

Global Thematic Review on Training in  
Community-Based Research

# Asset-based development

## Final Report

*Prepared by*

SHEENA CAMERON

Review guidance by Alison Mathie  
Coady International Institute  
St. Francis Xavier University



First published in 2016

© PRIA and University of Victoria

This publication is licensed under a Creative Commons license, Attribution - Noncommercial - No Derivative 3.0 (see [www.creativecommons.org](http://www.creativecommons.org)). The text may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes, provided that credit is given to the original author(s).

To obtain permission for uses beyond those outlined in the Creative Commons license, please contact PRIA at [library@pria.org](mailto:library@pria.org)

*This report is an initiative of the UNESCO Chair in Community Based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education, under the project "Training the Next Generation of Community Based Researchers", supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), Canada*



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization



UNESCO Chair in Community Based  
Research and Social Responsibility  
in Higher Education



University  
of Victoria



Knowledge. Voice. Democracy.  
PRIA

# Table of Contents

Introduction . . . . .	1
Narrative description of the search process . . . . .	2
Content of narrative synthesis. . . . .	4
i. Terminology/language that best describes the practices related to training in CBR in asset-based community development. . . . .	4
ii. Places where people are getting training in CBR . . . . .	4
iii. Types and length of training . . . . .	6
iv. Content of the training curricula and skills/capacities that learners are expected to learn to do CBR. . . . .	7
Top training programs . . . . .	8
1) National Islamic University, Surabaya, Indonesia . . . . .	8
2) The Coady International Institute . . . . .	9
3) Arctic Institute of Community-Based Research . . . . .	10
4) CIP UPWARD . . . . .	11
5) International Institute for Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) . . . . .	12
6) Training and Research Support Centre (TARSC) . . . . .	13
References for the Introduction. . . . .	15
References of sampled and reviewed items . . . . .	15



# Asset-based development

## Final Report

### Introduction

The thematic area of “asset-based development” is extremely broad, covering asset-based “thinking”, community mobilizing, and strategies for building sustainable livelihoods. The literature on Community Based Research in this area is also diffuse. However, literature specific to *training* in CBR in asset-based development is relatively sparse; few training opportunities explicitly link CBR exclusively to asset-based development, and more needs to be done to dig deeper into the training opportunities that do exist to see how CBR and asset-based development are implicitly or potentially combined. This global thematic review is a step in this direction.

For the purposes of this review, “asset-based development” is explored in three strands of literature. One strand is the literature on local asset building for resilience and sustainable development, such as the work advanced by many development organizations using the sustainable livelihoods framework (DFID, 2012). In this framework different kinds of assets or “capitals” are identified to inform decisions about how to move from a precarious livelihood to a sustainable one and the role of markets and government policy to facilitate this (Bebbington, 1999; Moser, 2007). There are several variants of this framework, including the Community Capitals Framework, advanced by Emery and Flora (2006) and the Wealth Creation Framework of Yellow Wood and Associates and the Ford Foundation, US. Another strand of literature focuses on mobilizing assets into “agency”, the collective potential to take action (Dale, 2013; Mathie and Cunningham, 2009; Krishna, 2002). This strand is represented in training in asset-based and citizen-led development (ABCD) or its variants. As members of a family of strengths-based approaches, these have been used to strengthen local economies, promote social inclusion, and even promote “Asset-based community engagement in higher education” (Hemerlinck and Plaut, 2014). The CBR process that is associated with these is the means by which assets are identified by the community, built through community action, and tracked by the community to inform decision-making. A final strand of literature is dedicated to the study of diverse economies, conserving assets in diverse forms to ensure resilience against short term or long term crisis. Resisting pressure brought to bear by the global economy on existing natural resources, local asset-building is designed to diversify forms of livelihood, resist complete absorption into the global capitalist economy, and anticipate the impacts of climate change. (Gibson-Graham et al. 2013; Armitage, 2005).

In all these types of “asset-based development” there is an integration of process (identifying, appreciating, and mobilizing assets and encouraging a shift in focus from needs/deficits to assets and opportunities) with specific objectives to build assets locally and, in so doing, build agency or capacity to act among those people experiencing exclusion, or choosing to resist commodification and participation in the global economy. In all these variants, there is a confluence of the principles of community engaged research for action, with the principles of community development through an asset-based development orientation.

Rarely however is such confluence evident in the literature on training in CBR, suggesting that opportunities exist for building linkages and integrating different trainings into more coherent education programs on CBR for local asset-based development in both Higher Education Institutions and in CSO training institutions.

## Narrative description of the search process

Between August and November 2014, systematic searches were conducted on CBR training for the theme “asset-based development” within electronic databases (Academic Search Complete, Social Sciences Index, LexisNexis Academic, SAGE Journals Online, JSTOR, Project Muse, and Google Scholar) and unpublished “grey” literature within electronic databases (Open Grey, Education Resources Information Centre, OECD iLibrary, Oxford Handbooks online, Cengage Learning and Proquest Dissertations and Theses Global). These searches were conducted using each key term or a combination of key terms as identified within research guidelines: community based research, asset based community development, sustainable livelihoods, asset building, training, action learning, action research, community action research, community based participatory research, community service learning, community-university research partnerships/engagement, collaborative/co-operative inquiry, indigenous research methodologies, knowledge democracy, knowledge mobilization, knowledge translation, organizational action research, participatory action research, participatory development, participatory evaluation, participatory research, participatory video, and sustainable research.

When conducting searches, using one term alone produced higher results than using a combination of terms. Searches using a combination of the terms “community based research” and “asset based community development”, or variations of this (see table), and “training” produced very few results. Where there were results (in JSTOR) for example, further exploration of the text found relatively few high value results. Additionally, some combinations in certain journals produced no results (i.e. “community based research” and “sustainable livelihoods approach” in SAGE Journals or any of the search combinations in Open Grey). To this end, various combinations were used and relevant articles, upon a scan of the abstract, were selected to be part of the initial list of articles. Noteworthy search combinations are listed in the table below:

Database / Journal	Date	Key Terms/Search string	Search field (e.g., Topic, Title, Abstract)	# Results
SAGE Journals Online	August	“Community based research”	All fields	1158
	August	“Community based research” and “asset based community development”	All fields	3
	August	“Community based research” and “sustainable livelihoods approach”	All fields	0
	August	“Community based research” and “sustainable livelihoods”	All fields	3
	August	“Community based research” and “asset building”	All fields	6
	September	“community based research” and “asset based community development” and “sustainable livelihoods” and “asset building” and “training”	All fields	0
	September	“community based research” and “asset building” and “training”	All fields	6
	September	“community based research” and “action learning” and “action research” and “community action research” and “community based participatory research” and “community service learning” and “community-university research partnerships/engagement” and “collaborative/co-operative inquiry” and “indigenous research methodologies” and “knowledge democracy” and “knowledge mobilization” and “knowledge translation” and “organizational action research” and “participatory action research” and “participatory development” and “participatory evaluation” and “participatory research” and “participatory video”	All fields	0

Database / Journal	Date	Key Terms/Search string	Search field (e.g., Topic, Title, Abstract)	# Results
JSTOR	September	“community based research” and “asset-based community development”	Full-text	128,872
	September	“community based research” and “sustainable livelihoods”	Full-text	3,321
	September	“community based research” and “asset building”	Full-text	30,193
	September	“community based research” and “asset based community development” and “sustainable livelihoods” and “asset building”	Full-text	1,374
	September	“community based research” and “asset based community development” and “sustainable livelihoods” and “asset building” and “training”	Full-text	519
	October	“community based research” and “action learning” and “action research” and “community action research”	Full-text	1,302,436

Database / Journal	Date	Key Terms/Search string	Search field (e.g., Topic, Title, Abstract)	# Results
Project Muse	October	“community based research” and “sustainable research” and “asset based community development” and “asset building” and “training”	Content for All	26

Database / Journal	Date	Key Terms/Search string	Search field (e.g., Topic, Title, Abstract)	# Results
Open Grey	October	“community based research” and “sustainable research” and “asset based community development” and “asset building” and “training”		0
	October	“community based research” and “asset based community development” and “sustainable livelihoods” and “training”		0
	October	“community based research” and “asset based community development” and “asset building” and “training”		0
	October	“community based research” and “asset based community development” and “training”		0

Database / Journal	Date	Key Terms/Search string	Search field (e.g., Topic, Title, Abstract)	# Results
Education Resources Information Center (ERIC)	October	“community based research” and “training”		39

Additionally, within this period and between December 2014 and January 2015, institutional searches were conducted using the above key terms, pre-existing contacts or institutions working in this field were asked to provide suggestions. From these a list of institutions providing training in CBR within asset-based development, asset-building, asset-based community development, or sustainable livelihoods was developed.

After filtering out un-related or irrelevant articles on the basis of the abstract, articles were selected and additional ones found within their reference pages or on websites of relevant institutions selected.

Based on these searches, a list of resources and a list of institutions were developed. These resources were further divided into 1) literature and case studies and 2) training materials and the data synthesized based on the categories delineated.

The data synthesis took place between January and March 2015 and although there were some additional resources that could have been included in the data synthesis, time constraints prevented their inclusion. The following are the total number of “literature and case studies” (26) and “training materials” (20) included in the final data synthesis. There were four resources that were included in both “literature and case studies” and “training materials” as they were considered relevant to both.

Although initial searches on community-based research yielded ample results, resources in the area of training in CBR for asset based development or variations of this sub-theme were more difficult to come by and we had to become more creative in our ability to recognize or acknowledge particular resources as potential CBR in asset based development trainings.

## **Content of narrative synthesis**

### **i. Terminology/language that best describes the practices related to training in CBR in asset-based community development**

There are various terms and language used to describe asset-based development within the field of community based research, the most common being asset based community development (ABCD) sometimes referred to as asset-based citizen-led development or asset-based community-led development. As outlined in the introduction, these terms refer to an approach to community development that highlights a community’s strengths, assets, capacities, skills and resources and helps communities organize to build on those assets. It stands in contrast to a needs-based, problem-centred or deficit model of development, and has implications for how local institutions connect with and respond to community initiative.

Tools or techniques of asset-based development include an array of asset-mapping and inventory-making, appreciative inquiry, story-telling, most significant change analysis, all of which can be employed for action research purposes in addition to community mobilizing, as the Coady institute has done with its partners in Ethiopia. Thus, participatory action research describes well the process that unfolds.

Asset-based development has also been presented as a way of promoting sustainable livelihoods. For example, assets are identified in the sustainable livelihoods framework (or its variant the seven capitals/forms of wealth framework) and a people-centred approach is the means by which such frameworks are put into action. In this sense there is significant overlap with ABCD’s action orientation.

Other terms associated with the process and outcomes include: community-engagement, community-mobilization, community-empowerment, community-driven development, resilience, endogenous development, positive deviance, diverse economies, transformative development, a people-centred approach, sustainable livelihoods, sustainable community development, and grassroots development.

### **ii. Places where people are getting training in CBR**

Based on the institutional search and the “literature and case studies” and “training materials” that were compiled for this research, it became evident that trainings in the area of local asset development/asset-based development are happening in different locations around the world. However, the degree to which training in CBR *per se* is embedded in local asset development/asset-based development training is less clear. Similarly, the degree to which training opportunities in participatory research or community based research is oriented towards asset-based and citizen-led development is not always easy to infer.



A couple of observations are relevant to this discussion. First, training in ABCD is typically about community mobilizing. Implicit in this is the CBR with local communities to identify assets but this may not be characterized as such or systematized as research (“It is not about mapping, it’s about organizing!”).

Second, in terms of “demand” for training, organizations that use CBR for livelihoods research (such as members of the Consultative Group in International Agricultural Research network, for example) often contract partners to conduct customized training appropriate to the local context rather than send staff to more generalized training elsewhere.

Third, in terms of “supply”, there are Higher Education Institutions that have been at the vanguard of participatory methodologies, such as IDS Sussex in the UK (with its MA program in Participation, Power and Social Change the most obvious example of its expertise in this area), but its specific application to asset-based development can be inferred rather than clearly identified. Similarly, Wageningen University in the Netherlands is world renowned for its research and education in rural livelihoods, “healthy living environments, safe and secure food, and sustainable value chains”, with graduates in the forefront of much of the innovative work in CBR and interdisciplinary programs, yet specific courses in CBR are not mentioned in their course outlines, other than courses dedicated to participatory monitoring and evaluation. Similarly, the Simon Fraser University Centre for Sustainable Community Development, using an asset-based approach does not specify CBR courses as such.

Nevertheless, these three institutions are exceptions to the view that Higher Education Institutions have resisted the trans-disciplinary orientation that CBR often requires, especially if broad-based asset-development is the purpose of such CBR.

Similarly, in the United States, there are higher education institutions that have been heavily influenced by the ABCD approach for community mobilizing, but do not specify a combination of ABCD with CBR. For example, the Mandel School of Applied Social Science (MSASS) at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland has a concentration in Community Practice for Social Change in its social work program which it claims to be ABCD oriented. MSASS is expanding with a dedicated center for community building. Also, at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio, the Community Building Institute, (which John McKnight of the ABCD institute helped to establish) runs workshops and seminars in ABCD. At the same university, The James and Delrose Eigel Center for Community-Engaged learning supports faculty and students interested in community based research partnerships. The synergy between these entities needs further exploration.

This review therefore suggests that further exploration could be made into HEIs where education/training on CBR in asset-based development would be expected but not identified to see why such training is not appearing in the literature search.

In the following paragraphs are the results of the institutional research, where asset-based development and CBR are more explicitly linked:

The initial influence of Kretzmann and McKnight with the Asset-Based Community Development Institute in the United States is evident in training manuals and guidebooks available online on their website. The Institute’s associate faculty provide training courses as requested throughout the USA and beyond, some of which have included elements of CBR. The Coady International Institute in Canada offers certificates in both ABCD and CBR mostly for development practitioners in the Global South but increasingly for North Americans also. Following on from its Canada-based courses, it also works with a number of organizations and institutions around the world that offer courses based on the Coady approach or in collaboration with the Coady (Self-Employed Women’s Association (SEWA) – India; South East Asia Rural Social Leadership Institute (SEARSOLIN) – Philippines; Gordon Institute of Business

Science – South Africa; Ikhala Trust – South Africa), where CBR in the form of asset identification and participatory monitoring and evaluation is covered. In a university setting – National Islamic University in Indonesia -- there is an explicit linkage between CBR and ABCD, for the purpose of filling its mandate to give equal attention to teaching, research, and community engagement. Several other universities offer training in asset-based development broadly as well as having in-house expertise in participatory or community based research (University of South Africa (UNISA) Geography Dept, Trent University – Ghana Year Abroad course, Ryerson University - Canada, University for Development Studies (UDS) – Ghana, Missouri and Lincoln Universities – United States, Institute for Development Studies – UK, University of Pretoria – South Africa, Coady International Institute – Canada, Durham University – UK, Agroecologia Universidad Cochabamba – Bolivia, Xavier University, Mindanao –Philippines).

Apart from the Coady Institute, other educational or research institutes that integrate CBR with asset-based development include Arctic Institute of Community Based Research (AICBR) – Canada, Community Organization Training and Research Advocacy Institute (COTRAIN) – Luzon, The Institute for Community Research – US, and SEARSOLIN/Xavier University – Philippines. Non-profit organizations or networks that offer short term or contract-based training in CBR with an asset-based orientation include International Potato Centre (CIP) User’s Perspectives With Agricultural Research and Development (UPWARD) or CIP UPWARD – Philippines, Falls Brook Centre – Canada, GreenViet – Vietnam, International Institute for Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) – Philippines, Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), Scottish Community Development Centre – Scotland, Sustainable Livelihoods Foundation – South Africa, Training and Research Support Centre (TARSC) – Zimbabwe, Tamarack Institute – Canada, Training for Change – US.

Some institutions offer online trainings, tools or courses in community planning that require CBR for assets and opportunity assessments (Community Planning Toolkit - US, Community Tool Box – US, RAND Corporation- US/UK). Although their community planning work assumes an asset-based CBR approach, the specifics of these trainings require further exploration.

### **iii. Types and length of training**

Although we have listed institutions that are providing training in CBR with an asset-based development orientation, by no means is this exhaustive of what is being offered worldwide, instead this merely serves as a snapshot of the diversity of training that is taking place. The type and length of trainings also vary from online resources and trainings, to webinars, to distance or on-site, short or semester-long courses, as part of a program, or full certificates or diplomas. Lengths of trainings range from a couple days for short courses or workshops to a couple weeks for certificates and a full semester for diplomas or university courses.

Frequently, trainings through universities include a combination of academic (on-site or online) coursework and fieldwork whereas community organizations usually offer short workshops or courses in communities. Some of the institutions offer one-off training of trainer programs for applying an asset-based approach in specific projects (i.e. Ikhala Trust - ABCD Workshops, International Development Research Centre (IDRC) - MALAKAS! program, International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) - A Rope to Tie a Lion Project, SEWA - Jeevika Project, Africa Rice Centre - Rice Videos Project) that teach various skills in community leadership and investigation, community organizing, asset-building monitoring and evaluation .

Many of the training programs are also collaborations between various community stakeholders, partners, and organizations or community-university partnerships. For example projects like the Aotearoa Video Project (collaboration between a group of Maaori people in Aotearoa New Zealand and the Victoria

University of Wellington), the Gedam Sefer Project (collaboration between Gedam Sefer community and the social work programs at the University of Illinois and Addis Ababa University). Or institutions like AICBR (collaborating with First Nations communities, research and health institutes, universities and NGOs), CO-MULTIVERSITY (collaborating with community organizers and social development professionals) or Falls Brook Centre (collaborating with community development practitioners, NGOs, schools, community members and grassroots organizations). Additionally, there are multi-stakeholder community university projects such as UNISA (Geography Department collaborating with community organizations and other university departments), UDS – Ghana (collaborating with communities, organizations, institutes, associations and other universities). Furthermore, many training programs give credit to other institutions (i.e. Coady International Institute) for providing the initial trainings that they went on to develop in their own locations (SEARSOLIN, SEWA, etc.).

#### **iv. Content of the training curricula and skills/capacities that learners are expected to learn to do CBR**

For the most part, training in asset-based community development (ABCD) attributes the initial use of the term and its philosophical underpinning to Kretzmann and MacKnight (1993). Many, however, draw their inspiration from the Sustainable Livelihoods approach and its variants (IIRR, for example). However, many programs localize and adapt their curricula to the local environment, community context and issues. There are also a number of training programs that use this approach and framework but do not label it as asset-based development or any of the variations of this term, despite the fact that they are working from a people/community-centred approach focusing on strengths and resources that could be utilized for local empowerment and mobilization.

The content is highly variable depending on whether the training is in local asset building/ABCD with a CBR component, (often in the form of asset-mapping, community economic analysis, and ongoing AR) or whether the training is in CBR with references to strengthening livelihoods/building assets. Asset-based development (especially ABCD) and CBR are highly participatory or citizen-led, operating with similar philosophical/theoretical underpinnings. Most curricula on ABCD include the background or context under which this approach became relevant and the benefits of the approach compared to the conventional needs-based model. CBR, when included, is highly compatible with the self-organizing for action premise of an asset-based approach.

For example, in the Coady Institute's Building Assets and Agency for Citizen-led development curriculum, concepts of active citizenship, "agency", and the value of social capital for community building is introduced. A broad understanding of assets include the non-material such as "cohesion", "voting power" or the power to act in political spaces, as well as those assets mobilized for economic and social spaces. Considerable attention is given to participatory methods of identifying assets. Tools and techniques used include story-telling, asset mapping, skills and capacities inventories, community economic analysis with popular education tools such as "the leaky bucket", The main idea is that this identification of assets will spur organizing and action, but the data gathering can also be used selectively as base-line data for action research to track the changes in the community that take place as a result of community initiative supported by the external organizations such as local government and civil society organizations that respond to that initiative. The curriculum includes hands on practice of these skills as well as role-plays as community members organizing to mobilize the assets identified. Videos, TED talks, cases studies are also used and a manual has been well developed and updated over the ten year run of this course. A new manual combining concepts and tools is planned for completion by 2016. Further details are provided in the next section.

# Top training programs

## 1) National Islamic University, Surabaya, Indonesia

The National Islamic University of Surabaya (UIN-S) is one of two universities under the Ministry of Religious Affairs of Indonesia (the other is UIN-Makassar). Universities in Indonesia are mandated to divide their functions equally between teaching, research and service. To that end, the Supporting Islamic Leadership in Indonesia (SILE) project has brought together multiple partners in Indonesia and Canada to strengthen the two UIN capacities for community engagement. As well as a combined focus on CBR and ABCD/PAR in its teaching and research, an ABCD orientation is also reflected in the character of partnerships developed with local NGOs and community groups. See <http://www.uinsby.ac.id/> and <http://sile.uinsby.ac.id>

### ***Training Objectives***

Run by the Community Development Department, the ABCD course is one of two options for a mandatory course for all students at the university. It has been offered since 2012. The other is the pre-existing PAR course. Both are one semester (3 credit) courses, preparing students for a one month mandatory service learning practicum where the emphasis is on students learning together with the local community, with the idea that both students and communities benefit. In addition, training in CBR is provided to university lecturers and CSO partners to encourage relevant research with communities, often involving student placements.

### ***Content and Design***

Since several core teaching staff attended the Coady Institute's ABCD course, the content is influenced by Coady material but adapted to the Indonesian context.

The CBR content has also been influenced by the training offered to teaching staff by the Community Based Research Institute, based in Toronto. The course offers an overview of participatory community-based research methods and principles, with an emphasis on action.. The idea is to strive for both academic excellence and community relevance.

In combination, the SILE project links the student placement for service learning (for which either a PAR or ABCD course is mandatory) with possibilities for CBR for 50 university faculty now trained in CBR.

### ***Underlying philosophy/pedagogy***

Teachers of this course strive to help students (as well as their colleagues) take an asset-based approach (rather than a problem focus) to their work with communities, and instill in them a respect for the communities they will be living and working with during their time service-learning. This is not only a philosophical position, but also a practical one as it establishes the community-student relationship (and their potential careers in community development) as one of equal respect rather than "expert" and beneficiary.

Classes are large. In any one year, 700 students must take either the ABCD or the PAR course. The pedagogical approach is lecture based, but the service learning practicum provides an experiential learning experience.

### ***Facilitators' and students' profiles***

Courses are taught by university lecturers in the Community Development Department who have had training in both CBR and ABCD and who have adapted this based on their own experience of the local context.

The students of ABCD and PAR courses are undergraduates. The CBR training has been focused on faculty researchers within the university.

### ***Expected learning impacts***

As indicated above, the undergraduate student is expected to engage with communities as learners. Courses prepare them to engage respectfully and humbly. Those students who are engaged with researchers and CSOs in CBR gain additional experience. Researchers trained in CBR are expected to learn how to balance demands of research excellence with community relevance.

## **2) The Coady International Institute**

The Coady Institute was established in 1959 to offer educational programmes to adult learners from the Global South. Over the years it has shifted from cooperative education to community-based development, then to development leadership and citizen-led development. Drawing on the legacy of the Antigonish Movement that mobilized farmers and fishermen into cooperatives in the Depression years and beyond, the thread running through this evolution is self-organizing for social and economic justice. Drawing on the experience of adult learning through study clubs and kitchen meetings during the Antigonish Movement, the Coady Institute follows a participatory adult education approach that emphasizes the agency of the learner to contribute to social change. It offers a 6 month Diploma Program in Development Leadership and 15 two to three week certificate courses. The courses of particular relevance to CBR in local asset development include:

1. Building Assets and Agency for Citizen-led development (on-site: English only; off-site: French, Spanish.)
2. Building on Local and Indigenous Knowledge for Community Resilience
3. Livelihoods and Markets
4. Community-based microfinance
5. Research for citizen-led change (on-site: English only)

In the first four of these courses there is some coverage of community-based research, but a fuller treatment is given in Research for Citizen-Led Change. At present these are not run concurrently.

### ***Research for Citizen-Led Change: Course Objectives***

During this three week course, participants explore the principles and methods for research for citizen-led change, with a special focus on action and participatory research. The course includes how to design action research with local citizens, how to involve different stakeholders in a collaborative research process, how to select appropriate methods for the purpose of the research, and how to get the message out about the research findings. Drawing on many examples of action research around the world, and building on the experience of participants, the course includes collaboration on the design of an action research initiative. A field visit to try out action research skills is also included.

### ***Content and Design***

This is an intensive course delivered over 15 days. In this course, participants design their own action research initiative step-by-step, learning about the principles and methods appropriate for different types of research for citizen-led change and exploring ways to ensure participation, learning and influence. The course includes: question and objective setting with the community, involving multiple stakeholders, the place for participatory tools and methods, design for purpose, data analysis, communicating the results and ethical issues. The course is applicable to all three Coady thematic areas: Building Resilient Communities, Promoting Accountable Democracies and Strengthening Local Economies. The course



also draws upon the Coady Institute's recent collaboration with IDRC on research "excellence" criteria (design, participation, influence and learning) for research striving to democratize knowledge building. The course makes extensive use of case studies, and includes a field visit in a local community

### ***Underlying philosophy/pedagogy***

The Coady Institute prefers to use the language of "education" rather than "training" to highlight its participatory adult education approach. Using these principles, classes are highly interactive, practical, and build on the experience of course participants. Classes are approximately 20 in size.

### ***Facilitators and students profiles***

In its first year in 2014, the course was team taught by Alison Mathie (PhD), John Gaventa (PhD) and Eileen Alma (MA), all experienced in Action Research, participatory action research, mixed-method and participatory evaluation, and case study research. All three were core staff at the Coady Institute, where facilitators need an MA to be qualified to teach (several have a Masters in Adult Education).

Participants are a combination of those in the Diploma in Development Leadership program who take this as a specialization, or participants who come for this 3 week period only and earn a certificate. In either case, participants are from the mid to senior level professional practitioners in the civil society sector in the Global South and have extensive field experience. Canadians also attend, also from the civil society sector or government, but typically in smaller numbers.

### ***Expected learning outcomes***

In this short course, the tangible outcome is the design of an Action Research initiative, evaluated by the class in terms of quality of design, and potential for co-construction of knowledge, participation of relevant stakeholders and capacity to influence. Participants are able to collaborate on this design in small groups, and gain confidence in their ability to seek advice from each other and to critique each other's work constructively.

## **3) Arctic Institute of Community-Based Research**

The Arctic Institute of Community-Based Research (AICBR) is a research institute based in the Yukon, Canada, established originally as the Arctic Health Research Network in 2007. It focuses on health and well-being in the Canadian North. AICBR facilitates and promotes community-led health research aimed at improving the health of Indigenous and non-Indigenous Northerners. The institute believes strongly that to accurately reflect the reality of communities in the North, community-based research must be conducted in an environment where funds and partners from multiple sources can contribute to solutions to complex issues that go beyond health specifically. CBR capacity building is typically offered in English.

### ***Training objectives***

An important, identified priority of trainings is building capacity at the community level, particularly for front-line health resource workers. Other priorities include knowledge synthesis and translation, partnership development, evaluating ethical health research protocols, and community-based research training.

### ***Content***

All programming includes cross-cutting themes of community health and well-being with current priorities including food security, climate change, youth, injury prevention, diabetes prevention, and healthy lifestyles.

## ***Design***

AICBR works with communities to determine issues and develop projects, trainings and workshops in collaboration with communities, researchers and organizations, however, this only happens with the invitation of a Yukon First Nations government or community. Knowledge translation is used as a model with information/knowledge within CBR moving from communities to researchers to help clarify context, issues and intended outcomes, in addition to cultural and other considerations specific to the community or community of practice. Information/knowledge moves from researchers to communities or other knowledge users in terms of methodologies and considerations for applying results, as well as the results themselves.

## ***Underlying philosophy/pedagogy***

AICBR maintains community-based research as a foundational approach in all aspects of their work and include the following key elements: driven by community priorities; includes community members in all stages; adheres to local First Nation and territorial government protocols; upholds the principles of OCAP (ownership, control, access, and possession); occurs in a holistic context; results benefit community; influences community/First Nations' governments health policies; includes a strong communication plan. This work is grounded in a grassroots, community-based approach.

## ***Facilitators' and students' profiles***

AICBR staff work in partnership with other organizations to achieve common goals and include a wide range of knowledge, skills and expertise of academic, scientific and indigenous knowledge.

Participants and collaborators include First Nation and non First Nation Yukon residents and communities as well as organizations, institutions and government within and outside of the Yukon.

## ***Expected learning impacts***

Outcomes include expanded citizen participation, expanded leadership base, strengthened individual skills, creation of a widely shared understanding and vision, development of a strategic community agenda, evidence of consistent, tangible progress toward goals, evidence of more effective community organizations and institutions and evidence of better resources utilization by the community.

## **4) CIP UPWARD**

Connected to, the International Potato Centre (CIP) in Peru, the User's Perspectives With Agricultural Research and Development (UPWARD) is an agricultural network of scientists and development scientists, individuals and institutions participating in collaborative field research, training, information/publishing and mentoring activities, working to increase participation by farmers and other users of agricultural technology in research and development. Established in 1989 in the Philippines, it sponsors and/or organizes learning workshops and short courses, specialized individual training and internship programs, MSc and PhD thesis research, cross-visits and study tours, mentoring schemes, conferences and seminars. Collaborative research activities form the core of UPWARD networking agenda and membership. Capacity building in PAR is offered in English and Spanish

## ***Training objectives***

UPWARD seeks to address challenges facing agricultural research and development by linking users and R&D professionals for more effective agricultural innovation, by bringing sustained benefits to less favoured farming areas and marginalized groups and by working with households and local communities as key actors in research and learning activities.

## ***Content and Design***

Four key phases are used in UPWARD programming: assessment and diagnosis (situation analysis, needs and opportunities assessment, problem diagnosis, gender and stakeholder analysis, documentation and characterization), experimenting with technology options (joint agenda setting for experimentations, technology development and evaluation, integration of technology components and piloting), facilitating local innovation (bridging social and technical innovations, sustaining PR&D through institutional and policy innovations, facilitating multi-perspective negotiation and conflict management, community mobilization and action, local capacity development, strengthening local partnerships) and dissemination and scaling up (development of learning and extension mechanisms, information support to macro-policy development, promoting networking and horizontal linkages).

## ***Underlying philosophy/pedagogy***

Philosophies include a commitment to user responsiveness, household orientation, livelihood systems framework, integration of scientific and local knowledge, interdisciplinary mode, inter-institutional partnership, problem-based agenda, impact-driven objectives and field-based action.

## ***Facilitators' and students' profiles***

Over 50 institutions in Asia and around the world participate in UPWARD, including national/local research institutes, universities/colleges, international research/donor organizations, development and extension agencies, NGOs and local government units. Technical input for projects is provided by East and Southeast Asia and the Pacific (ESEAP), South, West and Central Asia (SWCA), Dutch Support Group (DSG), Wageningen Agricultural University, and the UPWARD Resource and Advisory Committee (composed of senior Asian researchers).

UPWARD works with and seeks to engage farmers, marginalized groups, especially women, households and local communities, intermediate (peoples organizations, research institutes, extension agencies, NGOs, local government units and academic institutions)- and end-users (cultivators, seed producers, entrepreneurs, traders and consumers).

## ***Expected learning impacts***

Goals of programs are to introduce innovations that optimize the contribution of crops in local agricultural livelihood systems, to field-test and promote participatory approaches in developing and sustaining local innovations and to strengthen PR&D capacity and networking among Asian R&D professionals and their organizations.

## **5) International Institute for Rural Reconstruction (IIRR)**

The International Institute for Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) is a community development and hands on training organization from the Philippines established in 1960. IIRR works with and through partners to achieve its development goals for overcoming poverty and sustainable development. An important partnership is its connection to PROLINNOVA (a global network of partners “promoting local innovation in ecologically-oriented agriculture and natural resource management”) and its collaboration on farmer-led joint research. Partner relationships are informed by and managed by a set of principles based on leveraging complementary skills and respect for various contributions (mutual respect, mutual knowledge, mutual trust, mutual help and mutual accountability). Training programs are offered English.

## ***Training objectives***

Each course has specific training objectives, for example, the goal of the Engaging Communities for Climate Change Actions for Food and Livelihood Security participants is to learn how to facilitate participatory climate vulnerability assessments and community adaptation planning. There are also



several courses in participatory monitoring and evaluation and learning. Overall, training courses and workshops seek to provide participants with increased knowledge in the particular subject-area and hands-on, practical skills that empower them and their organizations for community development and network building.

### ***Content***

Current training themes focus on: building and measuring resilient communities, participatory monitoring, evaluation and learning, co-creating knowledge with farmers, food security in a changing climate and environment, integrating value chain perspectives in micro and small scale enterprise development, democratizing governance, livelihood security.

### ***Design***

Training courses and workshops are designed to provide hands-on, practice-based learning. Students/course participants develop realistic and achievable individual action plans and become part of an alumni network with access to on-going mentoring and best practice sharing as well as learning exchanges (conferences, dialogues, and roundtable discussions). IIRR also designs customized courses and study programs on development-related topics.

### ***Underlying philosophy/pedagogy***

They use a people-centred approach to development emphasizing education and capacity-building for change within their own communities. Using an adult education philosophy/pedagogy, training courses and workshops emphasize that participants are simultaneously learners and resource persons and combines the sharing of rural development experiences and insights with a hands-on, practice-based applied learning approach. Experiences, lessons and good practices are then documented in a process of sharing knowledge and drawing lessons from experiences in a Writeshop Process.

### ***Facilitators' and students' profiles***

Courses are taught by practitioners and experts from the field that draw on extensive experience working in community development to develop topical, professional-level courses that give participants useful, practical training on a variety of topics, especially in community-led and participatory development. The literature does not stipulate the minimum qualifications of these facilitators and would require further exploration.

The primary populations their programs serve are women and youth and under-served or marginalized communities in Africa and Asia. Their training courses and workshops work with local, national and international community development organizations and practitioners from all levels of experience.

### ***Expected learning impacts***

Learning impacts are specific to each training course, however, overall they hope to provide knowledge and skills that empower individuals and organizations to make change in their communities through developing an achievable action plan.

## **6) Training and Research Support Centre (TARSC)**

The Training and Research Support Centre (TARSC) is a non-profit learning and knowledge organization based in Zimbabwe that works with a variety of national and international organizations. TARSC provides training, research and support services to state and civil society organizations at national and international levels. TARSC is a learning and knowledge organization, with a particular focus on skills building, research and technical support and a commitment to long term capacity building in the public sector and in civil society. Training is offered in English.

## ***Training objectives***

Training objectives vary based on the specific course, for example, the training in community based research skills attempts to support local levels skills for assessments and monitoring, and to build and use evidence based approaches to planning and management programs. Overall, trainings aims to raise community voice in strengthening knowledge, skills and resources through participatory approaches to build community roles in accountability and action.

## ***Content***

TARSC runs training courses at community, national and international levels and has expertise in course design and facilitation. TARSC training covers major skill areas of occupational and public health, HIV and AIDS, health equity, social security, food security and nutrition, gender equity, child and adolescent health and social development and reproductive health. Current courses include regional health literacy and participatory action research training, the Public Health Act, community monitoring for social accountability, and community based research skills training

## ***Design***

TARSC works with organizations to design, build skills in and implement community based research using a range of methods. TARSC trainings are designed as formal training workshops and short courses, mentoring within specific research activities, and exchange visits and attachments (with TARSC and partner organizations). They also have a portfolio of publications and interactive web-based training materials.

## ***Underlying philosophy/pedagogy***

TARSC uses participatory and community based research methods to explore research issues brought to the organization by community and public sector organizations. They aim for scientific quality, innovation and relevance to communities and public services. They aim to demystify research as a tool for building and using knowledge.

## ***Facilitators' and students' profiles***

Facilitators of TARSC programs have a range of capacities and skills, depending on the specific program area (public health, health, participatory and formal research skills, etc.) and co-operate with institutions that provide expertise in other areas (IT, economics, legal, labour relations, etc.). The literature does not indicate the educational qualifications of these facilitators and would require further investigation. National and regional networking is promoted to build interdisciplinary approaches to community issues.

Participants in trainings include local, national, regional and international community based organizations and civil society organizations, youth, women, etc.

## ***Expected learning impacts***

Trainings attempt to build knowledge, skills and resources in the particular subject area through participatory action methodologies to empower individuals and organizations to create social change.

*Please Note:* As stated on page 8, this review suggests that further exploration could be made into HEIs where education/training on CBR in asset-based development would be expected but not identified to see why such training is not appearing in the literature search.

## References for the Introduction

- Bebbington, A. (1999). Capitals and capabilities: a framework for analysing peasant viability, rural livelihoods and poverty." *World Development* Vol. 27(12); 2021-2044.
- Dale, A. (2013). Agency: Individual "fit" and sustainable community development. *Community Development Journal* (November). doi: 10.1093/cdj/bst055
- Emery, M. and C.B. Flora. 2006. "Spiraling-Up: Mapping Community Transformation with Community Capitals Framework." *Community Development: Journal of the Community Development Society* 37: 19-35. <http://www.ncrcrd.iastate.edu/pubs/flora/spiralingup.htm>.
- Ford Foundation (n.d.) *Building assets to reduce poverty and injustice*. Asset-building and Community Development Program, Ford Foundation [http://www.fordfoundation.org/pdfs/library/building\\_assets.pdf](http://www.fordfoundation.org/pdfs/library/building_assets.pdf) (accessed 12 October 2013).
- Gibson, K., Cahill, A. and McKay, D. 2010: 'Rethinking the Dynamics of Rural Transformation: Performing Different Development Pathways in a Philippines Municipality', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 35(2): 237-55.
- Hamerlinck, J. and Plaut, J. (2014) *Asset-Based Community Engagement in Higher Education*. Minnesota: Campus Contract
- Krishna, A. (2002). *Active social capital: Tracing the roots of development and democracy*. New York: Columbia.
- Mathie, A. and Cunningham, G. 2003: 'From Clients to Citizens: Asset-based community development as a strategy for community-driven development.' *Development in Practice* 13(5): 474-486.
- Mathie, A. and Cunningham, G. (eds) 2008: *From Clients to Citizens: Communities Changing the Course of Their Own Development*, Rugby, UK: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Moser, C. 2006: *Asset-based Approaches to Poverty Reduction in a Globalized Context: An Introduction to Asset Accumulation Policy and Summary of Workshop Findings*, Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

## References of sampled and reviewed items

- Beaulieu, L.J. (2002). Mapping the Assets of Your Community: A Key Component for Building Local Capacity. Instructor's Guide. Southern Rural Development Center.
- Bergdall, T. (2012). Facilitating Asset Based Community Development. Chapter 9 from *Changing Lives, Changing Society: ICA's Experience in Nepal and in the World*. T. Timsina & D. Neupane (eds). Institute for Cultural Affairs. Nepal.
- Bona, A. (2005). *Implementing asset-based community development: A case study from the Philippines*. (MPhil Thesis). Massey University. New Zealand.
- Cahn, M., & Liu, M. (2008). Women and rural livelihood training: A case study from Papua New Guinea. *Gender and Development*, 16(1, Rural Livelihoods and Agriculture), 133-146. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.stfx.ca/stable/20461254>
- Chandra, A. & J.D. Acosta. (2013). Building Resilient Communities: An Online Training. RAND Corporation.
- Collins, C. & A. Laue. (2012). Permaculture Schools Project – KwaZakhele Community. With support from Coady International Institute. South Africa.

- Cunningham, G., Y. Ghore, A. Mathie & B. Peters. (2014). *Asset-Based Community Development*. Presentation. Aspen.
- Cunningham, G., A. Mathie & B. Peters. (2014). *Mobilizing Assets for Community Driven Development*. Participant Manual. *Coady International Institute*, St. Francis University.
- Cunningham, G. & Y. Ghore. (2014). *Strengthening Local Economies*. Days 1-3. Presentations. Coady International Institute.
- Curley, Jami. et al. (2014). *Child development accounts (CDAs): An asset-building strategy to empower girls in Uganda*. *International Social Work*. Sage Publications.
- Davies, R. & J. Dart. (2005). *The 'Most Significant Change (MSC) Technique: A Guide to its Use*.
- Dureau, Christopher. *Asset Based and Actor Led Development*. (2013). *Australian Community Development and Civil Society Strengthening Scheme Phase II*.
- Gibson, Katherine, Amanda Cahill & Dierdre McKay. (2009). *Rethinking the Dynamics of rural transformation: performing different development pathways in a Philippine municipality*. *Royal Geographical Society*. Vol 35. Pg 237 – 255.
- Green, Gary Paul & Ann Goetting. (2010). *Mobilizing Communities: Asset Building as A Community Development Strategy*. Temple University Press. Philadelphia.
- Hipwell, W. (2009). 'An Asset-based Approach to Indigenous Development in Taiwan', *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 50(3): 289–306.
- Hope, A. & S. Timmel (2009). *Training for Transformation: A Handbook for Community Workers*. Book IV. Practical Action Publishing. UK.
- Hunt, S. & F. Spreckley. (2005). *Participation Toolkit: Exercises for Working Together*. Local Livelihoods Ltd. Retrieved from: <http://www.locallivelihoods.com/cmsms/uploads/PDFs/Participation%20Toolkit%20-%20First%20Edition%202007.pdf>
- Ikhala Trust (2011). *Report for Ikhala Trust: A 3 ½ Day Training Course in Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) for Ikhala Trust grantees and networking partners*. Ikhala Trust.
- International Development Research Council (IDRC). (Nov. 12, 2010). *MALAKAS!* Retrieved from: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BEts\\_EhXPok](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BEts_EhXPok)
- International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI). (Oct 2, 2012). *A Rope to Tie A Lion*. Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7SSOm1hsCsE>
- Kindon, S. (2003). *Participatory video in geographic research: A feminist practice of looking?* *Area*, 35(2), 142-153. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.stfx.ca/stable/20004304>
- Kretzmann, J.P. & McKnight, J. (2005). *Discovering Community Power: A Guide to Mobilizing Local Assets and Youth Organization's Capacity*. Asset-Based Community Development Institute. Northwestern University.
- Kretzmann, J., & McKnight, J. (1993). In Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Neighborhood Innovations Network (Ed.), *Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets* Northwestern University.
- Lightfoot, Elizabeth., Jennifer Simmelink McCleary, and Terry Lum. (2014). *Asset Mapping as a Research Tool for Community-Based Participatory Research in Social Work*. *Social Work Research*. 38(1): 59-64.

- Mathie, Alison., Jenny Cameron & Katherine Gibson. Asset-based and citizen-led development: changing the development conversation?
- Mathie, Alison & Gord Cunningham. (2003). From Clients to Citizens: Asset-Based Community Development as a Strategy for Community-Driven Development. *Development in Practice*. Vol 13. No. 5. Carfax Publishing
- Mathie, Alison. (2008). From DCBA to ABCD: The Potential for Strengthening Citizens Engagement with Local Government: A Case Study from Mindanao, Philippines. *Coady International Institute*.
- Moser, Caroline., Pamela Sparr & James Pickett. (2007). Cutting-Edge Development Issues for INGOs: Applications of an Asset Accumulation Approach. *Asset Debate Paper*. No 1.
- Nyemah, Joseph. (2011). Would Asset Mapping Help to Support jobsHere. Regional Planning and Development. Learning and Discussion Paper Number 3. Nova Scotia Department of Economic and Rural Development.
- O’Leary, Tara., Ingrid Burkett & Kate Braithwaite. (2011). Appreciating Assets. *International Association for Community Development*. Carnegie UK Trust.
- Ollner, Annika. (2010). Involving Youth in Research: A Guide to the Literature on Participatory Research with Youth. The Assets Coming Together for Youth Project. York University.
- Pasick, Rena., Geraldine Oliva, Ellen Goldstein, & Tung Nguyen. (2010). Community Engaged Research with Community-Based Organizations: A Resource Manual for Researchers.
- Peters, Brianne., Alison Mathie, & Solomon Legesse. (2013). Testing an asset-based, community-driven development approach: 10 years of action research in Ethiopia. IDRC/Coady LF Reflection Paper.
- Puntenney, D. (2014). Asset-Mapping. In D. Coghlan & M. Brydon Miller (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Action Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Reardon, K. M. (2014). Asset-Based Community Development. In D. Coghlan & M. Brydon-Miller (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Action Research*. P. 65 – 68. London: Sage Publications.
- SEWA. (2011). Building on what we have: Activating assets for community-driven development. Part 1: A trainer’s manual & Part 2: A resource guide. Self-Employed Women’s Association (SEWA).
- SEWA. (n.d.). An Asset-based Approach to Community Development: A Manual for Village Organizers. Self-Employed Women’s Association (SEWA) Jeevika Project and the Coady International Institute. St. Francis Xavier University.
- Van Mele, P. V., Wanvoeke, J., & Zossou, E. (2010). Enhancing rural learning, linkages, and institutions: The rice videos in Africa. *Development in Practice*, 20(3), 414-421. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.stfx.ca/stable/27806717>
- Wealth Works. (2013). Connecting Community Assets with Market Demand for Lasting Livelihoods: An Overview. Presentation, Framework, Coaching Curriculum Background & Modules 2 – 5. *Yellow Wood associate, inc.*
- Westoby, P., & Blerk, R. v. (2012). An investigation into the training of community development workers within South Africa. *Development in Practice*, 22(8), 1082-1096. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.stfx.ca/stable/41723170>
- Yeneabat, M & A. K. Butterfield (2012). “We Can’t Eat a Road:” Asset-Based Community Development and the The Gedam Sefer Community Partnership in Ethiopia. *Journal of Community Practice*, 20:1-2, p. 134-153. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10705422.2012.650121>