Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Sustainable urban community development from the grassroots: Challenges and opportunities in a pedestrian street initiative

Lenore Newman,[a]* Levi Waldron,[a] Ann Dale[a] & Kelsey Carriere[b]

[a]*Canada Research Chair in Sustainable Community Development, Royal Roads University, Ottawa, Canada;* [b]*Streets Are for People! and P.S. Kensington, Toronto, Canada*

ABSTRACT   A local sustainable development initiative to establish a temporary pedestrian zone within a Canadian urban community served as a research study into the efficacy of social capital in the development of a network for community action. This community-based initiative used social capital to overcome campaign obstacles and the campaign itself generated new social capital within the neighbourhood through the creation of adaptive networks of participants. The campaign succeeded in creating a part-time pedestrian-only space that serves as an educational example of change for sustainable community development that is replicable in other communities, and provides an example of alternative occupation of community space. Contrary to other literature, little evidence of "core burnout" was found although the network does continue to expend a large amount of effort and time on fundraising. While social capital is a powerful tool for local grassroots action, the availability of a critical source of economic capital may prove vital to the long-term success and sustainability of the network.

Introduction

The Kensington Market community, in Toronto, Canada, is an area of 35 hectares bounded by Spadina Ave, Bathurst Street, College Street, and Dundas Street, four major arteries that all carry streetcar lines. This area is thus extremely well served by public transport. The market is perpetually congested with automobile traffic and both legally and illegally parked cars and delivery trucks despite the existence of two municipal car parks. The streets within the market, however, are very

narrow, with both T-junctions and high volumes of foot and bicycle traffic that slow car traffic. The lot size is very small, leading to a high density of two-storey buildings. Usage is highly mixed; row housing coexists with converted heritage homes housing retail on the ground floor and residential above. Rent has traditionally been very low. The market also contains Bellevue Square Park, a small urban green space containing a playground that is often the centre of community activity. Cafe life and shop goods spill onto the sidewalks. The area's vibrant mix of immigrant culture and counterculture draws an increasing number of tourists to the area, along with Torontonians shopping for vintage clothing, cheap produce, and specialty goods. The growing popularity of the area has caused some gentrification of the north block closest to College Street, with upscale businesses atypical of the market attracting a different demographic than the vintage clothing and grocery stores and keeping people on the street later into the evening.

The Kensington area has faced various "clean-up", "renewal", and development pressures since the early 20th century. In the earlier part of the century this came in the form of health inspectors and police checking for peddler's licences. During the 1960s, government interest in cleaning up the area intensified as planners of the time cleared dense mixed-use areas in favour of planned housing developments. In nearby Alexandra Park, an 18-acre area site was expropriated, demolished, and completely redeveloped into a 430-unit low-income housing development. Similar plans for Kensington were stopped by successful grassroots opposition at the time. A number of other plans have since threatened Kensington, each brought forth by agencies with powers of expropriation. Successful community opposition to these projects has allowed the community's continued survival. This history of successful resistance in the Kensington Market community has both enabled and constrained the pedestrian initiative of the grassroots organisation we studied; the community is both inspired by grassroots projects and wary of changes that may affect the cherished character of the Market.

Sustainable development was defined by the Brundtland commission's 1987 report *Our common future* as "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". This concept has grown in popularity and plays a role in many planning processes at all levels of community organisation. Though sustainable development was initially formulated at the international level, sustainable development initiatives are now ubiquitous at the community level. This is promising, as sustainable development will be best facilitated when federal and provincial governments have local partnerships (Dale 2001). In many cases, federal and provincial governments can be out of touch with local conditions (Roy and Tisdell 1998), thus local participation is crucial to long-term implementation of sustainable development. Many communities, however, find themselves with limited access to diverse economic resources, and lack the social contacts needed to access information and agency (Dale and Newman 2005).

Community sustainable development initiatives are often self-organising as groups of concerned citizens mobilise around specific issues to rebuild community-level systems to meet their needs and to resolve conflicts. Such issues, however, involve both local interests and decision makers from municipal and regional governments. Solutions, therefore, must both incorporate community

input and involve government and regulation at multiple scales. The volunteer nature of many community sustainable development initiatives can lead to scarce human resources being overly diluted, especially if the initiative involves protracted conflict over a long period of time. The ability of local communities to handle the stresses associated with sustainable development initiatives has not been adequately studied to date.

As volunteer groups do not always have easy access to economic capital, much attention has subsequently focused on "social capital" formation as one way to overcome lack of economic access. Social capital has been defined as "social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them" (Putnam 2000). Social capital is found in the individual connections between people, as well as through networks that a group can use collectively to achieve its objectives. Effective mobilisation of social capital involves the creation of networks. Networks are a powerful means of distributing knowledge and can lead to the reconciliation of previously competing information, interests, and agendas (Dale and Onyx 2005).

Networks consist of individuals connected by ties, and the variation in these ties creates different types of networks with different skills (Borgatti and Foster 2003). The evolution of a group's network ties will ultimately contribute to the success or failure of the group in achieving its sustainable development goals. Research distinguishes between "bonding" and "bridging" ties (Putnam 2000, Onyx and Bullen 2000). Bonding ties are those connecting people who have common relations, such as family members, close friends, or neighbours. Bonding ties create dense clusters of interconnected people and strong but localised trust. Bridging ties are connections to people from other groups and communities which allow access to resources and opportunities (Granovetter 1973).

It was our assumption that a group with a diverse network of both bonding and bridging ties would have the necessary resources to respond to the complex nature of ecological and social problems without exhausting itself over the long term.

The limits and potentials of social capital

The exact role of social capital in forming sustainable communities is unclear. One of the goals of this case study is to examine what role social capital plays in the success or failure of local community initiatives. In order to determine the role of social capital, we studied a grassroots initiative within a Canadian urban community. Before beginning our study, we found opinion in the literature to be quite diverse. Some argue that social capital is a good that could tip the balance in favour of more action (Fukuyama 1999). Others suggest that social capital is the missing link in community health (Schafft and Brown 2003), that it creates economic prosperity (Wilson 1997), and that it is "self-reinforcing", in effect "free" (Wilson 1997). We were particularly interested in studying the argument that social capital creates more social capital when used, since this could have dramatic effects on the ability of communities to sustain or expand their grassroots efforts. We wondered if social capital increases or decreases in the community as the local grassroots initiative evolves, and if increases or decreases of social capital function differently in the core than in the periphery of the group.

The literature conflicts in opinions of the value of social capital to community initiatives; several authors have highlighted negative aspects of social capital within community groups. Fine (1999) states, "There is not necessarily anything positive or predetermined about the impact of social capital." Further, some scholars suggest that social capital can imprison actors in maladaptive situations or facilitate undesirable behaviour (Borgatti and Foster 2003). Though the structure of a network affects its ability to adapt to a significant change in environment (Gargiulo and Benassi 2000), the surrounding social network's structure (Dale and Sparkes forthcoming) might be central to the initial departure from convention during an innovation process. Social structure is both enabling and constraining (Reuf 2002) in the initiation of grassroots initiatives. Were there signs of the negative effects of social capital within this particular instance of network formation?

We were also interested in how the network dynamics of the group evolved over time and how this affected the agency of the group. Social capital depends on the number of people in the network, their ability to lend support, and their willingness to do so (Volker and Flap 2001). As socially similar people spend time in the same places (Burt 1992), groups can initially be quite homogeneous. These groups then evolve quite quickly; it has been shown that voluntary associations lose atypical members fastest (Popielarz and McPherson 1995), a finding supported by Burt, who found that bridging ties decay faster than bonding ties, endangering a group's social capital (Burt 2002). We thus expect a core of strongly tied individuals to emerge within a group over time as peripheral players drift away. Did a strong core/weak periphery form within the group, and how did this affect the group? If in time a strong core with weak periphery develops, as observed by other researchers (Bourgeois and Friedkin 2001, Cummings and Higgins 2006), how does this effect the group's ability to address the issue at hand?

A critical question is whether the group and the larger community feel that the campaign was successful, regardless of external validation. It is thought that social capital is maintained when people feel rewarded for working together (Lemmel 2001). It has also been argued that the forming of networks is what makes "common good" projects beneficial as the forming of networks adds value for the participants (Rydin and Holman 2004). We were interested in how the group felt about their efforts. Did the grassroots sustainable development initiatives feel that their efforts had been successful? Did the core members feel empowered through forming and belonging to the network? Would they undertake such a project again? These research questions were addressed through interviews with the Streets Are for People!/ P.S. Kensington organisers, conducted over various time periods in 2005 and 2006.

History of the P.S. Kensington Project

Various car-free initiatives have been initiated in Canadian cities, usually by municipal governments. In Kensington Market, the idea of a car-free zone has been considered several times over the last few decades, yet in an urban centre such as Toronto which is largely fixated on car travel, conversion to a pedestrian street can seem insurmountable. After four years of work, the grassroots organisation that we chose to study has managed to build a tradition of Pedestrian Sundays in Kensington Market, and is attempting to spread the idea of Pedestrian

Sundays to other neighbourhoods. The following is an examination of the project's history and an analysis of the group's use of social capital.

On 21 July 2002, a group of employees from a small French bistro in Kensington Market entered into heated discussion about the congestion and pollution in their neighbourhood, and the fact that their streets were over-run by cars and trucks to the point where it often felt unsafe to walk or ride a bike on the streets. Deciding to take action, they gathered friends, neighbours, and activists together in an event they called "Streets Are for People!: a celebration of bikes, pedestrians, and the idea of a car free Kensington Market" at which they fed the parking meters to park their "non-motorised vehicles" (i.e. their bikes) in parking spots on their block of North Augusta and used the public space of the parking spots to repair bicycles, play music, have picnics, and make art. On this same afternoon Samba Elegua, a vibrant twenty-odd piece percussion band who practised on Sundays in the neighbourhood, heard about the event and asked if they could hold their practice at the parking meter party. The streets were soon crammed to such an extent with music and dancing and people who came upon this impromptu street party that car traffic was forced to detour.

The event got a lot of people thinking about the idea of a car-free Kensington Market. The organisers of the first Streets Are for People! event threw a car-free day "street opening" in September of that year during which they collected over 500 signatures for a petition asking the city to consider creating pedestrian zones in Toronto. The organisers presented this petition to city hall and gave deputations to council, who assured them that the city was interested in pedestrianisation initiatives, but that the organisers needed to come up with a plan and prove that the community was behind it. After a winter of planning, Streets Are for People! held a third, larger event, a market-wide parking meter party, which resulted in quite a strong polarisation of opinions around the idea of a car-free Kensington. It became obvious that many people loved the idea and felt very passionate about it, while others feared the effect that this change might have on their businesses and the character of the Market and overtly opposed the idea. It became clear that whether people supported or opposed the idea of a car-free Kensington Market depended entirely on how they imagined it; some residents saw it as an opportunity for renewal and some saw it as a threat to access and business. The organisers realised that if they were going to pursue this idea, they were going to have to take everyone's concerns very seriously and find a way to show them how a pedestrian street could work.

In the summer of 2003, Streets Are for People! had the fortune of meeting with Red Pepper Spectacle Arts, a local community arts organisation that had been planning a Harvest Festival for that autumn which would involve all of the merchants of the neighbourhood in a street festival of food, culture, music, and art. Streets Are for People! collaborated with Red Pepper in the building of the festival and worked closely with the merchants of the Market to get them involved. The street closure went very well and large crowds came to the market; everyone was inspired by this event and the incredible success of the Harvest Festival gave people a new reference for how the streets could be used.

Following the Harvest Festival, Streets Are for People! began to try to solidify a plan for a pedestrian project in Kensington Market which would be viable and

non-threatening. After many months of conducting door-to-door surveys and interviews with the merchants and residents of the community, it became obvious that such an idea would have to be introduced very slowly. A plan was developed to have weekly street closures on Sundays, the day with the least amount of car traffic, and the day that seemed the least disruptive to regular business patterns. A larger working group was formed to pursue the project, which came to be called P.S. Kensington or Pedestrian Sundays.

After years of expressing interest in pedestrian initiatives in Toronto, the city decided to collaborate on the Pedestrian Sundays, and supported the inaugural year of the initiative with staff and some funding. With city involvement and the larger P.S. Kensington Working Group planning the project together, the more radical politics of Streets Are for People! from which P.S. Kensington had grown had to be separated from the Pedestrian Sundays initiative, which is entirely subject to community consultation. The process of differentiating core organisers' work on these two projects became an interesting illustration of the enabling and constraining characteristics of social capital. As part of the P.S. Kensington Working Group, the core organisers were able to work intimately with the whole Kensington Market community, which allowed them to revise plans to suit the vast majority of the merchants and residents of the community. This enabled them to involve many more people in the project, and taught them to build a viable plan out of a whole neighbourhood of diverse opinions. These skills allowed the creation of a project that has the most benefit and least inconvenience for both merchants and residents with vastly varying feelings about the car-free concept, and have made the initiative adaptive and sustainable. At the same time, progress is much slower with every decision being made in a larger group setting and subjected to community consultation in the form of door-to-door surveys. The core organisers learned how constraining this can be as ideas get scrutinised and or rejected.

Since P.S. Kensington was a city-sponsored event and is held on city streets, the event became subject to a series of municipal regulations. Since there is no history of pedestrian markets in Toronto, there is no department responsible for pedestrian streets and no categorisation for such a project as Pedestrian Sundays except as a "special event" that requires insurance, paid-duty police officers, barricades, and regulated signage, all of which dramatically increase the financial burden of running Pedestrian Sundays. This default "special event" road closure status is strict in its people-and-cars-don't mix policy, therefore no deliveries are allowed to the shops during this time, and the rules also fail to differentiate bicycles from the rest of the "vehicular traffic" that is prohibited during Pedestrian Sundays; these are two of the many problems with "special event" status which need to be overcome if Toronto is to pursue pedestrianisation initiatives, yet to date the city seems unable or unwilling to make a new categorisation for Pedestrian Sundays.

Some research has established the critical role that government can play in enabling greater social capital by strategic policy interventions. Government involvement can be very enabling for a project, but, like social capital, can also have its drawbacks. For example, in the first summer of Pedestrian Sundays, the city partnered with the P.S. Kensington Working Group and the seven consecutive

Pedestrian Sundays were well attended and it seemed to have been a successful pilot project. One lifetime resident of Kensington Market stood up at the end-of-year community meeting and spoke of the Pedestrian Sundays as the way she had always dreamed of the Market. At the grand street opening of the first Pedestrian Sunday, urban planner Jane Jacobs spoke of how this was just the way things ought to happen: the community gets a good idea and the city helps to support it.

The project, however, suffered a serious setback when the city conducted its own mail-out survey after the first summer of Pedestrian Sundays to gauge local community response. The overly long and complicated survey drew very little response and much of the response it did receive was negative. After many months of awaiting the city survey results, organisers were told that there simply wasn't enough community support to continue the project. Organisers couldn't bear the thought of dropping such a seemingly successful idea completely just because of some third-party survey results. They began to discuss the idea of having smaller block parties, just to keep the spirit of Pedestrian Sundays alive, even if they weren't allowed to do full market street closures. When neighbours were informed of this, people began to complain bitterly that there wouldn't be Pedestrian Sundays, so the organisers decided that they ought to do their own survey to see whether or not there was enough support to continue the project. After a few weeks of talking individually with each merchant and many residents, it seemed that there was even greater support for the project than there had been the year before. Unfortunately, by the time the decision was made to continue with a second summer of Pedestrian Sundays, it was far too late to apply for grants or funding, and organisers were forced to fundraise the approximately $2500 (Canadian dollars) per event to run the Pedestrian Sundays, while at the same time planning and running the events.

The group recognises that the present workload on the four core organisers to secure funding and fill the street with events is not sustainable, and is also looking for changes in city bylaws and provincial Highway Traffic Act regulations that would allow the events to occur without "special event" status and its resultant high administrative costs to grassroots organisers.

Findings

Interviews with the four primary Streets Are for People! organisers were conducted in February 2006, almost four years after their first small event and after two summers of intensive organising of the Pedestrian Sunday events showed strong evidence of increases in social capital and minimal indications of depleting social capital. Bridging capital was evident; for example they formed a strong relationship with Jean Francois Gouin, doctor of atmospheric chemistry at York University, who received funding to conduct air quality tests to prove the environmental benefit of removing cars from urban streets. Also Richard Underhill, an internationally renowned musician, started the Kensington Horns Community Band as part of P.S. Kensington, which allowed novice players to learn and perform with professionals. Also, many examples of bridging capital are visible in the group's relationships with city councillors and the various departments

with which they deal, and with the numerous musicians, artists, volunteers, and community members whom Pedestrian Sundays has brought together.

The organisers spent a great deal of effort overcoming the obstacles of government inertia and unhelpful regulation, fundraising, and efforts organising the pedestrian events. The core organisers discussed dealing with government over-regulation as the most tiring and difficult part of their work, which they did with little outside help. On its own, this impediment may have led to depletion of social capital and burnout. Each of the four core organisers, however, spoke with excitement and passion about the rest of their project, and the third season of Pedestrian Sundays.

Organising and experiencing these events provided motivation and positive feedback to the Streets Are for People! network, which in turn attracted larger numbers of participants and peripheral volunteers who strengthened and expanded the primary organisers' personal networks. For example, one organiser claims his personal network has expanded so much as a result of his involvement that he can rarely walk two blocks in Kensington without meeting someone he knows. One organiser became involved in Streets Are for People! shortly after moving back to Toronto in 2003; since then her involvement has led to an advisory board position for a national knowledge transfer initiative at the Centre for Social Innovation, and has also introduced her to numerous small-industry, not-for-profit, and arts organisations. The widespread public familiarity with P.S. Kensington continues to start conversations and open doors for her.

Some spin-offs from the P.S. Kensington events have happened, including the formation of the ReEvolution Day Arkestra, a massive open street band including members of the Kensington Horns Community Band, Samba Elegua, and the New Kings; self-described as a "band of music veterans brought together by a fearless passion for social activism and a spirit for Rock'n'Roll". Anecdotal evidence shows how Pedestrian Sundays bring together people of various ages and social groups experiencing art, music, and culture who would not necessarily have experienced it together had it not been presented to them in the street setting. Such events can promote development of a diversity of urban social and physical infrastructure and agency, an essential component of sustainable community development (Newman and Dale 2005).

Ironically, there seem to be no signs of burnout or decreasing social capital among the core organisers after several years of heavy involvement. All say that not only would they continue working on Pedestrian Sundays and Streets Are for People! projects, but they also plan to push for a change in regulation to help Pedestrian Sundays to spread more easily to other Toronto neighbourhoods. This next step will help to make Pedestrian Sundays cheaper and more accessible to other neighbourhoods, as not every neighbourhood has a core group of organisers dedicated enough to surmount government regulation, fundraise, and organise events all at once.

It was difficult to discover any signs of the negative effects of social capital within the Streets Are for People! group. As a group they have evolved from rather idealistic car-free activists to community organisers and event planners, helping to build community and celebrate culture without ever losing sight of their vision to help Toronto break its automobile addiction. Through both their

formal surveys and informal feedback from residents, visitors, and merchants, they have maintained responsiveness to the larger community rather than becoming inwardly focused or entirely self-reinforcing. Aside from a few instances of negative feedback they have been able to demonstrate and stimulate broad support for their initiative.

Despite regular community meetings, most of the planning for Streets Are for People! and P.S. Kensington gets done by the four friends who have become the core members of both groups, after hours in the restaurant owned by one member where the whole idea began. This may or may not have limited the potential involvement of others. There is clearly a strong core of four organisers, which has remained unchanged since the beginning, and durable throughout the campaign. One is now preparing to leave town and another is preparing to take over full ownership of his restaurant; they are considering changes such as holding parking meter party planning meetings on the street to express the openness of the process and to get people involved in the project.

The core organisers have many close friends who help out with the events, and other community members have provided assistance and input through attendance at the larger public P.S. Kensington meetings. The initiative is run entirely by volunteers with even large numbers of professional musicians donating their time because they believe in the cause, and because it's fun. The core group describes organising these events as fun and energising, bringing together many people in their planning and participation. People often ask why they do it, and how they find the time. They describe throwing street parties, bringing their friends and neighbours together in celebration, while making the world a better place, as a satisfying hobby. Their difficult work has been in dealing with government obstacles and bureaucracy: making annual applications to city council for "special event" permission and funding, organising barriers and marshals, recovering from one season to the next without funding while working, going to school, and pursuing other personal projects at the same time. The core organisers have been essentially alone in their dealings with city hall. They have had support from the local city councillor and city staff, although not enough to achieve the needed changes to assure the continuation of Pedestrian Sundays without intensive volunteer efforts.

The core group uniformly believes that their efforts have been successful, and that with guidance and inspiration from their community they have made a positive social and environmental contribution. Despite the endless frustrations of this type of work, the results still outweigh the effort. Although some of the organisers reported experiencing isolated periods of burnout, their close friendships with the other core organisers, positive feedback from the community, enjoyment of organising and experiencing the events, and feelings of making a difference have kept them motivated through three years of organising. They do hope to soon make P.S. Kensington self-sustaining so they can start working on car-free initiatives elsewhere.

Conclusion

The Streets Are for People! and P.S. Kensingon network demonstrates the capacity of local groups to build agency and mobilise social capital to enhance community

sustainable development and the liveability of a neighbourhood. Throughout the shift from their radical beginnings to the creation of a community-wide project, the network has continued to work to reduce automobile dependency and to create a tradition of Pedestrian Sundays in Toronto. Despite the difficulties they faced in their dealings with municipal bureaucracy, they mobilised existing social capital, and over the course of their campaign increased their available social capital as measured by the expansion of their network through the addition of new bonding and bridging ties. Our research confirms the core/periphery model literature; the initially formed core remains the backbone of the project, raising some questions about how succession and knowledge transfer will occur over the longer term. Overall, the greatest obstacles to this local initiative were a lack of funding and inflexible regulations at the municipal and provincial levels. This suggests that access to steady funding at critical points in network formation and a realignment of regulations strategically directed to locally based grassroots initiatives at the bridging and vertical tie levels could contribute to the success of network formation around local sustainable community development initiatives. More critically, it would appear that local network formation is sustained by positive critical feedback from the local community, regardless of deviation from original objectives, and that a sustained programme campaign led by critical nodes, connectors, or mavens is critical to the long-term viability of the network.

References

Borgatti, S. and Foster, P., 2003. The network paradigm in organizational research: a review and typology. *Journal of management*, 29 (6), 991–1013.

Bourgeois, M. and Friedkin, N., 2001. The distant core: social solidarity, social distance, and interpersonal ties in core periphery structures. *Social networks*, 23, 245–260.

Brundtland, G., 1987. *Our common future: World Commission on Environment and Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Burt, R., 1992. *Structural holes: the social structure of competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Burt, R., 2002. Bridge decay. *Social networks*, 24, 333–363.

Cummings, J. and Higgins, M., 2006. Relational instability at the network core: support dynamics in developmental networks. *Social networks*, 28, 38–55.

Dale, A., 2001. *At the edge: sustainable development in the 21st century*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dale, A. and Newman, L., 2005. The role of agency in sustainable local community development. *Local environment*, 10 (5), 477–486.

Dale, A. and Onyx, J., 2005. *A dynamic balance: social capital and sustainable community development*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Fine, B., 1999. The development state is dead: long live social capital? *Development and change*, 30 (1), 1–19.

Fukuyama, F., 1999. *The great disruption: human nature and the reconstitution of social order*. New York: Free Press.

Gargiulo, M. and Benassi, M., 2000. Trapped in your own net? Network cohesion, structural holes, and the adaptation of social capital. *Organization science*, 11 (2), 183–196.

Granovetter, M., 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American journal of sociology*, 78 (6), 1360–1380.

Lemmel, L., 2001. The dynamics of social capital: creating trust-based relationships and trustworthy environments. *National civic review*, 90 (1), 97–104.

Newman, L. and Dale, A., 2005. The role of agency in sustainable local community development. *Local environment*, 10 (5), 477–486.

Onyx, J. and Bullen, P., 2000. Measuring social capital in five communities. *Journal of applied behavioral science*, 36 (1), 23–42.

Popielarz, P. and McPherson, J., 1995. On the edge or in between: niche position, niche overlap, and the duration of voluntary association memberships. *American journal of sociology*, 101 (3), 698–720.

Putnam, R., 2000. *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Roy, K. and Tisdell, C., 1998. Good governance in sustainable development: the impact of institutions. *International journal of social economics*, 25 (6–8), 1310–1325.

Ruef, M., 2002. Strong ties, weak ties and islands: structural and cultural predictors of organizational innovation. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11 (3), 427–449.

Rydin, Y. and Holman, N., 2004. Re-evaluating the contribution of social capital in achieving sustainable development. *Local environment*, 9 (2), 117–133.

Schafft, K. and Brown, D., 2003. Social capital, social networks, and social power. *Social epistemology*, 17 (4), 329–342.

Volker, B. and Flap, H., 2001. Weak ties as a liability: the case of East Germany. *Rationality and society*, 13 (4), 397–428.

Wilson, P., 1997. Building social capital: a learning agenda for the twenty-first century. *Urban studies*, 34 (5–6), 745–760.