant to this research because the logic behind competitive tendering is designed to ensure the progressive adoption of all these aspects of enterprise culture. Two key processes by which enterprise culture and its attendant values, practices and discourse have risen to such contemporary prominence are the technologisation and commodification of discourse. Fairclough defines the technologization of discourse as

the process of intervention in the sphere of discourse practices with the objective of constructing a new hegemony in the order of discourse of the institution or organisation concerned, as part of a more general struggle to impose restructured hegemonies in institutional practices and culture (Fairclough, 1995:102)

Discourse technologists provide a standardised training in the new hegemony in the guise of 'value free' and generally applicable skills and principles of communication and commercial enterprise operation. These skills and principles include managerial skills, business plans and workplace structures. Workers are expected through this training to absorb, accept and even enthuse about the impact of such changes on their work, which as a matter of course is redefined in terms of this discourse. Thus, the 'new and changing realities' are seen to require the practitioners of community development to embrace enterprise discourse and apply them particularly in their dealings with their 'customers'. Thus, the technologisation of discourse involves the sweeping introduction of such standardised formulae characterised by the discursive practices of enterprise culture. Thus,
organisations...like the social services and even the arts......are being drawn into commercial and consumerist modes of operation (and) are under pressure to transform their organisational practices and 'cultures' in this direction, undertaking in many cases systematic strategies of training and other forms of intervention to achieve these ends (Fairclough, 1995:101).

Enterprise culture can therefore be understood in this context as a process of organisational transformation. Whole systems and institutions in education, the arts and community services (not to mention their workers and those who make use of them) are 'drawn in' to the vortex of enterprise culture through this dynamic—primarily through the funding framework controlled by the state. The state, therefore, has a key role to play in sponsoring the spread of enterprise culture in its various manifestations.

In terms of analysing the challenge presented by enterprise culture, there are many words that have come to be synonymous with such changes. Two that have become catchcries of enterprise culture devotees are enterprise and empowerment. An examination of how the meanings of both have been 'captured' and the role of discourse technologists in the dissemination of these meanings serves to illustrate the importance of reshaping discourse as an integral component of organisational and institutional transformation to the 'world' of business.

Enterprise: constructed meaning and hegemony

Discursive practices associated with the term enterprise provide a useful case study in the "claiming" of key terms to assist in establishing hegemony across and within key institutions and domains. Extensive use of the term has developed since it was popularised in the United Kingdom by Lord Young of Graffham (Secretary of State in successive Conservative Governments). Fairclough (1989 & 1995) notes that it has three senses as a non count noun,
1. 'Engagement in bold, arduous or momentous undertakings'

2. 'Disposition or readiness to engage in undertakings of difficulty, risk or danger; daring spirit'

3. (In colocation with 'private' or 'free') 'private business' as a collective noun (1989:113).

He argues that these three can be referred to as the 'activity', 'quality' (as in personal quality) and 'business' senses (1989:113). The 1989 OECD Report, *Towards an Enterprising Culture*, identified two approaches to enterprise. Firstly, what it termed a 'narrow' definition of the term merely defining business entrepreneurship and secondly, a broader definition that encapsulates a set of qualities and competencies that enable individuals, organisations, communities and societies to be flexible, creative and adaptable in the face of change.

Ball (1988:3-4), in reviewing the literature on the meaning of enterprise concluded also that there were two schools of thought. The first he described as the economy school (the OECD's narrow definition) which equates enterprise with entrepreneurship, risk taking, skills and cash rewards and the second, the education school, encapsulates the broader definition of the OECD- to be creative, imaginative, taking responsibility, organising, making decisions and dealing with others. He notes that enterprise skills are designed to promote independent action, in relation to both the labour market other settings.

The promotion of enterprise culture in Australia has privileged the narrow definition championed by the economy school- essentially limiting its meaning to that which serves to reinforce enterprise culture. This definition has been particularly significant in shaping educational discourse. In terms of the earlier discussion about the technologisation of discourse, it is insightful to examine how *intertextuality* serves to consolidate the standardised formula of enterprise culture. Two influential educational publications in the burgeoning field of 'enterprise studies'- the Victorian Certificate of Education Study Guide for the unit 'Industry and Enterprise Studies' (1996:9) produced by the Board of Studies and *Approaches to*
Enterprise Education (1993:13) produced by the Curriculum Corporation as part of the Vocational Education in Schools Project for the Commonwealth Government initially suggest that such studies seek to equip students with a set of attitudes and skills to cope with change and risk. Having briefly flirted with the broader definition of the term enterprise, both texts then proceed to narrowly apply the term in a curriculum and practical context to the ability to run a small business- to be entrepreneurial in a capitalist sense. Needless to say, there are no examples of co-operatives or not for profit organisations that utilise the characteristics deemed to define enterprise. In terms of Fairclough’s framework of the meanings of enterprise, the activity and quality senses of the word have been applied in practice exclusively to the third meaning -that is private business.

Manifest intertextuality refers to the explicit use of other texts to form the basis of a text- in particular the adoption of ideas to new settings. Thus, the pattern of privileging a narrow economy school definition of enterprise as the basis for the entire education system in Australia reflects similar developments in Britain a decade earlier. It is important to remember that the education system was noted earlier as a prime target of enterprise culture because it was perceived to be a source of anti enterprise sentiment. This illustrates one of the key themes of this research that the whole push towards enterprise discourse is, in part directed toward reasserting and reinvigorating capitalism after the 1980s crash- redecorating it with a fresh coat of paint. Enterprise culture and its promotion became the cause celebre of education and the state.

Crowther and Caldwell (1991) in The Entrepreneurial School, argue that a culture of entrepreneurship or enterprise is the solution for ensuring that Australia can deal with its economic, cultural and environmental challenges. Schools are a focus for the development of this culture because they have too often been anti entrepreneurial and they are well placed to,

nurture the type of culture in which initiative, ingenuity and experimentation can be developed (Crowther and Caldwell,1991:8)
They bemoan the fact that we have neglected the history of innovation and enterprise to be found in white Australia. This raises interesting questions about the 60,000 plus years of black history, associated heritage and undoubted use of enterprise to flourish across the continent. They argue that Australians should replace the negative public images of entrepreneurship of the 1980s (‘money shuffling’, ‘a consuming concern for personal wealth at the expense of community welfare’) with positive qualities (‘self direction’, ‘self reliance’, ‘ingenuity’ and ‘initiative’). (Crowther & Caldwell, 1991:8) In yet another example of intertextuality, they make use of the term entrepreneurship (which equates with the narrow economy school definition of enterprise) drawing on definitions derived from the management theorists, Drucker and Peters and the Harvard Business School.

Within the text, the colonisation of education discourse by enterprise culture is also illustrated. Educationalists throughout the book relate to their vocation in enterprise discourse. Strategies such as participation are now claimed by the authors as prime examples of entrepreneurialism. The use of terms such as school as community have origins in the democratic traditions of collectivism, yet are claimed by Cahill to belong to an alternative entrepreneurial perspective (Cahill, 1991:1991:18). The work and challenges faced by educators are throughout the text recontextualized as examples of entrepreneurialism, with the use and application of words with other origins and meanings. The rich history of education discourse, its underlying values and strategies are marginalised or put to the service of enterprise discourse.

Placing this discussion in a broader context, Selden (1991:62) notes that enterprise discourse has been appropriated by the values of entrepreneurialism.

*The general human qualities of enterprise have been reinscribed in a specific narrow economic discourse.*

Similarly, McDonald and Coffield (1991:39) suggest that the word enterprise has essentially been used as a "front" to promote an American style capitalism with minimal government
intervention based on a mix of social authoritarianism and neo liberal economics. They note (1991:29-30) four conceptual and definitional problems with the use of the term enterprise:

- the variety of skills eg, creativity, leadership, that are variously ascribed to denote the term, are loosely applied and packaged in the language of education,

- a number of the characteristics ascribed to enterprise have been "borrowed" from psychology and simplified, decontextualized and invested with a significance and power which few psychologists would be prepared to support. (1991:29-30)

- the lack of a specific context for skills such as capability render them as meaningless in terms of describing individual attributes,

- Fourthly and importantly, in studying the impact of local enterprise schemes in the United Kingdom, they found that enterprise was seen as an individual attribute to be acquired by young enterprising entrepreneurs who could then run their own business regardless of local economic conditions and structural factors. Their extensive review found there was no convincing evidence that such schemes have been effective and yet they were often expanded without the evaluations normally required in an age of accountability and value for money. (McDonald and Coffield, 1991:29-30)

In a highly relevant and timely analysis, Gee and Lankshear (1991) discuss why contestations over meanings of terms such as enterprise is so relevant,

different meanings of terms got connected to larger discursive systems and related social identities. Socially contested words get caught up with different discourses- different ways of being in the world, different ways of life, different integrations of words.......arguments over such socially contested words are what lead to the adoption of social beliefs and the theories behind them, and
These theories and beliefs lead to social action and the maintenance and creation of social worlds (1991:11).

Their argument is that the use of words that have meaning and attraction across a range of domains to transform ideological visions into reality raises the real prospect of cooption to other agendas, the loss of visions derived from different values and ideologies. Fairclough (1991) has argued that each discursive act can tell us a great deal about the processes through which hegemonic patterns are established. Self directed learning is another term much used in texts such as *The Entrepreneurial School*. Associated notions of autonomous and empowered learners are also used frequently. Gee and Lankshear (1991:14) argue that in fact the stronger linking of education to both industry driven outcomes and private enterprise ideology constrains the meaning of terms such as self directed learning, autonomy and empowerment to the meeting of,

*external standards and contexts such as organisation bottom lines, production schedules, corporate goals* (1991:13).

They argue this meaning is about heteronomy: a willingness to accept externally imposed directions and directives for learning. Education is primarily seen as a conduit for the transmission of a narrow set of values derived from private enterprise. However, the ideas are put across as "common sense" and ideologically neutral. The narrow meaning of enterprise therefore underpins and forms an integral part of the political project (outlined in Chapter 2) to transform key public institutions and policies to reflect an individualist and competitive ideological stance. It is reflective of a series of tendencies in political discourse promoted by 'economic rationalists' aimed at enshrining a market based morality. These tendencies have meant that,

*Social values and policies are increasingly measured against their economic viability and potential contribution to national economic efficiency* (Beeson, 1995:26).
The harnessing of public resources to the cause of private enterprise has involved a recasting of the role of the state as a promoter of enterprise discourse in all domains and a recontextualizing and restructuring of the relationship between the state and the citizen, in particular the young. Thus,

_The inculcation of new enterprise values is likely to provide the greatest return on the community's investment in its young. Teachers and educators are to be the principal agents in the promotion of the new mindset, especially if they are encouraged to understand the value of enterprise to Australia's wealth by teaching the fundamentals of the business system. The intention is that the culture of enterprise should be systematically 'threaded through the entire socialisation process' (Becson, 1995:26)._ 

The meanings of enterprise identified by Fairclough (see above) have been manipulated in such a way as to subsume the first two meanings dealing with quality and activity under the third—the business sense. In terms of hegemony this is extremely powerful because private enterprise is privileged as the pinnacle of achievement and endeavour in our society. It is the point of comparison, the font of wisdom and the primary source of our values as a society. The texts such as those described above eulogise examples of entrepreneurship as the salvation of our nation. These works constitute a prime example of the work of discourse technologists whose brief is to provide the training in the new hegemony in the guise of 'value free' and generally applicable skills and principles of communication and commercial enterprise operation.

This discussion on enterprise reveals the process of commodification sponsored and promoted by the state and disseminated through the work of discourse technologists. Domains such as community development with a history of discourses and practices that reflect a different origin and ideological base, are apart from fleeting references, marginalised and silenced. They certainly do not appear in such texts as the showcase examples of enterprise. Given these narrow definitions increasingly form the basis of the education our young receive, it is possible that they may not be introduced to the many important historical and contemporary examples of enterprise in non capitalistic or profit making settings. In other words, our young
are being inculcated with values of private enterprise and the idea that the quality and activity meanings associated with the term have their main or sole legitimacy and credibility in an individualistic and competitive business context.

Domains such as community development that emphasise a collective discourse sceptical and/or critical of the claims made on behalf of market capitalism and hegemony do have a heritage of enterprise in the activity and quality sense. The concomitant decline in so called 'unprofitable' disciplines such as history is also a direct result of the hegemonic promotion of profit and commercial courses. Such decline, it could be argued, does nothing to promote enterprise in its broadest sense.

The struggles for recognition continue for indigenous people, alongside other issues of social justice and ecological health. In fact, the process of narrowing the meanings of key terms such as enterprise serves to marginalise further those who may be critical of dominant patterns of power and privilege in our society. These struggles and the practice of community development provide numerous examples of enterprise. The devaluing of the work and commitment of generations of people and the learning that the young can derive from their struggles is another outcome of the narrowing of meanings as part of hegemony.

With private enterprise as the key point of reference to which all else is to be compared, it emerges as an unassailable god, not open to critique or dissent. Its discourse is the real 'political correctness'. We look then to its 'wisdom' when we seek to explain increasing inequalities of wealth and income distribution in society, a declining public sector and a concentration of capital and economic power. How enterprising, is it then, for a society to privilege one approach to all discursive practice across all domains? For those, with economic power, the answer is that it is extremely enterprising. It opens up new sources of profit, nullifies opposition and actually affirms their practices and discourses as the pinnacle of achievement to which all should aspire.

None of this is meant to suggest that the centrally administered public education has systematically opposed capitalism throughout its 120 plus years of existence or was without
need of reform. It has historically served the needs of industrial capitalism by supplying a trained workforce for industries. However, it is being transformed to meet the changing needs of global capitalism and this transformation includes its underlying values, organisational structures, financing, the role of teachers, and perhaps most importantly, the range of ideas, skills and ways of thinking and learning that learners are experiencing.

Empowerment as managerialist discourse: the impact on workers and organisations

The privileging of a narrow definition of enterprise has, as we have seen, been the cornerstone of an attempted massive restructuring of attitudes and behaviour within society: an example of cultural engineering sponsored by and through the state. Workers and organisations have increasingly been the targets of discourse technologists and their "training" in enterprise culture. In many respects, discourse technologists represent the vanguard of the promotion of its hegemonic embrace. As noted, the promotion of enterprise culture is seen to require the remodelling of institutions as commercial enterprises emphasising the customer and the acquisition and exercising of the enterprising qualities outlined above. Workers are expected through their training by discourse technologists to absorb, accept and even enthuse about the impact of such changes on their work, which as a matter of course is redefined in terms appropriate to enterprise discourse.

The irony in the midst of these ramifications of the process of commodification is that workers engaged in community development are increasingly turning to areas of enterprise education within universities and Institutes of Technical and Further Education on the pretext of needing to learn business skills to survive in a climate of competitive tendering, economic measures of efficiency and accountability and the seemingly constant threat of amalgamation and service closure.

One paradox of the totalising processes associated with enterprise discourse as hegemonic practice that has been noted is its utilisation of discourse appropriated from the very domains being colonised such as community development. Thus, in answer to trade union fears, the discourse technologists argue that workplace changes are not about greater control by capital
over labour for those are tired cliches. No, this is to be an enchanted workforce, autonomous and self directed. In fact, trade unions are a monopoly interfering with the free flow of labour in the market place. They serve to deprive individual workers of their autonomy because they operate collectively. The flexibility required of current industrial relations, it is claimed, reduces the relevance of unions. Crowther and Caldwell go so far as to claim that the aim is to enable people to be,

*liberated, inspired and empowered to face an uncertain future with optimism, to seize the opportunities it offers, and to develop creative solutions to its problems* (1991:13)

Empowerment, as a term has diverse origins. As noted earlier, it is a term that many community development practitioners would claim as their own. Underpinning as it does their conceptualisation of practice. In contrast, Hayek and later Friedman, argued that the market is the ultimate source of individual freedom because of its ability to provide choice and yet efficiently decide between competing uses of resources and arrive at decisions about what and how to produce goods and services. Peters adopted (1982) this line and extended it in the 1980s with claims that the market is liberating and actually *empowers* people. His brief has been to extend this liberating influence into all levels of management and institutions across society as part of what has been called 'new managerialism'. Thus, replicating the market relationships within and outside organisations makes everyone your customer, and reducing workplaces down to teams devolves decisions to those expected to carry them out.

The critique of old forms of management that has evolved from this market tradition of neoliberal economics, has targeted both the private and public sectors. However, the critique of the public sector has carried with it not just a managerial perspective on efficiency but also an underlying hostility and antagonism towards public provision and expenditure in general. The arguments around the welfare state have been discussed elsewhere in this study, but the linking of the moral argument postulated by Hayek that the collective pursuit of goals like equity through the state is coercive and against an individual's freedom (which conversely finds ultimate expression in the market) by Peters and the Harvard Business School to new managerialism has proven to be a powerful ideological tool. Thus, public sector management
is portrayed not just as anonymous, bureaucratic and distant (a claim also made against larger private companies), but also inherently inefficient and wasteful (Walsh, 1995:83).

Kerfoot and Knights (1995:221-225) extend this analysis by suggesting that the Total Quality Management (TQM) push advocated by Peters and others has really been about a reorganisation of capitalism to ensure the economic power of powerful corporations and capitalists is maintained and extended in an era of globalisation of business and an ideological push to assert the individual over the collective. TQM becomes a means of managing an increasingly fragmented workforce and emphasises individualism,

*individual autonomy finds a residual legacy within an ideology of privatisation, strategic cutbacks in welfare and a policy of laissez faire interventionism*  
(Kerfoot and Knights, 1995:223)

The three main features of TQM are:

i) a purchaser/provider split with a defined contract specifying tasks, timelines and cost

ii) breaking down of large organisations and thus devolving decision making

iii) the measurement of quality and linking its achievement to individual worker's performance (Walsh, 1995:88-89)

Participation of workers in decision making is seen to be central to their empowerment which is seen as making workers responsible for quality. The end is explicitly seen to be increased profitability and market share. The process of worker empowerment is, according to the Trade Union Congress (TUC) in Britain,

*...often concerned with obligations and duties rather than rights and collective representation. The language is of worker empowerment, with the stress on individualism,*
consensus building and openness... The main objective is usually to tie the employees' performance and behaviour more closely to overall goals of the organisation. (TUC, 1991:21)

Gee and Lankshear (1995:15) regard the use of empowerment by managerialists as a means of gaining the compliance of employees. Managers of organisations are to empower people to be more efficient and yet creative in the context of the organisation's primary purpose— to be competitive and earn profits. Empowerment is perceived as a means of improving organisational performance— it is an instrumental tool. Workers will own problems and are encouraged to find solutions that are creative. Empowerment is central to the vision expounded by enterprise culture. Individuals and teams of workers in this sense are able to excel in terms of the way they approach their work— they display initiative and assist the organisation's bottom line. Skills in critical reflection that might be developed are not intended to be used by workers

*to assess and (re)frame the goals of the organisation, or to generate a more powerful role for themselves within decision making structures and processes dealing with such matters as job tenure... (nor) in the sense of questioning systems as wholes and in their political relations to other systems.* (Gee and Lankshear, 1995:16-17)

The aim of empowerment in this context is not about shifts in power but rather in consolidating the power of management through the use of new configurations. Employees become bound to the organisation and its system of management and production and thereby contribute to their own exploitation. (McArdle et al., 1995:166-168). Extending Foucault's analysis of the panopticon as a means of surveillance, McArdle et al. (1995:169) argue that the changes in workplaces associated with TQM amount to an information panopticon. Management can thus monitor performance especially through the greater use of information technology as a means of disciplining workers and do so at apparent arms length— what Tucker (1995:78) has described as 'autonomous control'. With the decline of trade union or collective strength, TQM and its key strategies and processes of empowerment and participation perform an important hegemonic task of ensuring little if any opposition to
management's goals. It therefore needs to be regarded as one of the key tools in the kit bag of enterprise culture.

The reality for workers is far from enchanting or empowering. Their work is often redefined in a context in which autonomy means doing more with less—increased responsibility, longer hours with diminished resources. For all workers, but particularly those within the public and not for profit sectors, other reasons and motivations for working in their chosen field are devalued and marginalised. Their consent to participate in this process of redefinition is extracted from management in the guise of needing to respond to changing realities that mean we are all in the same boat—compete or die.

The promise of empowerment and autonomy is instrumental and circumscribed within managerial and organisational pressure for gaining and maintaining that competitive edge, of being profitable. Workers are reminded of the need for them to comply with the cultural changes taking place because their own and other workers' futures can only be secured if they cooperate fully, change their unproductive ways and become enterprising. A failure to cooperate could cause the organisation to fail and who would want that responsibility hanging over their head? It is the ultimate form of social control sold under the guise of greater worker autonomy. It also establishes a form of comparison of workers. Those who are not complying can be labelled as unenterprising, lacking in flexibility.

Crowther and Caldwell (1991) in fact argue that resistance from workers is simply fear of change and refer approvingly to Kanter who notes confusion, emotional 'leakage', loss of energy and breakdown of initiative may be present in workers involved in restructuring (1991:95). These "problems" are dismissed as minor and in fact they argue that the entrepreneurial schools they showcase show no signs of these problems. The other thing that is fascinating about such descriptions of workers' responses is that the problem is primarily seen as being of their own making, not what they are being asked to do or the theory underpinning such approaches which is based on an essentially competitive and individualistic view of society and change.
Workers in such enchanted workplaces invariably work longer hours, suffer increased stress, burnout and find their work is redefined in economic or cost terms. Jessica, one of the participants in this research reveals in Chapter 6 how the pursuit of 'enterprising', 'empowering' workplaces can also breed suspicion and distrust between work colleagues. Objections from the human services field are dealt with similarly. The push for community based services to operate in a more 'businesslike' manner is explained as being really about greater 'choice' for their 'customers': more accountable and efficient services. The fact that forms of practice capable of challenge such as community development are excluded increasingly from contracts is due to their difficulty of being measured or quantified. Instead, these changes will empower and promote entrepreneurship in the sector as organisations compete to deliver quality services that are benchmarked. Further, concerns about increased competition and lack of collaboration between services, the shift in focus to winning the next tender and the need to devote increasing staff time to tender preparation, accountability and monitoring requirements simply reflect the sorts of resistance to change amongst workers identified by Crowther and Caldwell above (1991). Instead, the new realities necessitate:

_the caring professionals... reliant on state sponsorship for their spheres of practice, their mandate and their conditional autonomy, (to)... renegotiate their position in the welfare state.
As agents of cultural reproduction they as much as those in business and firms are seen as needing to be transformed into the embodiments of the new spirit of enterprise rather than dependence._ (Cannan, 1991:11)

Similar impacts have been noted by Maile, during her research into the impact of managerial discourse in the restructuring of a Labour controlled district authority ('Westwood') in the United Kingdom. She sees managerialism as part of the wider project of enterprise culture (Maile, 1995). She observed a process of re-structuring and re-ordering aimed at instilling a "culture of change" as part of creating an "enterprising" enterprise.

_Cultural change can be seen as instrumental in instilling new values and orientations to work and in winning consent from the workforce._ (Maile, 1995:734)
Maile (1995:734-738) notes the way managerial discourse popularised by Peters (1982) and Drucker (1985) and the Harvard School of Business is increasingly evident in both public and private sectors. The fact that this phenomenon is common to many countries reflects intertextuality - the use of technologies by discourse technologists skilled in its promulgation. Thus, the training of managers was a conduit, she found for the promotion and application of enterprise discourse. This process involved the application of vocabularies including terms that have other connotations such as empowering, teamwork and vision to managerial discourse with meanings aligned with enterprise discourse. (Maile, 1995)

Her conclusions were that managers were modifying rather than simply reproducing enterprise discourse vocabularies. However,

*the degree to which officers use these terms to describe their work is indicative of the increasing dominance of the enterprise discourse as it infuses the professional, political and public service aims of Westward.*

(Maile, 1995:738)

Enterprise discourse in this context, is a many headed beast. It is a critical shaper of relationships between people, institutions and questions of power and access to resources. It has been harnessed to the plough of hegemony that is enterprise culture by discourse technologists in a variety of ways - all focused on redefining one or more of the following:

i) attitudes, behaviours, and motivators that can be acquired by an individual,
ii) the definition of work and the role of workers
iii) management practices
iv) the discursive practice and purpose of an organisation including its organisational culture and internal and external relationships

Enterprise discourse embodies firstly, an ideological view of the role of the individual worker, organisation and the state and secondly, a set of strategies accompanied by distinctive forms of discursive practice for transforming each actor and domain. Discourse technologists are
portrayed almost as doctors administering a cure to ailing organisations and workers seeking direction in a time of rapid change. They take their diagnostic methods and cure to any worker or organisation. Enterprise discourse knows no bounds. The many consultants employed by all layers of private and public sector organisations attest to the profitability of the "miracle cure" bandwagon. They seek in a naturally competitive environment to establish the cutting edge marketing, managerial or motivational tool or technique that will give them more business. The 'standard diagnosis and treatment' involve:

i) examining current practices to ascertain if they are 'enterprising' or 'unenterprising' through benchmarking and the assigning of dollar values to each and every activity. Highlight wasteful expenditures and practices- search for the cheapest alternative.

ii) checking that the organisational culture hums to the tune of enterprise discourse. If other discourses are present expose their essential unenterprising attributes. Quickly marginalise and neutralise them as inappropriate in the current climate.

iii) establish that enterprise discourse is lacking as a vision for the organisation, that workers require training to become autonomous, flexible and competitive.

iv) prescribe a dose of discourse renewal; redefine what everyone does to reflect the new paradigm which has been passed down to you through your training in business administration. Everyone is now a customer and you assist everyone to define their product, and how to market it.

v) present the changes as a creative response to current or potentially uncertain times for the workers and organisation that will in fact empower them improving their job satisfaction and autonomy. You have to earn your keep.

vi) offer the prospect for those who respond appropriately (in particular managers) the rewards of increased power, status and authority and regulation of workers (under the guise of teamwork and accountability) along with material perks of increased salary, cars and packages.
vii) marginalise and devalue those who do not respond appropriately, along with the discourses they espouse.

viii) entrench the changes as orthodoxy by ensuring that managers' positions and performance bonuses are conditional on their continued implementation (continuing improvement, benchmarking) and ensuring compliance by workers through increased surveillance under the guise of accountability.

Whilst presented somewhat 'tongue in cheek', this checklist may well reflect the experiences of increasing numbers of workers. Such 'empowering' techniques are seen as ensuring the emergence of an empowered organisation with empowered workers. As the new orthodoxy it is a sure winner. Competing discourses are anti enterprise and reflect tired, failed paradigms that ignore the harsh, competitive reality- the real world of rough and tumble competition. It is popular with managers because its implementation is seen to be dependent on the workers-they must adapt and be competitive. They know to succeed, to move up their chosen ladder they have to ensure that only words and concepts acceptable to the new orthodoxy flow from their lips.

Whilst often presented as a set of techniques or means, enterprise discourse is of course very much about ends- efficiency, profit and cost reduction. Ends which conflict with this market driven discourse are marginalised. Thus, graduates from courses are referred to as products-produced of course as efficiently as possible. For example, in a recent publication promoting Casey Institute of Technical and Further Education (now part of Chisholm Institute), its then Director and Chief Executive noted that its readers,

*will find the words 'business', 'product' and 'customers' mentioned frequently. In today's competitive world and this includes education, we at Casey Institute recognise the vital importance of customers and product to our future. We are now very accountable and demand driven (Casey Institute, 1997).*
Such sentiments clearly reflect the process of redefinition accompanying the increasing impact of enterprise culture on education and training, including the transformation of teachers in such institutions into 'discourse technologists'. Gee and Lankshear describe the world promised by discourse technologists as one of enchantment- a more meaningful world than the old. They note that enchantment can also mean under a spell. The reality, they suggest is one of workers bound to a corporate culture that sets the context of practice. Rather than empowerment, autonomy, freedom and participation, they suggest enforced conformity, corporate intrusiveness and coercion will result from such a situation (Gee & Lankshear, 1995:8-10). If the workers that are expected to flourish in the age of enterprise discourse are 'smart workers' based on the acquisition of information and knowledge, then service workers will be consigned to second class status. Gee and Lankshear suggest that increasing sub contracting will serve to reinforce existing class divisions with the core workforce being white, male and Anglo who will have more work that is diverse, better paid and requiring constant upgrading of skills. The periphery will consist predominantly of women, people of non English speaking background and other disadvantaged groups.

This discussion on discourse and hegemony has only touched on a number of key aspects relevant to this research through an interrogation of the key terms of enterprise and empowerment that have been associated with enterprise culture. It has sought to reveal the potency of claiming meanings that reflect hegemonic intent and the processes by which these terms and their meanings can come to be applied to new domains and sites. In illustrative terms, they serve to also highlight the ideological investment involved in these processes. What has emerged from this analysis is that terms like empowerment have been captured and harnessed to the plough of discourse technologists and equally, it seems evident that the associated process of commodification has captured the term enterprise to encapsulate the overall intent and aim of the political project that is enterprise culture. In other words analysis of both terms illustrates the processes by which hegemony is established or reasserted across domains within society and the relevance of analysing discourse as a means of revealing how texts are at one and the same time examples of discourse and broader socio cultural practice. The research frame that has been developed seeks to examine such processes in relation to the community development domain. This, then is the next task.
CHAPTER 5 - POSITIONING AND RESPONDING TO ENTERPRISE CULTURE

A framework of responses

The relationship between discursive practice and social change is particularly pertinent to this research. As has been shown above, the domain of community development has always been open to diffuse and fragmented discourses and enterprise discourse represents a powerful, all embracing challenge given its hegemonic message is delivered through the funding vinculum that binds community organisations to the state. Enterprise culture manifests itself in a discursive cluster that draws on a range of discourses subsumed within it such as neo liberalism, market theory, and managerialism (refer to the underlying assumptions of enterprise culture outlined in Chapter 2). It is further suggested that they intertwine to constitute a hegemonic "fix-all", seen as applicable to all manner of issues from redefining the roles of individual workers, the 'reorienting' of organisational culture towards competition, through to the funding regime and the role of the state. Given the dimensions and scale of the enterprise culture onslaught, this study intends to focus particularly on its impact on worker and organisational efforts to practice community development, particularly through an examination of changes in discursive practice amongst practitioners.

Analysis of the emergent different responses of community development practitioners to such changes is assisted by analysis of their discursive practice. This approach offers great insight into their forms of response to enterprise culture through its focus on word meanings and their relationship to practice. Shifts in meanings and practice can be subtle and the changes over time and space are of particular importance to the task of discerning trends in the nature of community development practice. Such shifts in discursive practice can be part of broader societal and cultural changes. A framework or typology for analysing these forms of embrace has been developed that focuses on the discourse and practice of the 15 practitioners who participated in the research.

Fairclough has influenced the formulation of this framework with his proposition that,

*people in their actual discoursal practice may react in various ways to pressures for change emanating from the technologisation of discourse: they may comply, they may tactically appear to comply, they may refuse to be budged, or they may arrive at all sorts of accommodations and compromises*
between existing practices and new techniques. The latter is perhaps the most common and certainly the most interesting case. Study of such accommodations in the discursal practice of workplaces strikes me as a likely source of insight into the actual impact of technologies of government on practice and into ongoing processes of change in social relations and social identities. (Fairclough:1995,77-78)

In terms of the research at hand, the development of accommodations and compromises between existing practices (community development) and new techniques (enterprise culture) constitutes the main focus. The dynamic processes associated with the introduction and possible consolidation of the techniques of enterprise culture in the domain of community development could be expected, it is argued, to result in responses that are fluid, open to change and that result in unintended consequences, both for workers and organisations. It may be that new forms of practice arise out of this process of change that either reflect the values of community development or marginalise them. It is suggested that the extent and nature of the response/s evident will be reflected in their discursive practice. The following three factors may also influence the responses;

a) the ideology that informs practice and in particular, the degree to which an oppositional politics and resistance or compliance are evident.

b) the degree of worker autonomy in defining their discourse and practice in the context of their organisational framework and its policy,

c) the relationship of the organisation to the state, its relative autonomy and relative preparedness to "test" the boundaries or interface of this relationship.

Given that enterprise culture embraces a particular form of discourse, set of relationships, and distribution of power over decision making, information and resources derived from essentially neo liberalist notions of individualism, the market and capitalism, its introduction into the domain of community development would appear to challenge its core values and commitments. However, the broad range of approaches, perspectives and fields (identified in Chapter 3) that lay claim to the rubric- community development, suggests caution is needed in making such an assertion. It is suggested that the following forms of response may be seen in the discursive practice of practitioners in disparate, diffuse and sometimes coexisting configurations.
i) hegemonic embrace, a) *complicit embrace* or b) *compelled accommodation*;
ii) strategic embrace;
iii) overt rejection.

**Hegemonic embrace**

Hegemonic embrace by community development practitioners, it is suggested, could emerge from one of two paths. The first, *complicit embrace*, involves the immediate and uncritical acceptance of enterprise culture as promoted by the state through competitive tendering. It is characterised by a spontaneity of response, a complicity towards the changes and a willingness to adopt the discourse of enterprise culture. Rapid internal organisational restructuring to reflect the business imperative occurs and the organisational culture reflects this shift as managerial concepts of line managers, and hierarchy are often instituted. The organisation and its workers are reconstituted as a business, ready to seize opportunities for growth by winning the next tender, providing evidence of best practice and keen to display an ability to provide the most cost effective and efficient services.

The work of the organisation or "business" becomes its product, to be marketed and sold to customers who are surveyed to assess their level of satisfaction, because it may influence the outcome of the next tender. The organisation, becomes complicit in the hegemony that is enterprise culture. In order to be 'successful', it increasingly requires managers who uncritically adopt the logic of enterprise culture. The changes are sold to practitioners as not only ensuring job security, but as actually increasing worker autonomy and providing new opportunities for job satisfaction. Thus, workers' jobs increasingly come to be dependent on the operationalisation of enterprise culture and their complicit embrace of its core tenets.

The ability to "sell a product" to generate income, prepare a business plan, undertake marketing strategies, achieve high levels of customer satisfaction are accorded high status within the management of the organisation. The quality of the service and its impact on those who utilise it is measured quantitatively in the context of securing the next tender. It is therefore postulated that a *complicit* form of hegemonic embrace is characterised by the predominance of the discursive cluster associated with enterprise culture and substantially altered forms of practice that comply with the social policy framework expounded by the state. Other characteristics of a complicit embrace may include the emergence of;
i) an ideology of compliance- either neo liberalist or pluralist, emphasising working within the circumscribed parameters of enterprise culture. Broader value commitments to social justice or social change are dispensed with in favour of delivering efficient services that meet the needs of the tendering body. Discourse is expansive, emphasising opportunities for growth, competition, positioning in the market place and customer driven services. There is a lack of any critiquing of the ideology and organisational culture, structures, procedures, decision making and policy are guided by enterprise culture.

ii) low levels of worker autonomy in terms of self definition of discourse and practice (as opposed to organisationally approved autonomy within a narrow frame of reference circumscribed by enterprise discourse). Practice reflects the ideology of compliance, and serves to reinforce by applying business plans and identifying opportunities for growth that are safe, and even better will earn income.

iii) an interlocking of the organisation and the state, with the organisation prepared to position and promote itself as an agent of the state, actively selling its agenda. There is no thought of testing the boundaries- the umpirc sets the rules and is not to be challenged.

The second path to the adoption of hegemonic embrace, involves elements of coercion and a sense of a lack of choice but to adopt enterprise culture and its ways of working. This path suggests a compelled accommodation, with workers in particular forced to adopt the changes and incorporate them into their work. As noted above, practitioners and their organisations have been under intense pressure to comply with the hegemonic embrace of enterprise culture advocated by the state. A compelled embrace represents a form of response to enterprise culture that is underpinned by resentment and a sense of powerlessness in the face of overwhelming pressures to conform. Thus, organisations and practitioners feel compelled to accept the changes foisted upon them by policy decision makers in order to maintain funding, programs and simply survive. It may result in a 'heads down' service delivery approach that focuses on the 'day to day' and survival.

Compelled embrace should be seen as a common initial or transitional response to enterprise culture, although it may remain evident in the longer term in the discourse and practice of some workers and/or organisations. This form of embrace may well be the initial reaction of some workers and organisations to the changes. It is a 'marooned on a desert island' response: hole up with provisions and wait to be rescued. It reflects a deep distrust of policy makers and a fear of the consequences of enterprise culture. Initially, the changes wrought by enterprise culture are seen as cyclical and the response becomes one of 'riding out the storm'.
There may be a sense that things might even return to how they were if only there was a change of government or policy. Over time, the disillusionment of workers can lead to high rates of burnout and resignation. The desire to retain the contract, to keep the funding leads to an outcome not dissimilar to hegemonic embrace. Compliance is secured and there is a growing silence regarding issues of import such as growing inequality. Values and discourse associated with community development are still evident, but they are put to one side, like a good novel - perhaps for later use? Changes to ways of working or the organisational culture are seen as necessary for survival and may involve an apparent adaptation in terms of public image or service changes in order to be acceptable to funding bodies.

Community development discourse and practice may well be placed on the back burner as too much of a threat in terms of funding, or only those terms deemed to be acceptable or benign are used. There is little innovation or critical reflection of the changes and their impact on practice. The concern with this approach, if adopted by a worker or organisation as their primary form of response is that it may result in a gradual loss of knowledge and experience of critical, progressive and activist forms of community development practice, further reducing the potential for social change. Thus, there is an increasing adoption of enterprise culture discourse and a continuing decline in pre-existing forms of community development practice. Discourse and practice associated with community development are, therefore marginalised and potentially silenced as the enterprise culture paradigm takes hold. The compelled form of hegemonic embrace can also be characterised by some or all of the following trends,

i) an emerging ideology of compliance, yet elements of a politics of resistance may remain, particularly among some workers critical of the changes.

ii) low levels of worker autonomy, as the organisation seeks to adapt to changes and present an image that will protect its funding, it becomes essential for workers to 'toe the line' and begin to 'talk the talk' and 'walk the walk';

iii) an evolving and hesitant relationship with the state, in the process of being renegotiated. There is a hesitancy to test the boundaries of the relationship, or fight funding policy changes lest it jeopardise funding.
Strategic embrace

A strategic embrace of enterprise culture opens up the possibility of fostering community development whilst utilising some of the techniques commonly associated with it. It is characterised by discursive practice that indicates an accommodation of the policy implications of enterprise discourse but firmly within a context of critical reflection based on a commitment to principles of social justice. A recontextualising is occurring and the parameters are shifting resulting in new forms of discursive practice that are embedded in the discourse of social justice and community development, yet modified to the increasingly hegemonic reality of enterprise discourse.

Viable and sustaining forms of strategic embrace as a response to enterprise culture, will be characterised by a number of important features. For example, whilst the critiques of enterprise culture emanating from this perspective are critical of its fundamental tenets there is a sense of movement, of responding in innovative ways and thereby moderating and altering the influence of enterprise discourse. The potential exists within the strategic embrace for new forms of innovative discursive practice that challenge enterprise discourse and build on the potential of community development. The critical element to this response is to preserve as much autonomy for worker and organisation and to create the space for manoeuvre and critical engagement. Thus the roles or workers and structures may reflect some of the pragmatic changes associated with enterprise discourse, but there is an explicit and continuing commitment to social justice and change in both discourse and practice. The prospect of alternative sources of funding to secure autonomy from the state is countenanced and acted on as circumstances permit. Strategic embrace can also feature the following elements:

i) a critical ideology that emphasises critique and reflection, resistance and counter hegemonic responses and new forms of practice to challenge enterprise culture. This critical ideology seeks to emphasise the alternative meanings of key concepts such as enterprise, empowerment, participation, and asserts the primacy of social justice, social change, equality and collective ways of working. There is a rejection of the ideology of compliance, yet a recognition of the historical conjuncture of forces operating in contemporary society. These social, political and economic changes are analysed in terms of their impact on issues of concern and the implications for workers and organisations in community development. Such
changes are viewed from a strategic perspective, informed by critical theory, that seeks to establish innovative forms of response without compromising core values.

ii) high levels of worker autonomy, with discourse and practice reflecting community development values within an organisational culture that nurtures similar values (often characterised by collective ways of working). Autonomy is encouraged as there is a willingness to trial innovative practice that reflects core values, progresses the cause of social change and may incorporate some of the discourse and practice of enterprise culture, but with meanings that sustain community development practice;

iii) critical and assertive relationship with the state, with a willingness to test the boundaries of the relationship by maintaining commitments to community development values and forms of practice, whilst adapting techniques associated with enterprise culture that do not compromise such values and commitments. There is constant reflection on the organisational culture and workers' practices, but there is an ongoing dialogue with and engagement of the state.

Overt rejection

Overt rejection signifies an explicit refusal to embrace any of the forms and discourse associated with enterprise culture. It could be expected to be found in unfunded social action groups, not bound by government funding or tendering arrangements. Such groups have been important in the development of community development for their innovative approaches to different social issues. Resistance to dominant ideas and practices such as enterprise culture would be found both in the ideological stance of practitioners and organisations and in their forms of practice with strategies such as social action and consciousness raising being particularly important. Preexisting forms of practice and a retention of community development discourse are both evident and there is no sense of any connection with aspects of enterprise culture. Given the realities of living within a broader economic system that exemplifies enterprise culture it is doubtful that any practitioner could practice a 'pure' form of overt rejection. It is likely to be found most strongly in terms of the intellectual critique of enterprise culture developed by some practitioners. One could also expect overt rejection to be also characterised by,
i) an ideology of resistance, an oppositional politics that emphasises a rejection of the tenets of enterprise culture and a refusal to work within its parameters. Consciousness raising and social action are undertaken as part of the oppositional politics.

ii) high degrees of worker autonomy, usually in a context of collective ways of working

iii) critical and confrontational relationship with the state, based on a politics of resistance.

The framework applied- practitioner perspectives-late 1996:

Practitioners were interviewed in December 1996 and again in December 1997 and asked to reflect on their community development practice, the organisational culture and funding context within which they practice. A number of key terms were discussed in the initial interview to assist in the identification of a lexicon based on usage and meaning that might describe the contemporary context of their practice. In the follow up interview 12 months later, practitioners were asked to reflect on any changes to either the lexicon and/or the context of their practice. The findings from these interviews form the basis of the analysis that follows. Three aspects of language use and word meaning emerged as central to the analysis of responses;

i) the emergence of terms and associated word meanings promoted by enterprise discourse such as business, enterprise, product, market, opportunity and efficiency as potentially indicative of the extent of its infiltration into the domain of community development,

ii) the absence or decline in usage of terms previously part of the lexicon of community development such as social action, social justice, social change and consciousness raising may signal a shift in practice under the guise of a recognition of the 'changed realities' of practice,

iii) the common usage of terms such as empowerment, participation, autonomy, collaboration, liberation by both the proponents of enterprise culture (in particular discourse technologists) and community development practitioners, opens up the prospect of a contestation of meaning and a possible merged discourse, or hegemonic cooption of such terms in the service of enterprise culture.
At the time of the initial interviews in late 1996, most of those interviewed were still funded through programmatic funding, and competitive tendering was either being considered or put into effect in their particular field. The main emphasis in this interview was to establish the current lexicon of practitioners and the currency in terms of both usage and meaning of key terms (for a full listing of those discussed see Appendix 1). Given earlier discussions earlier regarding the connection between discourse and practice, both usage and meaning were carefully analysed. The framework that has been proposed above for such an analysis seeks to establish common themes and patterns, yet caution was also exercised to avoid over generalising and categorising both practitioners and their organisations. As noted elsewhere, disparate, fragmented and at times seemingly contradictory positions were evident in responses.

Manifestations of enterprise culture

An initial focus was to establish the extent and origin of any infiltration of enterprise discourse into the domain of community development. Many respondents noted the first signs of this process in the discourse of management:

*I think the (organisation) .... sees itself as a business- it is trying to sell itself in the marketplace and compete with everybody else. (Dan)*

*That's probably coming more from management, we've got to market what we sell .... Someone said recently that we had to define our product and one of our products are applicants for our program... That's what one senior person in the organisation said. I struggle with using those terms because it is not where I come from ....(Frank)*

A sense of the initial uncertainty and anxiety that seemed to surround the responses of some committees and workers to the new discourse is evident in the following:

*(product) is still a very novel thought. I don't think many people are thinking about what we do as having a product or having a market... Once again back*
in that product market stuff. It's still part of the new language that's coming through, that we're still trying to understand so that we can minimise its negative impact and once again this is at a management level and for some committees. (Tracy)

The currency of terms such as business, quality, enterprise, product and market in the lexicon of workers was taken to be indicative of the degree of infiltration of enterprise culture. A number of practitioners explained when interviewed initially in late 1996, that the term market was being pushed by management. Maxine for example suggested:

*I think the organisation sees itself as a business - it is trying to sell itself in the marketplace and compete with everybody else....We talk about our market. We have to market our courses, target our courses and we have a business breakfast to tell the business world what we can offer them. God help us....The managing people would see themselves very much in competition with other education organisations around the place but lower down people would definitely see themselves in partnership or co-operation.*

Tracy argued:

*The idea of market* is coming more from management, we've got to market what we sell.

The research indicated that co-ordinators and directors of organisations, along with their committees of management were usually pushing the use of such terms and adoption of associated practices through a variety of processes aimed at changing worker strategies. The responses, especially from some practitioners such as Maxine also suggested that these decision makers were more likely to embrace the changes spontaneously and voluntarily and with urgency suggesting a complicit embrace.

The tensions and dilemmas for these workers are self evident. Not only is government through its funding engaged in establishing hegemony, community based organisations that until recently sought to create space and autonomy for their practice from the state are
displaying increasing levels of compliance with the 'new game in town'. This leaves workers as the front line caught between organisational imperatives to play the game and their own commitments to social justice and challenging structures and policies. Their language in describing these terms and their usage is laced with compulsion: *we have to, we've got to*. It may well be that they are having to adopt a compelled accommodation in order to retain their jobs. This compelled embrace carries with it many dilemmas for practitioners as previously accepted ways of working come to be challenged and often marginalised by management.

For example, the collaborative and networking abilities of the community sector have resulted in important gains around a number of important social issues especially in relation to developing the need for funding from the state to address them. Competition for tenders drives a wedge through this solidarity that has been so important to community development. For many practitioners it is integral to their practice and yet it has been fundamentally effected by competitive tendering. Trish reflects on such changes in her networks:

*I think it [tendering] generates a very unhealthy competitive environment where people are worried about their own employment but also neighbourhood houses have struggled and tried to operate as a collective or in a consensus mode where we're all in it together..... [a hierarchy] builds up competition and power relationships and devaluing of people's work.... what we'll get is a hierarchical structure which ends up to be alienating and dehumanising.*

A most important insight that is revealed by Trish is the way in which the competitive tendering process as an *external imperus* sets in train a transformation of the *internal structures, strategies and values* of community based organisations. For example, to win tenders means to be more efficient with time according to the logic of enterprise culture. In turn, it becomes a simple matter to argue that community development processes of collaboration, consensus decision making and flat structures without formal hierarchies must be dispensed as luxuries that cannot be afforded in the changed realities of the current climate. The discursive practice drives, therefore, fundamental changes in the organisational culture and context within which community development is practiced. This analysis
connects with the earlier discussion of Hall’s discursive chain and is potentially indicative of some of the processes involved in a hegemonic embrace. The beginnings of a discursive chain is revealed in this response from Jocelyn:

To be able to compete, and I said we didn’t use that word. To be able to compete we have to able to respond relatively quickly... no, we resist business and the obvious business plan by word association... oh we actually had core business, that is our three point way we work now I think about it.

This example indicates that enterprise discourse may infiltrate in subtle ways and be adopted by practitioners through constant and repeated exposure. The other aspect of competitive discourse on workers is that it becomes an effective form of controlling the workforce in a number of ways. The following quotes from Frank and Maxine illustrate just two of these:

Hilmer was the guru of competition and we’ve got it here. Not only are we competing between organisations, but we’re also competing amongst ourselves, sections against sections, we have to sell ourselves [Frank].

competition gets brought up when we bring up concerns, remember we are competing with people [Maxine].

Similarly, Tracy and Trish noted similar changes in the public face and networking approaches of their organisations:

organisations are increasingly driven by the mechanics of government tenders, they’re talking less about needs and using information strategically to position themselves. this means that agencies are being competitive by hiding information from each other but also continuing to be collaborative and sharing of those things that won’t affect the tender [Tracy].

all that co-operative stuff about working other groups, it’s all gone. It’s one group, one project. People are so insular. I can’t remember in 3 years ever going to a network meeting, whereas that was a strong thing of c.d.
[Community Development] and I think that has a lot to do with the competition [Trish].

This notion of competition between workers and organisations is in conflict with the patterns of collaboration and co-operation that have been the hallmarks of community development practice.

The prescriptive measurement of need through tender means that needs are being defined top down and there is less room for agencies to build local knowledge and understanding of needs as the source of information and ideas about what services are required. That link is another defining feature of effective community development practice.

Thus, formative elements of compelled embrace were evident in many of the interviews conducted. As a form of response that embodies the tensions and dilemmas practitioners experience as they seek to grapple with the changes in discursive practice occurring around them, compelled embrace is essentially a defensive response that appeared to be common as an initial reaction to the reality that policies and procedures associated with enterprise culture were being introduced by the state into the area in which they practiced.

People aren't at this stage comfortable with words like product and market and business. They've kind of become part of the language. People in the street are familiar with the words and you couldn't help but be with the constant bombardment you get about them and so I think ....people are taking them in as part of their jargon so they're comfortable at that level, but I think a lot of people wouldn't be comfortable with the way they would be applied to the things we do - yet. They may become so [Frank].

The changes imposed on organisations and workers as part of the implementation of policies emanating from enterprise culture have added to a sense of disempowerment as they are compelled to respond to a whole range of new demands associated with it:

a lot of what government seems to be saying now is that we want more accountability so you are more efficient, but in fact the demands for more
accountability take away from your time from the work you’re supposed to do so you become less efficient in meeting the needs and demands of people with disabilities,... I mean we’ve had a self assessment this year, we’ve had an audit this year, and we’ve just been told we will have another self assessment by the end of November... you’re talking about 72 sub standards that need to be addressed... it takes an enormous amount of time [Kate].

... spending more time in terms of accountability as opposed to being more innovative in developing programs [Trish].

... however there are real concerns from workers about the lack of adequate time available to spend with people to come to solutions as there are prescriptive measurements specifying how long is to be spent with people [Jocelyn].

The element of enterprise culture that can promote compliance and a compulsion to accept enterprise culture is the way it links worker "performance" to the organisation's "future". Thus, in a competitive world, your job and everyone else's will only remain if you toe the line and play the game.

they went for this quality award ... and the director spoke at one of the sessions and said it would only take one staff member to make or break the award... it was so threatening .. if you mucked up you could be responsible for losing this incredibly important award... I think that creates this amazing culture of fear and of people agreeing to things that are essentially to their detriment, it's very powerful [Natasha].

Another important aspect in seeking to gain an understanding of the processes of hegemonic embrace is the pace of change. The research indicated that once organisations developed a sense that competitive tendering was to be introduced to their area of practice, they responded pragmatically and with haste to remould and reposition the organisation. This lack of questioning and resistance is in itself the first step towards a hegemonic embrace because it indicates the development of an ideology of compliance and a willingness to further
interwove state and the community sector. In many cases the changes in discursive practice were evident within 12 months. In other situations practitioners reflected on the rapidity of the change they had observed around them.

*that has revolutionised the community sector, that we produce products for the market, it is no longer that we have a service, or we're there to respond to issues, we are there to produce a product that fits in with the business plan... we are meant to be identifying what product it is that we are marketing, how do you put down that the product we produce is caring about people or being a safe place to deal with the issues? [Trish]*

*there has been a general acceptance of economic rationalism in the field as the policy has been progressively implemented [Tracy].*

The evident haste with which organisations have sought to embrace enterprise culture was explained by some workers as stemming from an initial fear of losing funding. Survival of the organisation was the key message (and by implication workers' jobs), but once adopted, growth and opportunity became the main selling points pushed by management in seeking to persuade workers to join the complicit, uncritical embrace of enterprise culture. The employment of new workers that comes with growth carries a number of concerns:

*we have so many new staff here who don't have their roots in what the organisation was, that is one of the key risks we face, that the core values are more threatened by the new language and new ways of dealing with the world because of the rapid staff growth [Frank].*

The positioning of their organisations in response to enterprise culture was problematic. Practitioners generally expressed an ideology of resistance in their discourse to the tenets of enterprise culture and its perceived impact on their practice and their organisational context. Steve expressed a common sentiment,

*I think that words like market and customer and product relate to a business enterprise... they don't relate to the field of community development... I find*
the term customer offensive... I don't think we should ever get dragged into using that and therefore pretending we've made some sort of mindset because we're using those words... we're now more efficient... it's that myth that if we introduce competition to human services then we produce a better product. I always think the purpose of competition is to eliminate competition.

However, this was also a mixed message because it was evident that some felt constrained by a commitment to their organisation's survival to comply with at least some of the changes occurring. Thus, an ideology of compliance was also noted, driven by a sense of being compelled to comply because of the funding imperative. These broader constraints have an impact on worker autonomy; the ability to reflect one's own ideology in practice (praxis). At the time of the initial interviews conducted in late 1996, a number of workers were still employed through programmatic funding (funding by submission) and whilst there were concerns about increasing accountability based on narrow output criteria beginning to appear (as noted above), most still felt there was still "room to move" in terms of their praxis and relative autonomy. Most appeared to be gearing up for tendering within the following 12 months and as suggested below, were planning to develop a form of strategic embrace of the expected changes. This guarded optimism was due primarily to their relative success in practising in this manner under the previous (and at the time continuing) programmatic funding formula. Thus, whilst there were acknowledged constraints a number of practitioners were expansive about their ability to strategically retain their funding yet pursue more activist/progressive agendas. In Chapter 6, the follow up interviews one year later reveal some interesting outcomes of these changes.

Relatively few practitioners felt their organisations were spontaneously embracing the agenda of the state. Maxine, however identified clearly that those involved in the management of her organisation were more than prepared to play the game and adopt all the trappings of enterprise culture as part of seizing the opportunities to secure more funding.

the managing people would see themselves very much in competition with other education organisations around the place but lower down people would definitely see themselves in partnership or co-operation.
This reveals an important theme of tension at the interface of community development and enterprise culture. The changes being driven 'top down' by management are seeking to impose a new culture of competition on workers committed to co-operation. Part of the resistance amongst practitioners to such changes is evident in one strategy Maxine employed as part of her attempt to maintain her praxis,

*I'm organising this community forum day and I've invited people from other organisations that some... would see as our competitors and I've deliberately invited them so they can learn from the guy that's coming.*

Such examples of resistance highlight Fairclough's argument that hegemony is never complete; that struggles over discourse and practice prevail. Maxine is engaged in promoting ways of working that challenge the hegemonic message that as competitive businesses information should be jealously guarded especially any ideas or approaches to practice that could give you the upperhand when the next tender is advertised.

Community development discourse:

If the pressure is increasing to adopt the discursive practice of enterprise culture, it is pertinent to also check the 'other side of the coin'. What is happening to community development discourse? Is it disappearing or being replaced? What are the pressures on it? The research revealed a range of findings in terms of the currency of a number of key terms in the lexicon of community development practitioners. The focus was on words and practices that have underpinned the emergence of contemporary community development and a number of these key terms were reviewed in Chapter 4. A number of the terms have a long association; some since the 1970s such as participation, consciousness raising, social action, social change, gender and class. Others that were reviewed emerged more as part of the debate around rights in the 1980s including social justice and empowerment. The notion of autonomy in the context of community based management was also explored with practitioners.

Consciousness raising and social action
Consciousness raising and social action

Two strategies that are closely associated with social change and social justice are consciousness raising and social action. The reactions to both suggested that for some practitioners they were seen as outdated terms related to the realities of the 1970s: and therefore very much consigned to the age of the dinosaur in terms of their lexicons. The research seemed to indicate that such reactions were occurring independent of the pressures being felt from the infiltration of enterprise culture.

social action and consciousness raising... that's old fashioned words... I think what's happening here is a revisiting of words and after all they become jargon laden words. Social action and consciousness raising are really 70s words... and I'd rather have some new terminology to describe... [what] I actually agree is a process like... social action [Sonya].

social action... a bit passe, we don't use the term. I think we use the principle, we just don't necessarily call it social action [Jocelyn].

Others reflected that the terms lacked the currency they once possessed (or should possess):

consciousness raising... no you don't hear it about much... no [Frank].

consciousness raising... oh no I haven't heard that for a long time, in the unfunded stuff yes, but not in the funded stuff [Trish].

I'm not sure whether enough sharing goes on about what we're doing in the field and why, so consciousness raising happens incidentally and it doesn't get enough attention... when people are involved in practice... it's often let's do, not stop and think and it is just action [Kate].

social action... I work for an organisation that has a potential to be an agent for social action but no one would know what I'm talking about [Maxine].
The tensions associated with funding and survival produced some interesting dilemmas in Kate's experience:

*It's interesting ... that in the disability sector it is the people with disabilities themselves that keep pushing for social action and it is the workers who are less likely to (be) actually fighting... and saying we risk too much if we do that and we'll get cut [Kate].*

However, for a number of practitioners it was clear that both terms still possessed a degree of potency in terms of their importance in describing their practice:

*I think being more open, more aware of the whole community rather than just the Anglo-Celtic middle class values and once again that's awareness raising, consciousness raising [Tracy].*

*I think as c.d. workers or community organisers our role is not to organise stuff on behalf of people, but a lot of us do have skills in how do you run a campaign or strategic thinking, how to critique and pull apart an issue. Perhaps it is about bringing people together, encouraging people to critically reflect, you know the Freire stuff, consciousness raising and critical dialogue [Trish].*

This latter view was also taken up by Frances. As a practitioner engaged in projects overseas, she identified relatively few of the tensions outlined above. For example, in terms of her practice of consciousness raising and social action she noted:

*In terms of consciousness raising, (and) gender issues,... in Vietnam women with increasing income would improve the diet of their husbands and children but never of themselves and were working incredibly long hours so consciousness raising about the consequences of working such long hours including their health needs and in terms of their value and their importance so it was challenging,... and social action in... Cambodia- the status of women*
is extremely poor. Challenging some of the social structures and assisting women in the organisations to speak out, to get in touch with what they saw their needs were and then to find ways of how to bring about change to improve their situation.

Frances appeared to be relatively autonomous within her organisational context, to practice community development in a reflexive style that many of the other practitioners clearly valued yet felt constrained to fully practice. However, her ability to do this was undoubtedly influenced by the funding source for the projects she worked on. Her organisation received a great deal of its money from the community and this independence enabled autonomy in practice to be a reality. However, she noted there was less autonomy in terms of practice when funding was from the Australian government. This may indicate that such autonomy is a necessary precursor for either a strategic embrace or overt rejection of enterprise culture in the sense that having the room to manoeuvre and employ progressive strategies for social change is a necessary precondition for both forms of response. Janis and Trish also identified the unfunded activist groups as a site of emergent social action, perhaps reflecting their independence from hegemonic processes such as competitive tendering:

*I have seen more community development happen at a local unpaid level in my area as a response to the Draconian measures that the state and federal governments have put in place... we've seen a whole group of people who've never been activists before in the local community get together and be very active with holding public meetings and deputations etc. (Janis)*

*social action... heaps in the unfunded ratbaggy fringe, grassroots based community organisations, that's the big word... most groups are now talking about social action and how do we do it... I quite often get asked training for new campaigns... from some of the most conservative groups that I never think would be interested (Trish).*
Social justice and social change

Whilst a number of practitioners regarded social justice and social change as underpinning their practice, they noted the increasing contestation over meaning associated with enterprise culture and its impacts on social policy and/or the silencing and marginalisation of such terms due to a growing, perceived unacceptability in terms of funding of using them as part of discursive practice:

social change...happening all the time anyway... but it is about social change that is progressive, trying to equalise the imbalances and mean that people who need support get it and that is not what is happening. I mean the social change direction is smaller government and governments not taking responsibility and that means not collectively using the wealth of the community to support people who need it (Kate)

oh yeah, we’re a social change organisation aren’t we? Now again what does that mean? There is a lot of social change going on but we wouldn’t want to put our name on it.....our community education program we would see that at one level as a social change process...(to) have an impact on people. (Frank)

that’s a word that’s used a lot around here. I suppose Jeff Kennett would believe he is involved in social change but to us social change would be in the context of bringing about social justice. (Joe)

However, there was some concern that whilst social change was central to practice, it was either not reflected in the organisational culture or was under threat from the changed realities:

social change...we have the potential but we don’t see it that way (Maxine).

in the funded stuff, community groups, a lot more of it is just survival rather than social change (Trish).
still very much part of our lexicon, but I think it is a dying part of the vocabulary within the [organisation] [Dan].

...if you use vocabulary like social change they very quickly remind you that we've had a change of government and that's no longer the flavour of the month [Janis].

Similarly, social justice was seen to be a term, very much in retreat in terms of currency of usage:

social justice ... ooooh no, that is going back about ten years [Trish].

social justice- where is it? Shrinking resources and all the rest of it. Governments aren't prepared to put that as a priority ... All the things we used to talk about, we can't mention it any more. You're not allowed to talk about social justice ... like everyone else at the moment you're looking for new words ... you know with the change of government you don't use the words any more [Frank].

... increasingly obvious is the absence of words like social justice ... You know the whole sort of language used in the mission statement has made a huge shift from the social value language to a much more business orientated focus [Tracy].

The increasing marginalising and subsequent removal of key terms such as social justice from the lexicon of practitioners and their silencing in the midst of such change highlights the degree of compliance achieved by the state through its control of the funding relationship with organisations. This process is an important aspect of both the compelled and complicit forms of hegemonic embrace. The absence of such terms can tell us much about changes in discursive formations- in other words the silences can be as revealing as the actual discursive practice. Removing terms of signification such as social justice that serve to define the essence of community development practice is perhaps one of the most powerful hegemonic acts undertaken by the state. Their replacement by terms aligned with enterprise culture in
more formal texts such as mission statements referred to by Tracy reflects the consolidation of hegemonic forms of embrace. Thus, one of the paradoxes facing practitioners in terms of responding to enterprise culture in its various manifestations is the uncertainty of knowing how much ground to give in terms of social justice considerations. A manual for managers of human service organisations titled *Just change: the cost conscious manager’s tool kit* (1993) highlights this dilemma. The authors argue that it is possible to maintain a social justice perspective [as ends] and take on board many of the processes of enterprise culture [as ends]. Within an overt context of social justice, they identify three categories of possible organisational and worker response to changes associated with enterprise culture:

i) Direct challenge by workers to changes seen as diametrically opposed to social justice goals and principles (thereby placing funding at risk). In terms of this research, this response borders on an overt rejection.

ii) Adapt or seem to adapt in terms of public image and industrial and service changes, but try and maintain elements of social justice programs and principles.

iii) Explicitly affirm a commitment to social justice and adopt only those techniques that do not compromise this commitment. The ‘toolkit’ notes that these approaches are not ‘mutually exclusive’ and that:

*Many of those processes... are quite compatible with social justice principles and goals... different strategies may be adopted at different times and for different purposes. The crucial issue is to be clear about social justice principles and goals, and at the same time to be strategic in implementation, using currently popular techniques to achieve desired goals (Auor et al, 1993:14-15).*

The handbook suggests the development of enterprise culture processes such as best practice, total quality management (TQM) and structural efficiency enable multi skilling of workers, teamwork and greater individual responsibility for quality control. The authors suggest that a number of the techniques associated with enterprise culture can be adopted by community organisations in ways that do not compromise their commitment to social justice. Elements of this view can be found in some of the responses of some practitioners,
I do want to see things done efficiently and effectively. I want us to be learning from what we know.

Tracy reiterated that her priority was to keep challenging the dominant discourse and she felt this could be best done by:

*maintaining our awareness as workers of social justice in a climate of economic rationalism and demystifying the language because language is what it is all about, so that our communities can understand what is going on. Too many people are starting to believe the rhetoric so you can get really depressed, but you don’t...*

She affirms the need to maintain her own social justice values and perspectives, yet the balancing act required to achieve this in the face of enterprise discourse and its increasing influence is clearly difficult. She acknowledges the energy required and the frustration that accompany her best endeavours to practice in ways that promote social justice:

*when things are so regressive you feel like you are just trying to hold the ground that you are on and stop from going backwards and that’s yeah, hard psychologically for everybody I think.*

The perception of a number of those interviewed was that the energies and focus of workers appear to be increasingly, on survival. Trish has noted that:

*in the funded stuff, community groups, a lot more of it is just survival than social change.*

Thus contesting and challenging discursive practice within the context of a competitive tendering environment whilst trying to maintain commitments to social justice appears to be a tiring and draining process for practitioners. Hence notions of social justice are under siege and the authors of *Just Change* acknowledge the concern that the constant change associated with funding and the struggle for resources may lead to a loss of commitment to social justice (Auer, Repin & Roc, 1993:14). Thus, what may start out as a strategic embrace of enterprise discourse defending broader goals such as social justice may end up as cooption
and hegemony - a trojan horse; as *cultural change* transforms the organisational culture and context of community development practice. Gewirtz, Ball and Bowe (1993), in a review of changes in the value base of the education system in the United Kingdom could have been describing this process of discursive transformation effecting community development when they argued that:

> concern for social justice is being replaced by concern for institutional survival, collectivism with individualism, co-operation with suspicion, and need with expediency (1993:252)

Thus, the prospects of retaining community development discourse in the face of enterprise discourse appear to be extremely problematic. As this is a key feature of a strategic embrace it suggests that this form of response will require a great deal of commitment and perseverance from practitioners if it is to emerge as a real alternative. Kate, for example notes:

> I think you need to talk about what you mean and not just talk about a word and assume that everybody is going to mean the same thing and what is really behind it all: find out all the details rather than assume this is the buzz word and therefore it is going to be the way to go, like opportunities can really be a way to be done over.

Trish summarised this process of 'discursive challenge' thus:

> I reckon we've got to do two things. I think there is some value in using their language back ... there are advantages in doing that, but I think it has to be critiqued as well, not just use their language and accept it but use it and then critique it and turn it around.

It is timely, then, in the context of seeking to establish possible forms of strategic embrace to revisit two terms that were discussed in Chapter 2 as illustrative of enterprise discourse - empowerment and enterprise, and discuss the potential to develop such a critical discourse.
Empowerment

Empowerment is an illustrative term that highlights the problematic nature of using key terms uncritically, the potential for meanings to be transformed and the need to reassert meanings that reflect community development principles. It is a central concept that also illustrates the notion of a contested terrain. Empowerment involves the process whereby individuals begin to see connections between their lives, others in the community and the broader reality—social, political and economic—and the way these connections shape their destinies. Empowerment appears to be seen as a springboard for action for individuals—to take control or power over their lives, to boost self-esteem and raise consciousness. It is central to a commitment to social change and collective liberation and transformation. Salamanca et al (1995:19-20) found respondents to their study identified the attainment of self-determination and social transformation or 'cultural change' through 'empowerment and education' as central to their vision and practice of community development.

Baistow identifies a number of similarities between current discourses of empowerment promulgated by both the left and the new right. She argues they both see it as essentially a ground up activity emphasising 'localised' strategies to improve 'user choice', control and participation (Baistow 1994/5:38). It is relevant at this point to briefly re-visit a discussion in Chapter 3 regarding the meaning attached to empowerment by management theorists such as Peters (1982) and included for the purposes of this study under the broader umbrella of enterprise culture. Within this context, the meaning is on producing a quality product from a workforce that is innovative and keen. Empowerment is seen as an instrumental means to greater efficiency and profit. Thus the use of teams to ensure a common solution, greater participation and sense of personal control on the part of workers, may all prove to be little more than a smokescreen hiding longer hours, greater stress, a downward transfer of administration tasks, less staff and a consolidation of hierarchy. Its usage by 'new managerialism' to promote enchanted workplaces has been noted elsewhere (Gee and Lankshcar, 1995) and Baistow (1994/5) reiterates the point that under the guise of empowerment, the process of transforming organisations to embody a productive culture actually increases the power, status and control of managers as they become experts in empowerment—the techniques of how to get more out of employees.

Baistow (1994/5:37-41) argues that empowerment, even in its more common usage in community service settings shares not only the common characteristics noted above but also
the same emphasis on paid professionals to enact it as a strategy. Hence, managers of private enterprise organisations are required to be skilled in team building, and communication skills if they are to transform their organisations and along the way acquire more power, roles and apparent expertise- not less. Similarly, community development practitioners are not any less powerful in their roles of empowering others and in fact they are often central to it and can have increased interventions in the lives of others on the pretext of their empowering practices. The process of empowering others may be somewhat problematic because far from doing one out of a job as respondents suggested was the case in the Salamanca et al study (1995:19), the process may have quite different outcomes. Baistow believes the danger is that some definitions actually enhance the role of the professional because of the reliance of the judgement of workers about 'candidates' for empowerment. The expression, 'candidates' for empowerment includes service users, clients, parents or employees because they are perceived by professionals to be groups who would benefit from "it" or they have a right to power (Baistow,1994/95:37-41). She applies similar analysis to the left discourse of empowerment, questioning how practitioners can know that it is translated into action and it actually makes a difference to lives and contributes to broader issues of social change. Trish expressed similar reservations about the term:

*I still have a problem with that word,...there are heaps of people like new graduates talking about the importance of empowerment....I just hear empowerment all the time. For me I find the term patronising because it infers that somehow I as an individual am going to empower somebody else so it sets up a power imbalance. I think that people take their own power and we need processes not to block people doing it, but I'm not sure we can make them do it.*

What is indicated from the discussion so far then, is the need for a meaning of empowerment that emphasises giving voice to those excluded and silenced to be applied in practice in order breathe new life into the term as a practice with 'critical potential' (Baistow,1994/95:37-45). The challenge for community development would appear to be to define and practice empowerment as one that is truly liberating- both for individuals and collectivities, and capable of challenging the exclusion and invisibility of many that are powerless within society. Gee & Lankshear (1995) also advocate a broader conception of empowerment based on critical language awareness that embraces the sorts of meanings pertinent to community
development. This view sees empowerment as a process that enables individuals and groups to challenge the values and goals of organisations, institutions and society. Empowerment in this sense embodies critical reflection as a stepping stone to action on issues of concern in people's lives. Many individuals working together on issues can through collective empowerment challenge hegemony in many ways as history has shown. It requires a raised consciousness and skills in critical reflection - both important parts of a practitioner's repertoire. That said, the dilemmas revealed by Baistow regarding the term highlight its potentially problematic and slippery nature both in terms of definition and enactment.

Some of the practitioners interviewed appear to utilise the term empowerment in the broader sense advocated by Baistow (1994/5) and Gee and Lankshear (1995). For example, they appear to link the concepts of empowerment and structural change:

*to empower and change, that is the bottom line - to address the structures that disempower. That's why I practice it (Josie)*.

*the end point of community development is to create environmentally, economically and socially sustainable communities and the way to get there is to make some major changes in the structures that we have (Steve).*

*community development is about social justice, it's about a more equitable distribution of resources, it's about wealth and power and it is about empowering our service users to be able to run with issues themselves....(it) is trying to bring about social and systemic change in the issues that seriously affect our service users and we certainly do community education which we see as part of community development (Joe)*

A Deakin University study, 'Transformation of the Welfare State' suggests some of the integral aspects of any definition of empowerment and also suggests the sites where such definitions are most in evidence. Kenny (1996), reporting on initial findings from the research stated:
the linkages between the principles of self determination, commitment to
devolution of power and responsibility, the politics of redistribution and the
politics of difference and recognition were most clearly articulated in
organisations with a focus on Aboriginal and gender issues. (1996:18)

Empowerment, then remains central to a commitment to progressive community
development. The challenge made explicit in this research and responded to below, is how to
recontextualise these guiding principles and apply them in practice in a context of enterprise
culture.

Enterprise- a contested term?

If part of the supposed allure of competitive tendering is meant to be autonomy then any
exploration of the range of potential strategies for creatively challenging enterprise culture
(such as strategic embrace) needs to consider how to create this space or autonomy. To this
end, participants in the initial interview were asked to consider the extent to which they
regarded their practice as enterprising. This question sought to establish whether the term
could be open to contestation of meaning or if it had been captured by enterprise culture as
defining qualities and activities that only really blossom and flourish in private business
settings (see earlier discussion on definitions of enterprise). If practitioners perceived their
work in the quality and activity senses of the term enterprise, it may open up the possibility of
challenging the dominant or hegemonic meaning attached to the term and contribute to the
evolution of strategic forms of embrace and creative forms of practice. On the other hand, if
practitioners dismissed enterprise as equating with business ways of working, then the term
could be regarded as claimed by enterprise culture in terms of their practice.

Enterprise is another term potentially open to contestation that has been central to the
promotion of an enterprise culture by its proponents. As noted elsewhere, they have
privileged business/market modes of operation and being as the paradigm within which the
characteristics of enterprise will flourish. In this definition, enterprise equates with
entrepreneurialism and individual profit making. Yet, the broader meaning of enterprise
discussed elsewhere establishes that the activity and quality senses of the term are applicable
in multifarious settings. Ball argues that enterprise is a form of renewal for depressed
communities in Britain- but in a context of social justice. He believes that the narrow
(economy school) definition is a subset of the broader (education school). Thus, enterprise skills are those that result in increased capacity for independent action in and outside the labour market with an emphasis on self reliance, with workers as enablers not directors and enterprise itself is a way of achieving other ends rather than as an end in itself Ball, 1988:3-4). Such a view appears to reflect some of the perceptions of respondents. When asked if they perceived their community development practice as enterprising, practitioners were perhaps surprisingly comfortable in answering in the affirmative, yet drawing a distinction between the narrow (for profit) meaning and the broader sense of the term:

... not in a private enterprise way... enterprising-yeah... enterprising in that it is about new and exciting things and change and challenging and cutting edge, it is about developing new ways of structuring society and new ways for people to live, so yeah it is enterprising. (Kate)

showing initiative and taking advantage of networks and opportunities but you've got a goal that's not about making profit whereas normally the goal for enterprise is making profit... my goal is activating and increasing ownership and accountability... so to be enterprising would mean to me that you have your own agenda ...enterprising- oh yes I don't see anything wrong with that word when it's linked with c.d....(Maxine)

I would see enterprising as being creative, as looking at different ways, as taking risks, as pushing the boundaries and I would say that it is what we try to do and try to encourage and get excited about and enjoy (Natasha)

responsive to need, attempting to be visionary, attempting to reflect on practice, to build on practice. So all those things could be seen as enterprising. We've almost had the word stamped in my head another way... it's been used in terms of go out and make money and if that is the definition then I think we'd reject it...(Janis)
I think we are enterprising very much so because we provide a service we provide services that government cannot provide and we enable many people to find out about their rights information. We are in a very practical way enterprising ... we are still here, we still receive funding, so in that sense we are enterprising ...(Irene)

What is interesting about our enterprise if you like is that not only are we using funds that we've got for specific purposes in the most enterprising way that we can but also within that we're doing bits and pieces that actually bring in extra dosh all the time. (Sonya)

We are on one side of the coin very enterprising, we make sure that what surplus funds we have are invested in the highest interest rate return. We are enterprising in chasing funding. We are enterprising in trying to keep our costs down, entering in the way we might get around funding issues and taking on things a bit outside our funding guidelines, we think we have a very enterprising organisational structure but we certainly do not embrace another concept of the word... the term that might be used by the right, we'd find that sort of enterprise a bit abhorrent to us. (Joe)

The activity and quality meanings of enterprise are very much in evidence and interestingly, this term generated the most unanimity amongst practitioners regarding meaning. They are clearly claiming meanings for the term that describe components of their practice. Their common message, although differing in emphasis, is that community development is enterprising: it can promote innovation, creativity, vision, and energy. In other words, the organisational culture and settings required for enterprising qualities and activities to occur do not need to be those narrowly circumscribed by enterprise culture. Community based groups can be powerful sites for promoting enterprise in its broadest sense. The other important aspect of these quotes is the rejection of profit as the motive and ends being sought in favour of collective notions that reflect social justice such as community ownership, building new ways of living and space for people to move. It is suggested, therefore, that such strategic contestation of meanings that challenge hegemonic boundaries may be part of a response to enterprise culture. This process of claiming meanings and naming alternative
sites and modes of practice that exemplify it is crucial and potentially counter hegemonic. In seeking to focus on such possible ways forward, it is relevant to be mindful of an important characteristic of enterprise discourse noted by Fairclough:

'enterprise discourse' ought not to be understood too rigidly, and enterprise discourse itself is a rather diffuse set of tendencies affecting the 'order of discourse' of contemporary British society as part of wider tendencies of cultural change (Fairclough, 1995:112).

This suggests that enterprise culture, whilst hegemonic in intent, finds expression in a myriad of forms and is open to contestation. If community development is to do more than survive and offer the basis of resistance to enterprise culture, practitioners must be prepared to be engaged in a process of seizing the initiative by strategically seeking to contest and reclaim the terrain of discourse and practice. As noted above, the struggle for survival is fast taking its toll as merged forms of discourse revolving around complicit and compelled forms of embrace emerge as predominant. However, the diffuse and fragmented form of aspects of enterprise discourse opens the door to resistance - a dialectic that can draw on the heritage of community development and potentially spawn creative forms of practice. Fairclough, in seeking to make sense of enterprise culture and its process of colonisation of domains notes the divergent forms it might take. Sites of potential opposition such as community development interest him in terms of:

... the question of resistance: how, if at all, is enterprise discourse opposed in the various domains among which it is distributed, and what are the outcomes of struggle between opposing discourses? This may be, for example, a matter of struggle over the meaning of 'enterprising' by perhaps applying it to activities distant from business or of drawing upon an alternative vocabulary (eg focusing upon cultivating creativity rather than enterprise in education) or constituting alternative subject positions in discourse. (Fairclough, 1992:122)

As one element in an overall response to enterprise culture, community development practitioners have the potential to be part of this resistance, or discursive challenge through the development of a critical discourse, a notion outlined in some detail in Chapter 7.
The dilemma of autonomy and community based management

A term that seemed to reveal dilemmas for practitioners was autonomy. In the discussion above, the notion of autonomy to establish practice parameters was identified as an important precursor to challenging enterprise culture and developing progressive practice. Yet, it would appear to be a two edged sword - perhaps revealing another aspect of the soft underbelly? Jocelyn, for example noted:

In terms of my management committee, I feel like I have got far too much autonomy. I don't think I am going to be brought to question on very much and I'd feel happier if they were going to ask a few questions a little more often and that would mean they were providing a bit more support, a bit more direction.

This perspective reflects Jocelyn's broader ambivalence about some community development practice in the past: that it has not been effective in promoting change or social justice:

[I have] watched too much money get whittled away in a time when there was more money and ... I think we actually got carried away a bit in the past collective caring sharing modes and I think you need to be able to ask yourself if you're doing something in a way that is going to generate the best outcomes with what you have got available to you.

Similarly, Tracy commented:

yes I basically have autonomy. However, I think that has a negative impact on the establishment of community development in practice simply because it is far too easy to go off and do what I want because I can see it rather than involve the community and so it takes a great deal of hang on stop, you're doing this on your own, go back through your process so it takes a lot of evaluation.
However, whilst autonomy represents a dilemma in terms of how workers exercise the power that might come with it, Tracy saw a loss of autonomy occurring in the relationship between community houses and funding bodies. In terms of the forms of embrace outlined above, this is a crucial point. It again reveals the power in the hands of the state through its control of the funding nexus.

Autonomy... something we used to be and aren't any longer... community houses from what I'm hearing are saying they are losing their autonomy because they are being dictated by other people as to how they should run ie, go into business plans, more professionalism. I think your autonomy is there if you take it, it is up to you how much you want to Kow Tow. ... If you don't want to do what they ask then find [the money] somewhere else, but that is not that simple, autonomy is threatened.

Similarly, Trish found autonomy was a term she:

hadn't heard of ... for a long time, certainly it is there in the government propaganda, public relations sort of stuff, that the tendering process is all about generating greater autonomy at the point of service delivery. I've never seen a definition of what they mean by autonomy. We get x amount of dollars which is much less than we need and somehow we are autonomous enough to operate on that level.

Autonomy thus emerges as an ambiguous term, reflecting contested meaning and also informing part of the critique of pre-existing forms of practice for practitioners like Jocelyn.

Jessica, with a background in women's housing felt that the weak link in community based management has always potentially been the power exerted by some co-ordinators over their management committees. This perspective echoes some of the concerns of Jocelyn and Tracy. However, she adds another twist in suggesting that:
co-ordinators or managers can use this power to take on the trappings of being a business-pursuing contracts and leaving workers no choice but to go along with what is happening.

This suggests that for those with power within an organisation, the processes such as competitive tendering may well open doors for autonomy of action, but the workers themselves may find less autonomy as tenders prescribe program specifications ever more tightly.

The interface between community development and enterprise culture

From the analysis of the initial interviews with practitioners, it is evident that the interface between community development and enterprise culture is a source of conflict and contestation for many. The initial interviews revealed that all practitioners were engaged in some form of response to enterprise culture and that there had been no total overt rejection of its discourse and associated practices and policies. Practitioners were generally sceptical about the claims attributed to such practices and policies and many were opposed to the introduction of processes such as competitive tendering. The dilemma associated with choosing not to participate in such processes was apparent to most and there was a degree of hostility and impassioned critiquing of the impacts of such changes. The majority, however, felt they would have no choice but to participate, to "play the game". In all interviews the 'bet each way' was apparent, and to some extent such positioning is not unusual in community development. The juggling of seemingly opposing ideas and/or policies is often a central part of practice. The qualified incorporation of terms that were seen to possibly enhance practice if interpreted carefully was seen as acceptable to a number of those interviewed. Trish, for example, noted:

*I do think there is a need to market in some way, to be sympathetic to who we're marketing towards and I think we need to market towards the community with which we are working, have the occasional public relations day to launch certain things, but I worry about spending all the time on marketing and not doing what we should be there for.*
Similarly, Kate, felt the term product:

*is not something that can't be related if... notions of who controls what is a product are in the right place... if it's people with disabilities who determine what the product should be, then that is alright, but if what the product should be is determined by the market, then no... It (the market) is about saying there is a level playing field and there obviously isn't... people don't compete equally in a market and the notion of a market is about people buying and selling themselves and what they have to offer... if you don't have strength then you won't do a good deal and nobody is going to hold your hand to support you to get a good deal... people with disabilities, women, working class people all end up pretty much getting the bad end of the deal of that sort of market.*

Steve also found some of the discourse associated with enterprise culture had relevance to community development, provided its meaning could be altered to reflect the domain's concerns:

*I don't have such a problem with efficiency because I don't think there is anything wrong with an agency looking at itself continually and asking what is it we are on about and putting into that picture everything, not just the measurable things, and asking how can we achieve better than we are at the moment, how can we be more effective.....I wouldn't use the term efficiency, I'd rather use honesty or effectiveness.*

This re-conceptualising and contextualising of terms such as marketing and product as something that may not be totally alien to the practice of community development is reflective of the dynamics of discursive change that is always evident where established discourse and practice is confronted with a new discourse. Steve added an important proviso regarding the potential for a strategic embrace that incorporates elements of enterprise discourse into the domain of community development. For example, he believes that there is very little merit in community development organisations portraying themselves as businesses:
I think it is a very dangerous thing to do. I think it side-tracks us from what we're on about; in a sense it mainstreams us and we become part of the problem.

He also draws a very clear distinction between the making of money from the provision of human services and dollars earnt from community enterprises using market discourse to make a profit. Community development cannot and should not be subjected to the processes of marketisation. Thus, whilst a community development worker may well be instrumental in establishing co-operatives or micro enterprises, the ways of working should remain within community development discourse and the organisation should avoid positioning itself as an enterprise:

It is a different field, a different mindset, a different reason for existence. Enterprises in the way I use it as a business enterprise either community or private, needs to make a profit otherwise to my definition it is not an enterprise. Community development agencies, local government and government don't need to make a profit to survive, to that extent they are very different.

Tracy felt that the main strategy for workers responding to enterprise culture was to maintain:

awareness as workers of social justice in a climate of economic rationalism and demystifying the language because language is what it is all about so that our communities can understand what is going on is still a major part of what we are doing here. Too many people are starting to believe the rhetoric so you can get really depressed but you don't... I think that's why we're doing the vision day... the myth of economic rationalism challenges social justice to the enth degree and I think we need to continually look at why we are here because otherwise buying those myths, the economic rationalist statement of user pays, it's too easy to just accept and become part of a philosophy for a
ccntrc that has to pay its own way... if you really want it you'll pay for it you're responsible for your situation the individual is to blame continually it's harder for people to see the social structures as being part of the problem.

Trish was quite pessimistic about the prospects for progressive community development as paid employment:

*I think we are losing c.d. out of the funded sector and the challenge is to get it back into the funded sector. The funded sector and individuals within that are copping out whilst still sitting on massive resources, buildings, photocopiers and should bloody well know better to sit back and worry about their own arse. I really think the challenge is to try inject it back and say to those organisations ok what is it we are here for? Are we here for Kennett and economic rationalism or are we here because we have a vision for our community or issues for women should be dealt with and try and inject it back because the reality is that groups have gone whether they have been happy little vegemites with the government or disruptive.*

Trish reflects an activist stance that suggests challenging the funding nexus with the state through collective action and solidarity. In terms of responses, Trish came closest to proposing an overt rejection of enterprise culture and its central tenets. She clearly laments the preparedness of fellow practitioners to display such solidarity.

If the development of strategic forms of embrace is to be a viable alternative response to enterprise culture, it would seem to require an ability on the part of practitioners to balance pragmatic acceptance of the 'mechanics' of enterprise culture and retain the core elements of their community development practice. The need to adapt and modify has long been a part of community development, especially in the context of relating to the welfare state. It is evident there is no "pure" practice- there are instead, various hybridised forms influenced by a whole range of ideological, value and policy issues. Enterprise culture represents a significant challenge because it offers a package of alternative approaches that appear to run counter to community development. The struggle of practitioners to redefine and recontextualise their practice is an evolving process- a dialectic. Enterprise culture has contributed to a massive
re-think of the policy and practice context of community development. It has exposed the "soft" underbelly of community development - the question of accountability and autonomy.

The responses of practitioners have indicated the conflicts they are experiencing as they seek to make sense of the recontextualising of their practice in the light of the impact of enterprise culture. Many disparate threads are evident, revealing manifestations of the different forms of embrace in various configurations. An emphasis on service delivery and consequently a concomitant dependency on competitive tendering to fund such work characterises most of the organisations employing the practitioners who were part of this study. This organisational setting would appear, from the findings of the initial interviews to make the sustaining of an ideology of resistance difficult. In fact, what might start out as a strategic embrace, for example, may well evolve into a hegemonic embrace in order to retain the service delivery component and therefore survive as an entity. Overt rejection did not emerge as a significant form of response amongst the practitioners interviewed, except in fragments of discursive practice.

The potential, therefore, for community development practitioners to move beyond and/or avoid adopting a hegemonic form of embrace would appear to require a living, breathing practice of community development where the interface with enterprise culture becomes the arena for contestation of ideas and discourse. The question is what is the potential of the adoption of strategic forms of embrace as competitive tendering and other manifestations of enterprise culture become entrenched? The practitioners interviewed appear to indicate that hegemonic forms of embrace are a distinct possibility as organisations jostle to survive in a competitive environment. Will there still be the space to engage with the discourse and practices of enterprise culture and manoeuvre and reposition one's practice? Are hybridised or merged forms of discourse the most likely outcome? The findings from the follow up interviews 12 months on reveal some interesting responses to such questions.
CHAPTER 6- Hegemonic or Strategic Embrace?

Practitioner responses 12 months on

The unfolding of practitioner responses to enterprise culture and its associated discourse and practice is a fragmented and diverse story. Analysis so far has sought to place this dialectic in a politico-economic context that highlights the already existing dilemmas faced by practitioners. The purpose in following up practitioners 12 months later (late 1997) was to further examine the unfolding of this dialectic evolving at the interface between community development and enterprise culture as reflected in their discourse. In particular, was there some relationship between the immediate pressure of responding to competitive tendering and associated processes and moves towards forms of hegemonic embrace? This emergent trend was evident in some of the responses to the first interview. In other words, those already experiencing the full impacts of enterprise culture were finding it more difficult to respond strategically than practitioners whose organisations and their programs were not as yet subject to such processes.

Maxine's story

The unravelling of Maxine’s experience in working in a provincial town for an agency whose committee of management complicitly embraced enterprise culture is illustrative. The chairperson of the committee, along with the executive officer were instrumental in the early decision to “play the game” and opted for a strategy of growth applying widely for tenders. It saw itself as a flexible community business. Growth became an end in itself after initial claims that this new approach was needed to enable the organisation to survive. The organisation’s complicit embrace of enterprise culture led to a period of rapid growth in terms of staff numbers, office locations and range of services. Querying such directions was fruitless and communication was often poor. In fact, Maxine’s organisation emerges as hierarchical and distant from its workers which would appear to be in contrast with the rhetoric of enterprise culture with its extolling of the virtues of worker empowerment and teamwork. She notes:  

1
very little was done to communicate with the staff the reasons why decisions were being made, staff communicated with the eo in many different ways and attempted to communicate with the committee that we didn't think it was a sound financial or philosophical way to go but the message that was given back was that in order to survive we will have to take this path....then I guess the rationale shifted a little bit to now that we have expanded to this size of staff we have to keep employing people...

When workers including Maxine, did query the direction of the organisation and its financial status, they were marginalised often on the basis of crude stereotyping:

one [worker] who would get very articulate and strong always only argued from a financial view: this is bad business what you are doing, we can see you undertendering for things and draining what resources the organisations and she could back that up with figures but she was seen to be emotional, a trouble maker, and I would argue on a philosophical point of view and I was patronisingly called the conscience of the place.

The organisation displayed the essential characteristics of a complicit embrace. There was an ideology of compliance evident in the sense that those within the organisation with decision making power played the tendering game with enthusiasm and spontaneity and refused to question or allow meaningful discussion with the staff on the direction it was taking. Thus, there were relatively low levels of worker autonomy in terms of defining discourse and practice. Finally, the organisation was more than prepared to interlock its activities with the state. Workers within the organisation who sought to question this complicit embrace were, as has been noted, marginalised. Maxine endeavoured to create her own space and to work strategically in terms of responding to the management's embrace of enterprise culture. However, in many respects she was compelled to accommodate the changing organisational culture and adoption of business structures and processes.
The flexible community business had to close down in 1997 with insufficient funds to pay its staff two weeks back pay and was technically bankrupt. The process of adopting enterprise culture through such an emphatic embrace appears to have been a key contributing factor. The process of informing staff of the closure is illustrative:

>I guess within probably about five weeks before the place closed down decisions were made to close down four centres and staff were given just one day's notice and asked to leave and I don't know if any of those people got any redundancy payments. Then on the night before the organisation closed down the committee made the decision to wind up and a couple of staff were informed that that was going to happen, and they were asked to phone everybody else and it took a full week for people to get a letter informing that the place was going to close down and they were now redundant. Most of us would be in the position that I am in now that we didn't get paid for the final two weeks of our work, and we had not had our tax paid for most of the year and we hadn't had our super paid for most of the year.

Maxine further lamented that:

>the task for committees in this day and age is just so difficult and if you lose that link with your local community, well, you're just done for.

The organisation died without any public comment. The sacked worker noted the loss of identity and ownership by the community towards the organisation as it had tendered everywhere for work, often gaining tenders a long distance from its base. The observation was made to this worker that the explanation was quite straightforward. The community began to ask:

>don't they care about us here locally? .... they saw you getting too big for your boots.... they saw you moving away from local needs and so they have no
comment now and that indicates to me that it was an organisation dying for some time.

There are a number of salient points that arise from Maxine’s experience:

i) the adoption of a complicit form of embrace by management has the potential to lead to an organisation growing beyond its capacity and experience and stretch the resources of the committee of management.

ii) staff’s input is valued if it affirms with the complicit embrace and does not question the direction of policy and practice. However, workers whose views conflict with the agenda of management can be marginalised or effectively silenced by being denied access to decision making processes. The organisation becomes closed to other viewpoints. Hierarchical forms of management can arise that privilege the views of those with more decision making power

iii) the broader aims of an organisation become subsumed under the greater goal of growth as the means and ends of its existence. Commitments and connections to the local community are lost, along with explicit value statements and practices affirming social justice and social change.

iv) the transformation of a community based organisation into a business transforms more than the name of that organisation. Perceptions alter from both within and outside the organisation about its modus operandi- a hegemonic 'creep' seems to appear. In other words, the changes may appear subtle, but discursive changes signal changes in policy, style and practice,

v) workers in Maxine’s position, whilst opposing the changes are often compelled to accept them- or leave.

Jocelyn’s story

The follow up interview with Jocelyn, who has an extensive background in women’s services, further illustrates the ‘creeping’ hegemony that emerged strongly over the 12 month period, and the dilemmas this poses for practitioners. Jocelyn when interviewed in 1996, expressed concerns about the accountability of community development practice.
[accountability is]... a word being used more and more around the organisation and I don't think it is a bad thing. I think workers should be able to be accountable within the organisation. I think it is some of that professionalism. It's moving to expecting something more than we've expected in the past so I don't say there are some workers who won't like it. If we can't be accountable for what we are doing then we shouldn't be doing it. Again I don't have any trouble in saying we should providing the most efficient service but it depends on how you measure efficient... I encourage us not to be scared of it at all but efficient doesn't mean the most for the less, efficient means a good sound approach that has a quality outcome.

The capacity of committees to manage and workers to be accountable to those committees has been an issue for Jocelyn for some time. It appears that these concerns have opened the door to her changed stance on enterprise culture and her form of response. Twelve months on and she has changed jobs. Asked to reflect on any changes in her perceptions of her practice, she commented:

My thinking has changed enormously and possibly my practice too but that some of that reflects a different role in my work. My thinking has changed to the extent to which I am not longer willing to battle against the system. I am working in a larger organisation and I think that has made it easier for me to not take it to heart and to go with the flow....

Jocelyn's discourse reflects some important aspects of worker responses after they have been involved in the accommodations and compromises that go hand in hand with dealing with the impacts of enterprise culture. There is a sense that there is no other alternative (which suggests a compelled embrace) in the phrase 'system. Jocelyn, in contrast to Maxine, has made a conscious decision to not only integrate the approach of management advocated by enterprise culture into her practice, but to affirm it as her approach. An emphasis on achieving organisational growth as a necessary means of survival emerged as a key indicator of organisations and workers adopting a complicit embrace of enterprise culture, especially as the trends consolidated, and more and more
sectors become subject to competitive tendering. In other words, as noted in the findings from Maxine's experiences, organisations appear to run the risk of entering a vortex of an irresistible force which leads them further down the road of all the trappings of hegemonic embrace. The discursive practices within such organisations appear to increasingly reflect the discourse of business as part of this process. Community development workers face increasingly restricted choices in such employment situations because the institutions and players (funding bodies, committees of management, coordinators/managers/executive officers) that determine the nature and parameters of their practice have their feet firmly planted on the accelerator of enterprise culture and the brakes on community development. As noted, Jocelyn's choice has been clearly to assimilate her discourse and practice into the broader fold of organisational imperatives that are driving it to compete and grow, and hence there are formative threads of complicit embrace in both:

[It is] a larger organisation that is pragmatically dealing with the issues at hand, most particularly the funding structures. [It] is not so much about the work we do but the compromises we make as far as how we structure who we compete with and we do compete with a range of organisations. There are a number of things I accept which I wouldn't have in the past ...[including] the need to strategically position the organisation to survive in the future and the way we are doing that is to assume that we will get larger and larger and that we will take over ...and we will pick up roles that smaller organisations have done.

The discourse of enterprise culture is evident throughout this quote. The need to 'compete', to grow to survive, and that to achieve this it will be necessary to 'takeover' smaller organisations. The transformation from community based organisation to quasi business is apparently well underway. One of the outcomes of this transformation is an increasing interlocking of the organisation with the state and its policies and programs. The scramble for funds and survival encourages this process and an ideology of compliance can emerge as organisational discourse begins to embrace enterprise discourse. Thus, the elements of a complicit embrace begin to evolve. Growth begins to be interlocked with more than mere survival. Opportunities for organisations to do 'more' is a powerful lure. It enshrines winners as the big players and the losers as the smaller players. This in fact reflects what has and is
occurring to many organisations that have been sites for community development practice. The challenge at this stage in responding to enterprise culture is to establish whether such accommodations could be part of a strategic embrace or whether they reflect an evolving complicit embrace. Part of the reason for the endorsement of growth from Jocelyn is her long held concern about community based management that was alluded to previously. She notes:

*the shift in my thinking has a few components partially it is because I am in a larger organisation that says that is the way things go and I'm working with the organisation towards those ends and there is a part of me that it might not be such a big shift and came out the last time we spoke that is a little disillusioned with community management anyway and at some levels I am not convinced that those programs are provided any more effectively in a small organisation than they are in a large organisation.*

The threads and elements that have combined to lead Jocelyn to her current thinking and discursive practice emerge clearly in this piece. She is reflecting on nearly 20 years in community development practice and noting that her disillusionment with aspects of community based management has found expression in her approval of the drive to expansion, an endorsement of the notion that larger organisations can be more effective in delivering a service. Jocelyn revealed that her discourse had changed dramatically in 12 months, although notions of core business were already evident in the initial interview and have been discussed above. Interestingly, terms such as enterprise are now common place. For example, the strategic plan (1997-2000) of her organisation has as a key result area—enterprise, innovation and technology. A sub-point under that heading states:

- *Enterprise provides opportunities to encourage staff interest and involvement.* (1997:1)

Interestingly, the statement of purpose affirms empowerment as an underpinning focus, also stressing a local emphasis and a commitment to cultural sensitivity. The organisation is
prepared to countenance strategic alignments with other groups and is conscious that its growth may mean other smaller organisations are amalgamated according to Jocelyn. Such a response reflects the dilemmas that are inherent in the dynamic occurring at the interface between enterprise culture and sites where community development is practiced. This approach to practice, for Jocelyn, is concerned with:

*doing better with the resources we've got. If we have picked up anything from industry it is client focused services. OK let us take a step back and look at who are we providing services for and it is tied up with things like continuous quality assurance and all those terms*

The origin of those changes in thinking, discourse and practice is acknowledged quite clearly as being from private enterprise, but applied by the state through funding arrangements. In particular, Jocelyn believes that the principles embodied in client-focused services:

*are not at odds with what we want to do and I'd argue there are lots of services that have been provided for a long time with a great awareness of the needs of workers and not necessarily meeting the needs of the community...one of the things we are doing which comes from an enterprise notion is targeting our services.*

The decision to target services away from 'yuppies' towards those who most need the services is seen as a good outcome by Jocelyn. It has emerged from:

*commiting ourselves to a strategic way we provide our services. An underlying thing that has moved a long way since a year ago are the moves afoot from the Department to fund much larger organisations so we are gearing ourselves up to being one of those so we can be in a position to tender for a $20 million contract. Now in tendering for that we need to set ourselves apart from private providers who might tender and one of the things we will argue is quality and assessed need of the most disadvantaged.*
Jocelyn has moved she feels more towards an embrace of enterprise culture at all levels - values, discourse and practice. However, she sees her current position as being torn between a compelled and strategic embrace. Strategically, she believes there are still some levels of choice and independence in both the formulation and making of decisions that reflect her values. In other aspects of her work there is no doubt in her mind that a compelled embrace is the only form of response that is viable. Aspects of her discursive practice would also appear to suggest that there are some elements of a complicit embrace. Some aspects of this embrace are simply about improving the way practice occurs rather than representing any 'sell out' of principles, according to Jocelyn:

you could say the same about us introducing computers years ago. My first job we typed on a typewriter with carbon and put things through the roneo machine and so in the same way that enterprise and technology were ahead of us they became a key part of our service delivery. They are not just awful things in themselves.

This perspective emphasises the argument of means versus ends, that is, a practitioner can adopt the techniques of enterprise culture without embracing its ends and other means you might find objectionable. For example, Jocelyn argues that the key difference in embracing elements of enterprise culture is that you are not also adopting a key defining characteristic of capitalism- the profit motive. Further, the 'common good' remains as the abiding ends sought by those engaged in organisations associated with community development.

The final notable issue regarding Jocelyn's interview is the relative absence in the 1997 interview of community development concepts and definitions of practice. Part of this reflects a changed job but also a more limited perspective on the viability of community development as a form of practice:

I think there is still the ability to maintain a community development approach within the one to one casework that can and will continue
Frank's story

The views expressed by Jocelyn were echoed by others. Essentially, community development as a form of practice should be accountable in a context of both efficiency and effectiveness. Frank, in his follow up interview noted:

*One part of enterprise culture that has been worthwhile for CD to be exposed to is that of the need for accountability. This has strong links to evaluation and has forced the field to think beyond airy fairy notions of helping.*

He also reflects the same struggle of seeking to balance and juggle the ends and values that there is a deep commitment whilst incorporating progressively 'techniques' associated with enterprise culture and rejecting what might be seen as the community development alternative. For example, in the following quote he reveals the tensions of re-casting and re-moulding his organisation's practice away from the latter towards to those of enterprise culture:

*there is a great tension between the need to operate in the world of business and hierarchies and trying to do the things you think are good to do and also the frustration of having to deal with community development processes that are often time consuming and difficult and I think it is difficult for an organisation of this size to realistically do that, I think we have to be more hard headed than that.*

*By the term hard headed are you suggesting more business like?*

*Yeah, well, I think businesslike probably describes it. That is not implying anything necessarily about the values of the organisation, just about the way it operates.*
Frank reflects similar trends underway in his organisation to those reported by Jocelyn and Maxine. He believes the origin of the initial drive for an increase in the size, scale and scope of his organisation was survival, but growth has been offered as a means of providing opportunities to do more:

_The impetus for change has come from survival. I don't think we were threatened but looking ahead and saying we will threatened if we don't change. In fact it gives us the opportunity to do more. We think what we do is valuable, if we can do more then that is more valuable. The organisation has a strong commitment to its values, but at the same time there are all sorts of ways in which we can do things and achieve the same thing. Let's explore those because we can grow. Growth is a funny thing because sometimes it is a self perpetuating thing. It is like the paradigm within which we live, so if you don't grow you die and I have always had so much trouble with that but at the same time growth also means we can also do more and if we believe in what we do then why shouldn't we do more of it?_

On the other hand, he also reflected some ambivalence about the trend towards competition and individualism in his own job and workplace, seeing it as illustrative of broader trends in society, yet in conflict with his own values that emphasise cooperation and collectivism:

_[Frank] The thing that troubles me about all this stuff is that everything is turned into a competition, so we get the Grand Prix and Adelaide loses, but who is winning here?...There has to be a way that does take into account the ethics and morality of it and not just local but a global sense of morality...I ultimately rely on the fact that people collectively will in some ways evolve towards something where people see problems with these things... until we get some groundswell in the community about what is quality of life and how does it relate it to standard of living, what gives you quality of life...I feel like an alien sometimes._

_[Interviewer] Do you feel like your ideas are in retreat?
[Frank] They are at the moment—absolutely. All the things we used to talk about we can’t mention anymore—you’re not allowed to talk about social justice.

Thus, again in Frank’s interview we see the same disparate threads (albeit in different configurations to Jocelyn’s responses) of a range of responses, with elements of complicit, compelled and strategic embrace evident.

What the stories reveal

Individual interpretations such as that provided by Jocelyn and Frank highlight the ambivalent nature of community development practice in a late capitalist society that have existed long before the active promotion of enterprise culture. Many aspects of capitalism are deeply embedded within all who live within it through processes of socialisation and experience. To some extent, the accommodations and compromises have always been part of practice. An oppositional dualism that has dogged much modernist thinking and practice is also in evidence. Thus, embracing enterprise culture appears to involve a rejection of community development as a form of practice. Part of the difficulty practitioners such as Frank and Jocelyn appeared to have experienced in their emerging response to enterprise culture is that some of the arguments around accountability, decision making processes and the role of workers in community development espoused through enterprise culture have struck a chord with them and their own experiences in the domain. The struggle to make sense of the message and associated practices of enterprise culture resounds in their responses. Their experiences reflect the fragmented and hybridised form of many responses to enterprise culture. The key feature of these experiences, however, appears to be the centrality of the tendering process in building even tighter interlocking bonds between the organisation and the state and the consequent transformation of organisational culture and context towards an ideology of compliance. Practitioners such as Maxine and Frank who question the nature, extent and pace of such changes are then caught in the middle— their funding sets parameters for their practice that often marginalise community development processes and ways of working and organisational imperatives suggest compliance is all that is possible if they want to keep their jobs. Thus, a compelled embrace is in evidence in terms of a declining politics of resistance, and levels of worker autonomy in defining their practice responses. Yet,
the critiquing at an intellectual level remains, and concerns about the wholesale nature of the changes ushered in by enterprise culture are evident in the transcripts of Frank, Maxine and Jocelyn.

Joe's story

Joe, when interviewed twelve months earlier had every confidence that his service and his practice could strategically embrace enterprise culture critically and resist those elements that conflicted with social justice. However, in his second interview, his mood had changed:

*certainly we are getting very caught up in the concern about our funding. That is one of our main priorities especially as a small agency... a lot of our time is planning and networks to position ourselves for the inevitable which is our core funding from Human Services will be tendered out.*

The strategies his organisation had adopted in response to this threat reflect how the funding nexus tics practitioners and their organisations to the purse, and therefore, policy and ideological strings of the state. Its first strategic move reflects the experiences of Jocelyn and Frank:

*we have absolutely no choice. We know to get our core funding we will have to get much bigger and I am negotiating with [other agencies] ..to re-suspe [services] to our agency and all this is part of positioning. I hope that will then double the size of the agency.*

The need to grow by acquiring other services from small organisations is stressed by Joe. This process of 'rationalisation' of the sector has led to the demise of dozens of small community based groups. Joe reminisced on one such demise locally:
it is interesting to see what happened to the tenants service....it maintained the 70s style of working and they went down the gurgler. I thought my god, I don't want our agency to go that way and just going to their final break up- to me it was the end of an era. The whole organisation is now gone. It is now regionalised. Despite their lack of sophistication in handling what was happening they still provided an excellent service. It was a service that was embraced by the community ...with dedicated workers. That has gone now and that puts more pressure on us.

Several key points are revealed in this passage. Firstly, Joe sees a strong connection between the maintenance of '70s' ways of working and the demise of the organisation. Secondly, there is evident anxiety and a sense of the need for hasty manoeuvring and repositioning of his organisation to ensure they survive. Thus, the need to be larger and play more of the game that is in town, ie enterprise culture, is rapidly and pragmatically accepted. Hence, he observes the tenants service lack of sophistication in responding to its changed policy and funding context. Thirdly, is the sense of loss- that both the nature of the service- local and accessible and the workers who gave it its essential character are gone - never to return. In other words, the landscape is forever altered- the context of community development has moved from a welfare state/public policy context to a market/corporate context. An emphasis on growth for survival is a strong message coming through in Joe's account of the pressures and the subsequent manoeuvring of his organisation. Another strategic move involves the source of their funding:

we would chase any funding in reason to survive....we will start to sell our service...we could provide [it] for a substantial fee ....and that would fill our coffers again to support the other work we are doing...[the idea being] to sell ourselves to other big businesses who have lots of dollars... to try and get hold of the corporate dollars to fund our core community development activities.

The pursuit of the 'corporate dollar' is seen by Joe as having merit if:
we could get independent funding not have to rely on government funding to hold us together...[it] could allow me to do community development work,..... to position ourselves to have a degree of flexibility in funding to pursue issues.

This strategy raises many interesting questions and possible dilemmas. For Joe, it is a case of winning a contract, delivering a service and then using that money to sustain core community development practice. In terms of responding to enterprise culture it would put his organisation on a business footing competing for private contracts against private for profit organisations. Is this suggestive of a hegemonic embrace or is it an interesting and emergent form of strategic embrace of enterprise culture- using the processes, playing the game on the surface, yet doing so to buttress and protect community development ways of working? This possible option is explored in more detail in Chapter 7. Joe feels that to rely totally on government funding will guarantee that organisations end up in a hegemonic embrace of enterprise culture:

people will become so reliant on government funding.....[groups] are stating that they started off as unfunded groups of people who were fighting injustices, and then they get funding and how that has polluted and corrupted their process to the point now where they are at the beck and call of governments that are pulling the strings...I think as the ideological pursuit embraces a lot of these processes into place, it is going to diminish our chance to do really good community development work.

He sees huge changes in the responses of his colleagues in community development in terms of their willingness to hegemonically embrace the changes:

[the] pursuit of individual survival and individualism does rub off right through the community and I think even the community development trained students I'm seeing have been brought up in a society that is debilitating....people are
preoccupied with their survival and are being coopted by stealth and maybe not quite realising it.

The idea of cooption by stealth is suggestive of a domino effect— the changes are incrementally introduced at all levels of organisational culture and operation and like dominoes the pre-existing forms of practice are subsumed under the weight of necessity (read hegemony). Yet, many of Joe’s own responses attest again to the hegemonic and social control functions of funding imperatives when he observes:

it gets back to the individual situation. We don’t want to fall into that trap but we will be taken up with our survival until we know about our funding.

In other words, his own positioning is constrained by the same anxiety about survival and whilst there is an awareness of falling into “that trap”, he echoes the sentiments of others regarding the pragmatism that goes with survival. However, whilst funding continued on the previous programmatic basis, Joe still saw room to put those values into practice:

we try and demonstrate that we work from an empowerment model and we are encouraging our service users to go and see their politicians and take direct social action about things.

The prospect of this continuing in a tender environment is at best problematic. As stated above, this appears to be why Joe is seeking other forms of funding to ensure autonomy. Prospects of maintaining a critical perspective of enterprise culture and developing a strategic embrace that is reflected in one’s practice appear to diminish rapidly as the hegemonic “realities” epitomised in competitive tendering are imposed on organisations. As a postscript, Joe’s organisation lost a tender bid to continue part of its funded service in June 1998. In explaining the reason for the loss of the tender, Joe’s perspective is clear:
The tender process is at worst flawed and subverted and used to implement a particular agenda. We have been unofficially told that specialist, stand alone agencies will be forced out of the industry.

The successful tendering organisation has no history of practice in this particular field. It is, however, one of the rapidly expanding welfare oriented agencies that has emerged as a big player in the competitive tender game. The experience of Joe and his agency is illustrative. He is particularly critical of some who in the domain who have appeared to have complicitly embraced enterprise culture.

I am seeing a lot of community development people going off to do business management courses because I think they want to run agencies because they think there is some buzz in getting involved in agencies. ...I fear there is a running of it at a 100% ...people are introduced to academic rigour and get their third year and it is an easy way into a middle class job.

Joe is referring here particularly to workers who have gained their primary knowledge of community development through initial Diploma level training in the Technical and Further Education (TAFE) system and subsequently have completed a third year upgrade to a Bachelor of Arts (Community Development) through university. Even though the theory informing both courses is highly critical of enterprise culture, Joe believes graduates are being co-opted by the "realities" around them and their uncritical embrace of those realities,

They have come from a disadvantaged situation and never really embraced social justice and they are so pleased where they have got, and like the oppressed becoming the oppressor, there is an element of that and I am fascinated with the psychology behind all this because myself with middle class values and upbringing seem to maintain and hang onto the values.
Natasha’s story

Natasha picks up on similar themes to Joe when she notes,

this comes back for me to the whole thing of professionalising community development and now we have graduates with degrees, with MAs, who are coming into that very conservative climate and who believe they should be in those positions. The very act of going to uni is setting up in people's minds, well, I've done all this study and therefore I deserve rather than the grassroots of coming up through the system.

Natasha, in her second interview, echoes a similar perspective of changes in the domain, their impact on organisations, and her own practice. In particular, she notes increasing emphasis on growth for survival and the related trend of larger regionalised organisations "managing" diverse projects:

I guess from the part time work I have been doing the sense I get is the shift from community managed services to regionally managed by big organisations ....or groups of community services that have tendered and become a statewide organisation. The trend is becoming much more back to the big church organisations and a return to the welfare charity model as opposed to the community development model, although lots of services are trying desperately to hang onto that preferred work practice.

This perspective of the changes indicates other issues including the removal of a local community base and ownership of programs, to management controlled from head office through the conduit of regional delivery structures; the transfer of resources from community control to these large, often religiously affiliated organisations; the re-emergence of the welfare charity model as the preferred mode of practice and a reduction of the sites for potential resistance and critiquing of enterprise culture [in its various manifestations] through
the concentration of "ownership" of programs. This concentration of "ownership" certainly parallels the tendency in capitalism ownership to become highly centralised. This last point is particularly relevant for community development, (along with the removal of the local community base) given that its modus operandi has been predicated on notions of decentralised structures, participation and bottom up or grassroots organising. These activist, organising themes that have characterised community development as resistance are the first to be axed as part of the "rush for the lifeboats" called survival.

Attempting to analyse and make sense of this contemporary scenario and the responses it evokes by placing them in a politico-cultural context, enables one to utilise the notion of enterprise culture as state sponsored hegemony. When applied with this meaning, it offers the analytical space to make sense of the accommodation of apparently divergent tendencies. For example, the co-existence of the welfare/charity, professional, managerial and market modes of community service and community development practice that have been variously developed by Ife (1997) and Kenny (1996) would on the surface appear to be somewhat contradictory. Yet, in practice terms, it is suggested that combinations of these modes of practice can and do proliferate in an age of enterprise culture. Some workers and organisations can accommodate and come to terms with enterprise culture (whether that accommodation be complicit or compelled) through so doing and this research suggests that numbers are doing just that. This insight indicates that we should not see enterprise culture as just equalling the market mode, but rather as a hegemonic project that is a many headed beast that privileges any mode that is willing to support its fundamental tenets and "play the game" by its rules. For example, professional modes of practice are reflected in the views of some practitioners that business ways of working are simply their reward for many years of unrecognised work. Within this context, the sorts of incentives offered to workers by the managerial and market modes of practice are often seized upon. Natasha notes:

I'll give an instance of a very small disability agency where they have a small pool of cars they take to training etc. What has happened since the restructuring business is that certain people have traded off conditions to get a car and so one of the ways of disenfranchising the workers and causing a lot of discontent- fighting over cars.....
When it was suggested to Natasha that perhaps community development has never been particularly radical or alternative and that such actions as she described did not represent such a big jump for workers she replied:

*it is very tempting, we live in a very materialistic society. It is getting harder and harder to survive materially for a whole range of people. When these things are offered to you in a climate where you know your conditions are eroding, and the union movement is not backing you up as they ought to or they do not have the power that they once did, and someone is saying to you you can have this car if you give up your time in lieu, well it is a ripe time for that to happen.*

Natasha is reflecting here on one of the most important impacts of enterprise culture on workers. The chimera of an enchanted workplace where those who are "enterprising" are rewarded has been referred to earlier (Gee and Lankshear, 1995). The recent use of salary packaging has been taken by some to be an example of enterprise culture— the use of managerial style incentives. Another line is that they just represent rewards for diligence. Jocelyn's perspective is that incentives like salary packaging exist and are:

*discussed in terms potential benefits for staff for taking those extra steps, for going the extra mile, for being enterprising.*

The other impact on workers that Natasha has observed is the "other side of the coin" to this chimera of empowering workers through the privileging of a few with enterprise culture incentives such as salary packaging and use of cars. This Janus face of managerialism and total quality management is also exposed by Gee and Lankshear (1995) and is discussed elsewhere. It is the face of:

*engendered fear- job loss etc and it is a reality. It is hard to get jobs in a sector that is disappearing. It forces people into a very difficult position. Whether this*
is a basic individualism that has just been lying dormant in CD workers... I don't think we are separate from what we have internalised around us- this culture. We have a culture of individualism and competitiveness and it has been given open slather- the open market, and if you can perform, you can have the benefits.

A further result of such processes is, according to Natasha, reflected in a shifting value base underpinning practice,

*I think there has been a real conservatising of workers in the field. There are lots of workers who really believe that people should work for the dole, that organisations should be run like a business and that there are deserving and undeserving.*

This quote illustrates the ease with which more conservative values can be adopted in a climate of enterprise culture. Such reconfigurations reflect the dynamic underpinning of the competitive tendering process and its attendant power to shape all facets of practice. This is the dialectic that characterises the hegemonic embrace of enterprise culture- a political project engaged in the establishment and reinforcement of hegemony. Natasha conceptualises the changes thus:

*Within the community sector the whole notion of providing these services as a business as opposed to providing these services because they are a right for people to have these services because they find themselves in different circumstance in their lives and we as a society should be supporting them at that time. There is a real shift from people's right to community services to almost a privilege to get help in the classic welfare sense.*

Modes of practice that are resistant to the discursive claims of enterprise culture conceptualised as activist in Kenny's (1996) framework and community or ecological social justice in lfc's (1997) frameworks) cannot be accommodated in such a conceptualisation.
Thus it is little wonder that they are marginalised and silenced through the hegemonic processes of competitive tendering. However, this is not the full picture regarding such modes because the activist and community modes are in need of renewal and repositioning in the context of enterprise culture if they are to be of use to practitioners in the contemporary climate in which they find themselves.

The incorporation of managerialist, and market modes of practice are also evident in the changes Natasha has witnessed occurring at an organisational level. The emphasis here is on processes - the changes that are occurring and the responses that are emerging. Patterns of discourse, organisational structures and worker’s practice can reflect elements of pre-existing forms, alongside managerialist and market modes of practice (although this situation is not without its tensions and contradictions). For example, Natasha observed a colleague’s changing workplace in the following terms:

*a disability organisation that is still run by a committee of management, however they have had a new manager who is very business oriented and so the whole language of that committee of management has completely changed over the last two months and now they are actually asking workers to bargain off conditions for certain things, eg, salary packaging if they do not have a rostered day off. Some of the workers are saying we will think about that instead of saying hang on a minute this is our industrial right. We are entitled to do this.*

The point of note in this quote is the pace of change and the way that discursive and employment practices have altered so rapidly. The rapidity of change can also see organisations de-funded, workers lose their jobs and communities lose locally run and accessible services:

*I am not saying it is not a hard battle. I was on a committee of management of a domestic violence outreach service....that was taken over by a (bigger amalgamated organisation) and they obviously had been doing deals long before we knew anything about it. We were approached by Human Services*
and told we were too small as a committee of management we were not representative. They regionalised the whole thing and there is now no service in [x].

Natasha is extremely pessimistic in terms of the longer term prospects for community development as a form of practice in the funded sector:

*it is disappearing and not only that, ...[it is the way] they talk about CD. It isn’t social action, it is about running groups for isolated people, that is a good thing, but the focus is away from advocacy and social action, working together-consciousness raising.*

She believes that the only strategy for dealing with enterprise culture is to:

*reject the culture and keep providing the same service and have creative accounting in order to provide the facts for funders. Once you start to see your role as a business, we’re talking human services here, social change, we’re talking advocacy, we’re talking people’s rights. We shouldn’t be talking about outcomes and profit.*

In terms of this research, such a response to enterprise culture represents elements of both overt rejection and strategic embrace, but with an emphasis on the latter because she is not suggesting withdrawing from the whole process. Kate, in her follow up interview expressed similar sentiments to Natasha. In terms of changes that had occurred in the field of disability advocacy since we last spoke, she commented,

*I don’t know if I have noticed any new trends but I have noticed a solidifying and feel the brunt of the trends that were just beginning when I last spoke to you like competitive tendering.....we underestimated how under prepared we were.*
This theme of lack of preparation for the enormity of the changes that come with competitive tendering has been repeated in a number of interviews. Prospects of maintaining a progressive approach to practice were seen as much brighter by Kate in her first interview compared to her second. At the time of her first interview, competitive tendering had not been introduced. When it was introduced to the field of disability advocacy Kate believes there were a range of responses from workers and organisations:

*It is interesting to see how different organisations and workers have responded to that sort of environment because some have been arguing well we are not going to go along that track. We are not going to be involved in competitive tendering but others have said let's play the game but keep it on our terms. Some in the sector are attempting to set up a statewide body, which was one of the things we feared would be imposed on us, so they are in a position to get the money when it comes out and thereby retain control of the resources and there has been a major split with others who say we should oppose the whole process.*

The groups that protested about cuts to the sector were represented by a delegation that went to see departmental heads and it was out of this meeting that the 'strategic' proposal of establishing the statewide body emerged:

*the delegation group was asked by Departmental heads to be involved in the brief and they got conned because it will be put out to tender and it will be expected to provide a statewide service for less money and I consider that colluding with the state government because they went in there to protest and came out and said to the sector this is an opportunity to shape advocacy in Victoria.*

The question as to whether this is collusion or strategic practice is to some extent in the eye of the beholder and open to the test of time. However, this example tends to highlight the way co-option and complicity can emerge when organisations are driven by survival. It is
remarkable that a group that when into protest changes around de-funding of organisations came out fired up to "play the game". Their language - an opportunity to shape advocacy, reflects the marketing zeal of enterprise culture. This example would appear to reveal the potential for some practitioners to conceptually re-frame their response rapidly; from protest (resistance) to survival (compelled accommodation) to opportunity (complicit embrace).

Kate's story

Kate offers a number of insights in terms of the positioning of organisations at the time of the changes and the consequences of the stances they adopted in the face of such impending change:

*a lot of the State funded advocacy groups were de-funded...some of the groups stayed back and did not come forward and fight because they concerned that they could suffer from that and that in turn people with disabilities will suffer....also they thought this State Government cannot be changed by lobbying so what is to be gained. In this climate they did not want to be seen as troublemakers...other groups did a lot - media and working with the opposition and demonstrations, but it wasn't unified.*

Once again, that agent of fear - being de-funded, and its cohort, survival, seem to be evident. Kate's perspective on the reactions of organisations to changes in funding extends our understanding of the impacts of enterprise culture on community development as a domain because the social control aspect of competitive tendering occurs very early on in the process of such change. In other words, the prospect of it being introduced is the point at which many groups begin to manoeuvre, "to pull their heads in", to not challenge in order to hopefully survive. The shutters go down and the organisations seek to practice in ways that are "acceptable". However, Kate believes this approach ignores the dynamic of enterprise culture as it finds expression in the introduction of competitive tendering:
I think they felt that if they did stand up they would be next whereas I think that is naive. You cannot protect yourself from these cuts. They are not being done for vindictive reasons, they are being done because we are in a climate of panning back the government and getting rid of what are not seen to be essential services and less and less government spending on social programs. So, something like human rights advocacy services are not seen to be essential so things that they will see as essential are service delivery and they are even cutting those services. I don't think it is about who is good and who is bad. There will always be conservative groups who will never challenge government....Those groups that have backed away from protesting and supporting de-funded groups cannot remake themselves as conservative groups. The damage is done- they are known.

Organisations and workers in a sense are building their own prison walls- the sense of fear and anxiety over survival of programs that they have invested a great deal in finds expression in symbolic control. The boundaries are not tested in terms of their interface with the state. They not only agree to play by the rules of enterprise culture; they impose a further restrictive set of conditions on their own practice that extends and further reinforces the power and the message behind the changes. Thus, a whole of strategies and possible responses to enterprise culture are not even considered. As Kate has observed, terms such as opportunities and strategic are buzz words that are short hand for:

*play along and we'll still be here... they will pay lip service to what is being lost but that is not where their energy and focus is.....let's be pragmatic and that means sort of let's not worry about what the constituents of the organisations think, it doesn't matter, let's survive.*

The organisational priorities of those larger groups that do survive and 'grow' also change, in Kate's estimation. In a sense, their survival increasingly becomes conditional on the demise of other organisations that may once have been allies or part of the same network. One such large organisation in the housing field:
[Kate] played the game, they contributed to the de-funding of [organisation x] and to a whole range of local tenant groups. They have taken over their premises and won't let the local tenants groups meet in them. It thought it could continue to be a lobby group and the recent bill has whittled away rights. They've been conned, they left themselves in a position where they had given so much support to it that when it was finally released there was no time to organise and because they have lost their tenant base.

[Interviewer] Do they become focused on winning the next tender and that becomes their reason for being there and they lose the activism?

[Kate] Yes, and the administration of keeping the huge empire going.

Such stories were reflected in other interviews and they reinforce the power of the funding nexus to unravel whole structures of collaboration between individual organisations and introduce a mindset that offers competition as the means to survive resulting in suspicion and division within and between organisations and workers. For example, what had been a network of coalition of small advocacy groups in the disabilities field has now:

set itself up to be a provider of advocacy and it wants to be able to take funding. A major split has occurred and half the people walked away saying they didn't want this sort of organisation, but the other half voted for the organisation to be a provider of advocacy and they talked about taking strong advocacy but they were almost becoming a competitor with what existing groups are doing.

Interestingly, Kate notes that her perceptions would be seen by those pushing such changes as:

naive and not seeing the writing on the wall and in the end they will be there and I will be gone. Many groups have tried to play that game but I don't think they are doing a better job for the people who are their constituents.
Further, the new funding arrangements bind organisations even further to the state in the name of accountability and dramatically increase the burden of administration. Kate observes that in the housing field:

*It is about cutting workers hours, reducing administration of the whole system and the regional housing managers are in absolute shock at the amount they have taken on. The Housing Establishment Fund was previously only $20,000 for a regional housing council and it is now up to $200,000-400,000, with one and a half workers to administer and they are meant to be doing all the housing referral support for people in transitional housing...In effect numbers are cut, it is a saving and in addition they have extra responsibilities and programs....Where is the time for advocacy and policy work?*

Such wholesale changes, however they are regarded by those intimately involved in the processes, have re-shaped the fields where community development has been practiced. These impacts rebound onto the individual organisations, practitioners and those for whom the programs and services were initially established. It is creating winners and losers at all levels- organisational, practitioner and constituent. There is no doubt community development as activist and challenging discourse will seldom be found in the corridors of many organisations today. For Kate, the result is that any attempt to play the game will not further the cause of community development as a vehicle promoting social justice and social change. In fact, she argues:

*I don't see any point in just being managers of services. I don't see that that's necessarily the solution to the problems that capitalism throws up.... You get co-opted...you get conned, you end up with less resources......and people at the top get paid an enormous amount of money to make sure they put the screws on .....those under them.*
Trish’s story

The unravelling of changes to the operation of community legal centres has affected Trish who began working at one such centre after our first interview. Asked during the second interview about her perceptions of the changes occurring in the field and her sense of the trends that are emerging, she commented:

*I think my language has changed. The stuff around purchaser/provider, competitive tendering where 12 months ago it hadn’t even happened and I hadn’t perceived it would happen so quickly like legal centres, refuges. They are going through the process and I think I am feeling a little more disillusioned about the capacity to politicise the issues, like even the capacity to enter the political debate as opposed to, oh well, it has happened to every other sector we just have to learn how to play the game and learn the language and just go ahead with doing it.*

The capacity, opportunity and space to organise and politicise the issues of funding and policy shifts has clearly not been as evident as Trish expected. She notes the sense of resignation and sense of lack of choice and, as in Kate’s experience, the field immediately split over how to respond to the changes. The catalyst for the changes has been a joint Federal-State review of Community Legal Centres. Victoria’s review commenced in 1997 and there were differing opinions over whether to participate in the review,

*We couldn’t get a consensus on non-participation in the review- the federation said we need to participate. Every centre had to fill in an intensive questionnaire with five days notice which included everything down to the floor measurements of the building which is about either amalgamation or assets registers, job descriptions and client numbers.*
When the issues paper that was meant to pull together the issues that came out of the survey was later released with none of the information from the survey, Trish found it difficult:

... convincing other centres that that was what was going on because many of them haven't been involved in the community sector and really believed that if you participate then they're gunna listen. I think they have been hit around the head in the last few weeks and they have gone, 'shit we were wrong'.

Part of the reason for this apparent hesitation to campaign and fight the changes can possibly be found in the varied response amongst organisations to the introduction of competitive tendering. There has not been universal opposition to such changes and many in paid managerial positions and voluntary committees have, as this research is indicating, apparently been willing to embrace the cultural change that is a necessary pre-requisite to participating in the competitive environment. In fact, it is fascinating to witness the relative lack of opposition and campaigning given the degree of change involved in the whole paradigm shift from the welfare state mode. It may be that as Habermas (1989:64) has argued regarding the welfare state,

\textit{The development of the welfare state has arrived at an impasse. With it, the energies of the utopian idea of a laboring society have exhausted themselves.}

Some of that loss of energy is indicated in the grassroots experience of community development practitioners. Having emerged from the struggle to establish community based services, community development as practiced in many funded positions has, according to some interviewees become an ideal limited by the constraints of the welfare state. There appears to be less opportunity to sustain its activist and challenging aspects. Trish comments:

\textit{(Trish) We had a big meeting of volunteers and committee members from around Victoria about what was happening and I walked away from that meeting with the feeling that they were really full of fight and then the next day I had a meeting with all the legal workers and it was like softly and my}
feeling is that it is about pay and there is not a long term commitment. I think it has been there although I haven’t wanted to see it- it’s a job, a career opportunity.

[Interviewer] Is it true then that as things like community development get institutionalised they lose some of that cutting edge?

[Trish] I think that is what happened.

Perhaps what is also being suggested here is that accommodations to enterprise culture by practitioners can be understood by their historical adaptation to living and working within the context of the welfare state, which provided them with conditional autonomy but also taught them how to work within the confines of funding imperatives? This passage also indicates a perception that compelled and explicit forms of embrace are likely to be commonplace as enterprise culture through the agency of competitive tendering and managerialism asserts itself. In other words are we witnessing the hegemonic process of replacing the discourse of cooperation and effectiveness for competition and efficiency? Trish’s own committee was considering withdrawing from the whole review process:

Under the threat of immediate de-funding... we... are prepared to work on as unpaid workers to get the centre up and running as a 100% volunteer centre occupying and seizing the building... the committee have gone fine yep... it’s great to see we have gutsy workers. The committee wants to set up a fighting fund.

The agenda of the whole review is clear to Trish:

The issues paper only talks about competitive tendering, fees for service, that if we charge our clients it gives them greater options; amalgamations. I think that is what they want- one centre for each region.
From her perspective, this ties in with the overall direction of the field in response to the changes:

*It's heading towards there just being the big community health centres and community legal centres...large multi-purpose centres who will be in a good position to tender and they have tendered against other community based organisations in their own communities. They are positioning themselves to be dominant in their part of the world.*

There would appear to be some congruence between this perspective and that of Jocelyn's who is employed by a large community health centre. Both perspectives reinforce the idea that there is an apparent impetus towards increasing scale, size and scope of many organisations who are involved in the competitive tendering process. Further, the source of this change is to be found within the social policy framework of the state which is underpinned by the ethos of enterprisc culture. Trish feels that at a strategic level there are two forms of response to such changes that should be explored. The first set of strategies that she feels must be pursued appear to represent elements of a possible strategic embrace:

*get together as all the legal centres which is what I am strategically suggesting we need to do using that consortium idea so that we can keep our independent models and operate in different ways.*

The idea of a consortium picks up on the example of a regional women's housing service who Trish explains:

*formed a consortium made up of the smaller groups with a new name...they actually maintained everything, they did not even have to sacrifice the local
committees of management or collective structures - everything remained the same apart from on top of it they've got a consortium/management structure overseeing the entire program with no cut in funding because they put in a realistic tender.

This form of response to enterprise culture is considered in Chapter 7, as one alternative means of re-positioning community development through a strategic embrace.

The second set of strategies alluded to by Trish reflects her strong commitment to activism and is suggestive of an overt rejection of enterprise culture. She argues that the project of enterprise culture in fact may well unwittingly be part of a process of renewal; a dialectic that takes community development back to its roots, enabling a revitalised practice to assert itself based on:

the activists stuff... I think that as everything gets removed from communities, it might take a while, but I think there is organising, we might start to see what happened in the '60s.

Kate suggests similarly that whilst community development is in retreat in the paid sector that energies should be put into:

helping to organise where those people are and it is good that groups are still around that can do community development, that do have the resources to be able to spend time working with people at the grassroots level and organising, but it is obviously less... if anything now we've got more sites of opposition for organising.

In the following chapter, the prospects of such forms of response to enterprise culture 'taking hold' amongst practitioners within the domain of community development will be examined.
It is argued that such prospects are contingent on the development of a critical discourse by practitioners.

Jessica's story

Jessica's employment with a women's housing service highlights a number of dilemmas associated with community development practice. Recently, the staff were presented with the following options for the future of the service. The co-ordinator explained that it could join the tender process, form a consortium, amalgamate with other services, wait to be swallowed up by other services or fold. To her, the options left workers with restricted options and there was no real opportunity to debate. She says their options were really to, *like it or leave.*

The transformation within the organisation has been rapid, and the role of the co-ordinator in promoting a complicit embrace has been pivotal, according to Jessica. It appears to her that,

*the co-ordinator is enjoying herself. She has experienced success with a consortium bid and she likes the idea of making things happen and the growth that comes with it.*

Whilst the co-ordinator has pushed through many of the changes and contributed to the domino effect alluded to earlier, Jessica reflects on the resentment that has arisen amongst the workers,

*there is resentment, suspicion, distrust. It is becoming almost like worker pitted against worker. Some of that is related to changes in conditions. There is sniping and also a sense of grieving- of having lost control of our service to the tender process.*
This experience reflects findings from an interesting study by Laws (1994) of an organisation in England. He notes the contradictions evident in the pursuit of enterprise as practiced within an enterprise culture context, and importantly reveals the dualist nature of organisational responses to it. He notes in *Organising Modernity* that enterprise demands particular things of a manager; on the one hand she/he is to be a mini entrepreneur, indeed capable of,

*taking* the pieces and pull them together, making pragmatic sense of all its components. *She* doesn't rejoice in the predicament of post modern fragmentation and celebrate incoherence. Instead she is a thoroughgoing modernist... [aware of the need] to scramble for resources... to perform for those resources... [enterprise stresses] competition, of the need to mount a performance that will impress those upon whom the [organisation] depends, those who already embody and perform enterprise (Laws, 1994:75,169).

On the other hand, Laws notes that inside the organisation, the sorts of trends noted by Jessica can emerge,

So it is that in enterprise the syntax of performance gets divided from the syntax of reality, and the need to perform starts to erode the possibility of trust...Performance, suspicion, surveillance of performance- within enterprise the three tend to go together and propel one another (Laws, 1994:176-177).

The contradictory set of tendencies outlined by Laws (1994) can arise within an organisation like Jessica's, that seek to promote and instil this sense of enterprise (or complicit embrace) amongst its staff. Co-ordinators and managers charged with this task can experience personally, an increase in power and responsibility- a charge, a sense of making a difference. Their own work conditions may improve as part of the changes. However, there are evident tensions in seeking to gain the agreement of staff to accept and embrace the changes. To some extent, the domino effect does this for them- the transformations flow thick and fast once the tendering process becomes the means by which the organisation is funded. Workers face, as Jessica noted restricted choices. However, those with the power within organisations
still require relatively high levels of co-operation from staff if they are going to ensure the sort of performance required to ensure success in future tenders. Thus, the pressure is on those who may not perform to specifications (especially those who may be critical of the nature and pace of change) to, as Jessica has been told 'like or lump it'. She believes that one reason for the pace with which her co-ordinator is apparently prepared to let go of any reference to community development in either her discourse or practice is because her original conception of it was very limited. Jessica notes,

I think she saw it as a way of supporting women and a way of communicating with them.

However, for Jessica, community development is about,

seeking to change structures and protecting our service model and its community development elements.

The contrast between the two perspectives offers important insights. If community development is reduced to a set of techniques around communication and access, then principles that suggest the need to critique, to promote social justice and challenge structures are not part of the discourse even prior to the impact of enterprise culture. So, for practitioners, especially those with decision making power within an organisation, the choice is not between community development ways of working and the manifestations of enterprise culture such as managerialism. Rather it is between the latter and models that have arisen out of the relationship between community based and managed groups and the welfare state that has funded them. As the adoption of business, commercial modes of operation is firmly integrated within the competitive tendering framework, the motivation to adopt such change is quite apparent.

Jessica laments the changes she sees within her organisation, particularly the haste with which they were adopted and the lack of critical debate about the process of adoption. She notes that nothing appears to be sacred in the face of pragmatism and in the name of survival
and growth. Thus, the organisation's service model which is highly regarded, is capable of being changed if it means new opportunities for funding. Enterpris culture, in effect, has managed to transform not just the organisational discourse, but relationships between workers, the organising principles upon which it is based and consolidated power over decision making with the co-ordinator, according to Jessica. When these dynamics are replicated across many organisations, all competing, seeking to grow and outperform, it is possible to imagine the same levels of suspicion and lack of trust developing across whole fields of practice. It is interesting to contemplate the point at which this might reach a stage where the whole process engenders inefficiency as information is withheld from competitors and effective ways of working dispensed with as they come to cost too much. This possible scenario stands in stark contrast to the collaborative environment within which the most effective and innovative forms of community development practice emerged— that is, cooperating, and networking agencies who did not see each other as competitor to be eyed off and kept at a distance. If enterprise culture has achieved nothing else, it would appear to being well on the way to neutralising a source of counter hegemonic discourse and practice impercept though it may have been. Whilst community development may well have been what Kenny (1994: 258) describes as, 'a trumpet in a herd of elephants', it has also been able to play its part in,

*imagining and developing strategies and processes for the transformation to a more humane, democratic and open society (Kenny, 1994:258).*

The point at issue for community development has always been that its dependency on the state for funding leaves it open to claims of cooption- to dancing to others' tunes. The disquieting aspect of enterprise culture is that it represents a social and political project that is able to produce the sort of dynamics noted by Jessica in her organisation. One wonders how many trumpets are being silenced?

Frances' story

Frances, reflecting the different context within which she practices community development, emphasised the need to challenge the dominant discourse. She saw this as a crucial ingredient in resisting enterprise culture,
How do we re-cast... disparate threads and claim new territory because a lot of it is a propagandistic war and all of the changes we have been through as a society I am convinced are about paradigm shifts, to weaken the unions, to weaken collectivism, and part of it has been about capturing the language. [Some people talk]... social development, others say we shouldn't use development because that has been captured by economists.

She particularly focused on the meaning of enterprise:

.... so often enterprise is to do with economic development when it really does have to look at social and environmental indicators.

Reflecting on trends outside Australia, Frances affirmed that community development was an integral part of her practice overseas. She continues to find that it is precisely those forms of practice that are in such demand. Her relative autonomy from state sanctioned guidelines has enabled her to continue such practices. In working with a women's group in Vietnam to establish a co-operative scheme of micro-credit, the emphasis was on:

a participatory approach... non-hierarchical ... giving much more attention to the local staff than the hierarchy.

She believes that it is these ways of working that community development must begin to re-emphasise and build on. Such forms of practice need to re-defined priorities and emphasise:

community well-being: groups of people designing together and this is where I love the CD skills; designing what would be the vision of the community. How would you know when you have achieved it and how to work towards it? Often individuals have ideas but it can be overwhelming because of a lack of resources and money and time but a group together there are possibilities. It is much more process and it is very much the group- community orientation in
all places that I have worked is the approach that is most effective because it is
the ownership issue. If you feel part of it no matter how small a part then you
are behind it.

This form of response echoes the views of Kate earlier in terms of rebuilding from the
grassroots. It also affirms community development process as the most appropriate means by
which to achieve it. Frances believes that the purpose of such community organising would be
to promote greater self-reliance. This view has similarities with Ile's (1996) argument that
community development is about a third way— not the market, nor the state determining
priorities, but rather communities and groups having decentralised decision making over key
areas that affect their lives. This has long been a point of conjecture and debate within
community development circles. The basis of these debates was discussed in Chapter 4 and
essentially revolve around critiques of the notion of community being romanticised and often
serving to exclude rather than acting as an inclusive vehicle for participation (Young, 1992).

The prospects for such community organising to occur appear limited for those practitioners
whose perspectives and experiences are reflected in this research— at least in their paid work.
Challenges to dominant ideas and practices have always tended to develop out of people's
experiences of dispossession, alienation, injustice and passion. The expressive and innovative
forms of such challenges reaffirm the need for autonomy and space that can only be fully
found outside the realm of state control, in particular outside its funding nexus. Thus the
potential for new configurations of practice, arising out of strategic embrace will most likely
be realised in unfunded, activist community development. This would appear to be a major
finding of the research undertaken.

Making sense of the experiences

The challenge to community development presented by the enterprise culture vanguard can
often appear all consuming. Processes associated with enterprise culture such as competitive
tendering and quantitative measures of accountability declare that community development is
a problematic approach— that it can be inefficient, and difficult to define. Thus, it is often
excluded (either explicitly or implicitly) from tender guidelines. Enterprise culture also offers a blueprint for organisational survival predicated on notions of individualism, competition, hierarchy and markets to replace notions of collective organisation. Based on this research, it seems to be cleverly packaged so that adopting one aspect of its 'logic' then leads practitioners and organisations to systematically employ progressively more and more of the discourse and practice of enterprise culture, leading workers and organisations towards what I have euphemistically described as a vortex. It is on the offensive, sanctioned and endorsed as the immutable truth by the state. It seems that once the first hurdle is crossed, that is deciding to no longer resist, but to actually promote enterprise culture, other implications of a hegemonic embrace follow; symbolising what one might call a 'domino effect'. This process has echoes of the discursive chain alluded to elsewhere. For example, to participate in competitive tendering necessitates organisational change to mirror a 'business for profit' company in organisational structure, culture and outlook. This organisational redefinition is crucial to understanding enterprise culture because it illustrates the process of hegemony. The tender specifications are a powerful tool of cooption and integration into dominant structures because they prescribe and privilege narrow organisational forms. Positioning as a business in a competitive market with an eye to the next tender then acts to circumscribe what are deemed to be "appropriate" strategies for practitioners to employ; what are "efficient" forms of 'consulting' with the public; what are "cost effective" and "politically neutral" ways of working. A more subtle aspect of such changes is the fact that the very act of preparing a tender can alter the organisational dynamic and the tasks that absorb the energy of workers. Both become increasingly directed to gearing up for the next tender and this imperative acts an omnipresence that overshadows all work undertaken. If workers aren't busy preparing a tender, they are filling out accountability forms- as well as ensuring programs are run. This domino effect is illustrated in Figure 6.1. The increasing pressure on practitioners and organisations to adopt elements of a hegemonic embrace is especially evident in the follow up interviews. Figure 6.1. graphically illustrates the process of transformation that can produce the vortex effect that can end up effecting all elements of practice. Whether survival or opportunity drives them, both workers and organisations wanting to play the tendering game firstly have to agree to play by the rules. A successful tender requires an emphasis on efficiency and compliance and must use the appropriate enterprise discourse. The state becomes the customer purchasing a service from the organisation. The organisation in order to maintain its funding must meet the specifications laid down. The autonomy to practice in challenging ways is often substantially reduced. Thus, an ideology of compliance can increasingly emerge. The potential to adopt a more strategic form of embrace that maintains
a critical perspective that contests key terms through an assertive relationship with the state did not appear to be strongly in evidence throughout the interviews. Elements of it along with aspects of an overt rejection were evident in some of the responses from practitioners like Natasha, Trish and Kate. As they acknowledge, the sustaining and nourishing of a strategic embrace or overt rejection of enterprise culture is difficult.

Figure 6.1.- The 'domino' effect

- Competitive tendering adopted as funding regime by the state
  - Tender specifications privilege organisational forms that mimic business operation, style and culture
  - Organisation 'reconstitutes' and reorganises along these lines-presenting as a competitive business
  - In applying for tenders, the 'business' promotes an image that is 'safe' and 'reliable', cost efficient.
  - Community development strategies that can "fit" within this context may be utilised, but any strategies that challenge it are marginalised.
  - Practitioners increasingly face the choice of following suit or leaving. Balancing personal values and organisational imperatives is an increasingly difficult task.
In seeking to further understand and make sense of the pressures and trends that are impacting on practitioners, it is useful to illustrate the relationship between discourse and practice and the trends and process of change that can emerge in the discursive practice of practitioners. Figure 6.2. provides a diagrammatic representation of this relationship. The vertical axis refers to the relative mix of discursive clusters utilised by practitioners with the community development and enterprise culture discourse clusters at opposite ends of the axis. The horizontal axis indicates the relative mix of practice with pre-existing forms of practice at one end signifying ways of working in existence prior to the presence of enterprise culture and altered forms of practice at the other end denoting the changes that follow its infiltration into sites where community development is practiced. The quadrants represent each of the four forms of possible response to enterprise culture:

*i) overt rejection quadrant* - a high degree of retention of both pre-existing forms of practice and community development discourse.

*ii) strategic embrace quadrant* - a retention of important aspects of pre-existing forms of practice, but with some modification of discursive practice. Commitments to key aims such as social justice remain.

*iii) hegemonic (compelled form) embrace quadrant* - the increasing usage of enterprise culture discourse and an attempt to retain pre-existing forms of practice. The strain and tension involved in such an approach means it is likely that a complicit embrace may emerge as the need to survive squeezes out pre-existing forms of practice.

*iv) hegemonic (complicit form) embrace quadrant* - the increasing adoption of altered forms of practice that reflect the impact of enterprise culture. Elements of community development discourse may remain, but are not translated into practice.

The term 'altered forms of practice' has been used as part of the axis essentially to reflect two divergent practice responses to the impact of enterprise culture on community development and to build on the consistent theme from this research that modified and recontextualised forms of practice are required that respond to new realities.

On the one hand, practice might be altered to simply mirror forms sanctioned by enterprise culture; those deemed politically safe and non-threatening (indicative of a *complicit embrace*). However, the second path is one where innovative and challenging forms of
practice emerge out of a climate of contestation (indicative of a strategic embrace). A key community development principle is that of critical reflection, that out of action and comes informed response and new ways of working. The forms of such ways of working is as yet unclear, but there are several possible paths of approach.

Figure 6.2. The relationship between discourse and practice:

In seeking to make sense of these possible paths it is instructive to return to the potential for discourse to be a site of contestation out of which may emerge new forms of practice. As has been noted earlier, the term empowerment expresses some of the tension inherent in the discourse of practitioners. Its usage in enterprise culture reflects an economic emphasis, of increasing the competitiveness of individuals and organisations. Community development discourse emphasises the justice and rights aspects of liberty underpinned by notions of collectivity and mutuality as part of citizenship and social capital. In practice terms, the dilemma for workers becomes how to promote the latter when it is increasingly set in the context of the former? Is the usage of the term itself an act of hegemony given the privileging of the narrow definition or can workers through their practice adapt it? How can workers act
to retain what is distinctive in their practice and discourse and yet endeavour to strategically embrace enterprise culture, especially in organisational contexts such as Jessica's? Given that there was no real practice based evidence of overt rejection and that a compelled embrace is a no-win situation, it is argued that workers need to reflect and develop strategic forms of embrace that will enable new forms of community development to emerge from the interface as part of a dialectic. The question is the degree to which enterprise culture is altering the character of community development. Will it result in a further marginalisation of forms of community development practice that are challenging, thus consolidating trends previously noted, it being either silenced and/or reduced to a form of service delivery with politically benign strategies? Or, is there a post modern tinge that suggests locally there are and will always be elements of challenge and subversion?

The conceptualisation proposed in Figure 6.2, is a useful framework to begin to examine such vexed issues as it allows for a fluidity of positions and changes over time. The formative research that has been undertaken has revealed the debates and contestations around discourse and practice occurring predominantly around the centre of the axis. The centrepoint can be seen as a site of dilemma and challenge for community development practitioners and organisations. In other words, symbolic of the cross-roads the domain finds itself in. It also enables a comparison of the different forms of embrace from the state, organisations individual practitioners. The state is clearly promoting the use of discourse and practice forms associated with complicit embrace through its control of funding (complicit embrace) and as is seeking to establish this form of embrace as the norm or hegemony. Organisations employing the practitioners engaged in this study seem to generally motivated by survival and are developing hybridised forms of hegemonic embrace. Practitioners appear to have responded to enterprise culture in a myriad of hybridised forms—elements of strategic embrace and compelled embrace have been indicated in responses. There is no doubt, however, that the impetus of enterprise culture has produced a situation where creeping (if not galloping) hegemony has been occurring at sites where community development is practiced thus placing strains on practitioners seeking to maintain pre-existing forms of practice.

The existence of a number of pre-existing forms of community development practice further adds to the complexity of assessing the prospects and dilemmas for community development.
Whilst the initial literature search suggested that community development practitioners would be most likely to overtly reject enterprise culture and that this would be reflected in their practice, this was not a predominant response given by those interviewed. However, it did emerge in the intellectual response of a number of practitioners. The omni present reality had led most to feel compelled to at least embrace some elements. Compelled embrace, then, emerges as a response that represents a retreat from community development, with practitioners feeling they face no choice but to progressively adopt elements of enterprise culture (as outlined in the domino effect).

Thus, a hybridised embrace, consisting of differing degrees of strategic and compelled forms of embrace was most common amongst practitioners interviewed as part of this research. There were some examples of complicit embrace, but this appeared to be the stance of some organisations, rather than the workers themselves. The interesting question is the extent to which increasing adoption of enterprise discourse and practice can come to represent an act of hegemony. Whilst the discourse of many workers was defiant, critical and expressed an attitude of non co-operation when referring to enterprise culture, their description of their own practice and its context indicated clearly the increasing adoption of enterprise culture. Kate, Natasha and Trish all emphasised the need in practice as well intellectually, to challenge and reject the essential tenets of enterprise culture. However, each attested to the daily accommodations that they had to make with enterprise culture in order to remain employed. The forms of response to enterprise culture developed through this research provide radically different answers to the challenges its introduction to the domain has produced. Given the degree and pace of change induced by enterprise culture as evidenced in the responses of practitioners there can be no denying that there are many hurdles facing practitioners seeking to promote social justice in such a climate. It is suggested that a strategic embrace may be the most productive form of response from community development to the onslaught of enterprise culture. In the final chapter, some of the possible paths that might lead to a strategic embrace that have been identified by both practitioners and relevant literature as the most potentially fruitful in dealing with enterprise culture will be discussed.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION- REPOSITIONING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT?

The potential for a strategic embrace of enterprise culture

The dynamics of responding to the increasing demands of enterprise culture and the degree of infiltration by its discursive cluster and associated practices into the domain of community development have served to severely restrict the choices open to practitioners. The follow up interviews indicated the extent of these trends into sites where community development is practiced. The research suggests that the prospects for practitioners to develop strategic forms of embrace as a response to enterprise culture are undoubtedly constrained by the impact of its many manifestations on their work. Enterprise culture has essentially reframed the funding and organisational frameworks that so heavily circumscribe the practice options. In its various guises, enterprise culture has fractured much of the terrain within which community development operates. This research has established that one emergent and increasingly tangible outcome of this process has been the incorporation of corporatist models of operation into this terrain, informed by notions of competition, growth and an increasing scale and scope of managerialism. Many of those interviewed are evidently pessimistic about the prospects for community development practice, some suggesting that only politically "acceptable" forms within economic rationalist terms of reference will remain and that there may even be a return to more conservative modes of practice. It is also evident from the research that merged or hybridised forms of response are appearing; as reflected in the discourse of those interviewed. What then are the prospects for community development? Has it become irrelevant, unpopular and politically unacceptable in the age of enterprise culture? Will only those aspects deemed politically acceptable or "neutral" remain within the tendering environment. Or, are there some possible avenues for finding a way through this maze?

In the preceding chapter, the links between discourse and practice that have been revealed in the data were discussed and illustrated in Figure 6.2. Two related strategies which may form the basis of a strategic embrace build on this linkage or praxis; contesting and reclaiming the terrain of discourse through workers developing a critical approach to language use, and second, a repositioning of community development practice that offers some prospect of ensuring its continuing viability across a range of settings.
Contesting and reclaiming the terrain of discourse: workers developing a critical discourse

In undertaking research, researchers adopting a critical approach should expect to have their own assumptions challenged. As a practitioner and educator in the domain of community development for nearly twenty years I commenced this research with the expectation that community development, whilst facing challenges from enterprise culture would be able to retain sufficient space and autonomy to remain viable. The use of a lexicon of key terms proved to be invaluable in identifying the trends emerging in the discursive practice of a number of experienced practitioners. Earlier chapters have already addressed the process of marginalisation that has occurred with regard to many of the terms that were once integral to the community development lexicon. It must be noted, however, that there was also a perception among a number of the practitioners of the need to 'move on'; that some aspects of practice were too rooted in the seventies and that change was needed, particularly in the area of accountability. To some extent, enterprise culture has served to expose this 'soft underbelly' of community development. An integral part of contesting and reclaiming ground is the need for workers to develop a critical discourse. Gee and Lankshear (1995), whilst referring more explicitly to education, cogently outline the beginnings of how to respond to enterprise culture or what they refer to as 'fast capitalism':

> enterprises like critical literacy/pedagogy and critical theory must be reframed as enactive projects, concerned with mobilising reflection and action around informed awareness and evaluation of the complex and extended relations of systems to wholes. Acknowledging and acting upon the importance of critical language awareness for all who participate in the practices and texts of the fast capitalist world presents a sound place from which to start (Gee and Lankshear, 1995:18).

In the light of earlier discussions around the links of discourse to broader patterns of social and political arrangements, such an 'enterprise' is vital because community development as a discursive domain has been substantially silenced. Interestingly, Gee and Lankshear refer to the tasks at hand to challenge hegemony as enterprises, which in itself is a challenge to the prevailing view of the term. Any potential to reframe community development as an 'enactive
project' capable of developing a critical discourse as part of a strategic embrace will require community development practitioners to engage in discursive practice that:

- contests the meanings of terms with shared usage within both community development discourse and enterprise discourse (such as empowerment, participation, autonomy) and assert the primacy of the former in relation to defining their practice,

- maintains and/or increases their usage of terms that are part of the lexicon of community development such as social justice,

- contextualises the use of terms from enterprise discourse within an explicit community development frame of reference and where possible, identifies alternative terms that are more appropriate for such contexts.

These elements of a critical discourse: being clear about meanings, reclaiming terms that have been marginalised or lost from the lexicon and actively contesting meanings of key terms like empowerment are central to a strategic embrace.

Repositioning community development practice possible alternatives

One of the key findings from this study has been the indication that in Australia as in the United Kingdom, the state has played a key role in promoting enterprise culture through social policy formulation and implementation. In particular, its control of funding arrangements with community-based groups appears to provide limited room for manoeuvre, as tender specifications increasingly prescribe outcomes and 'acceptable' forms of practice by which to achieve them. The practitioners who took part in this study were finding that they had to devote increasing time and energy to one overriding task- survival. Enterprise culture has been so effective because increasing numbers of practitioners appear to be 'talking its talk'. As noted elsewhere, a fear of not surviving has underpinned much of this talk, but such forms of symbolic control can lead to a silencing of divergent discourse. What then are the prospects for repositioning community development? Are there some options for developing alternatives, particularly in terms of funding that might nurture community development as a form of practice that would provide some space, independence and autonomy? Is it feasible or desirable to consider a similar process as that outlined in terms of developing a critical
discourse and claim some of the enterprise culture's methods but for collective and social justice ends?

Alternatives have been considered by some of the practitioners interviewed as part of the research. They fall into two main categories: the first involves repositioning organisations within the competitive tendering environment and the second is based on moving outside the funding framework provided by the state through the provision of some form of 'self' funding.

Repositioning organisations within the competitive tendering environment

One proposal being pursued by networks of organisations providing similar programs was outlined briefly by Trish. It essentially involves a consortium company being set up to submit a tender on behalf of localised, smaller groups. This overarching company would do all the negotiations with the state and operate as a community enterprise. This would enable local, community based groups under that umbrella to potentially maintain their service models (and hence elements of community development practice) and relieve the administrative burden. However, she noted a hesitation reflected also by Jessica's experience, that such structures can lead to a loss of control and can end up in effect being a take-over or amalgamation which merely exacerbates the sorts of trends accompanying enterprise culture that have been well documented elsewhere. To be effective and not counter productive, such a potential form of strategic embrace would need to be based on a collaborative, trusting network of organisations and practitioners and tender specifications that were not overly prescriptive and narrow in terms of permitted models of practice because often community development modes of practice have simply been omitted from the brief.

Self funding options

Two examples of possible forms of strategic embrace were provided by Trish and Joe. They both eschew to a greater or lesser degree, reliance on funding from the state and propose independent means of finance through a reframing of some of the 'techniques' of enterprise culture. This distinguishes them from the options cited elsewhere proposed in Just change (1994).

The first option, put forward by Trish, is based on the experience of a number of groups that have remained largely independent of funding from the state. The proposal is based on the
need to fund the activism her group is engaged in and involves the creation of a business by
the group that would generate sufficient profit to support its activities. Thus, the business
would be separate from the activism which would continue to operate on community
development principles.

The second example emerged from Joe's interview. This variant of a strategic embrace
consists of tendering for a range work within the purview of the organisation from a range of
sources, potentially even private business, and using the proceeds to fund and maintain the
core of its community development practice. Joe believes the prospects in his area of work
are bleak in terms of the potential to undertake progressive practice and his ideal is to gain
independent funding. He sees little prospect of grassroots activism being an option to bring
about change to the broader situation. His approach is to "go it alone" and continue a service
committed to social justice but funded through monies gained from sources other than the
state. His option differs from Trish's in that the focus of the agency's service would be applied
to income generation in order to sustain the core service. There may be questions around
autonomy in the future with this approach. Both of these options, it could be argued, if
adopted by organisations would potentially lead to further abrogation of the role of the state in
terms of funding. Trish, however, feels that the state would never fund the activism she is
currently engaged in because it challenges its social policy and programs. Joe sees the funding
base as continually being eroded by the state anyway by the process of tendering which
leaves smaller organisations increasingly vulnerable to defunding.

Such proposals have their roots in a branch of community development practice known
variously as community economic development or local enterprise development. An
interesting blend of discourses that appears to be drawn from the literature on local enterprise
development, ecofeminism and elements of enterprise culture emerges in Wildman's
argument that in terms of dealing with structural unemployment the development of an
enterprising culture is central. She notes,

...high levels of public sector expenditure on passive labour market strategies
does not encourage the development of an enterprising culture where things
such as entrepreneurial skills, initiative and innovation are seen as prime in
Australia reconstructed...To me, an enterprising culture represents the
outworking of an inner potential/capacity of people in society. This may be
called a self organising paradigm versus the existing top down organising paradigm. (Wildman, 1992:5-6)

At first glance, these two quotes could have been drawn from any number of pro market neo liberaliist tracts including the Karpin Report (1995). They reflect the need for individuals to develop enterprising qualities in an environment free of heavy handed public intervention. Yet Wildman is explicitly arguing from an ideological perspective with very different origins when she notes that:

_to be effective, small enterprise development needs to be embedded in the broader picture of community economic development, ..., this broader approach is increasingly drawing from eco-feminism, [with] links to social justice, ..., it needs to be facilitatory, bottom up and based on action learning by helping all involved learn from their actions and develop an overall enterprising culture (Wildman, 1992: Abstract)._

She labels this broader approach - a 'feminist community economic development' paradigm. It contains elements of the right's faith in small enterprise in a framework of community or collective responsibility for issues such as social justice. In fact community economic development is seen as a way of promoting social justice in an ecofeminist framework. Wildman talks long and hard about the virtues of creating an enterprising culture based on integrated decision making within and across all levels of society. Thus, for her, broader policy settings in terms of the economy are predicated on the achievement and maintenance of environmental balance, eg, bioregionalism and ecofeminism, self reliance and micro processes. (Wildman, 1992:32-33) Being enterprising, involves economic, social, political and environmental dimensions and an enterprising culture is characterised by a balance of these four (Wildman, 1992:32).

Is it possible then, that a branch of the community development tree, community economic development, may have something to offer the broader domain in terms of strategically responding to enterprise culture and developing innovative forms of practice? Community economic development in many ways straddles both community development and enterprise culture. Practitioners such as Steve and Frances who participated in this research would very
much claim a community development lineage and underpinning in terms of values, ways of working and goals. However, they are also comfortable with some of the "mechanics" of enterprise culture and aspects of its discourse. For example, notions of business operation and profit are part of their daily practice. Their argument, along with Wildman, is that these represent just some of the means along with co-operatives of a third way- heavily influenced it would seem, by the anarchist and localist traditions of community development. As has been noted elsewhere, these traditions are suspicious of centralised control—whether it be from the state or private capital and there is an emphasis on the grassroots and seeking to gain maximum control at the local level over decision making and resources. Elements of this perspective also tie accord with some within the green movement who favour such forms of social organisation.

Such forms of local enterprise development as responses to urban decline, poverty and unemployment have a long history. However there have been criticisms that such schemes merely mimic capitalism and its ways of working and motivation. As a potential form of strategic embrace such issues require consideration, as does the source of funding and who participates in the operation. Steve and Frances' perspectives stand in contrast to many of the other practitioners who focused on funding from the state and the changes wrought by enterprise culture and its associated policies and programs such as competitive tendering. The notion of community enterprise outlined above appears to potentially dovetail with the option for strategic embrace outlined by Trish and Joe. There is a long history of co-operatives and community enterprises and as a form of community development practice it predates the welfare state. The idea of community enterprises offers some prospect of building on these themes: that is deploying the rich heritage of community economic development and applying it to community based management of social policy areas. It emphasises local control and ownership. Whilst it has more generally been used as a term signifying a 'business' operating for community ends, there is potential to build on these principles and to re craft community enterprise as a model of community ownership concerned with a range of activities. In this sense it may well have some applicability to a range of issues including indigenous rights and environmental issues. For example, the notion of 'people-centred development' has been popularised to denote concerns for both ecological and social justice, with local self reliance a mediating and organising principle (Robertson, 1994).

A cautionary issue is the centrality to this perspective of the concept of community as a locus of action. As noted in Chapter 3, it has fallen into some disrepute as a problematic term,
more recently as a result of post modernist critiques. Young (1990), for example, suggests that whilst it is an understandable vision,

*those motivated by it will tend to suppress differences among themselves or implicitly to exclude from their political groups persons with whom they do not identify. The vision of small, face-to-face, decentralized units that this ideal promotes, moreover, is an unrealistic vision for transformative politics in mass urban society.* (1990:300)

Her argument is that homogeneity and a denial of difference are the outcomes of the desire for community. Whilst the emphasis is on feminist discourse in relation to the ideal of community, she argues that for urban society a politics of difference based on an 'unoppressive city' model is a more viable way forward in the search for social relations without domination. (Young 1990:302-4) Other critiques of community have stressed the illusory nature of the ideal of rural, self-sufficient communities in the context of urban society and gross inequalities. (see Kenny, 1994:32-37)

The other point of debate centres on the role of the state in this essentially anarchist vision. A central tenet of this thesis has been that the state is engaged in sponsoring enterprise culture as part of a broader response to changes in late capitalist society such as globalisation. The increasing commodification of social relations, institutional arrangements and domains such as community development has also contributed to a rapidly changing role of the state in relation to its citizens. Whilst much of the debate has been about the *quantitative* role of the state—how much it spends and does in particular policy areas, enterprise culture is contributing to a transformation of its *qualitative* role—which is taken here to mean its essential character and *raison d'être*. Anarchist visions also argue for such a transformation, but with different means and ends informing such a process. Essentially, they argue for community as a site of power—decentralised and working for collective ends but an emphasis on individual freedom. In contrast, the state is seen as a means of reinforcing the imbalance of wealth and legitimating inequality.

*Both economic styles of organisation—the privatisation of industry by the capitalist and nationalisation by the state—are opposed. They produce class domination or bureaucratic domination respectively.* (Leach, 1988:201)
Thus, simplicity of lifestyle and a complementary focus on the individual and the collective would be the centrepieces of anarchist society.

_Ultimately, anarchism stresses the paradox of individuality being discovered in freely given moral collective action. Personal authenticity can only emerge if people cherish each other as individuals, to be won over by reason and consensus, rather than by force, or even majority vote. (Leach, 1988:201)_

This linkage of individuality with collective action is relevant to contemporary discussions about the nature and focus of community development practice. Too often, a dualism has arisen in this domain based on earlier conceptions that the community is a site of radical action and the individual as a focus of action and energy is a counter-productive and conservative strategy. The reality is that effective community development practice requires attention to both. Young's critique of community can, in part be explained as a reflection of two or three decades of the promotion of this conception through the various social movements of prominence through this period, including feminism. However, it is suggested that a wholesale abandonment of community runs the risk of re-asserting individualism as the primary basis of social relationship and the emphasis on difference as so paramount leaves little, if any room for collective action. Anarchist conceptions, with their emphasis on the individual and collective action offer a useful basis from which to consider potential challenges. It has the heritage from which to meet head on the claims of individual freedom so often touted by enterprise culture.

Anarchism also stresses a spontaneity of action against structure and discipline and in this, it carries some important messages for community development. The development of creative forms of strategic embrace will require such spontaneity of action. Community development, when all is said and done, is a practical, action oriented domain. Action to re-claim discourse needs to be reinforced with practice examples that may provide inspiration and either revive pre-existing and/or give rise to new ways of working. Examples from community economic development may well be part of that jigsaw. Similarly, others may arise from within the environmental or green movement, building on Ife's model of ecological social justice (Ife, 1995).
For example, Roxas, an economist from the Philippines who heads an organisation, the *Foundation for Community Organization and Management Technology*, believes the basis for a sustainable future lies in community and that the dominance of the business enterprise as the dominant model of social organisation is proving catastrophic, both in terms of what he terms 'human values' and the environment. What is interesting in terms of the following quote is the evidence of a merged discourse with the discourse of the enterprise being used to explain a counter position:

*What I'm suggesting is that life is going to be more efficient when you measure efficiency in terms of human values. It's going to be far more efficient than the enterprise system... we must empower communities precisely by making them work like enterprises... If you look at communities around watersheds, it's amazing what potential there is for combining good business and good ecology in the community management system* (Roxas, 1994:9).

This conception of strategic embrace offers one alternative way of approaching the challenge of enterprise culture. Whilst it can be argued with some justification that it would be infeasible or not viable for many organisations located within the funding paradigm of the state, the point of this proposal is that it seeks to assert the efficacy of a discourse that offers the scope and room to pursue alternatives for social change. Organisations within the funding paradigm face new constraints in their relationship with the state which mean they are increasingly the hand maiden of the state. Others may feel that they can "play the game" in the manner outlined by Auer et al (1994) and in their own way create community enterprises. The catch is that the organisation is endeavouring to practice community development within a competitive environment. The strategic embrace options being countenanced here stress the need to separate and shelter community development from direct exposure to such pressures. Another possible approach alluded to above is a strategic embrace that straddles this debate through the establishment of a consortium company that is run as a business and administers the tender on behalf of, and in liaison with, local groups leaving them to continue to operate their own programs along community development lines.

This possibly suggests that there may be the potential for exceptions—sites of practice where community development is nurtured. Whilst alternative conceptions such as that those proposed, may appear destined to remain on the fringes of the mainstream, they have the
potential to harness creative energy for change around environmental and related issues. Analysis of the emergence of contemporary community development reveals the significance of individuals and groups on the fringes in influencing social change. This is often the site where there is most energy, creativity and innovation. Much has been learnt about collective ways of working and invaluable examples exist today. This heritage is a rich one which mustn't be lost. Wainwright (1994) has taken such thinking further and offers a valuable reassessment of the prospects for social change in an international context. She finds a politics and discourse of change and challenge in a 'distinct politics of knowledge' that rejects both state socialism and capitalist markets (1994:284-285). Hodgson (1984) has explored the idea of a market socialism based around participatory processes and a revisiting of some of these principles would be timely.

Hesitant attempts to establish associations of co-operation, democracy and egalitarianism can be located, yet as a third way, they remain worthy of consideration and exploration. Insufficient resources and energy have been devoted to this route - one that I would suggest is the 'natural' home of community development. In other guises, it has been promoted as social development or people-centred development. It offers resistance to the paradigm of enterprise culture, and the potential for living, creative alternatives to be established that may be part of 'new roads on the map'.
APPENDIX - METHODOLOGY

Key research questions

There were a number of key questions that prompted the research:

* what is the enterprise culture and the nature of its challenge to the community development domain?

* to what extent are community development practitioners who are part of this study absorbing and accommodating the processes, practices and ideology underpinning enterprise culture and still maintaining their commitment to community development as reflected through their discursive practice?

* is community development practice likely to remain a viable option for practitioners formal, paid sector?

* what are the prospects for challenging the enterprise culture? How might that challenge occur? Can community development prove resilient and in fact influence and/or challenge the language, practices and processes of the enterprise culture?

* are new forms or models of community development practice likely to emerge from the dialectic of change occurring at the interface of the domain and enterprise culture?

The expected outcomes of the research were:

* a substantial survey of the community development field and current forms of practice,
* a clear perspective on the form of infiltration of the values and practice of the enterprise culture into community development practice,
* an assessment of the nature of the response from community development to this infiltration utilising an appropriate interpretative framework,
* an analysis of emerging forms of community development practice within the context of the enterprise culture.
As a formative study, the research sought to establish some initial findings that may provide the basis for related studies. The focus on the language use of practitioners as an indicator of the impact of enterprise culture on their discourse and practice was influenced by the work of Fairclough on critical discourse analysis (1989,1992,1995). An interest in any possible changes over time in the nature and extent of any such impacts and/or the responses of practitioners indicated a need to do a follow up interview 12 months after the initial interview. The research utilises qualitative methodology and does not purport to constitute a representative sample of the entire range of practitioners within the domain of community development. The findings are, therefore illustrative and seek to reveal the complexities and dilemmas faced by practitioners at a time of rapid change both in the nature and context of their work.

Sampling method

Practitioners from a variety of settings illustrative of the range of community development discourse and practice were selected through a purposive or targeted sampling process in order to enable an empirical study of data related to the impact of the enterprise culture on community development. In all, sixteen practitioners were selected on the basis of their community development experience and current employment. Part of the purposive sampling process was also to ensure that the broad spectrum of fields or sites of community development practice was reflected in the practitioners chosen.

Dan has been a community educator for nearly ten years.

Frances has an extensive range of experience in community development in Asia with an overseas aid organisation. The projects she has been involved with have focused on women, co-operatives and finance.

Frank has also had experience in the overseas aid field working primarily on project evaluation.

Irene's experience is varied, having been employed in the disabilities field, and community education and information.

Jessica's community development experience has been primarily in the area of housing support for women.

Jocelyn has worked in a variety of settings including women's services, community centre, a community legal centre and community health centre.
Joe’s experience is predominantly in financial counselling and credit advocacy.
Josie’s recent employment history has been primarily in the area of community law.
Kate has been involved in disability advocacy, environmental issues and adult education.
Maxine has worked for the past five years in the areas of community development and community education in a rural area.
Melanie has an extensive background in disability advocacy, and community education with an emphasis on community development.
Natasha has experience in welfare rights, community education, and community arts.
Sonya’s recent employment has been in the field of community information and advocacy.
Steve has an extensive background in local enterprise development and co-operatives.
Tracy worked primarily in community centres and family support and advocacy programs.
Trish has been employed in a variety of settings ranging from community legal centres, community education, community centres as well as extensive experience as an activist.

The first round of interviews

The first interview (conducted in November/December 1996) consisted of background questions regarding the organisational context and definitions of community development and a lexicon of 26 terms that practitioners were asked to reflect on in relation to their meaning and currency of usage to describe elements of their daily practice and/or the context of that practice. The interview schedule was based on some preliminary trialling with practitioners of the range of possible questions. The interviews were taped and transcriptions made. These were sent to each participant to check for accuracy.

Interview Schedule

1. Introduction to interview

* The interview is part of a research project investigating trends in the community development field in the light of recent government policies, social and economic trends and the current and emerging needs and issues being addressed by organisations in which community development is practised.

* The general outline regarding the study has already been received by you. Are there any questions at this stage?

* The interview will run on a semi structured format. I have a number of questions to put to you, but other issues and themes may emerge which we can also pursue. I will run
through a checklist of words that I would like you to respond to in terms of the community development practice in this agency.

- The interview is scheduled to run for approx 60 minutes. Is it OK to tape the interview (keeping in mind the confidentiality provisions I have handed to you)? It can be turned off at any stage.

2. Organisational approach to community development

- Could you talk about the rationale/mission statement/aims of your organisation?
- Could you describe the needs and issues that your organisation is concerned with?
- Could you briefly describe how your organisation goes about responding to these needs and issues? Does your organisation (or workers within it) have a commitment to a community development approach as part of this response?
- To what extent is this commitment translated into action?
- Could you talk about the aspect/s of your organisation that are examples of community development? What makes them examples of community development?
- Could you tell me on what basis community development strategies were selected?
- Could you tell me what values underpin your community development approach?
- Do you perceive that your organisation's community development approach has altered/is altering? If yes, in what ways and in response to what?
- Could you talk about any debates/discussion currently occurring in your organisation about the role and relevance of community development? If yes, could you outline them please?
- How do you evaluate your community development approach? Is it worker based, organisation based or funding driven?
- Reflecting on the organisation's work, do you believe that certain aspects are becoming more/less important? Are certain aspects valued more/less? Please elaborate noting whose interpretation is being utilised.

3. Organisational Culture

- What do you see as the main features of the current context of your organisation?
- Often reference is made to an organisational culture. Do you think this concept is relevant to your organisation? Please explain.
- What is the current decision making structure in your organisation?
4. Relationship to external environment

- Have any these changes been related to your source, level and/or means of funding?
- What do you think of the changes? (positive/negative) Why?
- What have the changes meant and what has/have been the response/s to them?
- Is or has the way your organisation profiles/presents itself (its raison d'être) changing/ed? If yes, please describe? Why has/have this/these change/s occurred?
- Could you briefly outline the source/s of your funding? Has either the source or amount of funding altered over the last four years?
- Has your relationship to your funding body/ies changed?
- Has your organisation participated in compulsory competitive tendering?
- What is your organisation’s view of this form of funding?
- Could you talk about what government policies/initiatives/programs have impacted on your work? Could you describe the nature of this impact? Have they specifically affected your community development practice? (don’t know, easier, difficult, no difference)
- Are there areas of practice that are "off limits" or not being pursued by your organisation even though they are acknowledged as relevant? What are they and what is preventing them being taken up?

5. Lexicon

- What follows are a number of words that may or may not describe some aspect of your work. As I read them out please indicate if they are in current usage, by whom (including connection to organisation) and the meaning ascribed to them. Feel free to provide more than
one meaning if you feel such is the case. It would be helpful to know which is the meaning that carries most weight in your organisation and why.

- accountability
- empowerment
- output
- autonomy
- efficiency
- business
- enterprise
- participation
- competition
- collaboration
- social action
- consciousness raising
- advocacy
- social justice
- activism
- class
- gender
- market
- product
- businesslike
- quality
- collective
- social change
- customer
- initiative
- risk taking

Are there any other key phrases you would like to add that you feel are important to the community development practice of your organisation?

6. Personal perspectives on community development practice
- What values inform your practice? How do you translate these into action?
- Could you tell me about your specific work in the organisation and the aspects that you believe reflect a community development approach? On what criteria do you define them as community development?
- How would you define your relationship with your agency? How does the agency/organisation assist your community development work?
- Does your approach to community development accord with the following, i) your organisation’s approach to community development, and/or ii) your organisational culture? Please explain.
- If there is "discord", how do you go about practicing community development in such a climate? What strategies have you employed to affirm your practice? Have you had to alter the way you practice community development? Why?
- Do you possess autonomy in your job? In what ways has this assisted you in establishing your approach to community development?
- Could you provide your own assessment of the community development field? What are its strengths and weaknesses? What are the prospects for the future? Do you believe we can talk about a community development field? What are its defining characteristics? Are these changing? Are new issues, forms of practice emerging? What are they?
- Are there specific issues or forms of practice that you would like to discuss further?
- Do you believe your practice of community development is enterprising? Please explain.

7. Emergent forms of community development practice

- Are there areas of community development you would like to pursue? If yes, what are they and are there any constraints? What are they?

Data Analysis

The analysis of data involved some use of the NUDIST software package. This was utilised particularly to enable collation of meanings of the key terms outlined in the lexicon.
Follow up interviews

The second round of interviewing in November-December 1997 involved brief 15-20 minute 'updates' on changes that practitioners perceived had occurred since the initial interviews 12 months earlier. It consisted of more open ended questions that invited the interviewees to reflect on the relative impact of enterprise culture on their community development practice.
REFERENCE LIST


Heelas, P. (1990), "Reforming the self", in Keat, R. & Abercrombie, N.(eds.) (1990),

Heelas, P & Morris, P.(eds) (1992), The Values of the Enterprise Culture: The Moral Debate,
Routledge, London.

Hindness, B. (1987), Freedom, Equality and the Market: Arguments on Social Policy,
Tavistock, New York.


Hodgson, G, (1984), The Democratic Economy: A new look at planning, markets and power,
Penguin, Harmondsworth.


Wildman, P (1992), Responding to Structural Unemployment in Australia: Building small enterprise into a community economic development strategy, Paper presented to SEEANZ Conference.


