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Annex I
*Un movement social?* is the question posed by French sociologist Alain Touraine in the conclusion of his study of the 1976 student uprisings in France (Touraine, 1978, p. 359). But, as Touraine notes, the answer to this question is more likely to be determined by the analyst’s interpretation of a social movement than by the ideology, the events, or the organizations under observation. The crux of the research question is therefore one of interpretation: ask one hundred sociologists, "*How do you define a social movement?*", you would no doubt receive one hundred and one different responses. In referring to these differences, Patrick Develtere describes the competing paradigms which dominate this theoretical field a "*babylonic debate*" (Develtere, 1994, p. 21).

A social movement is not a monolithic structure and its identity not easily grasped. Social movements can be complex and fragmented, with a variety of factors and actors influencing their direction and shape. It is no doubt this nebulosity that has led to such a disparity of theory and methodology surrounding the study of social movements. For the student of the social movement, the disparity between these approaches seems perplexing at first, and the theories behind them even more contradictory.
There has often been a form of dualistic thinking when it comes to the study of social movements. Earlier sociologists have stressed the powerful forces driving society, for example, the laws of economic production and exchange. Social movements are formed as a result of and in response to the changes brought about by these forces. However, in recent years, sociologists have tended to focus more on the importance of actors' beliefs, intentions and cultural environment (Melucci, 1989, p. 197).

The methodological approaches to the study of social movements have varied as well. Sociologists have either concentrated on the ideologies of social movements or have focused on the relationship between the place of actors in the social structure and their patterns of belief and action. Using empirical data, this second group has attempted to explain the link between the structural and behavioural variables of collective action (Melucci, p. 198).

However, the different approaches to the study of social movements have generally focused on three different components or axis: ideology (vision), praxis (action) and organization (Develtere, 1993, p. 182). The ideology determines the mission of the movement: the image of the desirable society. The production of this vision takes place via some form of organizational structure and the demonstration of an alternative (praxis). All three forces (vision, organization, praxis) interact continuously, although at times, one may
dominate. When all three components are not acting coherently, movements loose strength, cohesion and legitimacy (Develtere, 1994, p. 23).

And yet, our preoccupation in this study is not with social movements *per se*, but with the cooperative "movement". Cooperatives have often been viewed as instruments of social change: the perception that cooperatives and their apex organizations form some type of collective "movement" is an indicator of the image held by the general public, not only of their cohesiveness but also of their role as transformer. This is by no means to suggest that the public image is the correct one. Nevertheless, throughout their history many scholars and cooperators, from both inside and outside the "movement", have regarded cooperatives not only as a collective response to the changes of the industrial age, but also as a means to further transforming a value system with its origins rooted in independence and personal interest (Smelser, 1959, p. 247). It is in this sense that the cooperative "movement" appears to offer an alternative value system, one based upon equality, equity and self-help (Craig, 1980, p.3).

Is the term "cooperative movement" a misnomer? Do cooperative enterprises act collectively and purposively to achieve common goals? Or is the use of economic participation afforded by cooperative enterprises a means to another objective? The disabled community uses cooperative housing to create integrated living opportunities for people with disabilities. The
environmental movement uses cooperative enterprises to promote issues and distribute environmentally safe products. The women’s movement creates leadership opportunities for women via cooperative organizations. If the cooperative “movement” actually exists as an independent entity, what are its goals? How does it organize? In what type of action does it engage?

**Objective**

The goal of this study is to create an analytical framework from which we can examine the present-day cooperative housing sector in Toronto. It is necessary to focus on one sector of the cooperative “movement” in order to make the study manageable. The cooperative housing sector is one of the most extensive and active in Canada.

The essay will open with an overview of the three central schools of social movement thought: collective action (structural functionalist), resource mobilization (strategy) and identity-orientation.

There follows an examination of each of these schools’ treatment of the three components of a social movement: ideology, organization, praxis. The findings will be coordinated into an analytical framework through which we will examine the cooperative housing sector in Toronto. Original research conducted on three housing cooperatives in Toronto will form part of the study.
Does the cooperative housing sector have a cohesive ideology, and if so, what is its mission? How is that vision produced? How does the cooperative housing "movement" mobilize its members and who are those members? What organizations are involved? What type of action do they engage in? Who are the central actors? At what level does the conflict exist? Do individual cooperatives form a cohesive social movement or are they a medium through which members of other social movements take action? Is the cooperative housing sector a movement in its own right or is it simply an appendage of another movement? And finally, is cooperative housing a means or an end? These are some of the questions that we hope to explore in this paper.

Our task is not to develop a new theory more suited to the housing cooperative example, nor is it to prove or disprove any particular hypothesis with regards to the cooperative movement. It is simply to observe and to reexamine cooperative ideology, organization and action (within the cooperative housing sector in Toronto) using these new examination tools afforded us by these different social movement models. And it is our expectation that they will help shed some light upon the nature of the cooperative housing movement and its evolution.
Collective Action/Structural Functionalism

Many researchers of social movements today have all but rejected the "collective action" or "structural-functionalist" theories of the 1950's and sixties. Indeed, several studies conducted during the late 1960's and early seventies appeared to disprove many of the central tenants of this school of thought. (McCarthy and Zald, 1977, p. 1214) The emergence of massive social movements in the United States and Europe during the sixties and seventies only served to further illuminate the inadequacies of this approach. And yet, certain elements of this explanation of societal conflict and change ring true, not just for the present day observer, but also for the historian or student of the social sciences.

Emile Durkheim popularized "breakdown" (Tilly, 1975, p.4) theories of social response in the early 1950's in his famous work, Suicide. According to Durkheim, during periods of tension and upheaval, collective action becomes a means of responding to the process of breakdown in society. Far-reaching structural rearrangements such as urbanization or industrialization are a source of much strain on the norms and controls that govern individual and social behaviour. A state of "deregulation" ensues as the chasm between aspirations and fulfillment widens, and feelings of uncertainty and dissatisfaction predominate. (Tilly, 1975, p.4). Thus, discontent, as a result of structural discontinuity, is a necessary, if not sufficient condition for collective action. (McCarthy & Zald, 1977, p. 1214)
Durkheim’s theory postulates that collective action allows for a new phase of integration to take place, which ultimately leads to a new equilibrium within society.

Marxist analysts have viewed collective action from a similar perspective with regards to a structural conception of society, yet they understand collective action in terms of “solidarity”: it occur as a result of solidarity amongst classes. Reorganization of society’s production creates new class divisions and new interests for each class which eventually result in class conflict. (Tilly, 1975, p. 7)

Collective action theories may thus be categorized in terms of breakdown/solidarity models, but also along structural/motivational lines as well (Melucci, 1989, p. 21). Sociologist Neil Smelser further developed what came to be known as the structural-functionalist approach to collective action. Social change is a three-way tug-of-war between the forces of tradition, the forces of differentiation and the new forces of integration. Smelser’s theory posits that social movements, like other forms of collective action, are a social response to situations of stress brought about by discontinuities within the social system. Far-reaching structural change such as industrialization and urbanization are part of a historical process of differentiation and integration that produces these movements.
The model of structural differentiation is an abstract theory of change. When one social role of organization becomes archaic under changing historical circumstances, it differentiates by a definite and specific sequence of events into two or more roles or organizations which function more effectively in the new historical circumstances. The new social units are structurally distinct from each other, but taken together are functionally equivalent to the original unit.... Any sequence of differentiation is set in motion by specific disequilibrating conditions. Initially this disequilibrium gives rise to symptoms of social disturbance which must be brought into line later by mechanisms of social control. Only then do specific ideas, suggestions, and attempts emerge to produce the more differentiated social units (Smelser, 1959, p.2).

Smelser’s “sequence of differentiation” is laid out in seven stages, where each stage is a necessary precursor to the following one. This predetermined process is only applicable to a growing, developing system, and not one in decline. Smelser outlines the seven stages as follows:

1) Dissatisfaction with the goal-achievements of the social system or subsystem in question and a sense of opportunity for change in terms of the potential availability of facilities.

2) Symptoms of disturbance in the form of “unjustified” negative emotional reactions and “unrealistic” aspirations on the part of various elements in the social system.

3) A covert handling of these tensions and a mobilization of motivational resources for new attempts to realize the implications of the existing values-system.

4) Encouragement of the resulting proliferation of “new ideas” without imposing specific responsibility for their implementation or for “taking the consequences.”

5) Positive attempts to reach specification of the new ideas and institutional patterns which will become the objects of commitments.
6) “Responsible” implementation of innovations carried out by persons or collectivities which are either rewarded or punished, depending on their acceptability or reprehensibility in terms of the existing value system.

7) If the implementations of Step 6 are receive favourably, they are gradually routinized into the usual patterns of performance and sanction; their extraordinary character thereby diminishes (Smelser, 1959, p. 15).

It is interesting to note here that for Smelser, co-operative action prior to 1844 and the founding of Rochdale is characteristic of step two of this sequence, whereas the cooperative movement which developed from Rochdale represents a further stage of development of the system, that is, steps five through seven.

Much emphasis is placed by some collective action theorists upon the perceived grievances and deprivation of the potential participants of social movements. A general belief, or loose ideology, about the causes of these grievances and the means to correction are precursors to the development of social movements.

For the structural-functionalists, the ideology of a social movement develops as a result of the chasm between aspirations and fulfillment. Ideology refers to an awareness of common grievances and a general or “loose” belief about how to fix them. Step one of Smelser’s model highlights this dissatisfaction, noting that it is in relation to goal achievement (as opposed to a value deficiency). An opportunity to change is also important: potential movement adherents will only become conscious of the existing chasm if the potential for
improvement has presented itself. However, it is not until step four that Smelser acknowledges the formation of any type of coherent ideology, as “new ideas” proliferate. With this ideology, "negative emotional reactions" (step two) develop into "positive attempts" (step five) and "responsible implementation of innovations" (step six). The development of movement ideology follows the same pre-determined steps that are characteristic of the movement’s organization and praxis.

Criticism regarding this particular type of analysis has been leveled at the structural functionalists both by American colleagues and their European counterparts. Many argue that to comprehend social movements as a product of social change is to perceive the equation in a backwards manner and to negate the creative contributions of movement participants: social movements are creators, not creatures, of social transformation. Social movements differ from other forms of collective action such as riots and protests (a distinction not made by Smelser) in two ways: social movements are a deliberate, anticipated action and they are socially constructive. (Banks, 1972, p. 15)

Studies conducted in the late 1960's and seventies (as noted above) consistently disproved the causal relationship between deprivation (both objective and subjective), and the outbreak of social movement phenomena, and participation in collective action (McCarthy and Zald 1977, p. 1214-5). A lack of evidence exists to prove that a generalized belief exists prior to the
commencement of collective action or to initial involvement in movement activity. Neither can it be proven that structural changes or discontinuities lead directly to a state of normlessness in society, as put forth by Smelser, nor can it be proven that anomie breeds collective or individual disorder. (Tilly, 1975, p. 7).

McCarthy and Zald also criticize some functionalists' emphasis on the psychological state of the supporter immediately prior to his or her involvement in a social movement, arguing that it fails to explain why or how persons or institutions outside of the collective group become involved. (1977, p. 1215).

Collective action theorists also faced criticism from yet another group of people: sociologists of the "identity" paradigm. Perhaps the most severe criticism comes from Alain Touraine, who argues that there is a contradiction in the method of analysis. While functionalists interpret situations and behaviour from the perspective of the potential supporter/actor (i.e. his or her psychological state), the same behaviour or situation which is being examined, must be done so as a function of a social system and its internal disharmony. (Touraine, 1985, p. 765).
Resource Mobilization/Strategy

The resource mobilization theory of social movements is almost uniquely an American construction of the 1970's and eighties. Like collective action theory, it does not form a unified body, but may be divided into two main orientations: the organizational-entrepreneurial approach of McCarthy and Zald and the conflict model of the Tillys (Cohen, 1985, p. 674).

The McCarthy-Zald model rejects the common-sense assumption that suffering and social inequality leads necessarily to collective action. Modeled after classic economic theory, resource-mobilization is based upon the premise of the rationality of the actors involved: social movement participants are merely pursuing their rational interests in groups. A certain level of discontent is always present in society, and is therefore not sufficient (or even necessary) to mobilize potential supporters. Grievances and discontent may be defined, created and manipulated by issue entrepreneurs and organizations (McCarthy and Zald, 1977, p. 1215). This allows for an important theoretical space in which questions can be asked about how movements produce themselves.

The conclusion drawn by resource-mobilization supporters is that mobilization is the direct result of the availability of power and resources of certain elite groups: pre-existing organization and the integration of those segments of a population which share preferences will determine the likelihood of collection
action taking place (McCarthy and Zald, 1977, p. 1218). Success is therefore measured by an organization's ability to gain recognition as a political actor or by increased material benefits (Cohen, 1985, p. 675).

Rejecting not only the emphasis on the psychological state of potential participants, but also the focus on social strain causing structural breakdown, supporters of the resource-mobilization school have also discarded the notion that individuals are the protagonists in social movements. McCarthy and Zald state, ... a social movement is a set of opinions and beliefs in a population which represents preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and/or reward distribution of a society (McCarthy and Zald, 1982, pp. 1217-8). Individual grievances are not part of the social movement equation.

McCarthy and Zald and the resource mobilization school flatly refute the chronological development of a social movement in the manner put forward by the Structural-Functionalists. Their argument states that an ideology does not necessary form prior to the development of a social movement, nor is it required for the genesis of social movements. In the resource mobilization paradigm the presence of any ideology is all but nonexistent: actors are not motivated by vision or mission, but by their own rational interests. The availability of power and resources is responsible for the mobilization of social actors and not a new vision of a better society. In this manner, McCarthy and Zald, like Smelser, view the role of ideology in a passive fashion. Social
movement organizations determine the nature or identity of the movement, which are in turn a creation of the resources available to them. It is for this reason that the resource mobilization school has oft been criticized for explaining the "how" but not the "why" of social movement formation.

In order to mobilize collective action, sophisticated organizational forms and modes of communication are required, elements which are not adequately dealt with by collective action models. Resource-mobilization theorists stress more "objective" variables such as organization, interest, resources, opportunities and strategies (Cohen, p. 674). Theorists use a crude supply and demand model to analyze these variables.

Social movement organizations (SMO), social movement sectors (SMS) and social movement industries (SMI) emulate the economic divisions within society. Preferences are translated into goals, and success in goal attainment depends largely upon an organization's ability to mobilize resources, which may include legitimacy, money, facilities and labour (discretionary resources include only time and money). This ability to mobilize resources, in turn, is primarily determined by an SMO's capacity to convert "adherents" (those who believe) into "constituents" (those who provide discretionary resources) (McCarthy and Zald, 1977, p. 1221). Developing a large support base of "conscience constituents" (those who provide resources for the organization
but do not benefit directly from goal attainment) is key to the growth and stability of SMOs (McCarthey and Zald, 1977, p. 1226).

Resource mobilization is rooted in classical economic theory which McCarthey and Zald apply to the study of SMOs in terms of a supply-demand analogy where goals are products and adherence is demand. If demand is elastic, then adherents will move more readily between SMOs, SMSs and SMIs. Although some “product” loyalty may exist, “issue attention cycles” and goal achievement may greatly affect an individual’s decision to remain with or to switch SMOs or SMIs. (McCarthey and Zald, 1977, p. 1229). An individual’s demand may also be affected by his or her relationship with the SMO, a relationship which is largely determined by the organization’s structure (federated or isolated). Media and advertising plays an important role in this dynamic.

Another hypothesis put forward by McCarthey and Zald which is particularly interesting from the point of view of the cooperative movement, is that …older, established SMOs are more likely than newer SMOs to persist throughout the cycle of SMF growth and decline (McCarthey and Zald, 1977, p. 1233). A history of accomplishment is an important asset and longevity provides and edge in the attainment of legitimacy (McCarthey and Zald, 1977).
A social movement organization's growth and transformation is greatly affected by its environment. Changing conditions in society increase or decrease the potential support base for a SMO which will in turn influence the organization's evolution and goal transformation. If society changes in the direction of organizational goals, and it appears that the goals will be met, support for the movement is likely to increase. However, if events occur that make it unlikely that goals will be attained, that too may influence potential support and sentiment. Finally, SMO's function in an environment with other organizations which may have similar goals: this determines the amount of competition faced by and SMO and may be the cause of alliances between organizations (Zald and Ash, 1966, p. 330).

The Tilly version of this organization-focused theory retains the Smelserian premise that large-scale structural change ("modernization") affects collective action (Cohen, 1985, p. 678). While Tilly demonstrates that it is not possible to directly link hardship, anomie, crises and conflict, he does not challenge the fact of differentiation in the transition from "community" to "society." Tilly maintains that the long-term transformations in society in turn affect the nature of collective action. As the social dynamic transforms - division of labour, urbanization, power structures - the "action repertoire" developed by collective actors shifts as well: we witness a replacement of communal solidarities by voluntary associations and organized groups. The major forms of collective action change as well, which explains why the food riots and tax rebellions of
the eighteenth century were superseded by the demonstrations and strikes of the nineteenth (Cohen, p. 679).

Tilly's historical approach documenting changes in collective action in the 18th and 19th centuries has interesting implications for a study of the development of the cooperative movement. Tilly distinguishes between the "reactive" collective action of the eighteenth century involving communal groups threatened by the state's attempt to control the general population and the "proactive" phase which began in the mid-nineteenth century and which has existed ever since. "Proactive" collective action refers to group claims to power, privileges or resources that have not previously existed. These "offensive" mobilizations typical of proactive movements involve the pooling of resources for the sake of recognition or a larger share of power (Cohen, p. 680).

The shift from reactive to proactive is largely due to gains in control won over by the "big structures" at the expense of households, communities and other small groups. Urbanization, mass electoral politics and the mass media also made large-scale mobilization a much more accessible form of collective action for organizations (Cohen, p. 681).

Although Tilly does not see this change from reactive to proactive collective actions as an evolutionary process, one cannot help but see the parallels with
Smelser’s seven-step sequence in which “negative emotional reactions” progress into a “responsible implementation of innovations”. Tilly’s analysis of changing bases of association and action repertoires relates to the resource-mobilization model in that it focuses uniquely on strategic considerations (Cohen, p. 682). Groups are the main actors in collective conflicts and they pursue collective interests.

Critics of the resource mobilization school are quick to point out that by focusing on the rationality of interests, this model fails to explain the “free rider” problem. Why would individuals acting rationally in pursuit of their own interests choose to become the “conscience constituents” of an organization that fails to offer them selective incentives? For Jean Cohen, this weakness results from the theory’s inability to explain three phenomena related to group formation: the problem of collective identity, the problem of consciousness and the problem of solidarity (Cohen, p. 685). The construction of group identity, the recognition of group interests and the creation of solidarity within and between groups is not adequately explained by this theory which stresses only rational interests.
Identity Orientation

Many authors have juxtaposed the strategy-oriented models directly with the identity-oriented paradigm of European schools. The main challenge to the traditional theories is the insistence on the prior organization of social actors and the rationality of collective action. Both Alain Touraine and Alberto Melucci have also argued that the rational actor model is not applicable to contemporary society: the logic of collective interaction entails something other than strategic or instrumental rationality (Cohen, p. 691).

Touraine differentiates a social movement from other conflicts as only one focused “around the social control of the main cultural patterns,” that is, the patterns through which human relationships with the environment are organized in a normative fashion. A social movement is one element of the field of action. It is defined by its antagonisms with other groups or opposition movements who want to control or keep control over the instruments of transformation and production of social life.

Society is regarded as a system of relationships between actors challenging for the social and political control of a culture. This type of conflict is “defined by a clear interrelation between conflicting actors and the stakes of their conflict” (Touraine, 1985, p. 760). A social movement is a very particular type of struggle: il se situe au niveau le plus élevé de la vie sociale, parce qu’il est un
élément constitutif de l'autoproduction conflictuelle de la société (Touraine, 1978, p. 359). Touraine also stresses the importance of intermediate agents such as political parties and trade unions in shaping the nature of collective action.

The role of an ideology in the identity orientation model is more difficult to grasp. While both Touraine and Melucci argue the inefficiencies of the rational actor model, they provide no clear direction as to the role of ideology in the genesis and evolution of social movements. For Touraine, the ideology of a social movement is not so much a vision, but instead involves a conflict for the control of the transformation and production of the cultural patterns. It is not clear how these conflicts generate social movements (Develtere, 1994, p. 25). Melucci’s focus is also on process. The process of building solidarity, that is, of actors’ recognition that they are part of a single unified social unit, is perhaps, parallel to Smelser’s realization of the potential for improvement, which forms the basis for a common vision or mission.

Touraine all but negates the role of the institutional nexus: a social movement is not an autonomous analytical unit. The unit of analysis in an identity-orientation model is no longer the sophisticated organizational structure, but instead the actors and the processes by which they create identities and solidarities. Actors in social movements create identities via social contestations that reinterpret societal norms. Jean Cohen has summarized
the actor’s role thus: *Collective actors strive to create a group identity within a general social identity whose interpretation they contest* (Cohen, p. 694). The analyst, using an identity-oriented model must therefore examine not only the identity and solidarity building processes but also the structural and cultural environment which affect the identities involved. Cultural orientations cannot be separated from social conflict as opponents share a common cultural field.

In order to respond to this “double” problem of identity, Touraine developed an analytical framework which operates on two levels. First, the elaboration of a theory of structural and cultural dimensions of contemporary society and second, an action-theoretical analysis of the processes of identity formation of collective actors (Cohen, p. 695). On this second level, Touraine developed a methodological approach whereby the researcher must become part of the movement in order to analyse the actions of the actors. Touraine’s motto: *Action sociologique au service d’une sociologie d’action* (Touraine, 1978, p. 13).

For Touraine, the lack of analysis on the first level by resource-mobilization theorists is akin to analyzing a social movement in a vacuum: He also argues that the concept of “society” is fluid, changing and unstable, comprised of a set of systems of actions and social relations. The social movement itself may never be unified, may never have a political consciousness of itself, but
yet it is a historical actor within society. Resource mobilization theory does not take these important factors into account.

Alberto Melucci, a pupil of Touraine, has developed a constructivist approach to social movement analysis. He designates a social movement as "a specific class of collective phenomena which contains three dimensions." The dimensions of a social movement are solidarity (actor's mutual recognition that they are part of a single social unit), conflict and the breaking of limits of comparability of a system (Melucci, 1989, p. 29). A social movement must therefore alter the structure of the social system in some way.

Melucci's main focus is how the process of constructing collective action actually takes place. Why do individuals become involved in social movements? To this question, Melucci draws upon the arguments put forward by the structural-functionalist and the resource-mobilizationist. In fact, there are three levels of explanation. First, individuals become involved because they belong to a specific social sector which is exposed to the contradictions of complex systems. This idea corresponds to the ideas posited by the structural-functionalists. Second, the availability of specific resources to individuals who calculate the costs and benefits of involvement. This is the explanation put forward by the resource mobilization school. To these two explanations, Melucci also adds that individuals involve themselves in social movements for highly personal reasons (Melucci, p. 216).
Melucci’s analysis shifts away from the focus on production-based conflicts to look at the management of resources in complex societies. The focus on the production of material goods shifts to the production of social relations (e.g. symbols, identities and needs). In this way, Melucci’s analysis is similar to Touraine.

Four characteristics describe the social movements of today, observations which have interesting consequences for our study of the cooperative housing sector. First, Melucci notes the important role played by information resources in the formation and evolution of social movements. Secondly, organizations are no longer vehicles for the implementation of their vision, but a way of experiencing collective action itself. Participation is not a means to an end, but an end in itself. Another characteristic is the complementarity between private life and publicly expressed commitments: living differently and changing society are complementary. Finally, there is a new awareness of the global dimensions of this complex society.
Towards a New Theoretical Framework: Develtere's Model

Individually, none of these approaches provides the researcher with a balanced and comprehensive tool for the study of social movements. For the structural functionalist, the level of analysis is focused at the psychological level of the individual. The resource mobilization school centres on the organization, and the identity orientation model, the action of creating identities and solidarities. Resource-Mobilization focuses solely on the “how” of mobilization. The Identity orientation paradigm stresses only the “why” of social movements in relation to the conflicts in the broader field of action. The Resource Mobilization school suffers from and actor or praxis deficit whereas the Identity orientation theorists do not take into consideration the institutional component of social movements. Structural functionalists fail to give credit to the creative power of social movements and their participants (Develtere, 1994, p. 22).

Nevertheless, these three perspectives are not necessarily incompatible: they are different foci of the same reality (idem). In his text, Co-operation and Development, Patrick Develtere develops a new model for the study of social movements, combining elements from all three perspectives\(^1\). It is this model which we will present here, and which we will use in our study of the cooperative housing movement.

\(^1\) Develtere has taken this model from Gerard and Martens.
Develtere identifies three forces which give identity to social movements: ideology (vision), praxis (action) and organization. Each component interact continuously with the others, although at times one may dominate. Develtere provides a visual representation of this interaction:

\[ \text{Social Movement Identity} \]

---

2 In the diagram presented by Develtere there is nothing connecting the environment with the social movement itself. Develtere does explain how social movements are affected by their environment, and in turn how they might affect their surroundings. It therefore seems logical to represent that interaction in the diagram.
The ideology or vision of a social movement provides a social movement with the images of a desirable society based upon more or less specified values and the ways to achieve this vision (idem). The praxis embodies the spontaneity which characterizes all social movements as well as the mobilization and participation of constituents and adherents. The praxis may be broken down into two different types of action: internal and external. Participation in the decision-making bodies of a social movement organization is a form of internal praxis, as are acts of loyalty towards that same organization (financial, patronage, etc.). External praxis refers to the power relations confronting social movement constituents and adherents -- individually and collectively with other actors and opponents such as state, other social movements or dominant groups. The external dimension of praxis is represented by overt collective acts such as demonstrations, rallies and negotiations. Hidden strategies and tactics also form part of the external praxis. (idem).

Social movements cannot be reduced to organizational structures because of the necessity of vision and praxis: they infuse any form of organizing with a logic and value orientation (Develtere, p. 23). Similarly, social movements cannot be reduced to praxis and a praxis-oriented identity, as Touraine would have. Social movements must develop a minimal organizational structure;
usually they are represented by several different social movement organizations (idem).

In addition to creating a vision for a new society (which becomes the ultimate mission of the movement), social movements define a vision of the praxis and a vision for the organization. In this manner, social movement doctrine determines the in/out groups, the operating principles and the institutional vehicles. However, as the diagram indicates, the interaction of ideology, praxis and organization also means that social movements encompass a praxis (or production) of their ideology as well as an organization of that ideology. Correspondingly, a praxis of the organization and an organization of the praxis form part of the social movement's identity (idem.). Let's examine these interactions in further detail.

The production of the ideology takes place via the praxis and involves the creation of an alternative vision for society. The production of the ideology may also take place via pamphlets, media, speeches, etc. The organization of the ideology occurs via selected instruments of norm and value transmission, for example, purposive propaganda, training, education, etc. (idem).

The praxis of the organization entails the use members make of movement apparatus to achieve an interpretation of the vision. It can also encompass members' engagement in formal and informal decision-making processes.
The organization of the praxis refers to mobilization of the available resources (adherents, constituents, financial means, media, etc.) and the efforts to obtain affiliate and clientele loyalty (idem.).

The table below summarizes this interplay:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>Praxis</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideology</strong></td>
<td>MISSION OF MOVEMENT</td>
<td>- demonstration of an alternative</td>
<td>- use of instruments of norm and value transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Praxis</strong></td>
<td>- define a vision of the praxis</td>
<td>SPONTANEITY MOBILIZATION PARTICIPATION COLLECTIVE ACTION</td>
<td>- mobilization of resources - attract loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- operating principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizatio n</strong></td>
<td>- define a vision of the organization</td>
<td>- use of movement apparatus - involvement in decision-making processes</td>
<td>SOCIAL MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- institutional vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- in/out group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The way in which these components interact and the results of this interaction create the identity of the social movement. The movement then becomes a retreat movement, a protest movement, a reform movement, etc. (idem.). As noted above, there is continuous interplay between these three forces, which
gives life to the movement, although each has a tendency to lead a life of its own (Develtere, p. 24).

In Develtere's model, four different types of actors determine this interplay: idealists, activists, managers and entrepreneurs (idem.). Idealists advocate purity in the vision and object to deviancies in the organization and praxis. Activists advocate action and involvement of and in response to members. Managers seek realism as they struggle to operate within a specific context or environment. Finally, entrepreneurs are responsible for reconciling the three forces: they steer the movement via strategical and tactical decisions (idem.).

All three forces are intrinsically linked to a pre-structured environment (idem.). They respond to contradictions and conflicts in their surrounding environment, as the diagram indicates. The context in which a social movement exists provides opportunity structures, allowing the movement to develop and function. Although movements generally oppose dominant ideologies, modes of organization and praxis in a given society, the existing forces (market, state, political, etc.) impose conditions and limitations which continuously challenge the stamina of a movement (idem.). The identity of a movement is therefore determined by the dominant forces and counter forces it confronts, and not just the result of the interaction between its own ideology, praxis and organization (idem.).
Develtere's social movement analysis also contains a model of central and peripheral movements, a component of his framework which is particularly applicable to the cooperative movement and its relationship with other movements. (Develtere, 1994, p. 30). Using the cooperative example, a central movement is one in which cooperation is "the focal point around which collective action of certain groups is centered" (e.g. Mondragon, the Desjardins system, consumer co-ops in Britain, etc.) (idem.). While other social movements are likely to be involved in stimulating this central movement, it is the central movement which directs the practice, organization and ideology (idem.).

Peripheral movements serve as instruments for goal and value achievement in other social movements. In this model, peripheral social movement organizations (e.g. cooperatives) function adjunctly with other movement organizations such as trade unions or political committees. It is these latter instruments which dominate the movement ideology, organization and praxis. Peripheral movements may have begun as more central instruments, but loose input into the agenda and the dynamism of the movement as it develops (idem.). The reverse can also occur.

We will use this model to proceed with our study of the cooperative housing movement in Toronto.
Study of the Cooperative Housing Sector in Toronto

Introduction

The cooperative housing sector in Canada is one of the most powerful arms of the cooperative movement in terms of sheer numbers. Few other cooperative sectors can boast active second and third tier organizations at the regional, provincial and national levels as well as hundreds of grassroots cooperatives. In Metropolitan Toronto alone, there are in excess of 43,000 people living in cooperative housing (Co-op housing is an election issue, Spring 1995).

My own personal interest in the housing cooperative sector stems from a cooperative living experience in Sherbrooke, Quebec. During my Master’s degree I also conducted several research projects with my own housing cooperative as well as with the regional federation.

In many respects, cooperative living appeared to be the most real and intense of cooperative experiences. Housing cooperative members commit to sharing resources and to seeking cooperative solutions on a daily basis for very tangible, and sometimes very challenging, problems. In a very altruistic sense, housing cooperatives help build better communities, where citizens are provided with communally-owned affordable housing. From my own perspective, the housing cooperative sector appeared to embody, more than other sectors such as financial or retail, the spirit of the cooperative values of self-help, equality and equity.
However, my own casual observations led me to conclude that it is a minority of housing cooperative members which make a cognizant decision to live cooperatively. These types of members are committed in an ideological way to a cooperative lifestyle which rejects personal gain at the expense of collective well-being. They understand and promote cooperative ideology and practice, and are, by conscious choice, part of the cooperative "movement".

At the other extreme, and, by my personal observations, in the majority, are housing cooperative members who are disinterested by, and may not even be aware of, the cooperative nature of their living arrangements. These members choose to live in a housing cooperative because it is affordable, convenient and available (or a combination of the three).

Cooperative housing staff can also be divided along similar lines. Some housing cooperative coordinators and support staff choose employment in a cooperative environment because of a personal commitment to the movement and its ideology. Other staff have a more utilitarian approach to their jobs.

And yet, when referring to this aggregate of people living and working in cooperative housing, both academics and activists consistently speak of a "movement". This question intrigued me. Is it a movement if the majority of members have not consciously chosen to join (and indeed, this has yet to be
proven)? Is it a movement if the "average" member is not familiar with cooperative ideology, principles or values? Is it a movement if only a very small minority choose to actively participate to promote cooperative goals and ideals. Is it a movement if the goals are strictly economic and there is no social agenda, only the provision of convenient and affordable housing? Is it a movement if it is not conscious of itself as such? It is the search of answers to these questions which led me to an examination of social movement theory and the cooperative housing "movement". Because of limited time and resources, the study was narrowed to include only the Metropolitan Toronto area.

**Cooperative Housing in Canada: Background**

The first housing cooperative in Canada, Campus Cooperative, was created by a group of students in Toronto in 1936. In 1960, inspired by European and American models of cooperative housing, the Cooperative Union of Canada began to investigate the possibility of adapting this type of housing to Canadian family life. The first housing cooperative in Canada created for families (and still in operation), was Willow Park in Winnipeg in 1961. In 1968, the Cooperative Housing Federation of Canada was constituted in order to promote the creation of cooperative housing. The Federation also provided organizational, technical and administrative support to new and existing housing cooperatives.
In June 1973, the federal government altered the housing laws to allow for mortgages to be issued to housing cooperatives via the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC). Prior to this change, the most commonly used cooperative housing model was the one adopted by the Antigonish movement in Maritime Canada: individual financing and individual ownership with little or no government intervention. This change in the housing laws, more than any other event in the history of cooperative housing, is the reason for the abundance of cooperative homes which now exist in Canada. During the four years which followed the official creation of the Canadian Cooperative Housing Program, 10,000 units in 240 housing cooperatives were constructed across the country. Between 1979 and 1985, 34,000 additional units in 900 cooperatives were built (Burke, 1990a, p. 13).

Cooperative housing models in Canada have often varied considerably, depending on time and place. In the late 1960’s, the progenitors of the cooperative movement in Toronto (e.g. the labour movement, the United Church and other advocates) began investigating some of the models used in European countries. The results of this investigation brought these different groups of players to form a vision and a mission for cooperative housing in the Toronto area: a not-for-profit cooperative housing program which would be 100% government financed. Members put in no equity, and took none out. There would be no surplus and no individual ownership. Members would not
be required to provide a downpayment, and carrying costs would be lower: cooperative housing would be permanently affordable.

The reason behind the development of a model was clear: the need to profit from home ownership created a barrier to people not already in the system. Long-term affordability became the driving ideological force behind the development of this model. Advocates argued that the government had a responsibility to provide financing for housing, and everyone should be able to benefit. A fear existed that if government was not wholly responsible for the creation and maintenance of cooperative units, they would have an escape to eventually remove themselves from financing the system.

If collective ownership, not-for-profit, and government responsibility were the first three components of the model, then income mix was the fourth. Early housing cooperative advocates were determined that housing cooperatives would not become ghettos for low-income families and other marginalized groups. Efforts were made to ensure that cooperative housing attracted a wide variety of different levels of wage earners, whether individuals or families.

People working in the sector at the time this model was created were motivated by different values. Some believed vehemently that affordable housing is right of all citizens, and that cooperative housing was a means of ensuring good, affordable housing for those who couldn’t afford their own
homes. The small "c" conservative elements of the sector believed that cooperative living was a means of promoting family and community values. Other cooperators felt that the goal of cooperative housing was primarily economic and hoped that by growing the cooperative sector to a substantial size, they would eventually be able to impact the housing marketplace as a whole.

The Federal government's decision to offer mortgage's to housing cooperative opened the door for the formation of a number of Resource Groups in Toronto, such as the Cooperative Housing Federation of Toronto (CHFT), the Metro Toronto Labour Council Development Foundation, Lantana, etc. These resource groups served as intermediaries between CMHC and community groups wishing to build housing cooperatives. As more and more housing cooperatives were built, CHFT's role gradually shifted towards the member services portfolio. Cooperative housing umbrella groups were also formed at the provincial and federal level: the now-defunct Cooperative Housing Association of Ontario (CHAO) and the Cooperative Housing Federation of Canada (CHFC).

Since 1973, the environment in which the cooperative housing sector operates has changed dramatically. The Federal government has increasingly withdrawn its involvement in the sector over the past fifteen years, handing the responsibility over to the provinces. In Ontario, consecutive governments have
sought to develop a one-size-fits-all approach to cooperative housing, while reducing housing subsidies to low income individuals and families.

The initial program introduced by the Federal government in 1973 was replaced in 1979 by a new program, which came to be known as “56.1”. With interest rates dropping, the government now permitted housing cooperatives to set up individual subsidy pools and control the number of subsidized units. The building of housing cooperatives continued to flourish under this program due to the autonomy and flexibility it allowed. However, high mortgage rates made this program an extremely expensive one. When the government indicated the possibility of terminating the program, CHFC began searching for a mortgage tool which would be more attractive to government bureaucrats.

In 1985, after much research and development on the part of CHFC, the Mulroney Government introduced the ILM (Index-linked Mortgage) program. Many new and existing cooperatives struggled under this program, and the number of new cooperatives being built decreased dramatically. In the early 1980’s, the CMHC was financing some 1500 new cooperative units a year in Metro. By the early 1990’s that number had dropped to approximately 100 units.

During the ILM program, the responsibility for cooperative housing continued to devolve to the provinces, and more markedly since 1992. The Federal
government has not created any new programs since 1992. However, the situation appeared to be improving for the housing sector in Ontario when David Peterson's minority Liberal Government signed a 10-point accord with the NDP caucus to form a coalition. One of the points of that accord was the creation of a provincial cooperative and not-for-profit housing program. Homes Now, P30,000 and P10,000 were some of the programs to emerge from the provincial governments in Ontario over the next few years. Nevertheless, the cost of borrowing remained the main obstacle for governments with ambitions plans, and rarely were their targets met.

The election of the Conservative government in Ontario in June of 1995 dealt a further blow to the housing cooperative sector in Toronto. A moratorium was place on the development of new cooperative housing units and the construction of approximately 380 scheduled units was cancelled. In addition, government cutbacks have led to expenditure controls, constraints and the capping of program costs.

The second frightening trend witnessed by cooperative housing sector employees and volunteers has been the increasing control of government bureaucrats over the supposedly autonomous Boards of Directors of housing cooperatives. The Harris government has ceased funding replacement reserves for major capital expenditures for individual cooperatives, and is considering creating large pools to be shared by the entire sector. Housing
Ministry officials now determine the manageable expenses for housing cooperatives and set limits on the number of staff permitted per unit.

The events and trends discussed above have affected, if not determined, the direction housing cooperative ideology, praxis and organization has taken in Canada over the past several decades. The study conducted as part of this research will isolate three housing cooperatives and one cooperative housing federation to examine more specifically the presence or absence of these elements in the cooperative housing sector in Toronto.

**A Study of Three Housing Cooperatives**

**Methodology**

The research study was conducted in three stages, using the text, *A Handbook of Social Science Research*, as a study guide. The initial phase involved formulating the problem to be studied and selecting research methods. Data was then collected and an analysis and interpretation of the results followed. This methodology, and the problems encountered during the study, will be examined in detail.

In essence, research began with the observation or notion (as noted previously) that the cooperative housing sector lacked the necessary
ingredients or elements to form what is traditionally defined as a movement:\(^3\) direction, cohesiveness and the desire for change, all of which I considered essential. In order to validate my own observations, I decided a more rigorous and objective study of the cooperative housing sector was in order.

Initially, the study centred around the development of a research question; a topic which would be limited in scope, narrow in focus, and confined to a specific time, place and set of conditions. The possibility of gathering relevant evidence was also considered. Because the goal of the research was descriptive and not explanatory, a research objective was established rather than an explicate hypothesis. This research objective is best stated as:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{to describe the identity of the cooperative housing movement in Metropolitan Toronto by studying, using social movement theories, three housing cooperatives and the Cooperative Housing Federation of Toronto.}
\end{quote}

One of the problems encountered during the study, which should be noted here, was the difficulty in finding willing participants (cooperatives) for the study. Every cooperative has its own institutional characteristics, and all attempts were made to avoid any bias.

\(^3\) The words "movement" and "sector" have been used interchangeably in this essay
The names of all the active housing cooperatives with postal codes beginning with "M" on the list supplied by the provincial government's Cooperative Development Service were placed in a container, and three names were drawn. Unfortunately several cooperatives contacted refused to participate in the study, and due to time constraints, one cooperative was selected from a personal contact on the board of directors.

The three cooperatives which participated in the study were:

**Alexandra Park Co-operative Incorporated**  
25 Eden Place, Suite 100  
Toronto, ON  
M5T 2V6

**Windmill Line Co-operative Homes Inc.**  
125 Scadding Avenue  
Toronto, ON  
M5A 4H8

**Windward Co-operative Homes Incorporated**  
34 Little Norway Cres.  
Toronto, ON  
M5V 3A3

*Selecting the Sample and Determining Size*

Some comments must be made on the accuracy of the sample studied. The sample included only cooperatives from Metropolitan Toronto and the Cooperative Housing Federation of Toronto, and therefore the conclusions drawn as a result of this study apply only to that region. Cooperatives from other cities or provinces may have produced significantly different results.

---

4 Postal codes beginning with the letter "M" represent addresses in the City of Toronto (formerly Metropolitan Toronto)
Every attempt was made to ensure random sampling procedures. However, as noted above, this was not possible because of the difficulty in finding cooperatives willing to participate in the study. This led to a certain bias in itself, as it could be concluded that cooperatives willing to participate in such a study are exhibiting certain values or characteristics which other cooperatives (which refused to participate), are not. One cooperative was selected because of personal contact within the organization. The final selection of the sample involved only cooperatives in downtown Toronto, which represents a certain bias, as more suburban cooperatives could possibly hold different values and objectives.

Determining the size of the sample is another difficult question. One of the predominant issues in this study was time and resources, which effectively kept the sample size small. The other issue under consideration was the homogeneity of the sample. It was estimated that the population in the sample was relatively heterogeneous (i.e. housing cooperative members and housing cooperatives themselves), therefore requiring a larger sample in order to achieve greater accuracy. However, as the purpose of this study was merely to observe the cooperatives and members in question, and not to prove or disprove a particular hypothesis, it was determined that a sample from three cooperatives in the Metropolitan Toronto area would suffice.
Only one very basic rule guided the sample population required for the questionnaire: a sample size of at least thirty individuals is required in order to provide a pool large enough for even a simple analysis. It was determined, therefore, that the 35 respondents to the questionnaire provided a large enough sample to draw conclusions with some accuracy.

Finally, it must be noted again, that the purpose of this study was not to prove or disprove a hypothesis concerning housing cooperatives and social movements. Rather, it was to observe, using some of the notions provided us by social movement theory, the housing cooperative sector in Toronto.

**Construction of the Study**

The practicality of utilizing resource mobilization theory for this study (i.e. a housing cooperative is an example of a social movement organization and the housing cooperative federation represents a social movement sector) resulted in a resource mobilization focus. Emphasis was placed on cooperatives as social movement organizations with the goals of the cooperatives embodying the ideology of the "movement" and their participation in their community, the "action".

The research objective contained several concepts which were isolated for the purposes of the study: **cooperative, social movement organization** and
**social movement.** In order to measure or define these concepts, variables were identified which would relate to them.

A *cooperative* was defined using the 1995 International Cooperative Alliance definition:

*A co-operative is an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly-owned and democratically-controlled enterprise.*

For the purposes of this study, it was determined that for each housing cooperative must be:

- a registered cooperative corporation with the Cooperative Development Service of the Government of Ontario;
- located within the boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto;
- currently in operation.

Using a list supplied by the Cooperative Development Service it was possible to accurately determine (by postal code) the cooperatives which met these three criteria.

Zald and Ash's definition (1966) of a *social movement organization* (SMO) was used to establish the criteria for an SMO:

*A social movement organization is a purposive and collective attempt of a number of people to change individuals or societal institutions and structures.*
The terms "purposive" and "collective" were further isolated in order to achieve more accurate measurements. Variables used to measure the "purposive" nature of the cooperative were defined as:

- incentives for members include extra-organizational goals;
- organizational goals imply change which transcends the immediate membership;
- organizational activities are not ends in themselves but are actions intended to make changes outside the group;
- organizational activities do not provide immediate gratification but at a later time.

Variables used to measure the "collective" nature of the cooperative were defined as:

- members of the organization work together; actions are not the impetus of individual members;
- interaction with other cooperatives/credit unions and/or federated organizations is both frequent and ongoing.

Social movement was the final concept isolated for this study. We determined from Develtere that a social movement develops its identity from the interaction between its own ideology/praxis/organization, and the dominant forces and counterforces it encounters (these existing forces impose conditions and limitations).
Although the resource mobilization perspective was used to study the different housing cooperatives as social movement organizations, the study itself was conducted under the broader perspective of Develtere's tripartite model. Ideology, praxis and organization are the variables which comprise this concept. Using the definitions provided by Develtere, these variables may be identified as:

- **Ideology**: the vision of the social movement; provides the movement with images of the desirable society based upon specified values and the ways to achieve this vision.

- **Praxis**: spontaneity as well as the mobilization and participation.

- **Organization**: the structures and decision-making bodies of a social movement.

Although Zald and Ash's model focuses primarily on the organizational structure of the social movement, its attempt to address the "purposive" and "collective" nature of these organizations is clearly a means of incorporating the concepts of ideology and action into the study of social movements. Therefore, an evaluation of the "purposive" or "collective" variables within a housing cooperative parallels Develtere's model which includes all three axis. The degree to which these variables are either present or absent within the specific housing cooperatives being studied will steer us towards the ideology and the action of the cooperative, if not the movement as a whole.

A table outlining these concepts and variables can be found on page 28.
Three measuring instruments were drafted to explore these variables. First, a written questionnaire was designed for distribution to members (see Annex 1 for a copy of the questionnaire). Using a Likert scale and ranking options, the questionnaire was designed to gauge the reasons and incentives for members to belong to the housing cooperative as well as the type of gratification received from participating in the cooperative’s activities. This aspect of the research focused on the ideology of individual members of each housing cooperative.

Second, a verbal interview with three members of the Board of Directors of each cooperative sought to determine if the coop had goals (ideology) and activities (action) which intended to make changes outside the sphere of the cooperative itself (see Annex 1 for a copy of the interview schedule). This interview also helped to determine the extent to which committees within the cooperative functioned collectively as well as the amount of interaction with other cooperatives and federated organizations. This portion of the research attempted to gauge the ideology of individual board members as well as the overall tone of the cooperative. It also sought to determine the degree and type of “action” in which the housing cooperatives were engaged.

Finally, a record/document content analysis examined each cooperative’s by-laws as well as committee meeting minutes, board meeting minutes and general members’ meeting minutes over the course of one fiscal year. The
purpose of this review was again to determine the nature of the cooperative's goals and activities and to gauge the amount of contact with other cooperatives and federated cooperative organizations. This part of the research focused on the organizational aspect of each housing cooperative.

Other research instruments used as part of the study included interviews with staff at the Cooperative Housing Federation as well as with other long-time participants of the cooperative and not-for-profit housing sectors in Toronto. These interviews were conducted in order to obtain an overall perspective of the movement, its members and organizations.

The results of this research were analyzed within the context of Patrick Develtere's model of social movements, looking individually at the ideology, organizational structures and practice of the cooperative housing sector in Toronto. We will then examined how these all three elements fit together to give the movement an identity. It should be noted here again, that the research was not conducted to prove or disprove and stated hypothesis, but rather to observe the cooperative housing sector using the model provided to us by Develtere.
Study Results

a) Questionnaire

One hundred and eighty questionnaires were randomly distributed (60 at each cooperative) with a total of 35 members responding from all three cooperatives. Although every attempt was made to ensure that no bias occurred during the distribution and collection of questionnaires, it is impossible to determine if the respondents represent an accurate sample. For example, respondents, by the very fact that they completed the questionnaire itself, may represent a sample of members which is more active and involved than is the norm.

The first section of the questionnaire was designed to solicit personal information about the respondent and his/her involvement in the cooperative or in other cooperatives.

The first three questions provided demographic data about members. The average age of the respondents was 43 years old. Forty-six percent of respondents were male and fifty-four percent were female. The average number of years as a member of the cooperative was seven and the total number of years was 240.8.
Questions four and five sought to determine the extent to which members are involved in other cooperatives as well as within their own housing cooperative. Sixty-six percent of respondents did not belong to any other cooperatives or credit unions. Eleven percent belonged to one other cooperative or credit union and three percent belonged to two or more cooperatives or credit unions in addition to the housing cooperative in which they lived. Thirty-four percent of members do not participate on any committees (including the Board of Directors) at their housing cooperative. Forty-nine percent belong to one committee at their housing cooperative and seventeen percent belong to two.

The following table summarizes the Personal Information section of the questionnaire:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>Average age = 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Gender | Male: 46%  
            Female: 54% |
| 3. Number of years as a member of the cooperative | Average: 7 years |
| 4. Membership in other cooperatives/credit unions | 0: 66%  
                                                        1: 31%  
                                                        2: 0%  
                                                        3: 0%  
                                                        4: 0%  
                                                        5: 3% |
| 5. Membership on committees of cooperative (including the Board of Directors) | 0: 34%  
                                                                                      1: 49%  
                                                                                      2: 17% |
Section two of the Questionnaire, entitled *Viewpoint*, used a Likert scale to measure the degree to which members viewed their cooperative as a "purposive" organization. Specifically, do incentives for members include extra-organizational goals? Do organizational activities provide immediate gratification, or gratification at a later time? In general, this section of the questionnaire sought to determine the presence or absence of a cooperative ideology amongst respondents: do members have a vision? It should be noted that the questionnaire did not in any way attempt to determine what the vision or ideology was, but whether ideology was a factor in the respondents decision to be a member of the cooperative.

In questions six, seven, eight, ten and twelve, agreement with the question indicates a strong belief in the purposive nature of the housing cooperative. The values assigned to the possible responses were:

Agree = 2
Agree in part = 1
Disagree = 0

In question eleven, agreement with the question indicates, not a disbelief in the extra-organizational goals of the cooperative, but a more utilitarian attitude towards membership in the housing cooperative. For this question, the values assigned to the possible responses were:
Agree = 0
Agree in part = 1
Disagree = 2

Due to difficulties with wording, no values were assigned for question nine and it was not used in the analysis of this study.

The highest score possible for the seven questions is 12 and the lowest is 0. A score of 12 indicates a strong belief in the purposive raison d’être of the housing cooperative. A score of 0 represents a respondent who does not believe that their housing cooperative has goals which reach beyond the provision of housing.

The average score for this section was 7.4 on a scale of 0 to 12, with a mode of 8. They are summarized in the following table (with 34 completed surveys for this section):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number of Respondents with score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score:</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section three of the survey, Preferences, used a ranking option to determine the respondents reasons for choosing to live in the housing cooperative. Respondents were given five options for choosing to live in the housing cooperative, and asked to rank, in order of importance, their reasons for choosing the housing cooperative. The five choices were:
1. Location/convenience
2. Belief/commitment to the cooperative movement and its principles
3. Cost of the product or service
4. Sense of community/social interaction offered by the cooperative
5. Belief/commitment to the goals of this cooperative

As in section two, the purpose of these questions was to determine to what extent the goals and activities of the cooperative (beyond the provision of housing) were of importance to the respondent.

Location/convenience was the primary reason for people to choose membership in their housing cooperative. The second most likely reason for people to be members was a sense of community and social interaction, followed closely by a belief or commitment to the cooperative movement and its principles. Cost and a belief in the goals of their specific cooperative were the least likely reasons for people to become or remain members of a housing cooperative.

The results are summarized in the following table. (with 32 surveys completed for this section):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Location/ Convenience</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Belief/commitment to cooperative movement and principles</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Cost</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Sense of community/ social interaction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Belief/commitment to goals of this cooperative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Interviews

Eight interviews were conducted with Board members from the three cooperatives involved in the study. Three interviews were conducted at Alexander Park, three at Windward and two at Windmill Line. The interviews were designed (see Annex I for a copy of the interview schedule) to measure four variables:

i) organizational goals imply change which transcends the immediate membership;

ii) organizational activities are not ends in themselves but are actions intended to make changes outside the group;

iii) members of the organization work together: actions are not the impetus of isolated members;

iv) interaction with other cooperatives/credit unions and/or federated organizations is both frequent and on-going.
Questions one and two were intended to gain insight into the Board member's history with the cooperative and on the Board of Directors. The average number of member years for all three cooperatives was 6.22. There was considerable variation between the three cooperatives. The average number of member years for interviewees at Alexandra Park (the oldest of the three cooperatives studied) was 12.33, while at Windward it was 4.58 and at Windmill Line, 1.75. Similarly, the average number of years as a member of the Board of Directors was 3.33 at Alexandra Park, 0.58 at Windward, and 0.25 at Windmill Line. The average for the eight interviewees was 1.39 Board member years.

Questions three through fourteen were designed to measure the "collectiveness" of each housing cooperative, both internally and externally. The collective nature of the organization is a key concept in the social movement organization model, and members' interaction within their own cooperative and with other cooperatives and cooperative organizations is an important factor in analysing the movement as a whole.

None of the eight Board members interviewed were currently or had ever been members of the Board of Directors of another cooperative or credit union. However, 7 of the 8, or 87.5% were members of other committees within their cooperative, providing representation on 9 different committees. Interviewees reported an average of 7 active committees per cooperative, which varied
considerable from 5 committees at Alexandra Park to 10 committees at Windmill Line. It was also estimated that an average of 32% of members participate actively in cooperative activities.

With regards to external collective action, interviewees all agreed that their cooperatives interact with other cooperatives and credit unions. Four of the eight Board members (50%), representing two of the housing cooperatives, noted that their cooperatives held an account at a credit union, and that members participated in the local neighbourhood association (as well as the Federation of Metro Tenants), the most commonly cited reasons for external interaction. Three Board members (37.5%) stated that members participated at conferences and/or seminars within the cooperative sector, while two interviewees (25%) identified staff contact between cooperative housing staff as a source of interaction. Donations to other cooperatives, the purchase of insurance from Co-operators Insurance, and membership in the Federation (not specified which Federation) were all mentioned by one Board member each (12.5%) as ways in which their cooperative interacts with other cooperative organizations.

The frequency of interaction of each cooperative with other cooperatives and cooperative organizations ranged from “seldom” to “once per month”. Two interviewees responded that interaction is solely amongst staff and that Board members never interact. One Board member interviewed did not know.
Questions twelve through fourteen were intended to measure each particular cooperative's role in the larger movement, i.e. their activity in or interaction with federated cooperative organizations. All three cooperatives involved in the study were members of the Cooperative Housing Federation of Toronto (CHFT). Two of the cooperatives had been members since the inception of the cooperative. At Windward, none of the three Board members interviewed were able to state when the cooperative joined the federation.

When asked to describe their cooperative's relationship with CHFT, 50% (4) of the interviews did not know what that relationship was. Three members from two different cooperatives (37.5%) stated that they relied on the Federation to disseminate information to member organizations. Two members (25%) described participation at workshops or programs as way in which their cooperative interacted with the Federation. Other responses as to how their cooperative related to the local Federation, each stated by one Board member, were: sending delegates to meetings, staff liaison, member relations/arbitration, conferences, and job postings.

Again, the frequency of interaction tended to vary according to the perspective of the interviewee. Four Board members (50%) were not able specify the frequency in which their cooperative dealt with the Federation. Other estimates
ranged from "daily for staff" to "every other month". One Board member indicated that interaction only occurred if a need existed.

Questions fifteen through eighteen sought to determine the Board members' perception of the purpose nature of goals and activities within the cooperative. Five members (62.5%), representing all three cooperatives in the study felt that their cooperative possessed goals beyond the provision of housing. These goals were defined as:

- provide community (2 responses)
- promote cooperative/affordable housing (2 responses)
- support other organizations via donations (1 response)
- support an alternative to private housing (1 response)
- support the local neighbourhood association (1 response)
- political goals (e.g. fight social/housing cuts) (1 response)
- a benevolent response to the needs of members (1 response)

Seven members also felt that their cooperative engaged in activities which were meant to make changes outside the organization. These activities were defined as:

- attend demonstrations against housing cuts (2 responses)
- participate at the local neighbourhood association (2 responses)
- send delegates to CHFC to deal with issues in common (1 response)
- act with outside organizations to foster cooperative housing (1 resp.)
- organize around fixed link to island airport (1 response)
- rent out common room (1 response)
- host all-candidates meetings (1 response)
- political action via CHFT (1 response)
- educate new governments about cooperatives (1 response)
- lobby local representatives (1 response)

The final questions in the interview were designed to test interviewees' knowledge of cooperative ideology by asking them to name three cooperative principles of the International Co-operative Alliance. Two interviewees were each able to name one cooperative principle: democratic control. This represents 4% of the total possible responses.

c) Content Analysis

The content analysis portion of the study examined the written records of each cooperative: by-laws, board meeting minutes, general members’ meeting minutes, etc. The time period under examination was the twelve months prior to the study, except for documents that were drafted at the time of incorporation. The purpose of the content analysis was to observe both the goals and activities of the cooperative as a means of observing the purposive and collective nature of the organization. Only activities or goals which appeared to have an external focus, or were designed to elicit change were recorded.

The documents studied at each cooperative were as follows:
Windmill Line

1. Certificate of Incorporation (May 1981)

2. By-laws

3. General Members’ meeting minutes (Oct. 22/94, Nov. 23/94, Jan. 18/95, Feb. 19/95, March 23/95, June 15/95, July 16/95, July 27/95, Sept. 27/95)

4. Board of Directors meeting minutes (Jan. 12/95, Jan. 26/95, Jan. 31/95, Feb. 7/95, Feb. 21/95, March 7/95, March 21/95, April 4/95, April 18/95, May 9/95)

Alexandra Park

1. By-law Schedules and Policies

2. Board of Directors meeting minutes (Nov/94, Dec /94, Jan/95, Feb/95, March/95, April/95, May/95, June/95, July/95, August/95, Sept/95, Oct/95)

3. General Members’ meeting minutes (Oct. 17/94, Jan. 29/95, April 24/95, July 31/95, Sept. 11/95)

Windward


3. Membership policies (January 1984)

4. Board of Directors meeting minutes (Jan. 23/95, July 10/95,)

5. General Members’ meeting minutes (June 14/95, October 24/95)
Content Analysis Results

Data collected from the content analysis was broken into two categories: activities (actions) and goals. For each recorded activity or action which occurred, the following observations were noted:

- if the activity was organized
  a) by an individual
  b) by a group/committee
  c) in partnership with other cooperatives/federation/groups;

- if the participants in the activity were
  a) solely members of the cooperative
  b) members of the cooperative and external groups/individuals
  c) solely external groups/individuals;

- if the target or focus of the activity was
  a) external
  b) internal.

For practical reasons, only those activities whose purpose was to induce some type of change were recorded. For example, the cooperative’s Christmas party would not have been recorded as an activity for this study. The focus of the desired change could be inside or outside the cooperative itself. Likewise, both activities to promote “positive” change and “negative” change were recorded. Some of the activities recorded in this data include:
- improve disabled parking
- waive meeting room fee for anti-racist/women's groups
- installation of composter and provision of bio bins
- provision of money for a democratic functioning conference
- "improve" neighbourhood by getting rid of criminals
- donating money to Roof Tops Canada
- improve accommodations for people with special needs
- host an all-candidates meeting

The content analysis also looked at activities engaged in by the three housing cooperatives that demonstrated a commitment to some type of change. Twenty activities were identified, the majority of them (11) at one cooperative. Unlike the goals of the cooperatives, a majority of these activities were focused on targets external to the cooperative. Examples of such external goals were: donating money to Roof Tops Canada, waiving meeting rooms fees for socially-progressive groups, and improving environmental practices. However none of these activities focused on strengthening the cooperative sector or promoting cooperative housing, or advancing the values of equity, equality or self-help within the cooperative housing movement.

The results were as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Windmill Line</th>
<th>Alexander Park</th>
<th>Windward</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of activities recorded</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer an individual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer a group or committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized in partnership with other cooperatives/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>federation/groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants members of the cooperative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants members of the cooperative and</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external groups/individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants external groups/individuals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target or focus internal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target or focus external to the cooperative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each recorded goal, the following observations were noted:

\[5\] It was not always possible to determine the target or focus of the activity. This explains why the numbers do not equal 100.
• if the goal was
  a) short term
  b) long term;
• if the target/focus of the goal was
  a) internal
  b) external;
• if there was effort made to realize the goal or objective during the period under study;
• if inter/intra cooperation was necessary to realize the goal.

Only those goals whose purpose was to induce some type of change were recorded. Some of the goals recorded in this data include:

- encourage and promote a better understanding of cooperative principles
- betterment of community/society
- reduction of domestic violence
- better access to vulnerable groups and people with disabilities
- create community with a full range of socio-economic families
- sector support - financial and otherwise

The results for the content analysis of goals were as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Windmill Line</th>
<th>Alexandra Park</th>
<th>Windward</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of goals/objectives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term goals (less than one year)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term goals (one year or more)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal target or focus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External target or focus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up to realize goal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No follow-up to realize goal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter/intra cooperation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No inter or intra-cooperation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cooperative Housing Federation of Toronto**

The purpose of examining the Cooperative Housing Federation of Toronto (CHFT) was to gain insight into the goals and activities of the movement as a whole. Much of the focus of the study of the three individual cooperatives focused on their participation in the cooperative housing federation. As Windward, Alexandra Park and Windmill Line were all members of CHFT, it seemed necessary to observe more closely the role of this larger, umbrella organization in the movement.

---

6 It was not always possible to determine if any effort had been made to realize the goal or objective. This explains why the numbers do not equal 100.
Research at CHFT was more informal than at the three housing cooperatives: no interviews were conducted, only a review of internal documents and external publications. Again, the content analysis focused on goals and actions which could be classified as cooperative ideology or action; collective and purposive attempts to create a movement with objectives beyond the provision of housing.

One of the documents examined was CHFT's Organizational By-laws, which stated CHFT's aims as:

a) to promote new housing cooperatives;
b) to promote services to existing housing cooperatives (e.g. education, develop communities to manage their own housing);
c) to bring together housing cooperatives, resource groups and staff associations to strengthen the cooperative housing sector;
d) to cooperate with other housing cooperatives in Ontario and across Canada;
e) to support the efforts of CHAO and CHFC.

The responsibilities of the Board of Directors of CHFC, as outlined in the By-laws, are grouped into five categories:

7 It was not always possible to determine if inter or intra cooperation was necessary to realize the goal or objective. This explains why the numbers do not equal 100.
Administration (9 responsibilities)

Membership (3 responsibilities)

Lobbying (3 responsibilities)

Providing Services (3 responsibilities)

Education to members (1 responsibility)

With regards to lobbying (the only responsibility of the Board which has an external focus), the Board’s duties include:

- making sure CHFT participates in the broader cooperative movement;
- taking action and recommending actions and policies to the members;
- promoting cooperative housing to the government and the public.

A second document published by CHFT, *Cooperatives and Community: Social Audit*, describes some of the social goals to which housing cooperatives can aspire. In a social audit proposal put forward by Woodsworth Housing Cooperative, the following social objectives were identified:

1) Democratic decision making: structure and approach
   a) member involvement is meaningful
   b) elections - all types of members run and are elected
   c) Board leadership fosters community spirit

2) Service Performance
   d) high quality of housing
   e) affordable pricing
3) Employment
   f) progressive employer

4) Membership Issues
   g) opportunities for participation
   h) committees and volunteer workers support and enhance life

5) Community Involvement
   i) be an active partner and participant in the cooperative housing sector and the broader Canadian cooperative movement
   j) be involved in important neighbourhood issues and in other social issues deemed relevant to members and the broader community
Interpreting the Results

a) Axis I: Ideology

Overview

All cooperatives are, in many ways, born with a predetermined ideology. The cooperative enterprise is in and of itself a vision of the praxis and a vision of the organization. Housing cooperatives are no exception. The image of the "desirable society" is expressed by the seven cooperative principles of the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA). These principles have been summarized above by Craig: equity, equality and self-help. Although interpretation of the cooperative principles varies from country to country and from cooperative to cooperative, the movement's principles provide all cooperatives with a set of guidelines for conducting business. This is what Develtere defines as the "vision of the praxis": establishing the operating principles of the movement.

However, these principles are not the **raisin d'être** of the cooperative movement, but rather one instance at which the vision, praxis and organization of the movement intersect. Cooperative enterprises are not an end in themselves, but a means to an end; a method of doing business which produces certain benefits to society not possible under a capitalist system. Unlike other modern-day social movements, such as the women's movement or the peace movement, the need for cooperatives will never become
obsolete. Women may eventually achieve equal status in society and we may ultimately achieve peace on planet earth, but cooperatives will always be necessary if we are to achieve a system based on cooperation and not profit.

In essence, the why of cooperation (i.e. the vision and goals of the cooperative movement) is not what binds cooperatives one to another to form a movement. It is the how: the institutional vehicles of the movement and its operating principles. The implications of this situation are readily observed. The cooperative movement is not driven so much by vision and goals, but rather by its method of organization and action. Do all those who subscribe to the practice of cooperation do so because of a vision of a society based upon equality, equity and self-help? Even the existence of a goal as rudimentary as the “cooperatization” of society or of a community is not one that is universal amongst cooperative associations.

That is not to say that all social movements are characterized by one, cohesive ideology that defines in explicit terms the exact nature of the praxis and the organization. One has only to observe the women’s movement to witness a powerful, successful social movement driven by differing, if not often opposing, visions.

But while cooperative associations worldwide have agreed on how their vision for a better society will define the praxis and the organization of the movement,
it is not evident that the dynamic of the reciprocated movement (i.e. the production of the ideology and the organization of the ideology) is a balanced one, if it exists at all.

**Ideology of the Cooperative Housing Movement**

In the first section of this essay, we examined the social movement model of the structural-functionalists, and their theories concerning the formation of social movements. For structural-functionalists, social movements were a means of responding to breakdown in society; a response to the stress and dissatisfaction brought about by societal change. These disequilibrating conditions set in motion a sequence of differentiation characterized by three separate forces: tradition, differentiation and integration.

This model is useful in exploring the formation of the housing cooperative movement in Toronto in the 1960's, and provides us with some insight into how these forces played a role in the development and evolution of this housing sector.

In North America and some European countries, the 1960's were a time of great change in societal value systems. Sexual liberation, the changing role of women in the family and in the workforce, and the onset of civil liberties for people of colour, were all part of rapidly-changing society where morals and roles had shifted dramatically. It is no coincidence that many social
movements experienced a birth or rebirth during this decade: the women's movement, the peace and environmental movements, student movements, and the gay and civil rights movements. All of these groups were, in certain respects, a response, not only to a new moral fabric, but to the opportunity to build a new society. Change results in new aspirations and a new vision. These new movements, the cooperative housing movement included, were therefore not only a response to "breakdown" in society, but a social response which would lead to further change. In summary, the movements born of this era were both a response to change and agents of change.

With this new moral system came a shift away from the traditional family towards the individual. Government came to play an increasingly important role in the provision of services which had once been the responsibility of families and communities: housing, health care, transportation, education, etc. Smelser writes of "new social units" as this process of differentiation occurs, and we see this in the shifting of responsibilities from family and communities to individuals and government.

Steps three through seven of Smelser's seven-step pattern appear to be particularly relevant to this period. As the family's role as "social unit" weakens, the struggle to determine which new "social unit" will fill the gap emerges. The newly-formed cooperative housing movement in Toronto was, in some ways, at the centre of this struggle, both in reaction to a changing
society, and as the creator of a new "social unit" that would replace some of the previously-held responsibilities of the family -- namely housing and community. And thus we witness a process of differentiation from the family as social unit to the housing cooperative (government housing) as social unit.

One function of the housing cooperative was to provide financial support, via subsidies, to individuals and families unable to afford housing on the open market. This was part of a growing trend of increasing government responsibilities in the wake of the decline of the family as social unit.

Not only did the cooperative provide government-subsidized housing to members, however, it also offered a sense of community. "Sense of community" was the second most likely reason for members to have chosen cooperative living, as indicated by the thirty-five questionnaires completed by housing coop members. As family ties weakened, and single parent families became more prevalent, as immigration increased and the number of same-sex families grew, people sought new ways to create new "social units" that would recreate a sense of belonging, previously the responsibility of the family.

The birth and growth of the housing cooperative sector in Toronto was therefore a result of and a creator of this process of differentiation from one social unit to another. Under these "new historical circumstances" the responsibilities of the family were transferred, new social units, in the form of
government subsidized housing, were required to take on the roles previously held by the family: housing and community.

**Interaction with the Vision and Praxis**

Develtere defined ideology as *images of a desirable society, based on specified values, and the ways to achieve this vision*. The initial vision of the cooperative housing movement in Toronto, as described in the previous section, was comprised of three primary objectives:

a) affordable, high-quality housing is a right extended to all;

b) the promotion of family and community values;

c) “cooperatise” the housing market.

As it is difficult to know the exact values held by the progenitors of the Toronto cooperative housing movement, we will use Craig’s interpretation:

a) equity - every citizen has access to the same resources;

b) equality - every citizen is treated equally;

c) self-help.

Using Develtere’s model, we can determine that, in addition to creating a vision for the new cooperative housing movement, the initial founders also create a “vision of the praxis”: a vision which defined the operating principles of the new movement:

a) collective ownership;

b) not-for-profit;

c) government responsibility;

d) income mix.
The table below illustrates the merger of these three constituents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION</th>
<th>Family and community values</th>
<th>Cooperate the housing market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable, high-quality housing is a right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td>self-help</td>
<td>equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equity</td>
<td></td>
<td>equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAXIS</td>
<td>- collective ownership</td>
<td>- collective ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- not-for-profit</td>
<td>- income mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gov’t responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>- collective ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This ideological model, as it was formulated, appears balanced between the three spheres of vision, values and method. Cooperative housing would be the institutional vehicle that would be used to implement this vision. It would be accessible housing, where citizens could be "owners" of housing units without the burden of an initial investment (this would be provided by the government). The absence of profit would only serve to make these living arrangements more affordable to those who could least afford this basic necessity. And, government subsidies would give everyone equal access to high-quality housing. The result: cooperative housing would be equitable.
Cooperative housing would give every member a voice about his or her own living arrangements, regardless of the member's ability to pay. The "cooperatisation" of the housing market would further serve to ensure equal access to the housing market. The result: cooperative housing would be the great equalizer.

And finally, cooperative housing would bring people of all different social and economic backgrounds together in the marketplace, allowing them greater influence than they would possess as individuals. It would allow them to turn to each other to improve their situation, rather than each relying on their own means. The result: cooperative housing would give people an opportunity to help themselves, rather than rely on the goodwill or benevolence of government or charity.

The potential for this model to succeed appears, at least on the surface, to be great. But somewhere in the process it broke down, and the balance was upset. The result: in today's cooperative housing sector the dynamic between the vision, the values and the methodology has become distorted.

The vision that affordable, high-quality housing is a right of all citizens is still strong within the current housing cooperative sector. Housing cooperative members still identify their role as an alternative to the volatile, often inflated, unaffordable Toronto housing market; a refuge for low-income individuals and
families. Within Toronto cooperative circles there are frequent uprisings of lobbying efforts to secure the government’s continued support. And the principle of “not-for-profit” has remained a steady pillar of cooperative housing ideology. That all citizens have equal access to good housing is still a strong part of the vision of the cooperative sector.

Likewise, the importance of family (however defined) and community values is still an identifiable part of the housing cooperative vision. Several references were made by both Board directors and members as to the importance of community and social interaction in their decision to live in a housing cooperative. In its social audit, Woodsworth Housing Cooperative defines one of its goals with regards to member relations as committees and volunteer workers support and enhance life. “Community/social interaction” was the second most likely reason for people to choose to live in a housing cooperative, according to the results of the questionnaire. Although in later years there has been a significant shift in the income mix towards lower-income families and individuals, it appears as if this notion of “togetherness” is still an important value for housing cooperative members.

Nevertheless, this affinity for “community” is part of the internal life of the cooperative after it is formed, and not the reason citizens have come together to create a cooperative, that is, to build a community that will be self-sufficient.
in the provision of housing. And this is where the vision of the praxis has failed.

In their determination to enforce the government's responsibility for lodging its citizens, the founders of cooperative housing in Toronto undermined the importance of people taking responsibility for themselves and their communities. The value of self-help became the weak link in this cooperative housing formula, an oversight which seriously hindered the growth and development, not only of cooperative housing itself, but of the cooperative vision driving the movement. One of the downfalls of cooperative housing has been its dependence on government funding, a direction which has led to a sentiment of "non-ownership" in the sector -- and too much involvement on the part of the government.

The concept of "self-help" is easily defined, but perhaps not so easily measured. Self-help (as captured by the cooperative economic model) is based on the notion that people act collectively in the marketplace in order to provide a product or service which would not otherwise be available to. "Self-help" also implies the elimination of a middleperson, such that the member-owners of a cooperative business are able to purchase a product or service at cost. A historical glance at the impetus of several of the cooperative models in Canada illustrates this notion: the founding of the Desjardins group in Quebec in the early 20th century, the development of insurance mutuals
among rural farmers, and the creation of the wheat pools in the west. Implicit in our comprehension of "self-help" is the idea that in coming together, communities are able to strengthen their economic situation, improve their quality of life, and preserve their culture if they rely upon themselves to build and maintain the business enterprises that will supply and sustain them.

If the originators of Toronto's cooperative housing sector did not envision this concept of self-help as an important value or goal upon which to build their movement, the importance of this value certainly did not gain any ground over the past twenty-five years. CHFT does state as one of its aims, to bring together housing cooperatives, resource groups and staff associations to strengthen the cooperative housing sector. In my research of the cooperative housing sector in Toronto, this is the only direct reference to the notion of "self-help" with regards to the housing sector at a macro level. Several other goals did pertain indirectly to the notion of self-help in relation to the provision of cooperative housing: the encouragement and promotion of a better understanding of cooperative principles, and support for the cooperative housing sector, financial and otherwise. However, it was not clear if any action was ever taken to realize these goals.

Interviews with eight board members indicated a general lack of knowledge about the cooperative model in and of itself. Perhaps the most indicative measurement was the inability of almost all Board members to name even
one of the seven cooperative principles. As these principles are the medium through which the values of the cooperative movement are realized, it is possible to conclude that these same cooperative leaders are unaware that the values of "equity", "equality" and "self-help" are all part of the vision of the praxis which defines cooperative operating principles. No Board member indicated that self-help or "working together" was either a goal or a value of his or her cooperative. Neither did the phrase "self-help" appear in any of the materials studied as part of the document analysis for each of the individual housing cooperatives.

This sense of community offered by a housing cooperative is solely related to the internal social and recreational life of the members. Sharing babysitting duties, shopping for groceries, organizing social events, etc., would likely be the types of activities associated with the notion of "community" by members. That is not to argue that this type of interaction is not a form of self-help: indeed, this "togetherness" no doubt enhances the quality of life for members. It differs, nonetheless, from the original notion of cooperative "self-help" which pertains to the provision of the service or product.

Today's housing cooperator might turn to his or her neighbours for assistance with the ongoing tasks of daily living. However, that same housing cooperative member is unlikely to regard his or her fellow cooperators as a collective entity within the housing marketplace. He or she is presumably
unaware that by acting together, they have the potential to provide themselves with a standard of housing unavailable to them as individuals within the marketplace. The image is no longer one of “desirable society”, but rather that of the “desirable cooperative.”

Desirable Society vs. Desirable Cooperative

In the questionnaire submitted to cooperative members, the section Viewpoint, was designed to measure the presence or absence of cooperative ideology amongst respondents, that is, do members believe their cooperative has a vision beyond the immediate goal of providing housing: is it a purposive organization? With “0” representing no goals beyond the immediate provision of housing, and a score of 12 representing a strong belief in the purposive nature of the cooperative, the average score of all respondents was 7.4. Some members therefore do identify that their cooperative has goals beyond the immediate provision of housing. The study of each cooperative’s written records was undertaken to identify more precisely the nature of those perceived goals.

The study of the three cooperatives’ documents (minutes, by-laws, policies, etc.) over the course of one year and in addition to the documents of incorporation, revealed a total of twelve goals whose intent was to induce some type of change. Almost half of these goals (5) were directed towards internal change within the cooperative. In three-quarters of the goals, there
was no evidence that any follow-up was undertaken to realize the goal: they existed on paper only. Two of the goals identified addressed the issues of equality and equity: better access to vulnerable groups and people with disabilities, and the creation of a community with a full range of socio-economic families. Several other of the goals dealt with what we have referred to as a "togetherness" approach to self-help which focuses on the social and recreational life of the cooperative: reduction of domestic violence, betterment of community, etc.

All of these factors point towards a trend in the ideology of the cooperative housing sector in Toronto: a move towards an internal focus within each individual cooperative, rather than an external vision of a community or even a society transformed by the collective ownership of housing. The values of the cooperative movement — equity, equality and self-help — still exist in the minds of modern cooperators and their leaders, however subconsciously.

Nevertheless, those values are no longer the foundation of a coherent ideology that drives the movement as a whole to achieve goals that extend beyond the immediate lives of the members themselves. Instead, they are the values that guide the internal life of each individual cooperative: they provide a framework for members that allows them to make decisions and conduct their transactions with each other in the spirit of cooperation.
Our examination of housing cooperatives in Toronto has demonstrated, not a lack of cooperative values, but a lack of vision: vision necessary to clearly define the praxis and the organization of the movement. Members strive to treat their fellow members and manage their cooperatives in an equitable fashion. Cooperatives attempt to meet a demand for quality housing at an affordable price for their members and potential members. But they do not seek to cooperatise the housing market, to educate the public about the benefits of cooperative housing or to bring together people in a meaningful forum that would allow them greater power in the marketplace than they possess as individuals.

None of these actions are part of the housing cooperative agenda today. But by examining the other two axes of Develtere's social movement triad -- organization and action -- we will discover how this deficiency within the vision affects the other parts of the movement, and how they in turn have affected the production of this vision.

b) Organization Axis

Overview

The organizational axis of all cooperative movements has, at first glance, been the strongest component. This is due to the role of the cooperative enterprise itself: the raison d'être of the cooperative movement is the creation of cooperative enterprises. As a result, the successful social movement
organization (SMO) (i.e. the cooperative) is not only a vehicle through which the movement is able to promote change, but also a desired outcome.

This symbiotic interaction between the SMO and the cooperative movement as a whole has led in many instances to an all-powerful influence of the "organization" component over the axes of praxis and vision. And while cooperative organizations have been the driving and sustaining force of many cooperative movements, this strength has tended to be a result of their business success: the dynamic between the organizational structures and the other two axes of the movement has not been operating with the same force.

**Organization of the Cooperative Housing Movement**

The "organization" of a social movement was defined above as the structures and decision-making bodies. Housing cooperatives are structured much like other cooperative organizations: a Board of Directors is elected by the general membership to govern the organization's affairs on its behalf. Each member has one vote, regardless of the size of his or her unit or the number of people living in the unit (in most housing cooperatives, all residents over the age of 16 are eligible for membership). None of the cooperatives studied had an Executive Committee empowered to make decisions of behalf of the Board as a whole. However, every cooperative had a committee structure in which members and Directors could participate. Most housing cooperatives have a
social committee, maintenance or gardening committee, membership
committee, finance committee, etc. The Board of Directors is responsible for
hiring staff, while members appoint the auditor and approve the organization's
financial statements. Members do not make a financial investment in the
cooperative, therefore no dividend is distributed. Cooperative umbrella
organizations, such as CHFT, emulate this model, in which cooperatives
themselves are members of the second-tier organization.

Almost all large and mid-size housing cooperatives in Toronto, and certainly
the ones studied for this research, are dependent upon a contingent of staff to
oversee the daily operations of the organization. A coordinator, bookkeeper,
administrative assistant and maintenance personnel are the usual
compliment of employees at most housing cooperatives. Although the
volunteer Board and committees play an active role, this reliance on staff for
many of the functions often carried out by volunteers in other jurisdictions\(^8\),
changes the dynamic of the organization considerably.

The organization of the housing cooperative sector is an excellent example of
the model advanced by Zald and Ash: social movement organizations, social
movement sectors, and social movement industries provide a sophisticated,
hierarchical organizational structure that supports and drives the movement. If

\(^8\) Most housing cooperatives in the province of Quebec operate without staff. Housing
cooerative members volunteer bookkeeping services, maintenance services, etc. The only tasks
which are compensated financially are the annual audit of the books and any major
renovation/construction jobs which are undertaken by the cooperative. The elected President of the
we use this model, individual housing cooperatives would be the “social movement organizations” of the movement.

Organizations such as CHFT, the former CHAO, and CHFC operate at the “sector” level. They promote new housing cooperatives and services to existing cooperatives. They serve to bring together people and organizations within the sector to strengthen it and provide a vehicle for support and mobilization. To this list might also be added other provincial or national not-for-profit housing organizations and tenant organizations. Likewise, other cause-based social movements that are part of this “sector” have used cooperative housing as “social movement organizations” to further their own activities. For example, in Toronto, a “women-only” housing cooperative provides a place for women to empower themselves through self-help and self-leadership, thus furthering the goals of the women’s movement.

The social movement industry organizations are national, such as the CCA and CCC, or international such as the ICA. These sophisticated organizational forms at all levels account for much of the cooperative housing movement’s success.

Zald and Ash also stress the importance of sophisticated modes of communication in mobilizing collective action. The housing cooperative,
perhaps more so than any other type of SMO, is able to facilitate interaction and communication amongst members due to the nature and frequency of contact. Not only are housing cooperative members brought together by common interests that hold great significance in their lives (i.e. their homes), the immediacy of their living arrangements makes for easy and frequent communication amongst them.

"Objective" variables such as (pre-existing) organization, interest, resources, opportunities and strategies are also important factors in analysing why collective action takes place, according to the resource mobilization model. Our analysis of the role ideology played in the formation of the cooperative housing sector in Toronto explained to some extent how "interest" (i.e. ideology) brought people together in Toronto to form the first housing cooperatives. However, these other variables – resources, pre-existing organization, opportunities and strategies – are also important tools for analysing the factors that catalyzed the formation of the cooperative housing movement in Toronto.

We have read how resources played a key role in mobilizing people to develop housing cooperatives. One resource which was critical to the initial success of the cooperative housing sector in Toronto and elsewhere was government funding. Funding or lack of funding by successive federal and provincial governments has been a key determinant of the success experienced by the
cooperative housing sector. As public support for social programs such as affordable housing waxes and wanes, government financial backing rises and falls as well.

The founders of the cooperative housing sector in Toronto were able to tap into valuable financial resources from government due to the wide-spread public endorsement for collective social welfare initiatives at the time. Access to these financial resources has steadily eroded since the spend-happy days of the 1960’s and 1970’s, as has public support for cooperative housing and other collective social endeavours. Today, financial support from government sources for new cooperative housing projects has disappeared, and ongoing investment in the cooperative housing sector in Toronto is steadily declining. This direct link between public support, government financial resources, and the growth and success of cooperative housing becomes clear when we isolate it in this manner.

According to Zald and Ash, pre-existing organization and strategies also play an important role in the formation of collective action. Many cooperative activists involved in the construction of the first “family” cooperative housing units in Toronto had previously been involved in the student cooperative housing movement and its umbrella groups. It is also important to note that the development of the housing cooperative sector has also benefited from the experience, expertise and support of cooperatives in other sectors: financial,
consumer and employment. Similarly, the strategies and organizational structures of housing cooperatives in other countries (e.g. the United States and Britain) and provinces no doubt influenced the formation and development of the cooperative housing sector in Toronto.

In their model which uses the similar variables to an economic analysis, Zald and Ash translate individual "preferences" into goals. Success of an SMO in attaining its goals depends largely on its ability to mobilize resources, or, as in Develtere's model, on the "organization" of the praxis. Before examining the housing cooperative's success or failure in this domain, perhaps it is helpful to clarify the nature of these goals.

We determined in the previous section, *Ideology*, that, for the purpose of analysis, the three primary goals of the cooperative housing movement in Toronto were, at the time of its founding:

- affordable, high-quality housing is a right extended to all;
- the promotion of family and community values;
- the "cooperatisation" of the housing market.

We also concluded that, for the individual housing cooperatives being studied, these goals had evolved towards a more internal focus for the members. For example, the two most frequently-sighted goals by cooperative Board members, were:
- to provide community;
- to promote cooperative/affordable housing.

Similarly, of the twelve goals identified in the content analysis, many of them reflected this desire to build a more cohesive community. A sample of the 12 goals:

- encourage and promote a better understanding of cooperative principles;
- betterment of community/society;
- create community with a full range of socio-economic families;
- better access to vulnerable groups and people with disabilities.

However, with 75% of the goals, it was not evident that any follow-up had taken place to realize the goal. This brings us to our analysis of the housing cooperative movement's success in mobilizing its resources or the "organization of the action".

**Mobilization of Resources**

According to Zald and Ash, "resources" includes such factors as legitimacy, money, facilities and labor. Discretionary resources include time and money. The ability to mobilize resource is determined by a social movement organization's capacity to convert "adherents" (believers in the goals of the movements) into constituents (those who provide discretionary resources).
This dynamic of the "the organization of the praxis" is perhaps one of the weakest links in the tripartite analysis of the cooperative housing movement. Most housing cooperative members acknowledge the existence of goals within the cooperative housing sector. We know from our analysis that in measuring the degree to which members believe in the purposive nature of their housing cooperative, a score of 62% was recorded on the Likert scale.

But there is little evidence to prove that "member-believers" have been converted to "member-constituents" who give time and money\(^9\). It appears that most cooperative housing members are content to live within the walls of their cooperative without reaching beyond their immediate needs to achieve the goals of the housing cooperative movement at large. This was clearly indicated by the research results.

Sixty-six percent of questionnaire respondents did not belong to any other cooperative. Eighty-three percent either served on only one committee (including the Board of Directors) at their cooperative, or on no committee at all. Board members estimated that only 32% of members participate in activities at the cooperative (including social activities). Board member knowledge about interaction with the social movement sector was limited: 50% of Board members interviewed for the study could not describe their cooperative’s relationship with CHFT.
These figures speak to the fact that many cooperative housing members are “believers”, but not “constituents”. They believe in the goals of the movement. But they do not give the discretionary resources needed to further mobilize the resources of the movement. They do not support other cooperatives. They have minimal involvement with second and third-tier organizations. And within their own cooperatives, human effort is more likely to directed towards the organization of the annual Christmas Party than the education and training of members (the organization of the vision). Members believe, but not enough to give time to promote the housing cooperative or the cooperative movement.

Perhaps part of the difficulty in mobilizing resources within any cooperative movement is the structure of the movement itself. Members of a cooperative receive a direct benefit from their membership; in the case of a housing cooperative this direct benefit is a place to live. The housing cooperative, as a social movement organization, is not only a vehicle for the development of movement, but also an outcome in its own right.

Housing cooperative members may also benefit from the location/convenience of their cooperative, the sense of community or social interaction, and/or the below-market rents offered by their housing cooperative.

---

8 For the purposes of this study we will be concentrating exclusively on the resource of “time”, as we have already indicated that housing cooperative members are not required to invest financially in their cooperative.
Members of a housing cooperative are not necessarily "believers" in the cause of cooperative housing. Their choice of association with the cooperative may be solely due to the direct benefit they receive from their membership. This "non-believer" phenomenon is perhaps even greater among housing cooperative members than other types of cooperatives due to the importance of the benefit received as a result of membership. For example, the perceived value of a unit in a housing cooperative may be significant to the potential member. This potential member may choose the housing cooperative over other options because of its perceived "value", and not because of a belief in the goals of the cooperative housing movement.

This is perhaps more likely to occur with respect to a housing cooperative than other types of cooperatives, for example a food cooperative, due to the relative importance of the benefit being received. Members of a food cooperative are more likely to be members because of a belief in the goals of the cooperative movement, for the benefit received from patronizing the food cooperative is relatively small, and the products readily available elsewhere.

For the housing cooperative movement, the challenge to mobilize resources has not resulted as much from a need to convert "believers" into
"constituents", as to convert members into "believers". In essence, this dynamic has left the cooperative housing movement one step behind other social movements with regards to the organization of its praxis. And the cooperative housing movement has not shown itself to particularly adept at overcoming this obstacle.

Within the cooperative housing movement there are few "conscious constituents"; people who, as Zald and Ash have defined them, provide resources but do not benefit directly from the goal attainment of the movement. According to Zald and Ash, "conscious constituents" are an important part of the growth and stability of any social movement.

This lack of "conscious constituents" is, again, in part due to the structure of the cooperative enterprise itself. Membership in a cooperative results in certain benefits to the member: the service or product provided by the cooperative. A cooperative is a business: it will prosper only if members use it, thus directly benefiting from their membership.

However, part of the dilemma is the result of the movement's failure to promote cooperation as an achievable social goal. If, as in Zald and Ash's model, we equate goals with products and identify adherence as demand, we quickly realize that the competition is intense. Other types of housing (e.g. not-for-profit) and other social movements with similar types of goals are all
competing to attract the same "believers". However, social movements such as the women's movement and the environmental movement have succeeded in gaining recognition, legitimacy and support among the general public, even though membership in actual social movement organizations is relatively limited. The goals of the cooperative movement, or even its existence, are poorly recognized outside (and to some extent even inside) the movement.

This failure to transform large numbers of "members" into "believers" and "believers" into "adherents" has seriously restricted the cooperative housing movement's ability to attain its goals. Similarly, the movement's failure to attract a significant contingent of "conscious constituents" has also limited its capacity to have an impact on the public's recognition or perception of the movement.

Environment also affects a social movement's mobilization of resources. And as public opinion turns increasingly away from the notion of community collective responsibility and compassion, the cooperative housing movement's potential to mobilize resources will only decrease. The current trend in Ontario to move away from a welfare economy towards fiscal restraint has already had a devastating effect on the cooperative housing movement, especially among SMIs and SMSs. Competition between housing cooperatives and other housing options has also increased as interest rates
have dropped to their lowest in decades. Cooperative and not-for-profit housing are loosing out to the trend towards home ownership.

All of these factors have contributed to a weak organization-action axis. The mobilization of resources, or in Devletere's terms, the organization of the action, has presented a problem for the movement since its foundation. Until recently, the cooperative housing movement has been extremely successful in building organizational structures (SMOs and SMIs), but it has not used these structures to effectively mobilize resources or to transform believers into adherents. The weak organization-action axis has resulted in a weak organization-vision axis as well. The failure to mobilize members has resulted in limited training and education and negligible, in Devletere's terms, "purposive propaganda". The result? A failure to regenerate and proliferate cooperative ideology.

c) Axis III: Praxis

Overview
Of the three axes of Devletere's model, the "action" or "praxis" axis is the most difficult to analyse because of its fluidness. This is particularly true of a social movement such as the cooperative housing movement which has built itself around concrete organizational structures. Nevertheless, the praxis axis of this movement, unlike the organizational axis, is strong and dynamic, often overshadowing the other two components of the movement.
The study of the praxis of a social movement examines how members use the movement apparatus to interpret their vision and achieve their goals. Members of a cooperative are able to use the organization to provide themselves with products or services, or to access the decision-making structures to make changes to the SMO or to achieve their larger goals. For example, for some members of a housing cooperative, their only use of the organization may be for the provision of housing. For others, they may use the decision-making structures (i.e. the Board) to make changes within the cooperative itself (the SMO) or within the sector (SMS or SMI). It is this latter action which allows members of a cooperative to also act upon the vision of the movement (the production of the vision).

**Action of the Cooperative Housing Movement**

Spontaneous action is one type of action typical of social movements, but this is rare within the cooperative housing sector. Even actions such as protesting at anti-government rallies have an organized component to them, although sometimes there is a spontaneous element present if larger than expected numbers are in attendance. In general, most "action" associated with a cooperative movement is deliberate and focused around organized structures. Our analysis will focus on this type of participatory action and not spontaneous action.
External Praxis

The praxis of a social movement may be focused either internally or externally. The external dimension of praxis refers to the power relations confronting constituents and adherents. For the identity-oriented social movement models of Touraine and Melucci, a social movement is defined in terms of conflict: the conflict around the social control of main cultural patterns.

This is an interesting definition to apply to the cooperative housing movement in recent times. We have observed earlier in our analysis how the vision of the cooperative housing movement to provide social housing to low-income families has been in conflict with a societal trend towards individualism and a market-driven economy. One of the conflicts creating solidarities within the cooperative housing movement and with other socially-driven movements is the fight for control of a cultural pattern of collective responsibility and social welfare.

The cooperative housing movement currently find its consciousness as part of the new “left”; the forces fighting the neo-conservative right-wing agenda of individualism and a market-driven economy. In this respect the cooperative housing movement, as Touraine’s model would project, is not autonomous. It works in tandem with other housing groups and other cause-driven organizations that are part of the new “left”; groups striving to preserve the social fabric threatened by conservative power elites.
As we have discussed above, relations between the government and cooperative housing sector leaders have become increasingly hostile over the past decade. This relationship has revolved primarily around funding issues, however the crux of the conflict is much deeper.

There is a certain irony in the nature of the relationship between the cooperative housing movement and the state. In its initial start-up phase, cooperative housing leaders looked to the government to provide them with the financial resources to launch the movement. The government did support the movement financially, but for reasons that were often extraneous to the goals of the movement. For successive governments, cooperative housing served as a vehicle through which the government could provide “public” or “social” housing to low-income families and individuals. With regards to the other stated goals of the movement (community, cooperatisation of the housing market, etc.), governments ranged from indifference to direct opposition.

At the same time the cooperative housing movement was becoming increasingly dependent on government financial support to survive, it was also forced to step up its lobbying efforts against government actions. Cooperative housing lobbyists were, on one hand, asking for more money, while, at the same time, opposing the government’s new programs and policies that they
deemed detrimental to the growth of the movement. In essence, government has exploited cooperative housing to further its own abilities to provide low-cost public housing, without supporting the movement's broader goals or values. Once social housing was removed from the public's primary agenda, governments were no longer required to support the movement financially.

One result of this rather paradoxical relationship has been the cooperative movement's unhealthy dependence on government. In order to obtain the funds necessary for their survival, many housing cooperatives have had to relinquish much of their autonomy, a situation which has compromised their ability to operate as member-owned, democratically-controlled organizations. Government bureaucrats now set budgets and approve financial reports, previously key roles of the Board of Directors. Government regulations also now control many of the operational decisions formerly the mandate of the Board of Directors: how many staff a housing cooperative is permitted to employ, how their reserve funds will be used, etc.

Overall, the cooperative housing sector has been the looser. Government cutbacks have seriously hindered the sector's ability to provide high-quality, safe, community-oriented housing with a genuine mix of high and low-income families. At the same time, as public funds are withdrawn, government bureaucrats have increasing control over the affairs of housing cooperatives.
As an increasing number of housing cooperatives find themselves in financial difficulty, government control and regulations only become tighter.

In summarizing the power relations between the government and the cooperative housing movement, it is perhaps accurate to conclude that the relationship has been an exploitative one. Cooperative housing leaders were perhaps naïve to believe that they could obtain government support without government intervention. On the other hand, governments have supported the cooperative housing movement when it fit their agenda, abandoning it, when it did not.

Many other social and political entities have moved in and out of the cooperative housing movement’s sphere over the past three decades: trade unions, tenants movements, political parties, etc. Other social movements such as the environmental movement and women’s movements have also crossed paths with the cooperative housing movement. Often the values associated with cooperative living\(^\text{10}\) are interconnected with the goals and visions of other movements and organizations. Both movements may benefit from the structures, experience and vitality of the other.

For example, cooperative housing has been used by the women’s movement to provide housing to women choosing to live in a female-only environment.

\(^{10}\) Defined above as equality, equity and self help.
The cooperative values of equality, equity and self-help are harmonious with the values and goals of the women’s movement. Similarly, members of the housing cooperative movement may be members of other overlapping movements: environmental movements, gay and lesbian rights movements, anti-racism movements, etc. Again, the relations between these movements and the housing cooperative movement are more often than not symbiotic and not competitive.

The cooperative housing movement has also worked closely with other groups which may, on the surface, appear to have competing interests, such as the not-for-profit housing movement and tenants movements. In many instances, although they may have been competing for the same government funds, the larger issue of public support for social housing has overridden any immediate concerns concerning funding access.

**Internal**

The internal praxis of a housing cooperative refers to the collective action which is focused inward on the social movement and its structures. Participation in decision-making bodies, such as the Board of Directors, or participating in second and third-tier organizations would be considered part of the internal praxis of a social movement.
The most prevalent type of action amongst housing cooperative members is what we might term "participation": a "maintenance" type of passive action rather than a more creative action such as mobilization. Members "participate" at their cooperative by living there. At a more active level they might be members of the Board or a committee. But even at this level, the action is still focused on the maintenance of one particular cooperative or SMO.

This observation leads us to recall Melucci's observation that with modern-day social movements, social movement organizations are no longer vehicles for the implementation of a vision, but a means of experiencing collective action. Participation in a social movement is not necessarily a means to an end, but an end in itself. For many members of housing cooperatives, who appear to hold little interest in the vision of the movement, this observation would appear to be true.

There is very little mobilization which takes place at the SMI level within the housing cooperative sector, and much of this is staff-driven. For example, interviews conducted with housing cooperative Board members revealed that most Board members are not aware of the type or purpose of their cooperative's relationship with CHFT.

Within most social movements, acts of loyalty or financial patronage are also considered to be part of the internal praxis of the movement. The cooperative
movement is different from other social movements because the SMO (i.e. the cooperative) is more than just an organizational vehicle, it is a business. In this respect, cooperatives have an enormous advantage over other social movements. Because cooperatives provide services and products to their members, they are able to attract potential members by appealing to their self-interests. Cooperatives may also have a closer relationship with movement participants because of the member/owner/user relationship which exists between a cooperative and a member.

However this unique relationship between a cooperative and its member has not been used to its fullest advantage. It is possible to conclude from the research conducted on the three Toronto housing cooperatives that some members are not believers in the vision of the movement. These members may not be aware of the existence of the movement or aware that they are members of a cooperative. Even if the member is knowledgeable about the cooperative movement, he or she may choose to live in a housing cooperative out of self-interest; not due to a belief in the goals of the cooperative or of the movement.

As discussed above, one of the largest challenges facing the housing cooperative movement is to transform members into believers. Belief in the goals and vision of the movement is fundamental to participation in the
movement. In this respect, the problem faced by the cooperative movement is the inverse of many other social movements.

For example, large numbers of people living in western cultures might express belief in the goals of the environmental or women's movements. They are "believers" but not "adherents": they do not provide resources to either movement. However, within the cooperative movement the problem is reversed. Individuals may actively participate in the movement: this is measured by their business transactions with a cooperative. However these same individuals are not necessarily believers in the objectives of the movement. Their membership in the cooperative is motivated by self-interest. They are either unaware of, or do not believe in, the goals of the cooperative movement. Tremendous potential exists to transform these "users" into "believers" and subsequently into "adherents", but this potential is often left untapped.

It is for this reason that all acts of patronage between a member and his/her housing cooperative may not be considered "action". Members are not always conscious that by supporting a cooperative financially, they are supporting a social movement: the purposiveness of the action is absent. Without the awareness or the belief driving the action, it remains little more than a business transaction.
One final difficulty found in examining the praxis of a social movement is the fluidity of the action dynamic. Praxis includes all the actions that occur between individuals and between groups of people that are private, and often go unspoken or unnoticed. It includes actions such as networking, informal meetings, and conversations in the hallway or over lunch where ideas are bandied about but not written down. It includes the invisible tensions or power struggles that often exist only in the minds of the people involved. These types of actions are not based upon the formal organizational structures where minutes are recorded and made public.
Conclusion

Summary

In the opening section of this essay we examined three social movement models: structural-functionalist, resource mobilization and identity-orientation. Each of these models affords a different analytical tool from which the observer is able to explore the phenomenon of the social movement. The structural-functional model emphasizes the results of societal structural transformations and the affect on the psychological state of the individual. The resource mobilization school focuses on the actors’ rational interests in the mobilization of collective action and the formation of social movement organizations. Identity-orientation theorists are concerned with the process of building identities and solidarities.

Sociologist Patrick Develtere has synthesized these three schools of thought into a tri-partite model: ideology, organization and praxis. Using Develtere’s model, we examined how each of these axis interacts with each other and with the movement’s environment. The dynamic of these interactions determines the identity of the movement: if one dominates or if one is absent the movement may loose momentum and/or legitimacy.

It is this concept of “social movement identity” which we have tried to grasp in this essay, in particular, the identity of the cooperative housing movement in
Toronto. To obtain a better understanding of this particular movement we have examined in detail its ideology, its organizations and its praxis.

The purpose of the conclusion is to synthesize this analysis in asking the question: what is the identity of this social movement? The conclusion will summarize several of the themes which were developed in the essay. This conclusion will not in any way seek to make recommendations to modify the course of the movement.

**Social Movement Identity**

We determined from Develtere that a social movement develops its identity from:

- The interaction between its own ideology/praxis/organization, and;
- The dominant forces and counterforces it encounters (theses existing forces impose conditions and limitations).

**Organization**

Within the cooperative movement, the ideology and praxis are centred around the cooperative organization. It suggests a certain logic to conclude that the organizational axis drives the movement. In fact, this is not true. When we examined how the organizations of the movement function to mobilize their resources (the organization of the praxis), we concluded that the structure of
the cooperative organization itself and its relationship to its funding sources has created a movement of "non-believers".

Our findings demonstrate that within the cooperative housing movement in Toronto, the housing cooperative is not a social movement organization. In fact it appears that the housing cooperatives, despite being grassroots organizations, are in many ways severed from the ideology, actions and other organizations that define the movement. This is a structural issue and not a communications issue.

The dynamic between individual housing cooperatives and the movement itself is a paradoxical one: housing cooperative organizations, in developing the strength and autonomy they manifest currently, have created a discontinuity between themselves and the movement. Housing cooperatives are not the grassroots organizations the movement declares them to be. They are ends in and of themselves; not the vehicles through which the ideology and the praxis of the movement are realized.

Housing cooperatives are autonomous organizations whose mandate it is to provide housing. Their goals are focused on the daily business of managing a housing operation: they are inward-looking institutions. Housing cooperatives are driven primarily on their own immediate needs: securing adequate
funding, providing high-quality housing, organizing social events, and dealing with membership issues.

Housing cooperatives do not serve to mobilize the resources of the sector. They are not the foundations of a social movement structure of SMOs, SMSs and SMIs. The links between housing cooperatives and other organizations in the sector (e.g. CHFT) are often through individuals, and are not institutional. Often these links are initiated and maintained by paid staff, and serve only a functional purpose. The action and ideas of the movement take place higher up; at the SMS and SMI levels. There is little grassroots understanding or support for the movement: its leadership comes from above.

Housing cooperatives are not places where ideas are generated, where vision is discussed or where action is taken. Their raison d'être is extraneous to the mission of the housing cooperative movement. Their vision, as stated previously, is not of the desirable society, but of the desirable housing cooperative. They are not ideologically-driven organizations.

This truncated organization axis has, of course, affected the other axes of the movement. The second vector of the organizational axis, the organization of the ideology, is also weakened by the isolation of the housing cooperative: training, education and development of the philosophies and vision of the movement, and the promotion of pro-cooperative propaganda are all but
absent. Individual members and staff do participate in cooperative education programs organized by the sector, but this participation is isolated. The organization of the ideology does not occur in a systematic, continuous, aggregate fashion.

**Vision**

The dynamic of the vision of the organization and of the praxis appear to remain strong within the movement. This is in part due to the "ready-made" ideology inherited by the international cooperative movement: operating principles and values that guide all cooperative movements.

However, cooperative vision continues to be generated and developed by the leaders in the movement at the second and third tier levels. Publications and documents published by the Cooperative Housing Federation of Toronto and the Cooperative Housing Federation of Canada indicate a strong interest in and critique of the production of this ideology. The weakness of the ideology-praxis interaction arises in the dissemination and interpretation of this ideology. The top-heavy movement is driven from above, not below, another result of, and reason for, the limited interaction between the individual housing cooperatives and the movement.

One other observation of the ideology axis which resulted from this study is the absence of the notion of collective ownership. The dependence on
government subsidies, both at the formation of the movement, and continuing over three decades, resulted in little understanding of the notion of "self-help". It is plausible to suggest in this conclusion, although certainly not proven, that the lack of a sense of collective ownership was a catalyst for the housing cooperatives' transformations into internally-focused organizations. Without the sentiment of a collective presence in the housing marketplace, members had minimal motive to develop as an integrated movement.

**Praxis**

The study of the cooperative housing movement's praxis was focused on two different types of action: internal and external. When we examined the internal praxis we observed how, although members are engaged in the decision-making structures of their cooperative, these structures are not the structures of the movement. Housing cooperatives have isolated themselves from the movement, becoming focused on their own internal affairs.

Members participating in the decision-making structures of their cooperatives are unlikely to be focused on training or educating other members, or building solidarities with other social movement organizations. They are mobilized to deal with member issues, to create social communities or to manage the finances of the organization. Again, this internal focus has diverted energy away from building an integrated movement. It is paradoxical that, in the process of creating healthy, autonomous grassroots organizations, members
have succeeded in insulating themselves from the vision and action that defines the movement. They have been too successful.

Touraine reminds us that the analysis of a social movement can not take place in a vacuum: it is imperative that any movement be observed as part of a cultural and social context. These forces and counter-forces encountered by the housing cooperative movement form part of the external praxis. One of the central themes to emerge from this analysis was the exploitative role played by government. In many respects this relationship defined the movement since its inception.

As the force of the movement waned, we also observed the trend towards building solidarities with other organizations of the "new left". The praxis of the ideology became less focused on the vision of building cooperative housing, and moved towards an alternative to the social vision promoted by the market-driven neo-conservatives.

**Interaction and Identity**

According to Develtere, it is the dynamic of these interactions which determines the identity of a social movement. The interplay between these components makes a social movement a protest movement, a reactionary movement, etc.
Within the cooperative housing movement, we observed that the vision of the organization was the housing cooperative: the vehicle for the movement. The vision of the praxis was one of collective ownership, not-for-profit housing, government responsibility and mixed-income communities. However the structure of the organization was faulty: government responsibility usurped the notion of collective ownership. Realization of the members' self-interests was not conducive to the production of ideology or purposive action. This resulted in an organization-praxis deficit. Because the vision of the praxis, the operating principle of collective ownership, was not successfully managed, cooperative organizations became ineffective vehicles for the movement.

What is the resultant identity? A strong social movement which is no longer a central movement. New housing cooperatives are no longer being created and existing housing cooperatives are no longer purposive organizations. Isolated from the movement, the purpose of the housing cooperative is to perpetuate itself as an organization: to provide housing, to provide community and to serve the interests of the members.

The leaders of the housing cooperative movement have instead shifted their solidarities towards the "new left": social movement organizations and other groups of various causes, all in conflict with the neo-conservative trend towards individualism and a market-driven economy. For a movement which has found much of its identity over the past three decades in terms of its conflict with
government and state, this role as an alternative to the mainstream forces is not a new one.

In this new arena of identities and solidarities, the cooperative movement is a peripheral one: functioning adjunctly with other movement organizations (trade unions, political parties, etc.). Paradoxically, the movement's vision has both narrowed and broadened: it has had to, in a sense, abandon its fight to achieve the cooperatisation of the housing market, focusing solely on the broader issues of a social welfare state.

A superficial glance at the cooperative housing movement in Toronto would reveal that all is alive and well. However, the in-depth examination reveals a social movement fragmented and struggling to find direction. Grassroots housing cooperatives have removed themselves from the parameters of the movement itself. However, the leaders, claiming to represent these grassroots organizations, continue to speak on their behalf.

But without a balanced interaction between the organizational structures, the praxis and the ideology, the movement has been forced from its central role to a peripheral one. We can only hope that it will succeed, in its new role, in holding back the tides that would seek to destroy all that the cooperative housing movement has achieved thus far.
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INTERVIEWS

Annex I
### Interview Schedule

**Date:**

**Cooperative:**

**Position of interviewee on board:**

1. **How many years have you been a member of this cooperative?**
   
   (go to 2)

2. **How many years have you been a member of the board of directors of this cooperative?**
   
   (go to 3)

3. **Are you currently or have you ever been a member of the board of directors of another cooperative and/or credit union?**
   
   ______ yes
   
   (go to 4)

   ______ no
   
   (go to 5)

4. **Which ones and for how many years?**

   1. 
      
      No. of years:

   2. 
      
      No. of years:

   3. 
      
      No. of years:

   4. 
      
      No. of years

   (go to 5)
5. Are you a member of any other committees in the co-op?
   ______ yes
   (go to 6)
   ______ no
   (go to 7)

6. Which ones?
   1.
   2.
   3.
   (go to 7)

7. How many active committees does the cooperative have?
   (go to 8)

8. In your estimation, what percentage of the members of the co-op participate actively in co-operative activities?
   (go to 9)

9. Does your co-op interact with other co-operatives or credit unions?
   ______ yes
   (go to 10)
   ______ no
   (go to 12)

10. What types of activities/business brings you together?
    (go to 11)
11. How frequently do you interact?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Is your co-op a member of a federated organization?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>______ yes (go to 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ no (go to 15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Please describe the type of relationship the co-op has with the federation. How long have you been a member?

14. How frequently do you interact?

15. In your opinion, does this co-operative have goals outside of the provision of a service or a product? In other words, does the co-op in any way seek, to change society in general or individuals who are not members of the co-op?

| ______ yes (go to 16)                                      |
| ______ no (go to 17)                                      |
16. What are these goals?

1.

2.

3.

---

17. Does the co-operative ever engage in activities which are meant to make changes outside of your organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(go to 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>(go to 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>(go to 19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. What are these activities and how frequently do they occur?

---

(goto 19)
19. Would you be able to name three of the seven co-operative principles as stated by the International Co-operative Alliance?

1.

2.

3.

END
January, 1996

Dear Windmill Line Co-op Member,

Attached please find a simple, three-part questionnaire which I would ask one of the members of your household to complete and return to the co-op office. The person responding to the questionnaire should be a member of Windmill Line.

This questionnaire is part of a research project for my Master’s degree in Cooperative Management and Development. This degree is offered at the Université de Sherbrooke in Sherbrooke, Québec, however this particular project is being supervised by a professor at York University. My research objective is to observe and analyse the housing cooperative sector in Toronto using different approaches to social movement theory. In addition to this questionnaire, I will also be reviewing some of the co-op records and documents as well as undertaking interviews with members of the Board of Directors. The Board has approved this project.

I would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to answer theses questions. Completed questionnaires may be returned to the co-op office.

Yours cooperatively,

Heather Johnston
Member Questionnaire

* Please note that your participation in this questionnaire will remain anonymous *

I Personal Information

Please provide the following information:

1. Age
   ______  1

2. Gender
   M ______
   F ______

3. Number of years total as a member of this cooperative.
   ______  3

4. Number of other cooperatives/credit unions of which you are currently a member.
   ______  4

5. Number of committees (including the Board of Directors) of which you are currently a member in this cooperative.
   ______  5

II Viewpoint

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling the response that most nearly coincides with your own.

A = AGREE  P = AGREE IN PART  D = DO NOT AGREE

6. One of the objectives of this cooperative is to change or to effect in some way the behaviour of persons outside the coop or of society in general.
   A P D

7. One reason why I choose to be a member of this cooperative is because it seeks to bring about goals which I consider desirable.
   A P D

8. I participate in the cooperative because it attempts to accomplish purposes for which I stand.
   A P D

9. Some of the cooperative's activities allow me to have some fun and socialize with other members.
   A P D
10. My chief satisfaction from participating in the activities of the cooperative comes not as much when I do these things, as later when I see worthwhile and desirable results accomplished.

11. I take part in the cooperative’s activities just for the sake of participating. I really enjoy doing things with other members.

12. I receive as much or more pleasure from the attainment of the cooperative’s goals as from participation in coop activities.

III Preferences

Rank the following reasons from most (1) to least (5) in terms of their importance to you in your decision to become or remain a member of this cooperative.

13. a) Location/Convenience

b) Belief/Commitment to the cooperative movement and its principles

c) Cost of the product or service (e.g. daycare, housing, etc.)

d) Sense of community/social interaction offered by the cooperative.

e) Belief/Commitment to the goals of this cooperative