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The density and growing population in urban areas have led to an increasing number of slum communities amongst environments with scarce resources and hazardous living conditions. In order to revitalize and modernize urban areas, governments have begun relocating and resettling slum communities to outer areas of the metropolis. As a result, the displacement of people from former jobs, social networks, and cultural lifestyles have affected individual attitudes and created communities with limited community cohesion and sustainable livelihood. In order to alleviate the recreation of poverty, community development efforts in resettlement communities must include pro-poor, sustainable economic growth, inclusive social development, and good governance—the three pillars of the Asian Development Bank’s (ADB) Poverty Reduction Strategy. This thesis presents a community development model developed by Adamson University’s Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility (VCSR) as an innovative approach that is addressing urban poverty in the resettlement community of Southville I. Based on the results of a comparative analysis of the ADB and VCSR frameworks, the community development model is legitimized. The author further argues conceptual alternatives that imply innovation and expansion: communities with dual identities; individual, family, community transformation; and the university as the facilitator. These findings offer insight and recommendations that contribute to an effective framework for community development in resettlement communities.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

The density and growing population of urban areas presents distinct challenges to urban poverty reduction in developing countries. Confronted with the challenge of overpopulation, governments must maintain readily available employment, livable housing, and accessible health care and education in environments facing a scarcity of resources—a daunting task for many developing countries. In the Philippines, for instance, 60% of the population is currently urban and 36% of the total urban population resides in the Metro Manila area (The World Bank). This populated setting has led to the establishment of depressed settlements, or slums, where slum residents with income below the poverty threshold, or slum dwellers, live amongst deteriorated, hazardous, unsanitary living conditions (Ragragio 2003, 6). Whereas living in urban areas may offer residents advantages specific to their regional locality, such as close proximity to government, private, and non-governmental resources, these areas remain challenged with high unemployment rates, health threats, and inequitable access to various forms of capital necessary to sustain a healthy livelihood.

For the Philippines, the urgency to revitalize and modernize Manila and surrounding areas is apparent—over 526 slum communities in Metro Manila and a slum dweller population of 2.54 million people (Ragragio 2003, 5). Moreover, the revitalization and modernization process is confronted with the issue of informal settlements by individuals and families who are occupying land without the title or rights to do so, thus creating challenges to urban management (Ragragio 2003, 6) and resident identification. These common complexities pose problems to governments in the design
and implementation process of urban revitalization and modernization programs, and further continue to challenge urban poverty reduction efforts.

Urban revitalization and modernization programs, also known as urban upgrading, are vital components to urban poverty reduction. Most commonly, urban upgrading refers to the revitalization of physical infrastructure, including improving informal housing, transportation, and water sources, but it can also include improving the social infrastructure, or the access to social services and livelihood programs (Ragragio 2003, 17). Despite the earlier “hands-off”, limited government approach adopted by the World Bank in the 70’s and 80’s, lessons learned have shifted current strategies to focus on cross-sector partnerships and large coalitions to address the complexity of urban poverty, and invest in sustainable, integral slum upgrade (Werlin 1999, 1523). In the Philippines, urban upgrading is driven by government agencies and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) through projects aimed at improving both physical and social infrastructure (Ragragio 2003, 17). Previous urban upgrading efforts indicate the availability of affordable land, slum community participation and welfare, government support, and effective collaboration with People’s Organization—formal citizen organizations that promote the public interest1—essential components that determine the success or failure of these projects (Ragragio 2003, 17). However, as overpopulation and the limited availability of land continue to be major obstacles in Manila’s urban upgrading efforts, the alternative has led to the relocation and resettlement of slum communities to outer areas of the metropolis.

1 According to the Philippine Constitution, Article 13, section 15: “People's organizations are bona fide associations of citizens with demonstrated capacity to promote the public interest and with identifiable leadership, membership, and structure.”
Although resettlement communities provide former slum dwellers a healthier alternative living environment than their previous slum communities, the displacement of people from former jobs, social networks, and cultural lifestyles have affected individual attitudes and created communities with limited community cohesion and sustainable livelihood. To effectively establish sustainable resettlement communities, community development efforts must address core psychological and social deficiencies in individuals and families caused by displacement and urban poverty (Wilson 1996, 617). Thereby, the outcome is a transformation of individual, family, and community attitudes and behaviors that prepares and empowers resettlement community members for community development programs. This thesis will analyze the factors that facilitate the community development process of resettlement communities, specifically by examining the Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility’s community development model and the Asian Development Bank’s Poverty Reduction Strategy. In addition, a case study of a community in the Philippines will serve as the contextual foundation in order to explore the integration of partnerships, and psychological, social, and economic development paradigms used to transform individuals, families, and communities. This comparative analysis aims to fill the gaps in the literature and contribute to the development of a community development framework for resettlement communities.

The Case Study: The Community of Southville I

The challenges and obstacles of the relocation and resettlement process in Manila are exemplified in the community of Southville I, a case that will serve as the contextual
foundation for this thesis. This case study reveals deficiencies distinct to resettlement communities that stifle the development process, and provide a context in which to analyze the different frameworks for addressing these issues. Furthermore, the Southville I case represents one of many examples of resettlement communities throughout the Philippines, and possibly other regions in the world, that encounter these challenges to development.

Part of the development efforts in the Philippines, as identified by the Philippine national government, is the rehabilitation of the Philippine National Railway (PNR) of Central and Southern Luzon. Through this revitalization and modernization project, the vision was an effective and efficient transportation system from Metro Manila to northern and southern provinces of Luzon that would contribute to the economic growth throughout the region (The National Housing Authority). In order to implement this project, also known as the Rail Linkage Project, slum communities residing along the railway tracks needed to be cleared and relocated, as depicted in Figure1 (The National Housing Authority; Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council). Therefore, on December 10, 2001, Philippine President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo issued Memorandum Order no. 46, which directed the Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council (HUDCC) to relocate and provide housing for slum dwellers that would be affected by the Rail Linkage Project (The National Housing Authority; Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council). Following this presidential proclamation, HUDCC issued Memorandum no. 4, which identified the National Housing Authority (NHA) as the lead agency to oversee the relocation and resettlement of slum dwellers to several identified resettlement communities (The National Housing Authority; Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council).
Authority; Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council), one being the community of Southville I.
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Figure 1: Map of Metro Manila Railway/Highway (Philippine Government)

The land for the community of Southville I was originally used for agricultural purposes, then converted and used by NHA to accommodate resettlers from the Rail Linkage Project. Geographically, as depicted in Figure 2, the community is part of the city of Cabuyao, an urban municipality in the province of Laguna, and is located south east of Metro Manila and home to the Nestle Philippines Corporation, Asia Brewery Inc., and Malayan Colleges Laguna (Cabuyao Municipality) (See Also Appendix A). The community of Southville I consists of 8,026 families who had formally lived alongside railway tracks from the areas of Cabuyao, Makati, and Manila (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009). Based on an initial assessment, a majority of the resettled community members are daily or bi-weekly income earners through private or self-employment, either as casual, contractual, or seasonal workers (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009). In addition, 86% of the community earned a monthly
household income of less than $225, and a majority of the community members are elementary and high school graduates (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009).

However, the demographics of Southville I fail to indicate the distinct challenges and obstacles that impact the livelihood of the community. According to interviews and observations conducted by the Author, the displacement that the resettled families in Southville I experienced, among other factors, created an environment of distrust among neighbors, low individual and community morale, a lack of resources, and limited access to education, healthcare, economic opportunities to provide a source of income. Like many communities faced with poverty, options were limited, particularly the limited access to community capital, which included the social, political, economic, and environmental resources necessary for establishing a healthy, sustainable community.
Furthermore, interviews and observations also reveal community members of *Southville I* experiencing a psychological, social, and economic deficiency that threatened their well-being and that created barriers to establishing successful community development programs. Essentially, the relocation and resettlement process did not alleviate the issues of poverty for the resettled community members; on the contrary, the issues were materialized into a different form of poverty.

These challenges expose the ineffectiveness of the relocation and resettlement processes and its inability to address the core issues of poverty in the region. Moreover, it presents a community detached from essential community capital, or “various types of capital stock or resources upon which all community stakeholders rely and into which all community stakeholders contribute” (Callaghan & Colton 2007, 933)—necessary components to the livelihood of a community. In combination with the psychological and social deficiencies, the community of *Southville I* experienced low community member morale and community cohesion, which are obstacles shared with many slum and resettlement communities. In addition, the livelihood of developing areas, like resettlement communities, are further endangered by the recent financial crisis due to the lack of resources that are necessary to respond with remedial actions, thereby threatening community survival (The World Bank 2009, 1). This affirms the complex nature of poverty and signifies the urgent need for effective community development strategies, particularly for slum and resettlement communities. In order to provide a foundation for analysis, this thesis suggests the Asian Development Bank’s (ADB) Poverty Reduction Strategy as an effective framework for addressing urban poverty in the region. Following, an introduction of Adamson University’s Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility
(VCSR) community development model in *Southville I* is presented as an innovative shift to addressing urban poverty in resettlement communities.

The Asian Development Bank’s Poverty Reduction Strategy

Addressing the community deficiencies in *Southville I* requires a framework that recognizes poverty relative to the region, and more importantly, based on good practices that overcame obstacles similar to that of *Southville I*. As such, the ADB Poverty Reduction Strategy provides useful insight in analyzing poverty in resettlement communities, and encourages concepts applicable to the *Southville I* case. This framework recognizes the complexity of poverty and its diverse causes and conditions in Asia, and further asserts the need for poverty interventions to be tailored to its circumstances (Asian Development Bank 2004, 5). According to ADB’s Poverty Reduction Strategy, poverty is multidimensional, thus is framed using the following definition:

“Poverty is characterized by a lack of access to essential goods, services, assets, and opportunities to which every human being is entitled. Everyone should be free from hunger, should be able to live in peace, and should have access to basic education and primary health care services. Poor households need to sustain themselves by their labor and be reasonably rewarded and should have a degree of protection from external shocks. In addition, individuals and societies are also poor—and tend to remain so—if they are not empowered to participate in making the decisions that shape their lives.” (Asian Development Bank 2004, 1)

Nevertheless, ADB asserts the Poverty Reduction Strategy as an effective framework for poverty reduction. This encompasses three pillars that are interconnecting and mutually
reinforcing: (1) pro-poor, sustainable economic growth, (2) inclusive social development, and (3) good governance (Asian Development Bank 2004, 5). This framework requires the simultaneous strengthening of all three pillars for successful poverty reduction to occur (Asian Development Bank 2004, 5). In the figure below, the ADB Poverty Reduction Strategy is illustrated showing the relationship of each pillar, in addition to its relation to poverty reduction. As stated, the pillars are inter-connecting and mutually reinforcing, thus depicts the equal linkages of all three pillars. Furthermore, the inherent balance and equitable value of each pillar is illustrated in the figure, representing the simultaneous strengthening necessary to reduce poverty.
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**Figure 3: ADB Poverty Reduction Strategy**

The first pillar of the ADB framework is pro-poor, sustainable economic growth, which refers to policies and programs aimed at stimulating economic activity to benefit
the long-term development and welfare of the poor (Asian Development Bank 2004, 6). Due to the socio-economic stratification of many developing countries, it is crucial to identify economic growth strategies that are pro-poor and sustainable to effect short-term and long-term development. Thereby, the benefits of economic growth will not exclude marginalized populations. In addition, ADB suggests specific indicators for each pillar based on growth trends in the region and good practices worldwide to provide a foundation for measurement and evaluation. Although this framework was designed to be applied at the national, macro-management level for Asian countries, these concepts can be reduced to be applied at the local, micro-management level through a deductive logical process. Therefore, ADB identifies the following criteria to achieve pro-poor, sustainable economic growth.

- The Growth-Poverty Nexus – economic growth leads to societal benefits that contribute to the reduction of poverty. For instance, growth produces increases in labor demands and wages, which improves public revenues and allows for public spending on physical and social infrastructure (Asian Development Bank 2004, 6).

- Policies for Labor-Utilizing Growth – sustained economic growth is fostered by effective macroeconomic management and public policies favoring employment. This includes cultivating an environment for the private sector and income-generating activities for women and other marginalized groups (Asian Development Bank 2004, 6).

- Growth and Private Sector Development – the private and financial sectors have the ability to play a role in poverty reduction by participating in the development
of infrastructure and basic services to benefit the poor. Furthermore, as the private sector develops, governments must transition from being the producer and owner of goods and services to the facilitator and regulator (Asian Development Bank 2004, 7).

- Growth and Infrastructure – infrastructure development, or activities that increase capacity and efficiency, is essential for economic growth. Potentially, it can generate jobs and increase access to economic activities and social services, as well as contribute to poverty reduction (Asian Development Bank 2004, 7).

- Regional Cooperation to Underpin Growth – regional and sub-regional cooperation provides countries with limited options larger markets, economies of scale, and division of labor, which supports growth opportunities (Asian Development Bank 2004, 7).

- Environmental Sustainability – conservation and protection of the environment and natural resources is crucial to sustain economic growth. Moreover, poverty reduction strategies must incorporate a resource management system through policies and pro-environmental activities in order to promote long-term productivity of natural resources (Asian Development Bank 2004, 7).

However, ADB also asserts that pro-poor, sustainable economic growth must be accompanied with inclusive social development programs that encourage equitable access to the growth’s benefits and opportunities (Asian Development Bank 2004, 8). Within ADB’s second pillar, inclusive social development refers to the access to education, healthcare, and essential social services, which establishes opportunities to increase participation and the overall welfare of the poor (Asian Development Bank 2004, 8).
2004, 8). Through inclusive social development programs, the quality of life for all citizens will improve. To achieve this result, ADB identifies the following indicators.

- **Human Capital** – as an important asset of the poor, human capital plays a role in poverty reduction by developing a workforce with marketable skills (Asian Development Bank 2004, 8). In order for productivity and participation to affect economic growth, social services directed at building human capital should be relevant, quality, and accessible.

- **Population Policy** – the relationship between family size and poverty reveals a need for public intervention. Gender and access become important issues in combating overpopulation, particularly universal education for girls, access to reproductive health services, and creating income-generating activities for women (Asian Development Bank 2004, 8).

- **Gender and Development** – the gender imbalance of access to capital and social services is prevalent in many underdeveloped areas, further suppressing the development of women. The empowerment of women entails their participation in all levels of society, which contributes to the growth and positive well-being of a society (Asian Development Bank 2004, 8).

- **Social Capital** – a lack of social cohesion has detrimental effects on individuals and communities, often causing exclusion, marginalization, and conflict. Inclusive, participatory institutions and policies will reverse these effects and provide equitable access to economic opportunities (Asian Development Bank 2004, 8).
- Social Protection – vulnerable populations require social protection programs to manage risks and ensure economic security (Asian Development Bank 2004, 8). Such programs and strategies increase participation of the poor and the vulnerable in economic development activities.

In order to effectively manage economic growth and social development programs, ADB encourages good governance, which is a concept that is asserted and agreed by development institutions and government as a vital component to poverty reduction. In fact, in response to the UN Habitat’s Global Campaign on Urban Governance and its *Seven Norms on Good Urban Governance* framework, the Philippine government adopted its *7-Point Action Agenda* based on the good governance framework in order to localize the effort throughout the country (Philippine Urban Forum). Within ADB’s third pillar, the framework reiterates and reinforces the importance of good governance through the following indicators.

- Public Sector Reform – essential to reducing poverty is good governance, which includes pro-poor policies and macroeconomic management. Corruption and the lack of accountability within the government stifle economic growth and have detrimental effects on the welfare of the poor (Asian Development Bank 2004, 9).

- Corporate Governance – volatile economic markets due to globalization is evidence of the need for good governance and protection of the private sector. Through good corporate governance, the outcome is increased competition, efficiency, and financial resources to benefit all levels of society (Asian Development Bank 2004, 10).
Mainstreaming Good Governance – this entails the dissemination of good governance practices throughout all levels of society, which includes ensuring transparency and accountability in public services and operations (Asian Development Bank 2004, 10).

Partnerships with Civil Society – civil society plays a crucial role in poverty reduction and good governance, their experience, perspective, and grassroots network are valuable assets for community development (Asian Development Bank 2004, 10). Partnerships with civil society generate mutually-beneficial outcomes that often support economic growth and improve the welfare of the poor.

Applying the concepts of pro-poor, sustainable economic growth, inclusive social development, and good governance to the Southville I case explains the emergence of the community deficiencies. Through this framework, it implies that due to the absence of these pillars, the resettlement process was ineffective in reducing the poverty in Southville I, and thereby contributed to the creation of the community deficiencies. In addition, through the ADB framework, necessary components to addressing urban poverty in resettlement communities also emerge.

Adamson University’s Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility

Responding to the community deficiencies and the urban poverty in Southville I is Adamson University, a key partner in the community development efforts. Founded in
1932, the university is a Catholic Vincentian educational institution located in Manila, Philippines, with the vision to provide quality education to the socially disadvantaged (Adamson University). Building upon this vision, the university also aspires to organize and lead efforts to help the poor, and be a catalyst for social transformation (Adamson University). As a reflection of their values and principles, the university actualized their mission on September 28, 2007 through the establishment of the Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility (VCSR) (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009). Through the VCSR, Adamson University faculty, staff, and students are engaged in nation-building and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) poverty alleviation initiatives, which empowers communities using the same technologies and resources provided to students (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009). As such, these initiatives began the formation of a community development model—a distinct paradigm for development in the Philippines. Moreover, VCSR’s general objectives focuses on Moral, Socio-Economic, Environmental, and Cross-Sector Partnership development as a foundation for work in community-university engagement (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009):

- **Moral** - to inculcate Filipino and Christian values that leads to social development and inspires nationalism.
- **Socio-Economic** - to develop the employable skills of members for self-reliance and self-sustainability.
- **Environmental** - to instill the values of cooperation and synergy among members towards community development, thereby help maintain cleanliness, peace and order in the community.
- **Cross-Sector Partnerships** - to foster an effective linkage between the government, business, the civic society, and the academic community to achieve sustainable livelihood projects and holistic development programs.

(Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009)
Building on their commitment to community-university engagement, VCSR began its community development efforts in *Southville I* on November 17, 2007. Given the magnitude of the Rail Linkage Project and the challenges that resulted from the relocation and resettlement process, VCSR began with a pilot group that consisted of five blocks with twenty households per block to participate in their community development efforts (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009). Through this pilot group, VCSR aspired to establish a quality community-university partnership before replicating their community development model to other neighboring resettlement communities. Aligned with the ADB Poverty Reduction Strategy framework and the MDGs, VCSR’s community development model in *Southville I* incorporated three main components:

1. Community Entrepreneurship
2. Values Formation
3. Cross-Sector Partnerships

In the figure below, the VCSR community development model is illustrated showing the relationship of each component, as well as its connection to urban poverty reduction. The depiction reveals a linear continuum, distinguishing the relationship and order of each component of the model. At the base are cross-sector partnerships, which continuously strengthen and facilitate the connection of the other two components. The VCSR community development model represents a theoretical shift to address urban poverty—promoting a collective approach that recognizes the equitable value of each stakeholder, in addition to a direction and outcome throughout its process.
The first component of the VCSR community development is community entrepreneurship. Within this component, VCSR implemented a multi-dimensional approach to stimulate economic activity through community entrepreneurship in *Southville I*, and incorporated several elements. First, skills training workshops have provided community members with the opportunity to learn and develop skills essential to business management and development. Workshops include, but were not limited to, personal financial management, entrepreneurial skills development, English proficiency, computer literacy, rug making, and basket making (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009). At the request of community members, workshops are developed based on their existing skills, assets, and interests, and facilitated by staff and faculty from Adamson University.
Second, VCSR and Southville I established a community-based enterprise, a concept where a community acts as both the entrepreneur and the enterprise in pursuit of the common good (Peredo & Chrisman 2006, 310). Through the collaboration of Adamson University, Adamson University Alumni, VCSR, and Southville I, a soap making and repacking business developed known as SV SUDZ Detergent. In a training process that entailed technical aspects of soap production, managing a business, bookkeeping, savings, and marketing, Southville I community members learned to become collective business owners (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009). As a community-based enterprise, operations were integrated into the community structure and culture, and was collaboratively managed, marketed, and sold within the community and to surrounding areas. Once profits were distributed to participating families, a portion was also allocated to a community fund for mortuary benefits, community savings, infrastructure, and livelihood programs (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009).

Lastly, VCSR integrated a matching micro-savings program, known as Piso Mula Sa Puso (A Peso from the Heart), which is intended to motivate community members to save and be financially responsible (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009). Following the matching-gift concept, the Piso Mula Sa Puso program continually matches the incremental savings of participating community members instead of a one-time gift that matches a total saved over a period of time. Funds for the Piso Mula Sa Puso program are generated through donations by Adamson University faculty, staff, and students. In addition, an identical fund called the Dollar from the Heart was established for DePaul University, a Vincentian Catholic University in Chicago, USA, in order to
support the Piso Mula Sa Puso program (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009).

The second component of the VCSR community development model is values formation. Facilitated by VCSR facilitators, which are faculty and staff volunteers from Adamson University charged with facilitating the program, the values formation program is the initiating component to the community development efforts in Southville I. Designed to stimulate dialogue and reflection on three core values—trust, love, and synergy—the values formation program provides a forum for community members to obtain life skills and explore their spiritual and social development, in addition to developing a sense of community and camaraderie (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009). Groups are determined by resident location and consist of fifteen to twenty-five household representatives, and within this group, five members are elected and trained as co-facilitators (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009). The approach and methodology of VCSR facilitators uses active participation, efficient facilitation of participants’ knowledge, mobile visualization, and on-going evaluation (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009):

- Active Participation – emphasizes short lectures, plenary dialogues, and group works
- Efficient Facilitation and Participants’ Knowledge – promotes sharing of experiences and knowledge
- Mobile Visualization – uses flash cards as a communication tool to allow participants to demonstrate and impart concepts and ideas to other participants
- On-going Evaluation – managed jointly with participants, daily evaluation activities will facilitate open communication and establish co-responsibility in the outcome of the course (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009)
At the core of VCSR’s community development model are multi-fold cross-sector partnerships between Academia, People’s Organizations, civil society, businesses, and government institutions. For instance, partnerships with other academic institutions establish a network to share knowledge, experiences, and technologies, such as DePaul University, an international partner providing resources that support the community development efforts in *Southville I*. The private sector, particularly businesses from surrounding areas of *Southville I*, provides support through employment and manpower needs (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009). Government institutions, such as the NHA, support community development through public policy, programs, and funding. Partnerships with civil society, which include World of Hope, USA and Hope for the World Philippines, have developed a feeding program, day care program, scholarships, and medical and dental missions supporting development in *Southville I* (Vincentian Center for Social Responsibility 2009). Furthermore, the partnerships with People’s Organizations and the community serve as VCSR’s main partners in development. These components represent a collaborative, participatory, asset-based model that addresses the core psychological, social, and economic deficiencies in *Southville I*, and more importantly, responds to the necessary components to reduce urban poverty in resettlement communities.

**Goals of the Study**

VCSR’s community development model presents a distinct approach to addressing urban poverty in resettlement communities. As a comparative analysis, this
study will use ADB’s Poverty Reduction Strategy as the theoretical foundation for VCSR’s community development model in order to validate its effectiveness in reducing urban poverty in resettlement communities. As such, the aim of this study is two-fold:

- Goal One – Through the juxtaposition of VCSR’s community development model and ADB’s Poverty Reduction Strategy, the comparative analysis will lend legitimacy to the VCSR community development model and/or propose conceptual alternatives.
- Goal Two – The analysis will suggest VCSR’s community development model as a strategy for urban poverty reduction in resettlement communities.

Research Questions (RQ)

In order to achieve the study’s goals, it is appropriate to identify clear research questions to guide the overall study. Since the juxtaposition and alignment of the pillars and components of both frameworks are tri-fold, three research questions will guide the study’s analysis.

- RQ1 – How does community entrepreneurship stimulate pro-poor, sustainable economic growth?
- RQ2 – How does values formation programs encourage inclusive social development?
- RQ3 – How are cross-sector partnerships promoting good governance?
Overview of Chapters

In addition, the following chapters will form the basis of this research study. Chapter One provided an introduction to the research study by introducing the concept of slum communities, and the challenges of the slum relocation and resettlement process, an outcome of urban upgrading programs. The community of Southville I was introduced as the case study for this research. Lastly, the ADB and VCSR frameworks for urban poverty reduction were introduced as the community development models that will be used for analysis.

Chapter Two will be a literature review of several concepts examined in this thesis. First, poverty in the Philippines will be discussed, specifically examining the challenges and issues effecting the access to human capital, physical capital, natural capital, financial capital, and social capital. Urban upgrading and resettlement literature will present current frameworks on addressing the relocation and resettlement process. The literature on community entrepreneurship will examine the theory on community-based enterprises, as well as its benefits and potential threats. The values formation literature will discuss the individual and community transformation process within community development. Lastly, literature on cross-sector partnerships will present the role of partnerships in community economic development, including the introduction of community-university partnership models.

In Chapter Three, the research methodology for this study will be introduced. This will include the research design, sampling, data gathering methods, and data analysis. As a qualitative study, this chapter will discuss the Appreciative Inquiry model of research,
which guided the design of the questionnaire for VCSR and *Southville I* participants. Data gathering methods will include Adamson University’s role, the conduction of participant interviews, sources of data, and the adherence to DePaul University guidelines. In addition, the method for data analysis will introduce the comparative analysis used in Chapter Four and Five.

Chapter Four will reveal the results of the study. Based on interviews conducted with VCSR staff and volunteers and SV SUDZ community members, in addition to reports and literature provided by VCSR, data will be coded and categorized for analysis. Using the coded data, the results will be organized and juxtaposed to the ADB Poverty Reduction Strategy indicators. Through this juxtaposition, the comparisons will reveal linkages and gaps that will serve as the basis for the comparative analysis.

Lastly, Chapter Five will identify the major themes of the comparative analysis. Continuing the juxtaposition from Chapter Four, significant findings will be discussed within each pillar and component. In addition, this chapter will identify the limitations of the study, recommendations for future research and application, and overall conclusions.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The relocation and resettlement process threatened the livelihood of individuals, families, and communities caused by urban upgrading programs. Furthermore, the establishment of resettlement communities faces distinct challenges to creating sustainable community development. Whereas addressing these issues through an urban poverty lens is essential, it is necessary to recognize the multidimensional nature of urban poverty in resettlement communities.

Therefore, it is important for this study to present the current theories, frameworks, and case studies in community entrepreneurship, values formation, and cross-sector partnerships. As such, models on community-based enterprises, individual and community empowerment, and partnerships will be discussed. In addition, this study will begin with an examination of poverty in the Philippines and current frameworks and best practices in urban upgrading and resettlement in order to provide contextual background to approach urban poverty in resettlement communities.

Poverty in the Philippines

Critical to understanding the challenges of urban poverty in resettlement communities is recognizing the dynamics of poverty at the national level. This macroscopic perspective is effectively presented in the ADB Country Poverty Analysis of the Philippines (Asian Development Bank 2005). In this report, ADB identifies that the causes of poverty in the Philippines are due to the weak macroeconomic management,
employment issues, high population growth rates, an underperforming agricultural sector and unfinished land reform agenda, corruption and a weak government state, conflict and security issues in Mindanao, and disability (Asian Development Bank 2005, 2). In order to address these issues, an analytical framework is presented, which defines poverty as a deprivation and lack of access to essential assets, specifically referring to the access to human capital, physical capital, financial capital, natural capital, and social capital (Asian Development Bank 2005, 2). Within this framework, ADB further defines each essential asset. Human capital is the combination of skills, knowledge, and good health that allow people to generate income (Asian Development Bank 2005, 41). Physical capital refers to basic infrastructure and services that improve the welfare of people (Asian Development Bank 2005, 51). Financial capital is the financial resources that support people’s economic growth, particularly through organizational, institutional, and regulatory means (Asian Development Bank 2005, 56). Natural capital defines the intangible public goods, such as the environment or land (Asian Development Bank 2005, 62). Lastly, social capital refers to the social resources available to people (Asian Development Bank 2005, 65). The aggregate of these essential assets is also known as community capital (Callaghan & Colton 2007, 933).

environmental conditions affect natural capital in communities (Asian Development Bank 2005, 62). In addition, low levels of community participation in the development process challenge social capital (Asian Development Bank 2005, 65). These assets, or community capital, are critical to building sustainable communities; more importantly, they are essential to building resilient communities able to absorb and adapt quickly to change and crisis (Callaghan & Colton 2007, 939). Thus, resiliency is achieved by finding an appropriate balance of community capital within the community context (Callaghan & Colton 2007, 939). Although these challenges to community capital have defined poverty in the Philippines and affected the sustainability of communities, growth can occur by addressing the deprivation of community capital.

For instance, as indicated in the Philippine Midterm Progress Report on the Millennium Development Goals, progress has been made (Philippine Government 2007, 14). However, in order to achieve the standards set in the MDGs, further issues must be addressed. The recommendations in this report highlight priority actions in order to achieve the MDGs by 2015:

1) Addressing wide disparities across regions
2) Curbing the high population growth rates
3) Improving performance of the agriculture sector
4) Accelerating the implementation of basic education and health reforms
5) Ensuring strict enforcement of laws
6) Bridging the financial gap
7) Strengthening the capacity of local government units to deliver basic services and manage programs and projects
8) Ensuring transparency and accountability in government transactions
9) Addressing peace and security issues
10) Need for public-private partnership
11) Improving targeting, data bases, and monitoring
(Philippine Government 2007, 21-22)
Albeit, both the ADB Country Poverty Analysis and the Philippine Midterm Progress Report on the Millennium Development Goals address poverty from a top-down approach, an emphasis on improving the local capacity from the bottom-up has also been indicated (Philippine Government 2007, 14; Asian Development Bank 2005, 2).

Urban Upgrading & Resettlement

The World Bank’s earlier approach to addressing urban upgrading incorporated John F. C. Turner’s theory, which asserted that rather than demolishing existing housing structures, the solution to slums is a minimal government role, and an improvement in urban environments through waste management, little removal, and clean water (Werlin 1999, 1523). This would allow the slum dwellers’ inherent organizational skills in land management to maintain physical and social improvements (Werlin 1999, 1524). However, recent literature has shown this theory to be ineffective and has suggested powerful, bureaucratic interventions—a rare ability in underdeveloped countries—in land acquisitions, tenure, maintenance, and community participation (Werlin 1999, 1526). As in the case of Southville I, this reiterates the complexity of urban poverty and urban upgrading activities, and encourages relocation and resettlement, which has been determined to be a valid, alternative approach that is accompanied with physical and social benefits (Lall et. al 2006, 1037). As such, formal handbooks have been created to inform agencies effective methods to carry out the process. For instance, UN Habitat and Cities Alliance suggest a Pro-Poor Slum Upgrading Framework that provides case studies on community engagement, community mobilization, empowerment, capacity building,
networking, financial strategies, and partnerships (UN-Habitat 2006). In addition, the ADB Handbook on Resettlement highlights good practices in the planning and implementation of resettlement process (Asian Development Bank 1998, 9):

- Conceptualize and implement resettlement measures as development programs, to be part of all projects, including sector, private sector and co-financed projects, and loans to development finance institutions.
- Involve all stakeholders in a consultative process, especially all affected persons and vulnerable groups.
- Where people will lose income and livelihoods, establish appropriate income restoration programs with objectives to improve, or at least restore, their productive base.
- Provide a social preparation process for people affected when they are vulnerable, or when there is social tension associated with displacement. (Asian Development Bank 1998, 9-10)

For the Philippines, local best practices have revealed additional considerations from successful urban upgrading and resettlement projects. This includes the importance of context, specifically land ownership claims, kinship, economic viability, and empowerment of community members, as well as the importance of enablement and leadership (Ragragio 2003, 17-19). Nevertheless, the current literature on urban upgrading and resettlement provides general frameworks based on good practices, thereby introducing essential concepts that potentially reduce the challenges associated with these processes, and encourage a fair and effective transition for affected communities.

Community Entrepreneurship

Contrary to popular assumptions of developing communities, the existing economic, social, and political inequalities do not equate to a shortage of
entrepreneurship in developing areas (Peredo & Chrisman 2006, 312). In fact, the hard work and ingenuity that also exist in developing areas contribute to entrepreneurial communities that operate on their social networks (de Soto 2000, 28). Although the current literature on entrepreneurship emphasizes individualism, a value of the western world, it is the social capital within a community that facilitates the social networks and the community entrepreneurial activities (Peredo & Chrisman 2006, 311). For instance, the concept of “gift economy” (Mauss 2002, 8) describes transactions of goods and services to another community member, or among communities, without an explicit agreement and based on social arrangements, shared understanding, or obligation—indicating the value of social capital in local economic markets (Peredo & Chrisman 2006, 313; Cahn 2008, 9). Thus, these community entrepreneurial activities are creating and changing social capital into a medium that facilitates entrepreneurship (Ronning & Ljunggren 2007, 23).

These concepts have led to the exploration of community entrepreneurship, or a community acting as an entrepreneur and enterprise in pursuit of the common good (Peredo & Chrisman 2006, 310). Peredo and Chrisman’s theory on community-based enterprise (CBE) details the community entrepreneurship process, including the community orientation of CBE communities, the emergence of CBEs, and the characteristics of CBEs. They indicate that a community that is oriented leads to community members that feel entitled to societal benefits, thereby overriding the need for private property and eventually leading to the awareness and priority of community needs (Peredo & Chrisman 2006, 313). Based on the community orientation, the emergence of CBEs is indicative of the social and economic stress, the result of collective experiences
and learning, the existing social capital, and the size of a community (Peredo & Chrisman 2006, 316). Once a CBE is established, it possesses certain characteristics reflective of the community:

- **Availability of Community Skills** – includes ancestral and new skills, experiences, cooperative practices, and values
- **Multiplicity of Goals** – goals for overcoming poverty are holistic and multifaceted
- **Dependent on Community Participation** – includes community involvement in decision making and the alignment of the CBE governing structure with the community leadership structure (Peredo & Chrisman 2006, 319)

The management, ownership, and governing process of the CBE are people-centered, thus indicating a participatory model to the development of a community (Peredo & Chrisman 2006, 316). However, the CBE survival is dependent on accountability, in addition to operating independently from the local government (Berkes & Davidson-Hunt 2007, 217; Peredo 2005, 476) More importantly, scholars assert the success and sustainability of the CBE is determined by the alignment of the CBE with the community identity, such as cultural and religious values (Cahn 2008, 17; Dana & Dana 2007, 93; Peredo & Chrisman 2006, 313; Peredo 2005, 475). Albeit, these indicators may translate into short-term success for CBEs, long-term success requires CBEs to operate amongst a global market and against global competition. Since community survival may be dependent on CBE survival, it is imperative for CBEs to identify a mediating relationship with global actors (Berkes & Davidson-Hunt 2007, 211). Furthermore, building an adaptive capacity, or the ability for a CBE to withstand and adapt to change, also contributes to CBE success and sustainability (Berkes & Davidson-Hunt 2007, 218). This includes retaining “memory” that maximizes opportunities after distress, capacity-
building, partnerships, and securing access to resources (Berkes & Davidson-Hunt 2007, 218).

Nevertheless, the success of CBEs provides numerous community benefits and outcomes. For instance, communities regain control of their resources and activities on their land (Anderson 2002, 61; Berkes & Davidson-Hunt 2007, 211). Additional outcomes to successful CBEs include an end to dependency on aid due to economic self-sufficiency, the preservation and strengthening of cultural values and its application to economic development and business activities, and the improved socioeconomic well-being of individuals, families, and communities (Anderson 2002, 61). Notably, CBEs also inspire individual entrepreneurship and neighboring communities to engage in community entrepreneurial activities (Peredo & Chrisman 2006, 321).

These benefits and outcomes indicate an effective approach to community development—a bottom-up approach that is engaging local populations and building community capacities. However, due to the limited literature on community entrepreneurship, the scope of the concept was limited to the availability of information. Based on the aforementioned information on community entrepreneurship, gaps were revealed that imply the need for further examination of the concept, particularly the emergence of CBEs and community entrepreneurial activities through partnerships with civil society, academia, businesses, and government agencies. The current literature offers a foundation for the concept of community entrepreneurship, but more importantly, suggests an alternative approach to community economic development strategies.
Values Formation

Patricia A. Wilson suggests an alternative approach to community economic development: begin with the empowerment of an individual in order to empower a community.

“…community economic development, if it is truly to empower people, must build community from the inside out—i.e. from the individual’s realization of self-efficacy and interconnectedness with the larger community. Practitioners are discovering the pivotal role of the individual as subject—not object—of community economic development and social change” (Wilson 1996, 617).

This assertion links individual empowerment to community and societal change, implying that a transformation of the individual starts with building self-esteem, then leading to a feeling of connectedness with life, compassion for others, and a sense of self-fulfillment (Wilson 1996, 621). The individual transformation process continues as the individual develops political awareness and engages in political participation; thereby the individual establishes a sense of community and responsibility (Wilson 1996, 622). Furthermore, Wilson asserts the existence of a spiritual dimension in community economic development, an individual’s desire to belong to something larger than oneself—i.e. community building and the desire for service (Wilson 1996, 624). The community and societal change that results from the transformative process represents a paradigm shift, one that explores the dichotomy of the individual and the community in relation to community development.

This transformation process is stimulated by the communication and social learning of individuals in a group, whom reach a mutual understanding of learning, acceptance of diversity, and trust by sharing emotions, evaluating personal actions, and
support through collective action (Papa et. al. 2000, 117; Wilson 1996, 625).

Additionally, through this dialogue, individuals engage in a process of self-reflection, self-knowledge, and liberation from disempowering beliefs (Wilson 1996, 625). Democratic practices, civic knowledge, and participation are also outcomes of the individual and group empowerment through dialogue (Papa et. al. 2000, 116; Wilson 2004, 2). Hence, dialogue becomes an important medium to stimulate change in individuals and communities, leading to empowered individuals and cohesive communities.

Engaging individuals and communities in this process can be facilitated by consultants, local authority officers, or Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO), which strengthens the link between individual empowerment and community empowerment (Lyons et. al. 2001, 1249). Although the individual must be responsible for his or her self-transformation, the facilitator can provide the forum and a “conscious shock”, or stimulant, in order for the process to begin (Wilson 1996, 627). However, as indicated in Freirean pedagogy, education is a mutual process for both the learner and teacher; each person has knowledge based on his or her own experience and reflection (Freire 1970, 69). Thus, dialogue becomes imperative to social change in that reflective dialogue changes individual and group consciousness (Wilson & Vidyarthi 2005), and particularly, changes the consciousness and approach in the learning and teaching process for participants and facilitators. Albeit, the outcome of these empowerment initiatives and participatory development activities are dependent on the local politics and community structure, the process will create empowered community members that contribute to the sustainable development of the community (Lyons et. al. 2001, 1249). The literature on
values formation, specifically the empowerment of individuals to empower a community, presents an alternative approach absent in many community development programs. Although, the limited research on this concept indicates the necessity to further explore its dynamics, such as the influence of gender—since the literature in primarily focused on women’s groups—and its impact on succeeding community development programs.

Cross-Sector Partnerships

The United Stated Agency for International Development’s (USAID) User’s Guide to Intersectoral Partnerships, or cross-sector partnerships for the purpose of this study, is defined as “the process of creating joint inter-organizational initiatives across two or three sectors” (Charles et. al. 1998, 2). In this working document, USAID identifies key elements of successful cross-sector partnerships. First, cross-sector partnerships must be structurally flexible and be established as a network rather than a hierarchy (Charles et. al. 1998, 14). Second, identifying appropriate leadership, ensuring participant’s desire to learn, and commitment are necessary to establishing a resilient partnership able to withstand crises (Charles et. al. 1998, 14). Third, the partnership must generate creative strategies to respond to specific problems (Charles et. al. 1998, 14). Lastly, productive outcomes that address partner goals are produced (Charles et. al. 1998, 15).

In a complementary report on cross-sector partnerships, the University of Cambridge Programme for Industry further contributes to the concept, asserting that
partnerships add value to poverty eradication by enabling resources to be directed to primary development concerns (Rein et. al. 2005, 3). It adds that cross-sector partnerships contribute a perspective that enables communities to express their needs, draws attention to urgent problems in the community, and establish connections to other resources and complementary institutions, and thus providing a means to positive social awareness and change to take place (Rein et. al. 2005, 3). Furthermore, in order for partners to assess the value of their partnership and improve future partnership activities, the United Nations Global Compact created the Partnership Assessment Tool (PAT) (United Nations Global Compact 2007). PAT provides cross-sector partnerships the ability to assess the likelihood the partnership will be sustainable and whether it will generate a significant impact (United Nations Global Compact 2007, 6).

Due to the nature of the study, it is important to also explore the dynamics of partnerships specific to communities and academia. In fact, academia can play a distinct role in supporting community development programs, specifically facilitating urban poverty and MDG initiatives through cross-sector partnerships (Tavanti & Hollinger 2006, 14). In order to establish this role, academia must recalibrate their pedagogies, curriculum, and faculty work to be conducive to pro-poor initiatives, particularly through these partnerships (Tavanti & Hollinger 2006, 14). For instance, in a contextual model for research and action by Suarez-Balcazar et. al., their framework for community-university collaborations identifies elements to developing and sustaining a mutual collaboration (Suarez-Balcazar et. al. 2005, 86):

- Developing Trust and Mutual Respect – building a reciprocal relationship by appreciating and respecting the knowledge, skills, capacities, and experiences of both partners
- Establishing Adequate Communication – articulating both community and academic expectations, goals, principles, and preferred medium of communication
- Respecting Human Diversity – respecting diversity and the culture of the setting to achieve trust, mutual respect, and communication, regardless of differences in culture
- Establishing a Culture of Learning – creating a two-way learning environment recognizes the strengths of all partners
- Respecting Culture of the Setting and the Community – adapting activities to the culture and community
- Developing an Action Agenda – an action agenda is established in collaboration with the community, thereby facilitating a shared responsibility and accountability for all involved partners (Suarez-Balcazar et al. 2005, 86)

Similarly, Afshar’s framework, which focuses on the community-university partnership for economic development, adds continuous assessment and system of accountability, and an evaluation of expected benefits to determine cost and risks of participation to a successful partnership (Afshar 2005, 14-17). The cross-sector literature highlights the importance of partnerships in community development, however, the absence of a four-sector partnership that includes academia as a partner implies an inadequacy in its analysis. In addition, the literature on community-university partnerships are primarily US based case studies, indicating the need to explore the role of academia in urban poverty reduction worldwide.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

To effectively assess the community development model of VCSR, additional research was conducted in the three main components: community entrepreneurship, values formation, and cross-sector partnerships. Using ethnographic methods, this action research used semi-structured, participatory, open interviews and observations, as well as the examination of records to gather further data on these concepts. In this chapter, the research design, sampling methods, data gathering, and the data analysis plan is discussed.

Research Design

As an action research study, the researcher chose and conducted a qualitative study using ethnographic methods. The research examined the community of Southville I, specifically the community members involved with the community entrepreneurship program SV SUDZ and the staff and volunteers involved with VCSR, based on the three components of the VCSR community development model: community entrepreneurship, values formation, and cross-sector partnerships. In order to assess its impact on individuals, families, and the community, the research used a participatory, asset-based approach to achieve this objective. This approach entailed in-depth, semi-structured, open interviews with SV SUDZ community members and VCSR staff and volunteers, as well as community observations. Two sets of interview questions were created—one for VCSR staff and volunteers, and one for SV SUDZ community members—so that both
perspectives were represented. In addition, the interview questions for each questionnaire were standardized in order to increase the comparability of responses and reduce the bias potentially caused by the interviewer.

To guide this research, the researcher followed the Appreciative Inquiry research approach, developed by Dr. David Cooperrider from Case Western Reserve University\(^2\). This research approach is a strengths-based paradigm that focuses on the organization’s assets, achievements, and potentials, rather than its problems and needs (Case Western University). As such, the research will produce individual, organizational, and community change and engagement by assessing and recognizing the individual’s contributions throughout the leadership ladder. By using this method of research, questions directed at SV SUDZ and VCSR also explored the foundational strengths of each organization and the partnership, in addition to envisioning the positive future of the organizations and partnership.

Based on this design and VCSR’s community development model, the SV SUDZ interviews consisted of standardized demographic questions, as well as twenty-six standardized open-ended and rating questions (See Appendix B). The demographic questions explored the participant’s gender, age, marital status, and number of children. In addition, the questions asked participants their position and responsibilities, if any, in SV SUDZ, and their spouse’s occupation. The open-ended questions were categorized into five sections: community-university partnership, community-based enterprise emergence, community-based enterprise organizational structure, value generation, and community development. The rating questions focused on individual and community

\(^2\) Description of research method is available at [http://appreciativeinquiry.case.edu/](http://appreciativeinquiry.case.edu/)
empowerment, representing a self-assessment of the community’s ability to initiate, organize, and manage community projects, or for this case SV SUDZ.

In contrast, the VCSR interviews were also based on the Appreciative Inquiry approach and the VCSR community development model, and included similar demographic questions, twenty-one standardized open-ended questions, and rating questions (See Appendix C). In order to gain a broader perspective of the partnership and community development in Southville I, the open-ended questions focused on three sections: community-university partnership, value generation, and community development. The same individual and community empowerment rating questions were used for these interviews.

Sampling

The sample was chosen using purposive and snowball sampling techniques for VCSR and SV SUDZ participants. The purposive method was chosen in order to identify participants who represented a broad perspective, who have made significant contributions in the emergence and establishment of the VCSR community development model, and/or who serves in the current leadership of VCSR or SV SUDZ. The snowball method was used in order to allow a self-identification process to determine the participants who represent the mentioned criteria. For VCSR, the director initiated the self-identification process by suggesting the core group members, who are Adamson faculty and staff instrumental in the conceptual development and implementation of the
VCSR community development model, as participants for this study. Following, conversation with core group members led to the recognition and participation of facilitators whose significant involvement began since VCSR’s inception. For SV SUDZ, a community leader began the self-identification process by indicating the managing board of SV SUDZ as participants of the study. Through the managing board, they identified additional active and top selling SV SUDZ community members to participate in this study. Furthermore, the researcher aimed to choose a similar representation to the current, active SV SUDZ community members, thus encouraged the identification and participation of individuals with regard to gender, age, and location.

Data Gathering

The research process began on November 28, 2009 and was completed by December 20, 2009. Adamson University faculty and staff facilitated the research process through logistical support in transportation, access to data sources, recruitment of research participants, and translation. Entrance and introduction to the community and SV SUDZ was dependent on Adamson University and VCSR. Furthermore, the researcher is a Filipino-American with basic knowledge of Tagalog (the Philippine national language) and a general understanding of Philippine culture and issues. Although this may have created a potential bias during the data gathering phase of the research, this potentially facilitated trust and openness while identifying and conducting interviews.
During the three-week time period, interviews were conducted with the identified participants. Most of the interviews conducted were on a one-on-one basis, however in some cases, participants were given the option to participate in a collective interview. Although the small groups provided comfort for some participants, the researcher was fully aware of the risk of group think. In addition, community member interviews were translated by VCSR volunteers, whose presence may have influenced responses. The average interview time was one hour.

Additional data was collected at Adamson University, which included initial community assessments, training manuals, and evaluative reports. Furthermore, throughout the research process, ethical issues were fully recognized and the principal researcher adhered to DePaul University’s Institutional Review Board research policy guidelines. This included providing interview participants’ informed consent prior to each interview and removing identifying information from data sources.

Data Analysis

Open sampling and open coding methods were used to decipher the data gathered and to provide a better understanding of the VCSR community development model. Following, the ADB Poverty Reduction Strategy indicators were used for measurement and as the theoretical framework for this comparative analysis. Thereby, this analysis produced conceptual linkages and gaps that affirm or reject theoretical components, as well as provided conceptual alternatives. In addition, this study used both an inductive
and deductive approach for its analysis. In the preliminary analysis to design the research, a deductive approach was used to address the theoretical frameworks of the concepts. Then, the researcher used an inductive approach to analyze the data gathered, identifying and coding the major themes and patterns in the data to compare to the general frameworks and theories. Finally, to ensure validity, this research used multiple perspectives from both organizations, as well as obtained data from multiple data sources.

In summary, the inherent qualities of this research are participatory, collaborative, and evaluative. As a participatory study, it provided an opportunity for *Southville I* community members and VCSR staff and volunteers to express criticism and appreciation of the community development efforts. The collaboration between the researcher, Adamson University, VCSR, and the community of *Southville I* allowed for this research to be designed as an action research study, specifically with the intention to assess and validate the components of the community development model. Lastly, as an evaluative study, the analysis will serve as recommendations for future efforts.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

This chapter reveals the results of the research conducted with SV SUDZ and VCSR. The data gathered focused on the VCSR community development model, and will be organized and juxtaposed using the ADB Poverty Reduction Strategy indicators. As indicated, the ADB Poverty Reduction Strategy is a framework designed for macro-management application to address poverty in Asian countries. However, the concepts can be reduced and applied at the micro-management level through a deductive logical process. Thus, the comparisons reveal linkages and gaps that serve as the basis for the comparative analysis.

Sample

Using purposive, snowball sampling methods, the participants in the research were identified to provide a diverse, broad representation of the community development model in Southville I. As such, there were a total of 7 SV SUDZ participants, which included 6 female community members and 1 male community member (See Appendix D), with the age ranging between 29 and 51. All 7 participants are married. All 7 participants hold a position with the managing board of SV SUDZ, and as a collective, cover the management and operations of the community business. Lastly, 6 of the 7 participants have been involved with SV SUDZ since its inception on November 2008, with the exception joining in 2007.
As for the VCSR participants in the research, there were a total of 8 staff members and volunteers (See Appendix E). This included 5 female participants and 3 male participants, with the age ranging between 24 and 59. In addition, 7 participants are married and 1 is single. All 5 core group members participated—the founding group that conceptualized the VCSR community development model and now serves as its think tank. Lastly, 7 of the 8 participants have been involved with VCSR since September 2007, with the exception joining in February 2008, and 5 of the 8 participants visit Southville I at least three times a month.

Pro-Poor Sustainable, Economic Growth & Community Entrepreneurship

ADB identifies pro-poor, sustainable economic growth as policies and programs that stimulate economic growth to benefit the long-term development and welfare of the poor (Asian Development Bank 2004, 6). Within this pillar, ADB has identified indicators for measuring and evaluating pro-poor, sustainable economic growth, which includes growth-poverty nexus, policies for labor utilizing growth, growth and private sector development, growth and infrastructure, regional cooperation to underpin growth, and environmental sustainability. VCSR’s community entrepreneurship program aims at providing skills to participating community members and to stimulate economic growth in the community, particularly through skills trainings, workshops, SV SUDZ, and its matching micro-savings program. Data of VCSR’s community entrepreneurship program—the model’s economic growth component—will be organized within the aforementioned indicators.
The first indicator of pro-poor, sustainable economic growth is the growth-poverty nexus, or the correlation between economic growth and poverty reduction. Based on interviews with VCSR staff and volunteers and SZ SUDZ community members, responses reveal a connection between VCSR’s community development model and poverty reduction. As described in a VCSR interview, “Poverty is the lack of options, and engaging (the community) is giving them options” (VCSR Interview 5). Another VCSR participant indicates the community development model’s macro implications, stating “it becomes a way for systemic change. Its focus initially was to address MDGs, but eventually focused on social responsibility, changing their attitudes and behavior, and livelihood for poverty reduction” (VCSR Interview 2). Overall, the outcomes of the model were revealed by both VCSR and SV SUDZ participants. A VCSR participant suggested the community development model led to community members “helping other families, organizing meetings, leaders working for other organizations outside Southville I, and skills that have provided fathers employment” (VCSR Interview 1). In addition, SV SUDZ community members have asserted that the income generated from SV SUDZ has improved their lifestyle and helped with health and family expenses, one stating “before my husband didn’t earn enough to cover expenses, now I can support him with paying some expenses” (SV SUDZ Interview 4).

Furthermore, responses from interviews reveal the effect of the income generated from SV SUDZ on family financial management. Based on experiences with Southville I community members, a VCSR participant explains the effect of the increased savings attributed to SZ SUDZ, stating, “instead of living on a day-to-day basis, now (community members) live on a weekly basis” (VCSR Interview 1). Another VCSR
participant asserts that the income from SV SUDZ addresses the family’s daily financial need, asserting, “(SV SUDZ) sustains their daily needs. If you need food on the table, you sell three kilos” (VCSR Interview 7). The VCSR participant further adds that “earnings from the father became the savings, since he is only paid weekly. So, SV SUDZ answers the daily needs” (VCSR Interview 7). In addition, SV SUDZ provides an opportunity to engage other members in a family, “(SV SUDZ) provides alternative, additional income, especially for unproductive members of the family… it provides lolos (grandfathers) an opportunity to generate income” (VCSR Interview 7). These outcomes have led community members to begin thinking about their futures, a VCSR participant explains, “dreaming has become one of their characteristics, dreaming for their children, realistic dreaming, they feel their dreams can come true and are attainable” (VCSR Interview 5).

The second indicator is policies for labor utilizing growth, or as indicated by ADB, refers to the cultivation of an environment for the private sector and income generating activities that favor employment and engagement for women and marginalized groups (ADB, 2004, 6). Similarly, VCSR’s community entrepreneurship program entails income generating activities, seminars, and trainings aimed at providing employable skills. This includes, but not limited to, an English proficiency program, and seminars and trainings on basic accounting, bookkeeping, entrepreneurial skills development, computer literacy, webcasting, rug making, and basket making. These seminars and trainings facilitated the income generation of SV SUDZ, and generated a community income of 273,088 pesos ($5,860) from November 2008 until May 2009. Additionally, community savings reflect an environment of income generation, with one group
reporting 128,129 pesos ($2,749) saved and another group reporting 25,715 pesos ($551) saved as of June 2009. As such, based on an assessment conducted by VCSR, 89.1% of Southville I community members participating in the VCSR community development model have rated the SV SUDZ program to be quite useful.

Growth and private sector development, the third indicator, is the cultivation of an income generating environment. As exhibited in SV SUDZ, the community business is generating community income and community savings. A VCSR participant describes its formation, stating “after six months of values formation training, the community launched SV SUDZ. We did not want to encourage competition, so we created a community business. The collective savings of the people became capital and the matching savings program became the incentive” (VCSR Interview 7). SV SUDZ cultivates an environment of entrepreneurship, as suggested by a VCSR participant, who asserts, “the difference with VCSR’s community entrepreneurship program is that the community themselves are involved, the main goal is to transform people to become social entrepreneurs, others social entrepreneurship programs focus just on livelihood” (VCSR Interview 2). Another VCSR participant claims, “now the community considers everything a market. Before they didn’t like the population increase, but now they see that as a market” (VCSR Interview 7). This entrepreneurial spirit has gone beyond SV SUDZ and into small business development, as a VCSR participant recalls, “a community member is using the profit from SV SUDZ to get into another small business. SV SUDZ gave her the confidence to venture into other businesses” (VCSR Interview 1). As a result of SV SUDZ, there are plans for “a rugs-making business, a cooperative, a pharmacy, and a sari-sari store (small grocery store)” (VCSR Interview 7).
The fourth indicator for pro-poor, sustainable economic growth is growth and infrastructure, or the development of infrastructure in a community. Integrated into the VCSR community development model is the establishment of community funds, which includes funds for mortuary benefits, health, savings, and community development—funds that contribute to the development of infrastructure and beautification projects. A VCSR participant states, “they are now deciding how to allocate the funds, and the good thing is that they are giving importance to community development programs: the certification of community, putting up lights, naming the streets, and other projects that benefit the community” (VCSR Interview 7).

The fifth indicator, regional cooperation to underpin growth, is exemplified in the replication process of the model. The pilot group for VCSR’s community development model in Southville I consisted of five blocks with twenty households per block. Plans for replication will include the pilot group, and eventually become a self-led, self-sustaining replication process. Due to the results of the pilot group, neighboring communities have been inspired to join the programs, as indicated by a VCSR participant, asserting “it started with a small group, now other groups are inspired” (VCSR Interview 5). To encourage regional cooperation, a VCSR participant explains new products will be introduced, stating “SV SUDZ will only be for Batch 1 (pilot group). In replication, new products will be used: liquid detergent, fabric softener, and laundry soap bar” (VCSR Interview 7).

Lastly, environmental sustainability is the sixth indicator. Based on general observations, waste management was an apparent and urgent dilemma in Southville I. Although, according to schedules and reports provided by VCSR, past seminars included
environmental sustainability and solid waste management, as well as community events for tree planting and other beautification projects. In addition, according to a VCSR participant, plans include “environmental awareness and additional beautification projects” (VCSR Interview 5).

Inclusive Social Development & Values Formation

Inclusive social development refers to the access to essential social services, and the increase of participation and the welfare of the poor (Asian Development Bank 2004, 8). ADB has identified indicators within this pillar for measuring and evaluating inclusive social development, which include human capital, population policy, gender and development, social capital, and social protection. VCSR’s values formation program is aimed at stimulating dialogue and reflection among community members in order to explore their spiritual and social development, as well as develop community cohesion. Data of VCSR’s values formation program—the model’s social development component—will be organized within the aforementioned indicators.

The first indicator, human capital, is demonstrated through the values formation program, the seminars, and the trainings, which have provided community members the opportunity to gain employable, marketable skills. Based on interviews with community members, numerous skills were identified as being learned or gained: sales, general business, marketing, budgeting, savings, leadership, communication, customer service, bookkeeping, collection, organization, distribution, inventory, and time management.
Notably, a SV SUDZ participant expressed “it’s never too late to be educated, earn money, or learn new skills” (SV SUDZ Interview 7).

The second indicator of inclusive social development is population policy, or for this case, activities that regulate population growth. According to VCSR schedules and reports, the data indicates past seminars and trainings included a seminar titled “Responsible Parenthood and Population Management,” a mechanism that promotes the effects of overpopulation. In an assessment conducted by VCSR, 88.7% of Southville I community members participating in the VCSR community development model have rated this seminar to be quite useful, signifying a positive impact on community members and its potential to regulate population growth in Southville I.

Gender and development, or the third indicator, measures the participation of women, commonly recognized as a marginalized group in society. Based on general observations, women are the primary participants in the VCSR community development model. This distribution is represented in the makeup of SV SUDZ participants for this research, as well as the makeup of the managing board of SV SUDZ. Furthermore, according to the SV SUDZ participant interviews, many have become “more vocal” and “expressive”. In fact, a VCSR participant notes, “women are more empowered because of the seminars through VCSR. They (women) are asserting their rights and communicating with legal services in regards to domestic violence” (VCSR Interview 1). Another VCSR participant asserts women’s leadership in the program, stating “in the health feeding program, we link the sponsor to the food requirements, and then train mothers to cook for themselves. The mothers would say they own the program” (VCSR Interview 7). Women’s participation in the community development efforts is evident, as described by
a VCSR participant, who asserts there are “mothers who consistently attend the training programs, mothers who volunteer to teach children, Mothers who come here to attend seminars” (VCSR Interview 5).

The fourth indicator of inclusive social development is social capital, which according to the ADB, is needed to “reverse perceptions of social and psychological inferiority and to foster a sense of empowerment” (Asian Development Bank 2004, 9). Comparatively, resettlement communities experience these inferiorities, and values formation “reverses these perceptions” and fosters empowerment:

“Values Formation is important because it is the character. It’s what makes a person… The community has its former mindsets. They didn’t live as a group, so they need to be formed as one… Values Formation will make them appreciate their past. They have a treasure, it’s their past. No one will appreciate their past unless you process that and realize they have become very strong because of their past… Their values existed prior, but they didn’t accept it because they were treated as trash of society… Now you let them see what they have is something good. You talk with the leaders and tell them “all your life you’ve been fighting and you’re actually heroes,” but they haven’t seen that. Affirm the goodness of what they have done, which no one would like to affirm because it is a mechanism of control” (VCSR Interview 5).

Another VCSR participant suggests this empowerment and transformation increases confidence, stating “a community member was at first hesitant to assume the role of general manager. He felt inferior due to his lack of education, but after some projects and the encouragement from the community, he was confident to take the position” (VCSR Interview 2). In addition, trust develops, as suggested by a VCSR participant, “the program changes their frame of mind, develops their spirit, develops their confidence, and develops trust in other people. They become trustworthy themselves, so livelihood programs become effective” (VCSR Interview 7). Several VCSR interviews reiterate this transformation:
“Prior to the values formation, they were disorganized, they did not trust their leaders, they were not cooperative, they did not trust schools, they didn’t trust people, they were beaten about their situation, they hated the government, they didn’t have jobs, their children were malnourished, and there were no community projects. Now, they can speak about their welfare, they can deal with local government, they developed self confidence, they developed a sense of community, and they see hope in improving their economic situation” (VCSR Interview 7).

“Before they didn’t know their neighbors, now the community has become closer with each other. They are more religious, more concerned with other members of community, and they care for each other… They had a transformation with their perspective on partnership—a trust and belief that some people still care, and that some institutions are honest with their intention to help the community” (VCSR Interview 2).

A SV SUDZ participant also adds, “We came from different communities and relocation sites, with different values and attitudes. Now, we are organized, and we have changed our attitudes” (SV SUDZ Interview 6). As a result of this transformation, concern for others and community cohesion has developed, “by changing the attitudes of the people, there is a concern for everyone. If a family has nothing to eat, others will contribute to help the family” (VCSR Interview 1). Moreover, networking skills and social capital develops, as reflected by numerous VCSR and SV SUDZ participants, one stating “they go to other blocks and other provinces to network with nonmembers to sell the product. They network with other organizations, and initiate these new relationships” (VCSR Interview 2). Although, as indicated by a VCSR participant, the transformation must precede the community development efforts, asserting, “There are no good projects unless you develop and transform the person first. The community members were exposed to injustices, and experienced a lack of trust in others and themselves. Values formation changes the concept of who they are and who god is, and projects can only be implemented once the people are ready to do it. The main implementers must be the community members” (VCSR Interview 7).
When asked what the community members have gained and learned from values formation, the responses were diverse and plentiful. Overwhelmingly, many SV SUDZ participants identified social skills as an outcome. For instance, one stated, “before I didn’t talk, now I’m sociable with members” (SV SUDZ Interview 3), and another member shared similar views, “before I was a homebody, now I roam around the neighborhood to sell SV SUDZ” (SV SUDZ Interview 5). Some indicated they gained a sense of community, stating, “we gained better relationships with neighbors” (SV SUDZ Interview 1), “we help each other sell, and if we need to, we borrow the product to help one another” (SV SUDZ Interview 1), “relationships are more important now” (SV SUDZ Interview 5), and “before everyone was less concerned for one another, now we are concerned” (SV SUDZ Interview 3). Other SV SUDZ participants suggested they gained confidence from values formation, asserting, “before I had no income, now that I have more income it has improved my confidence” (SV SUDZ Interview 6), “before I didn’t believe that I can help others—I’m poor—now I share my knowledge, and I am fulfilled” (SV SUDZ Interview 3), and “before I lacked self-confidence, now I am communicating with international guests (referring to the researcher)” (SV SUDZ Interview 4). In addition, many SV SUDZ participants shared other similar responses, including friends, hope, tolerance, patience, and bonding. Notably, an assessment conducted by VCSR determined that 87.1% of Southville I community members participating in the VCSR community development model felt the implementation and process of values formation to be quite useful.

The final indicator of inclusive social development is social protection, which according to the ADB, refers to “programs designed to assist individuals, households, and
communities to manage risks better and to ensure economic security” (Asian Development Bank 2004, 9). In order to provide Southville I community members a financial safety-net and social protection, a community savings fund was established. Albeit, there is a lack of written information regarding the community savings fund, conversations with VCSR participants indicate the fund supports the financial security of the community.

Good Governance & Cross-Sector Partnerships

Good governance is the effective management of economic growth and social development programs. ADB has identified indicators within this pillar to measure and evaluate good governance, which include public sector reform, corporate governance, mainstreaming good governance, and partnerships with civil society. The VCSR community development model incorporates multi-fold cross-sector partnerships into its approach, which includes Academia, People’s Organizations, civil society, and government institutions. Data of VCSR’s cross-sector partnership approach—the model’s good governance component—will be organized within the aforementioned indicators.

The first indicator is public sector reform, which is reflected in the impact of the partnership and the sense of security that follows. Upon the arrival of the relocated community members, challenges with local government effected the development of Southville I, as stated by a VCSR participant, “the problem was that before there was no infrastructure, the local government was not cooperative, and relocated community
members were being discriminated against by natives of Cabuyao because the perception of relocatees were that they were criminals. VCSR helped establish the line of communication between Southville I and the local government that supported the development” (VCSR Interview 1). The partnership between VCSR and Southville I also provided a sense of security, one VCSR participant asserts, “The livelihood and community engagement did more than what people think; it changed the perspective of relocates. Now they feel very important, and developed a sense of security from political corruption for all relocation sites because the federation is housed at Adamson” (VCSR Interview 5). The federation, more specifically, the Homeowners Federation of Northville and Southville Incorporated (HFNSI) is an association of communities from the resettlement sites in Northville and Southville. The goals of HFNSI are to coordinate with government and NGOs, provide programs that respond to community needs, and elect a representative in the local and national government (Homeowners Federation of Northville and Southville Incorporated). As such, HFNSI serves as the voice of the resettlement communities with long-term plans to oversee the operations of the community development program, as stated by a VCSR participant, “we are currently facilitating the federation of the different relocation areas, but once the federation becomes functional, the federation will run the programs and projects. Right now the federation is solely political” (VCSR Interview 2). Another VCSR participant envisions a politically active Southville I, “I want Southville I to become a barangay (ward) so that they can access funds and elect their own leaders. I want them to have a political seat to lobby their own issues directly” (VCSR Interview 5). Lastly, VCSR has also supported
Southville I to create their own patrol system, and provided seminars on first aid and emergency safety measures due to the lack of public safety and emergency care.

The second indicator, or corporate governance, is exhibited in the partnership between Adamson University and corporations. For instance, as an academic institution, Adamson University’s network of alumni provides connections to numerous corporations. In fact, an alumnus associated with a soap manufacturer connected Adamson University with the corporation, and became the supplier of the soap for SV SUDZ. As “class C” quality soap, the corporation is able to donate the soap, which is then repackaged at Adamson University and distributed and sold through SV SUDZ. Long-term plans include attaining the required machinery for soap manufacturing, which will enable SV SUDZ to be the direct manufacturer, supplier, and seller.

The third indicator of good governance is mainstreaming good governance, or for this case, promoting the importance and sustainability of good governance within the community structure. Illustrating the importance of good governance in partnerships and development, a VCSR participant asserts, “A very important aspect of the partnership is good governance. Institutional conversion must happen first before the partnership—conversion within system in terms of systemic change. Social development comes with good governance when systems are in place” (VCSR Interview 5). Moreover, social responsibility encourages good governance, as a VCSR participant describes, “people now care about their own community. Community development is the responsibility of the community, not just the government” (VCSR Interview 7). This community responsibility, or community-led development, is described by a VCSR participant, “community-led process is the process to empower people. It is the democratic space that
you give to allow them to live and think; a process that could bridge the rich and poor; a process that allows the faculty and community to see each other as equals” (VCSR Interview 5). This process develops community leaders and promotes good governance, as stated by a VCSR participant, “forming good leaders that will train others; leaders who can speak on behalf of community” (VCSR Interview 5). The development of good leaders who practice good governance is exemplified in the implementation of the VCSR community development model, “during the implementation of the program, the activities involved the community leaders. They organized the community and implemented the plans. After evaluating the impact of programs through the community-based monitoring system (CBMS), we saw a change in the number of participants. The totality of the success can be measured based on the changed mindsets… they learned to trust more” (VCSR Interview 2).

Lastly, the fourth indicator is partnerships with civil society—an inherent characteristic of the VCSR community development model. The VCSR cross-sector partnership approach promotes mutually-beneficial relationships between academia, People’s Organizations, civil society, and government institutions. As such, the role of Adamson University becomes advantageous, as suggested by a VCSR participant, “academia can be a tool for social development. Before academia was a tool for individual and personal development. Now academia, especially in poor countries, is the tool for progress, not business. It’s a change and a shift” (VCSR Interview 5). Another VCSR participant describes academia’s importance based on prior experiences:

“My prior experiences with giving donation were not effective. For community development to be effective, you must engage the community. A project is sustainable when the community is involved. The “Touch and Gos” just leave
after giving. People then become dependent and consume, and after consumption, nothing has changed. “Touch and Go” has no measurable impact. When academia is involved there is a continuous flow of development. It can be slow, but there is a definite direction” (VCSR Interview 7).

However, it is also important to recognize the knowledge inherent in communities, as indicated by a VCSR participant, “community development should be community-based. Because this is a university, we assume we know everything. The poor know how to solve their own problems better than us. They know their own solution; they just don’t have the tools to do it” (VCSR Interview 5). Thereby, the university can be the link between the tools and technology, and community development, as stated by a VCSR participant, “the technical knowledge for community and human development is in the university. It’s a good source for students to help, faculty to teach” (VCSR Interview 7).

For Adamson University, VCSR is an extension of their mission and their identity, as stated by a VCSR participant, “Adamson is an institution and it is not meant for itself, but its growth depends on the other. I want the university to discover who it is by helping others” (VCSR Interview 5). Although, it is important to note that many VCSR participants indicated that community extension is part of the accreditation process for Philippines universities, in addition to research and instruction. Nevertheless, the community-university partnership also provides university benefits, as suggested by a VCSR participant, “we also learn. When we engage in community development, we learn from community members. It also gives the university an opportunity to work on its mission” (VCSR Interview 2). Another VCSR participant asserted, “The community has become the other school, or the “shadow school”. Our professors, teachers, and guests are learning from the poor. That is empowering. The community becomes proud to be Filipino” (VCSR Interview 5). Furthermore, community members begin to trust
partnerships, as one SV SUDZ participant asserts, “They (VCSR) won’t leave us; they continue to help us through livelihood” (SV SUDZ Interview 6).

In addition to the community-university partnership, the community development model includes other NGOs. Caritas provides trainings on webcasting and a workshop on English proficiency. Hope for the World-Philippine Children’s Center and World of Hope USA sponsor several projects, including a daycare project, child sponsorship, college sponsorship, medical and dental missions, and a feeding project. An additional educational sponsorship is sponsored by the Bayani Ka Ng Sambayanan Foundation. Lastly, Nourish the Children also supports the VCSR feeding program.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results of the study suggest an innovative shift in addressing community development in resettlement communities. Particularly, the results describe a community development model facilitating the economic growth, social development, and good governance of a community. In a comparative analysis of the two frameworks, the findings reveal linkages that legitimize the VCSR community development model, gaps that assert recommendations for future application, and significant findings that suggest conceptual alternatives. This chapter will discuss the findings of this analysis, and introduce a combined model representing the significant themes of the study. Moreover, limitations of the study will be identified, in addition to recommendations for future research and application.

Challenging the welfare of resettlement communities are core deficiencies that stifle the community development efforts. More specifically, the current literature on urban upgrading and resettlement, as well as the data gathered from VCSR and Southville I, confirm the community’s psychological, social, and economic deficiencies that resulted from displacement and urban poverty. Upon arrival to Southville I, many resettled community members expressed their low self-esteem and inability to communicate effectively, resulting in a lack of confidence, insecurity, and timidity that deterred social contact with other community members—a psychological deficiency. Community members also conveyed a lack of trust with other community members, NGOs, and government, a social deficiency that challenged community cohesion and effective development. Furthermore, the lack of income and opportunities for income generation
reflected an economic deficiency that threatened their ability to sustain daily needs, further endangering the welfare of community members.

These distinctions attest to the ineffectiveness of the relocation and resettlement process. However, as indicated in the results of this study, the deficiencies that previously existed were addressed through the VCSR community development model. For instance, the ADB asserts a growth-poverty nexus to achieve pro-poor, sustainable economic growth. Through the VCSR community entrepreneurship program, community income and savings were generated, establishing a livelihood that sustains daily needs and produces savings as a financial safety-net. This program is encouraging better financial management, inspiring community member engagement, and planning for community development projects and other business opportunities. Moreover, as asserted in current literature, SV SUDZ is achieving a multiplicity of goals and aligning with the community structure and identity. Thus, these linkages establish the nexus between economic growth and poverty reduction. Additional linkages were affirmed with the ADB indicators of policies for labor utilizing growth, and growth and private sector development. The results discuss a significant increase in human capital, which was facilitated through the trainings and seminars that provide community members employable, marketable skills; therefore, the cultivation of an able workforce and labor utilizing growth. As for private sector development, the success of SV SUDZ is fostering an entrepreneurial environment, and thereby encouraging business expansion and development. In addition, the ADB indicators of growth and infrastructure and regional cooperation to underpin growth are linked to elements of the VCSR model. The community funds for infrastructure and beatification projects, and the non-competitive replication process that
inspires and encourages regional cooperation, confirm these indicators. Although, based on general observations, the apparent inadequacy of waste management in the community challenges the effectiveness of previous environmental efforts. Therefore, the environmental sustainability indicator remains a gap in the VCSR model and a recommendation for future application.

Additionally, the VCSR values formation program produces linkages and gaps to the ADB pillar of inclusive social development. Human capital, for example, is reflected in the numerous trainings and seminars that are providing community members business, trade, and life skills valuable to the growth of the community and SV SUDZ—implying a linkage to the ADB indicator. Linkages are also present with the gender and development and social capital ADB indicators. As disclosed by several women SV SUDZ participants and VCSR participants, the participation of women is evident throughout the VCSR programs. Women have become more vocal and expressive, leading to the development of women leaders in the community. Moreover, the income contribution by SV SUDZ women to the household income is supporting daily expenses, increasing family savings, and decreasing domestic violence—a testament of gender and development in the VCSR community development model. The linkages between social capital and values formation are clear and plentiful. As discussed in current literature and the results of the study, the individual empowerment through the values formation program has led to an increase in confidence, concern for others, and the development of trust in people, organizations, and government. The outcome are community members networking and selling within and outside the community; a strong indication of social capital in the community. However, the linkage between the VCSR community development model
and the ADB indicator of population policy is uncertain. A seminar on population management addressed the effects of overpopulation in the community. Although, since religion guides the work of VCSR and has a strong presence in the community, the contradicting values of religion can potentially influence the seminar’s effectiveness. Lastly, the linkage between social protection and the VCSR community development model is minimal. The community savings fund established a financial safety-net for the community; however, this provides limited protection to manage the risks that may threaten vulnerable populations within Southville I.

Linkages and gaps are also present in the ADB pillar of good governance and the VCSR component of cross-sector partnerships. For instance, the ADB indicator of public sector reform is reflected in the empowerment of the community. The coalition of the HFNSI empowers resettlement communities in Northville and Southville, and enables these communities to assert and lobby their rights to affect national policy, thus affirming public sector reform and accountability. Furthermore, the facilitation and presence of VCSR is increasing community communication with local government, thereby allowing Southville I to assert their local rights and encourage government accountability. The ADB corporate governance indicator is affirmed due to the engagement of Adamson University alumni. Through the alumni network, Adamson University is able to leverage the affinity of alumni and engage corporations in community development. As such, a mutual-beneficial relationship is established, providing opportunities for corporations to act on their corporate social responsibility, in addition to generating resources for community development. Another indication of good governance is apparent in the mainstreaming of good governance, an ADB indicator, in the community. Through the
VCSR community development model, community members gain a sense of social responsibility, which has led to active civic participation and the development of community leaders. The increase in community engagement and vocal participation maintains good governance throughout the community, and further promotes equity, safety, and security. The last ADB indicator, partnerships with civil society, is evident in the community-university partnership. As a mutually-beneficial partnership, the university is able to actualize their mission and provide faculty, staff, and students an alternative learning environment. In contrast, the community benefits through the university knowledge, technologies, and resources, including partnerships with other NGOs.

The overwhelming linkages of the VCSR community development model and the ADB Poverty Reduction Strategy validate the effectiveness of the VCSR model. As an innovative shift in urban poverty reduction, this study also produces significant findings, relative to the juxtaposition of the ADB pillars and VCSR components, which represent conceptual alternatives to the ADB Poverty Reduction Strategy. First, a significant theme from the juxtaposition of pro-poor, sustainable economic growth and community entrepreneurship reveals a community with dual identities—the community as the entrepreneur and the community as the public servant. Second, by juxtaposing inclusive social development and values formation, the individual, family, and community transformation emerges as a significant finding. Lastly, the university as the facilitator is the significant theme produced by juxtaposing good governance and cross-sector partnerships.
In the figure below, a combined model is presented that represents the relationship and process of these significant findings. The illustration depicts a time-order relationship, identifying the individual, family, community transformation as the initial component of the process. Facilitating the process is the university, which simultaneously and equally strengthens and mobilizes the community to assume its dual identities, as the entrepreneur and the public servant. Once established, the community acts as both identities to facilitate, operate, and manage the reduction of urban poverty in the community. Notably, the reduction of urban poverty occurs throughout the process.

Figure 5: A Combined Model- VCSR & ADB
Pro-poor, Sustainable Economic Growth & Community Entrepreneurship

Through the juxtaposition of pro-poor, sustainable economic growth and community entrepreneurship, a major theme that emerges is the community with dual identities—the community as the entrepreneur and the community as the public servant. This implies the community as a pro-active entity that assumes both roles to compensate and improve the deficiencies challenging their development. As such, the concept of community shifts from being that of a location and aggregate of people, services, and culture to a unit working collectively to achieve a common good. Based on this concept of community, these identities encourage underdeveloped communities to adopt an alternate community structure, one that requires community participation, collective responsibility, and collective governance.

The community as the entrepreneur is exemplified in the case study of *Southville I*. As discussed, the relocated community members were displaced from former jobs and livelihood due to the relocation process. Through the VCSR community entrepreneurship program, the community-based enterprise SV SUDZ established an economic livelihood that provides a collective income for individuals and families within the community, therefore contributing to the community’s economic growth. As a community business, SV SUDZ becomes a collective responsibility for community members to manage and operate the business, a responsibility that is incentivized through the potential of their collective earnings. Therefore, the community becomes an entity responsible for their own economic livelihood. As indicated by several SV SUDZ participants, the reliance on the income to sustain daily needs, pay for medical expenses, and improve their quality of
life encourages community engagement and the successful operation of SV SUDZ. Moreover, the VCSR community development model reduced competition and promoted the accountability of fellow community members, in addition to encouraging the collective benefits rather than individual gains. Thereby, through this process, it established a cohesive business model that encompasses the characteristics of resiliency and sustainability.

Likewise, the case study also illustrates the community as the public servant. For instance, relocated community members experienced a lack of economic livelihood, infrastructure, social services, health, and education. Through the VCSR community development model, a portion of the collective income from SZ SUDZ is allocated to community funds. Thus, the establishment and maintenance of the community funds serve as self-sustaining funding for community development. As shareholders of the community funds, the community becomes the decision-making body to enact the community development projects. More importantly, as a decision-making body generating their own funding, the community regains control of their own priorities and agenda for community development, and further decreases dependence on external aid and/or the possibility for political exploitation. As exemplified in Southville I, the community may also serve as the workforce to provide the social services (cooks for the feeding program, barangay patrol), education (teachers for the children’s daycare), and infrastructure (carpenters for the infrastructure and beautification projects).
Inclusive Social Development & Values Formation

The juxtaposition of inclusive social development and values formation revealed individual, family, and community transformation as a major theme. Due to displacement and challenges of urban poverty, relocatees experience psychological deficiencies that effect their attitudes and behaviors, and often result in low self-confidence. This is indicated in the current literature and interviews with VCSR and SV SUDZ participants, and thus empowering the individual is suggested as an essential element to successful community development projects. Furthermore, this implies a time-order relationship in the transformation process of a community, a sequential order of empowering the individual, the family, then the community. Through this sequential transformation process, a community is built one level at a time, cultivating an environment for community development, and establishing a strong foundation to build a sustainable community.

This concept is demonstrated in the case study of Southville I. As the impetus of the community transformation process, the values formation program first addresses the psychological deficiencies affecting the individual. As indicated by SV SUDZ participants, relocated community members arrived to Southville I with low self-confidence, lack of communication skills, distrust with other community members, NGOs, and local government, and emotionally distraught. Through dialogue and self-reflection, individual empowerment and group cohesion began to form. These individual attitude and behavior changes, or general life skills, were transferred into the households, thereby altering family relationships. This produced improved relationships with spouses,
improved parenting, and engaged “unproductive” family members in community activities, as indicated in the VCSR and SV SUDZ interviews. The increased engagement, cohesion, and communication led to a community transformation—the formation of inclusive social development. The sequential transformation process became an asset-based approach; the rediscovery of individual, family, and community assets that are fostering the development of community capital.

Good Governance & Cross-Sector Partnerships

A major theme that emerges through the juxtaposition of good governance and cross-sector partnerships is the university as the facilitator. The role of academia is evolving, and the university’s extensive assets are a valuable resource for the field of community development. As an institution of knowledge, inquiry, technology, and resources, the university has shown to be an effective facilitator in connecting the various sectors of society. Specifically, its connections to corporations, government institutions, civil society, and communities translate into an ideal position to serve as the facilitator to establish, connect, and secure cross-sector partnerships for community development. This implies that the university encompasses a vested interest in community development and integrates an academic culture that encourages community outreach. Although, as indicated by VCSR participants, the role of the university as the facilitator in cross-sector partnerships generates advantages and benefits for the partners involved, and more importantly, it contributes to an inclusive society.
The concept of the university as the facilitator is represented in the case study of Southville I. For instance, due to Adamson University’s mission, culture of community outreach, and the Philippine university accreditation standards, the university is engaged and committed to community development. From the community’s perspective, Southville I developed distrust with the government and NGOs due to their unmet needs and failed programs, thereby creating a reluctance to form partnerships with organizations. However, Adamson University and VCSR represented an alternative. Their shared religious values, consistency, reputation of knowledge, and objectivity supported and developed the trust and partnership with the community. Thus, this position has attracted government institutions and NGOs to develop a partnership with the university and provide services to the community through the facilitation of VCSR. Moreover, the university’s assets and resources support and complement the services of the government and NGOs, which decreases any threat to their reputation or services. Additionally, as an academic institution, Adamson University’s alumni are natural partners that enable the connection between the university and corporations nationally and internationally. These partnerships provide the university resources and funding, and opportunities for corporations to engage in their corporate social responsibility. As such, this platform has established Adamson University and VCSR as the facilitator, connecting the sectors of society to community development and creating mutually-beneficial partnerships. Inherent through this platform is accountability and transparency, and therefore, fosters an environment of good governance.
Thesis Overview

This thesis has explored the context of urban poverty in the Philippines, particularly the challenges of resettlement communities. Using the case study of Southville I as the contextual foundation for this thesis, the VCSR community development model was examined and suggested as a strategy to address urban poverty in resettlement communities. Through the juxtaposition of the VCSR community development model and the ADB Poverty Reduction Strategy, a comparative analysis produced linkages that legitimized the VCSR model, gaps that serve as recommendations for future application, and significant findings that suggest conceptual alternatives. The study’s major findings reveal the community with dual identities, as the entrepreneur and the public servant, which contributes to a community’s economic growth. In addition, through the individual, family, and community transformation, specifically the sequential transformation process, communities are promoting inclusive social development. Lastly, the concept of the university as the facilitator is establishing, connecting, and securing cross-sector partnerships for community development, and further encouraging good governance in communities.

Limitations & Directions for Future Research

Albeit, a goal of this research is to suggest the VCSR community development model as a strategy for urban poverty reduction in resettlement communities, however, it is important to note that this study was limited to one case study. To further validate and
legitimize the VCSR community development model, it is necessary to conduct further research to assess the models impact on other resettlement communities. The data was also limited to the pilot group in Southville I, and the author recognizes the challenges and successes are specific to this group only. Thus, research must be conducted in other replication sites in Southville. Furthermore, it is important to note that each community possesses its own culture, own motivations, and face its own circumstances. Therefore, application of this model must recognize and incorporate these community identities into the model’s implementation.

In addition, this research was conducted a little over a year since the model’s inception in Southville I, and during this time, VCSR lacked extensive formal data that measured and evaluated its impact. As a result, it is essential for future research to conduct and assess the quantitative impact of this model on resettlement communities. Additionally, it is suggested to create and incorporate a measurement and evaluation system to track the progress of the programs and support future research. Finally, an exit strategy for VCSR was not incorporated into the model. In order for the model to be sustainable and replicable, an exit strategy must be developed. A strategy was informally and briefly mentioned and presumed; however, at the time of this research, an exit strategy had not been formalized.
Conclusion

Crucial to the reduction of urban poverty is the learning, understanding, and dissemination of good practices throughout the urban world. The community of Southville I, VCSR, and the VCSR community development model represents this good practice, but more importantly, symbolizes the potential of change, commitment, and solidarity. Through this thesis, the dissemination of the lessons drawn from this research will contribute to a framework for understanding urban poverty in resettlement communities. However, in order to learn how we approach the complexities of urban poverty, we must begin with learning from the communities we aim to help. As we begin to question our role, our communities are asking the same question: where do we go from here? As such, a VCSR participant reminds us that “the poor know how to solve their own problems better than us. They know their own solution; they just don’t have the tools to do it.”
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APPENDIX A: Map of the Philippines
# Community-University Partnership

1. When did you join SV SUDZ? Why?

2. What were your expectations of SV SUDZ? What were your expectations working with VCSR?

3. What are some examples when the partnership between SV SUDZ and VCSR was successful?
4. What future goals do you have for the partnership between SV SUDZ and VCSR?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community-Based Enterprise Emergence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Prior to SV SUDZ, what was your occupation/job? What skills did you have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What did you contribute to the creation of SV SUDZ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What was your initial impression of SV SUDZ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Enterprise Organizational Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> What have you learned from working with SV SUDZ? What skills have you gained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> How has working with SV SUDZ improved your relationships with your family? Neighbors? Other members of SV SUDZ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> What are the strengths and benefits of SV SUDZ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> What are the strengths of your block that make SV SUDZ successful?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. How do you want SV SUDZ to grow/expand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. How has SV SUDZ and the partnership with VCSR improved your Community? How has it changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How has SV SUDZ and the partnership with VCSR improved your family? How has it changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How has SV SUDZ and the partnership with VCSR improved your lifestyle? Has it changed your personal beliefs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Why is the VCSR values formation important?

Community Development

17. How has SV SUDZ contributed to the community development of Southville I?

18. What are some examples of the impact SV SUDZ has had on Southville I?

19. What new initiatives/ideas do you have to improve SV SUDZ? Southville I?
### Community Empowerment

**Impact of SV SUDZ:**

1. Self Confidence Among Community Members
   - Very Low  Low  Average  High  Very High

   Example:

2. Ability of the Community Members to Organize Itself
   - Very Low  Low  Average  High  Very High

   Example:

3. Residents Ability to Understand and Reflect About the Reality of the Environment in Which the Community is Living
   - Very Low  Low  Average  High  Very High

   Example:

4. Ability of the Community to Set Goals for the Future
   - Very Low  Low  Average  High  Very High

   Example:

5. Ability of the Community to Develop Plans
   - Very Low  Low  Average  High  Very High

   Example:

6. Ability of the Community to Put Its Plans Into Practice
   - Very Low  Low  Average  High  Very High

   Example:

7. Ability to Build Networks
   - Very Low  Low  Average  High  Very High

   Example:
### APPENDIX C: VCSR Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Role in VCSR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>Duties/Responsibilities in VCSR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Community-University Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How long have you volunteered/worked for VCSR? How often do you volunteer/work with Southville I?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. What is your personal motivation for being involved in VCSR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. What is your understanding of VCSR’s model of community development? How is it different from other forms of community development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How has VCSR contributed to the community development of Southville I?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. What are some examples of the impact VCSR has had on Southville I?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What new initiative/ideas do you have to improve SV SUDZ? Southville I?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Empowerment

Impact of SV SUDZ:

8. Self Confidence Among Community Members
   
   Very Low    Low    Average    High    Very High

Example:

9. Ability of the Community Members to Organize Itself

   Very Low    Low    Average    High    Very High

Example:

10. Residents Ability to Understand and Reflect About the Reality of the Environment in Which the Community is Living

   Very Low    Low    Average    High    Very High

Example:

11. Ability of the Community to Set Goals for the Future

   Very Low    Low    Average    High    Very High

Example:

12. Ability of the Community to Develop Plans

   Very Low    Low    Average    High    Very High

Example:

13. Ability of the Community to Put Its Plans Into Practice

   Very Low    Low    Average    High    Very High

Example:

14. Ability to Build Networks

   Very Low    Low    Average    High    Very High

Example:
APPENDIX D: SV SUDZ Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Relation to SV SUDZ</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SV SUDZ Participant 1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>12/03/2009 10:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV SUDZ Participant 2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>12/03/2009 10:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV SUDZ Participant 3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>12/03/2009 1:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV SUDZ Participant 4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>12/03/2009 1:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV SUDZ Participant 5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>12/03/2009 1:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV SUDZ Participant 6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>12/5/2009 9:30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV SUDZ Participant 7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>12/5/2009 11:00am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E: VCSR Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Relation to VCSR</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VCSR Participant 1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Facilitator, Core Group Member</td>
<td>12/10/2009 10:30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCSR Participant 2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Core Group Member</td>
<td>12/10/2009 11:30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCSR Participant 3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>12/10/2009 1:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCSR Participant 4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>12/10/2009 1:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCSR Participant 5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Staff, Core Group Member</td>
<td>12/10/2009 3:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCSR Participant 6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>12/10/2009 4:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCSR Participant 7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Core Group Member</td>
<td>12/11/2009 1:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCSR Participant 8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Facilitator, Core Group Member</td>
<td>12/11/2009 2:30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>